

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 10:00:12 -1000
From: Richard Salvador <salvador@hawaii.edu>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Annual General Meeting Minutes + More
To: wilpf <wilpf@iprolink.ch>
X-Sender: salvador@uhunix5
cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

To the whole network:

Thank you Felicity for putting out the Minutes of the Annual Meeting. The only IMPORTANT correction is that I am no longer with the AFSC Pacific Program and all identifying references should be immediately deleted. My address/contact information still remain the same. I most certainly will be affiliated with the Pacific Islands Association of NGOs. I will know this by the end of August. Thank you very kindly.

Richard Salvador

Return-Path: <ada77@pop.dial.pipex.com>
Comments: Authenticated sender is <ada77@pop.dial.pipex.com>
From: STEVEW@quaker.org.uk
Organization: Religious Society of Friends
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Date: Thu, 25 Jun 1998 09:46:31 +0000
Subject: Re: Ecumenical lobby of UK government
X-Confirm-Reading-To: STEVEW@quaker.org.uk
X-pmrqc: 1
Return-receipt-to: STEVEW@quaker.org.uk
Priority: normal

Dear Howard,

Sorry about the file attachment. It was a letter of invitation to those who may form a planning and working group for the lobby - as follows:

To: Representatives of Christian Peace Organisations working on nuclear disarmament:

APF, BPF, CANA, CCND, DPA, FoRE, MPF, NFPB, Pax Christi

24 June 1998

Dear friend,

Ecumenical Lobby of Parliament for Nuclear Disarmament

At its meeting in Oxford on 11-12 June, the Churches Peace Forum of the Council of Churches of Britain & Ireland unanimously endorsed the suggestion brought to it by QPS for an ecumenical lobby of parliament in October on the issue of nuclear disarmament.

Specifically, the lobby would

1. note the Labour Party election manifesto commitment to "actively pursue further measures of mutual, balanced and verifiable reduction in nuclear weapons worldwide" and
2. the vote by the British Government AGAINST the "Malaysian Resolution" at the United Nations General Assembly in December 1997, calling for early commencement of multilateral negotiations towards a nuclear weapons free world in accordance with the opinion of the International Court of Justice
3. urge the Government to reverse its vote when a similar resolution comes up for debate at the UN in December 1998.

You are invited to the first meeting of the planning group on Wednesday 8 July, 2pm, Room 11, Friends House, Euston Road, London (opposite Euston station).

I would be very grateful if you could let me know if you intend to come: 0171 663 1064 (direct/voicemail); 0171 663 1049 (fax); stevew@quaker.org.uk

In peace

Stephen Whiting
QPS Peace Witness & Action Section

Stephen Whiting

To: dkimball@clw.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Contacts in Kansas and Tennessee
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Daryl:

Two United Methodist bishops who are well-informed supporters of the CTBT are:

Bishop Albert Frederick Mutti

4201 SW 15th Street

P.O. Box 4187

Topeka, KS 6660

Phone: 785 272-0587

Fax: 785 272-9135

and

Bishop Kenneth L. Carder

Executive Park

520 Commerce Street, Suite 201

Nashville, TN 37203-3714

Phone: 615 742-8834

Fax: 615 742-3726

Robin Ringler of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society knows both of them and may be willing to make contacts for you. Robin's phone is 202 488-5647.

I'll be back in town on July 8 and can help then, but you probably want to move ahead before then

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 25 Jun 1998 09:24:21 -0700 (PDT)
From: Nevada Desert Experience <nde@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Nevada Desert Experience Address & Phone & Fax numbers
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Dear Aboliton Caucus June 25, 1998
About an hour ago I sent out the text of the World-Wide Franciscan leaders
that was written by Louie Vitale, OFM, co-founder of the Nevada Desert
Experience (NDE). I failed to give you our address, phone or fax number.

Nevada Desert Experience
P.O.Box 4487
Las Vegas, NV 89127
U.S.A.
(702)646-4814phone
(702)631-5538fax

NDE publishes a newsletter, Desert Voices, three or four times a year. Our
Summer 1998 issue just got back from the printer yesterday. I would be
happy to send a copy to anyone requesting it. This issue features a lead
article by Louie Vitale, OFM entitled, "U.S., India & Pakistan; Stop
Testing!"

Sincerely,
David Buer, OFM
NDE Interim Director

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
CC: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Date: Fri, 19 Jun 1998 21:57:06 +0100
From: Lindis Percy & Anni Rainbow <caab.lindis_anni@virgin.net>
Organization: CAAB
Reply-To: caab.lindis_anni@virgin.net
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Nuclear Weapons in UK
To: plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca

Hello Bill,

Thank you for publicising the Guardian articles on the British Government's proposals to reduce Trident warheads, possibly scrap the acquisition of more Trident missiles from the US and be more open about the number of warheads maintained etc.

What a shame our Government has continued to keep silent about the American B-61 free-fall nuclear bombs that are stored in underground bunkers below the aircraft hangers at USAF Lakenheath, Suffolk, England. Both the UK and US Governments continue to maintain a 'we will neither confirm nor deny the existence of nuclear weapons' regarding these bombs that are stored on a base officially named as 'RAF Lakenheath' but which is in reality a British base occupied and controlled by America and unaccountable to the British public and Parliament.

I enclose an item from the June 98 Nuke Watch Newsletter which may be of interest.

SENATOR 98

A joint US/UK Nuclear Weapon Exercise called Diagonal Glance will take place at the RAF Locking near Weston Super Mare in Sept 98.

The scenario to be played will involve a US plane carrying nuclear weapons crashing while on route to the US from RAF Lakenheath. Stages of the exercise will also take place in MOD Whitehall and at AWE Aldermaston.

At present over three hundred UK military personnel will be active during this week long exercise.

A number of county and district councils have been invited along with the various home office authorities and public utilities.

RAF Locking is home of the No 1 Radio School, training is undertaken with ground communications and Engineering, it is also home of the RAF south west band.

Tel. no. 01934 822131. 3.75 miles east of Weston Super Mare, the main entrance is on the A371. Grid Ref is OS ST 345602, sheet no 182.

Any questions or incoming info please contact Andy Stulpa on Tel. no.

01449 775395 or Fax 01449 770362 or e mail Andy@Defcon.keme.co.uk

In Peace,

Lindis and Anni

CAMPAIGN for the ACCOUNTABILITY of AMERICAN BASES(CAAB), UK.

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: CTBT Grassroots meetings
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

I am sharing this communication from Bob Tiller for your information.

Shalom,

Howard

>Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
>Date: Fri, 19 Jun 1998 18:10:08 -0400
>From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
>Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
>To: bmusil@psr.org, bharnet@ix.netcom.com, panukes@igc.org, rac_uahc@csi.com,
> dkimball@clw.org, dculp@nrdc.org, paprog@igc.org, paexec@igc.org,
> mupj@igc.org, jsmith@clw.org, joe@fcnl.org, kyourish@hotmail.com,
> disarmament@igc.org, kathy@fcnl.org, wandwill@clark.net,
> ledwidge@psr.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, meldredge@igc.org,
> armsintern@ucsusa.org, mfonte@clw.org, vision@2020vision.org,
> stevenraikin@delphi.com, tperry@ucsusa.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org
>Subject: CTBT Grassroots meetings

>
>The next Grassroots CTBT meeting will be as follows:

>
> Date: Thursday, June 25th
> Time: 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon
> Place: FCNL, 245 2nd Street N.E.

>
>We all know that we have lots of work to do. Please join us as we make
>decisions and commitments about our grassroots efforts.

>
>If you accepted a responsibility at our last meeting (and that includes
>many of you!), please get cracking.

>
> * * * * *

>
>Notes from the Grassroots CTBT meeting of 6-4-98:

>
>We began with reports on the six decisions/commitments made at the
>previous meeting:

- > 1. Calls to Democratic Senators to get them to speak out in support
>of CTBT -- we are all still doing this.
- > 2. Rallies and demonstrations at Senators' offices -- this was very
>successful. We had at least 19 events on (or near) May 28th, with lots
>of media coverage.
- > 3. Calls to Sen. Lott -- after a lengthy discussion on the value of
>such calls, we agreed that it is OK for our grassroots to do it, but we

- >will not push it.
- > 4. Sample letters to the editor -- these are done and now available
>on the web site.
- > 5. Religious leaders statement -- it was delivered to Senators and
>publicly released, but with little media coverage.
- > 6. Working Assets -- Gordon Clark is still talking with them.
- >
- >New decisions and actions:
- > 1. NSNS is setting up a teleconference with 30 editorial writers and
>Bob Bell. Grassroots folks should follow up with their own local
>editorial boards. We need "unlikely" folks calling their editorial
>boards, such as business people, lawyers and doctors.
- > 2. Peace Action has money available for a mailing to Mississippi
>activists, urging them to press Sen. Lott on CTBT. Bruce Hall will
>coordinate -- get labels of Mississippi activists to him.
- > 3. For those in states where both Senators are committed to
>supporting CTBT (such as CA, MA, WI, IL, MD, NJ), grassroots should
>thank their Senators and tell them to do more, e.g. (a) make floor
>speeches, (b) meet with editorial boards about CTBT.
- > 4. Mike Fonte presented a proposal about a speakers pool who would go
>out to speak to grassroots groups. Mike would like each of us to give
>him a list of available speakers, also some word about funds available
>for this. We discussed whether this emphasis should be this summer or
>later, with views on both sides. Mike said that we need to get to the
>larger picture, to reach more folks, to combine the short-term with the
>long-term. Everyone generally supported Mike's proposal and agreed to
>get the information to him. Lisa Ledwidge said that the speakers might
>use PSR's new slide show when it is finished.
- > 5. Steve Raikin proposed a big national demonstration in D.C. (as in
>New York City in 1982), and we discussed the idea. If Lee Butler would
>speak, it would help to build the crowd. However, it takes many years
>of smaller and medium demonstrations before we can pull off a big one.
- > 6. Bruce Hall suggested that student groups might hold teach-ins.
- > 7. Religious statements: (a) Howard Hallman is working on an
>international statement, and he also heard that Robert McNamara is
>working on one. (b) Work is being done on state and local statements.
- > 8. The money recently granted for grassroots work will pay for
>organizers in: OR, TN, ME, KS, CO, and WA, plus a conference call in UT.
>Kathy Crandall is coordinating. Polling will also be done in most of
>them with other money.
- > 9. 20/20 Vision will have a conference call on June 11 for grassroots
>folks in TN, KS, IN, WY.
- > 10. We discussed grassroots activities on August 6 and 9. Lisa
>Ledwidge will gather information on what is planned and post it.
- > 11. Refining our message -- We need to sharpen and refine our message
>in light of recent developments. Daryl Kimball will start an e-mail
>discussion among us to get this done.

>
>Shalom,
>Bob Tiller

>
>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Sat, 20 Jun 1998 23:53:03 -0400
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Canadian public opinion on having nuclear weapons
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

Canadian public opinion about having nuclear weapons:

91% were against India & Pakistan having nuclear weapons

77% were against P5 nuclear powers having nuclear weapons

Detailed Angus Reid poll analysis is available at:
<http://www.angusreid.com/pressrel/pr200698.html>

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net
<http://www.pgs.ca/>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 10:35:49 +0900
From: ic3t-kwt@asahi-net.or.jp (ic3t-kwt)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: "Use of Nuclear Weapons by Japan Would be Constitutional"
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Dear friends,

Recently Japanese government official stated that the use of nuclear weapons by Japan would be constitutional ! Japanese peace movemets including Gensui kyo, Japan Peace Committee are stongly protesting to that statement. I belive this should be condemned by international community as well. The following is a gist of an article of Japan Press Service (JPS).

Tadaaki KAWATA
WPC/JPC

"Use of Nuclear Weapons by Japan Would be Constitutional": Cabinet
Legislative Bureau Director General

On June 18 that Masasuke Omori, Cabinet Legislative Bureau director general, said in the Diet on June 17 in relation to Article 9 of the Constitution that the "use of nuclear weapons by Japan was a hypothetical possibility as long as it was the minimum necessary for defending Japan."

This is the first time that the government has said that it is "possible" for Japan to use nuclear weapons within the Constitution.

Omori made this serious statement in the House of Councilors Budget Committee on June 17, in reply to a Komei Dietmember who had asked whether Japan's Constitution allows the country to possess nuclear weapons and to use them.

The statement by the cabinet legislative bureau director general, which is regarded to represent the government's interpretation of the Constitution, accepts the possibility that even nuclear weapons could be used under the Constitution, although "hypothetically," it could have serious consequences in Japan and internationally.

Following the nuclear tests by India and Pakistan, the situation has become unstable and involves the possible danger of nuclear war; and on this background that public opinion in favor of nuclear weapons being eliminated has heightened, including 8 countries including Sweden publishing a joint declaration calling for taking immediate action for the elimination of nuclear weapons. And it is at such a time as this that a member of Japan's government, the only atomic-bombed country in the world, has chosen to state that the possibility exists of Japan using nuclear weapons. This is very serious because it is not only like throwing cold water on public opinion and the movement which is calling for nuclear weapons to be eliminated but it could encourage the further use of nuclear weapons.

Firstly Japan's Constitution which renounces war and the possession of war potential, based on the calamity of Hiroshima and Nagasaki being atom-bombed, doesn't allow nuclear weapons, the cruellest of weapons, to be "possessed" and "used" by Japan. It is also impossible that the use of nuclear weapons, with their tremendous destructive power, can be described as the "minimum necessary for defense." The argument for "nuclear weapons to be used in the interests of defense" is an extremely dangerous one.

The use of nuclear weapons being illegal based on international law has been established by recommended opinions of the International Court of Justice and by United Nations General Assembly resolutions which since 1961 have been consistently passed by overwhelming majority. In Japan, the Tokyo District Court ruling on the A-bomb lawsuit (1963) clearly recognized the atomic bombing as being illegal.

The Japanese government's initial statement to the ICJ said: It can't be said that the judgment that using nuclear weapons violates positive international laws has been established as common sense in the international community, which was very much criticized at home and abroad. When resolutions were being proposed in the U.N. general assembly calling for the conclusion of an international treaty to ban the use of nuclear weapons, Japan abstained from voting.

Omori's reply goes further than this because it suggests the possibility of Japan, the A-bombed country, using nuclear weapons under the Constitution. This must be described as a criminal statement which conflicts with the Japanese people's wish for nuclear weapons to be eliminated and their use banned.

(end item)

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 11:18:50 +0100 (BST)
From: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: New Cdn poll (fwd)
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
cc: abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de, org@gn.apc.org

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

Date: Sat, 20 Jun 1998 17:30:09 -0400 (EDT)
From: Project Ploughshares <plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>
Reply-To: abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca
To: abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca
Subject: New Cdn poll

June 20, 1998

Survey reveals strong Canadian views on
nuclear arms

TORONTO (CP) -- Canadians overwhelmingly believe developing countries should not have nuclear arms, and that it is also unacceptable for the five original nuclear powers to have them, an Angus Reid survey indicates.

And 43 per cent of those surveyed say Canada should take a leadership role in efforts to resolve the nuclear standoff between India and Pakistan, the two newest new nuclear powers.

Asked whether it is unacceptable or acceptable for certain countries such as India and Pakistan to have nuclear weapons, 91 per cent of those polled said unacceptable.

As well, 77 per cent said it is unacceptable for the five original nuclear powers -- the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China -- to have such weapons.

India and Pakistan raised fears of a new Cold War last month when first India, then Pakistan, conducted nuclear tests and declared themselves nuclear-weapons capable. The nuclear brinkmanship is the latest escalation in a longstanding rivalry between the two south Asian countries, who have fought three wars since the 1950s, two of them over the disputed border area Kashmir.

The 43 per cent who see a leadership role for Canada in the India-Pakistan nuclear standoff supported such a role even if it means committing Canadian peacekeeping troops and money, the survey showed.

However, 27 per cent said Canada should let the parties involved sort out

the conflict, and another 28 per cent said Canada should stand back and let major powers such as the United States try to resolve the issue, then support their efforts.

The survey, conducted by telephone from June 4-14, queried 1,501 adults. It has a margin of error of plus or minus 2.5 percentage points.

To: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Checks
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 12:09 PM 6/21/98 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard,
>
>I picked up a \$500 check from the First United Methodist Church, 315 West
>Larkin Street, Midland, MI this morning which I'll deposit tomorrow. There
>was no note. If this is for the reception, I'll deposit it in the general
>fund; if it's a contribution to MUPJ I generally put such large amounts in
>the education fund but there's no iron-clad rule. I await your guidance.
>
>(I also picked up the membership check you noted and the IGC bill.)

>
>Phil

>
>
Phil,

Joy Arthur lives in Midland, Michigan, so I assume that he produced this check as a contribution to MUPJ. So put it in the education fund. My requests for reception funding are to the FOR and AFSC, plus the bank wire for \$500 expected from the Christian Council of Japan.

You indicated that you will be away the first three weeks in July. I depart on June 26 for 12 days. Maybe you should send me a couple of checks with your signature in case there is a bill or two to pay. Make one to Bell Atlantic, and leave the other one blank. They can be from the education fund, for we're charging phone bills to Ploughshares until it runs out.

Thanks,
Howard

To: djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Contact with Holy See
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Doug:

I'm leaving for a 12 day vacation this Friday morning, June 26. I'd like to get off a communication to an appropriate contact in the Holy See before then if possible. Please advise me who to contact, address, and suggested emphasis of a message.

Shalom,
Howard

To: paexec@igc.org, tcollina@uscusa.org, dculp@nrdc.org, jdi@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org, btiller@psr.org, joe@fcnl.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Proposed citizen hearings on the CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

If by mid-July Senator Helms has not committed the Senate Foreign Relations to hold hearings on the CTBT in this session of Congress, I believe that we should organize and announce a set of citizen hearings on the treaty. In outline, here are a few suggestions about such citizen hearings.

1. Time: Starting Tuesday, September 8 and for several days thereafter. This is the day after Labor Day when Congress is just returning. There won't be much going on in Congress that day, so we might be able to attract C-Span, CNN, and other networks. If this succeeds in pressing the Senate to move, there still might be time to get the treaty approved before the end of the session.
2. Place: (a) a church basement (fellowship hall), such as Capitol Hill United Methodist Church at 5th and Seward Square, SE (just off Pennsylvania Avenue) or Church of the Reformation (Lutheran), 222 East Capitol Street, NE; or (b) a hotel. There are pros and cons for each.
3. Hearing officers: Among the possibilities would be four retired senators: Cranston, Exon, Hatfield, and Danforth, two from each party, respected, supportive of the CTBT but capable of holding fair hearings with opposition present. We could also have a retired military officer, a scientist, a religious leader, and other prominent persons.
4. Sponsorship: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and our interfaith group, which would need a name, such as Interfaith (or Religious), Coalition (or Working Group, Task Force) for the CTBT. This would bring together most of the leading advocates of the CTBT.
5. Witnesses: Invite the Clinton Administration (they might decline). Panels of (a) retired military officers, including former chairs of Joint Chiefs of Staff, (b) religious leaders (Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, peace church), (c) professionals (scientist, physician, engineer, etc.), (d) citizen organizations (such as Peace Action, League of Women Voters), (e) treaty opponents (ex-officials of Reagan Administration, etc.) (f) rebuttal witnesses, such as on verification issues.
6. Toward the end of July invite Senator Lott to testify so that he can detail his reasons why the CTBT should be put on the shelf because of the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests.
7. In the invitation letter to Lott, with copies all senators and released to the press, make the point that we are holding the citizen hearings because members of the Senate have allowed one-man rule (Senator Helms) to prevail in the Senate and have thereby defaulted on their obligation to hold hearings on and give floor consideration to a treaty supported by 73 percent of the American public.
8. In sum, our intent to have citizen hearings may push the Senate to act. If so, we would cancel them. Otherwise, we will have an excellent opportunity to gain public attention on the CTBT and the Senate's neglect.

Please let me know what you think of this approach. If you believe that something along these lines might be useful, I'll share this communication with other religious groups and find out if they would like to be involved collectively.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 09:16:15 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
CC: paexec@igc.org, tcollina@uscusa.org, dculp@nrdc.org, jdi@clw.org,
dkimball@clw.org, joe@fcnl.org
Subject: Re: Proposed citizen hearings on the CTBT
References: <2.2.16.19980622084755.3bd72f46@pop.igc.org>

I think this is a fine idea. I hope that you can move it forward. A few questions:

1. Budget?
2. Broader sponsorship?
3. Will anyone besides hearing officers be asking questions?
4. Which do you think is more important: to present our view heavily, or to have balance among the hearing officers and witnesses?
5. Who will make the decisions about the witness list -- the hearing officers or the sponsors?
6. Crowd control?
7. We might get more media attention and desired reponse from Lott if the hearings were held before Labor Day, i.e. September 1-2-3-4.

Shalom,
Bob T.

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

- >
- > Dear Colleagues:
- >
- > If by mid-July Senator Helms has not committed the Senate Foreign Relations
- > to hold hearings on the CTBT in this session of Congress, I believe that we
- > should organize and announce a set of citizen hearings on the treaty. In
- > outline, here are a few suggestions about such citizen hearings.
- >
- > 1. Time: Starting Tuesday, September 8 and for several days thereafter.
- > This is the day after Labor Day when Congress is just returning. There
- > won't be much going on in Congress that day, so we might be able to attract
- > C-Span, CNN, and other networks. If this succeeds in pressing the Senate to
- > move, there still might be time to get the treaty approved before the end of
- > the session.
- >
- > 2. Place: (a) a church basement (fellowship hall), such as Capitol Hill
- > United Methodist Church at 5th and Seward Square, SE (just off Pennsylvania
- > Avenue) or Church of the Reformation (Lutheran), 222 East Capitol Street,
- > NE; or (b) a hotel. There are pros and cons for each.
- >
- > 3. Hearing officers: Among the possibilities would be four retired senators:
- > Cranston, Exon, Hatfield, and Danforth, two from each party, respected,
- > supportive of the CTBT but capable of holding fair hearings with opposition
- > present. We could also have a retired military officer, a scientists, a

> religious leader, and other prominent persons.
>
> 4. Sponsorship: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and our interfaith
> group, which would need a name, such as Interfaith (or Religious), Coalition
> (or Working Group, Task Force) for the CTBT. This would bring together most
> of the leading advocates of the CTBT.
>
> 5. Witnesses: Invite the Clinton Administration (they might decline).
> Panels of (a) retired military officers, including former chairs of Joint
> Chiefs of Staff, (b) religious leaders (Catholic, Protestant, Jewish,
> Muslim, peace church), (c) professionals (scientist, physician, engineer,
> etc.), (d) citizen organizations (such as Peace Action, League of Women
> Voters), (e) treaty opponents (ex-officials of Reagan Administration, etc.)
> (f) rebuttal witnesses, such as on verification issues.
>
> 6. Toward the end of July invite Senator Lott to testify so that he can
> detail his reasons why the CTBT should be put on the shelf because of the
> Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests.
>
> 7. In the invitation letter to Lott, with copies all senators and released
> to the press, make the point that we are holding the citizen hearings
> because members of the Senate have allowed one-man rule (Senator Helms) to
> prevail in the Senate and have thereby defaulted on their obligation to hold
> hearings on and give floor consideration to a treaty supported by 73 percent
> of the American public.
>
> 8. In sum, our intent to have citizen hearings may push the Senate to act.
> If so, we would cancel them. Otherwise, we will have an excellent
> opportunity to gain public attention on the CTBT and the Senate's neglect.
>
> Please let me know what you think of this approach. If you believe that
> something along these lines might be useful, I'll share this communication
> with other religious groups and find out if they would like to be involved
> collectively.
>
> Shalom,
> Howard
>
> 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
>
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 09:31:44 -0400
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)
Subject: Re: Proposed citizen hearings on the CTBT
To: paexec@igc.org, tcollina@uscusa.org, jdi@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org,
btiller@psr.org, joe@fcnl.org, "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

Howard --

Our audience has to be Majority Leader Lott and the moderate Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee. I don't believe a citizens hearing by NGOs in Washington is likely to have much impact on them.

I think our time and energy is much better spent generating grassroots support for the CTBT in those states.

For example, I letter to Senator Hagel (R-Neb.) signed by 100 religious leaders in Nebraska, followed up by a personal meeting, would have an impact.

David

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 15:39:28 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Cc: impress@slt.lk
Subject: pov-1: June Bulletin from Suva, Fiji
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
June Edition

Contents:

Local Launch
Intermarriage in Fiji Vijay Narayan
Interfaith Youth Outreach Interfaith Search Fiji
Public Education Pamphlets on Constitutional Issues (Part Two) - CCF

LOCAL LAUNCH

The Peace to the City Campaign will be formally launched in Suva this month. The chief guest will be the President of the Fiji Methodist Church, Fiji's biggest denomination, Reverend Ilaitia Tuwere. A local human rights group, Women's Action for Change, will perform a piece of theatre relating to peace building. And local partners, Citizen's Constitutional Forum, Interfaith Search Fiji and People for Intercultural Awareness, will discuss their programmes. There will also be a demonstration of the Peace to the City websites. Many non-government organisations have been invited to participate.

INTERMARRIAGE IN FIJI - Vijay Narayan

"They would comment on the incident that happened in the coups and also some subject the parliament would bring up in time of their meeting about sending the Indians back to India and letting the Fijian rule this country. They would point out to me that particular subject. It would bother me because sometimes I turn to myself and say where would I go when I am centred in between these two cultures." - Daniel Stanley describing how he felt when Fiji was thrown into turmoil eleven years ago during the military coups of 1987. Daniel's father is an Indo-Fijian and his mother is an indigenous Fijian.

This article will look at the extent of racial discrimination in Fiji. Racial discrimination is when a person is pre-judged on the grounds of race, colour or ethnic origin. This report will also look at how the situation can be dealt with on a personal and national level.

Naveen is a 26-year-old Indo-Fijian who is married to an indigenous Fijian girl. As he explains, getting married wasn't an easy thing to do. "Coming from a very strong Hindu background, it was bit difficult at first marrying a Fijian girl but then we should encourage inter marriage in Fiji or in any other country because I think this could stop racial discrimination in the countries."

Naveen says encouraging the two main races of Fiji to understand each other can unite the country. He recalls an incident when he felt the full brunt of being a victim of racial discrimination.

"The only time I really felt I was racially discriminated was after the coup and things changed like the attitude between our brothers, Fijian brothers, it changed like a blink of an eye. And I remember one day going down to the market and I was doing something when one of the guys yelled out in Fijian and said Moku na kai-Idia ("Beat up the Indian") and that really made me scared and I took off from there."

Another person, who talks about his relationship with an Indo-Fijian, is Labasa resident Jone Kamea.

"I am married to an Indian girl and I am Fijian guy and we are really deep in love. Like from my side, it has not been accepted by my parents. They wanted me to get married to a Fijian girl and on the other hand her parents wanted the girl to get married to an Indian guy. At one stage I even was being threatened that if I ever spoke to that girl again I would be killed, but I took the risk and finally won the battle."

As an indigenous Fijian, Jone says he is trying his best to get the two different races together everywhere he goes.

"You are out in a wedding or somewhere, you see a group of Indian boys just enjoying a bowl of grog sitting down and in another group you have some Fijian guys. Although they are sitting under the same shed and there's gossip going around so I try and call them together and come sit down together."

Jone says he has been discriminated against due to his race.

"I knew it was happening when people used to see me maybe because of my race as a Fijian.. I could remember this incident on the bus. The bus was full and these two Indian guys refused to give me a seat, and while I was still standing, this Indian guy came and the two guys shifted and gave him a seat."

Daniel Stanley, whose father is an Indo Fijian and mum an indigenous Fijian, says he has been discriminated against by people on a few occasions.

"When I would be with my Indian friends I would be with them in times of having some good times, I would get over excited and I would show some reaction and some emotional feelings that does not go well with them and they would really point that out as a Fijian misunderstanding of Fijian emotional character."

Stanley says racial discrimination can be controlled if people coming from

different backgrounds understand each other. "Many people discriminate others by viewing their own perspective. If people begin to put their feet into the shoes of those fellows who are being discriminated they would gain understanding, they would understand and feel for them."

These are the voices of people who are trying to break the racial barriers in Fiji. My personal message to you: Why don't we try to do the same because we are all alike underneath our skin colour or race.

INTERFAITH YOUTH OUTREACH - Interfaith Search Fiji

To establish an interfaith youth group has been one of the "dreams" of Interfaith Search Fiji. Last year, 1997, this became a reality. We began with seminars, one in Suva 15th March and then one in Lautoka, the major town in the west of Viti Levu, on the 31st May 1997. We were assisted in the programmes by our partners, the Citizens Constitutional Forum through their financial support and the People for Intercultural Awareness through their participation in the planning and running of the actual programme. The day gave participants an opportunity:

To discover minor similarities and differences among their different religions through a "fun" activity.

To share on a one to one basis why they are happy to be members of their faith and learn why others feel the same about their own faith.

To search within themselves and then share with one another in small groups about their fears or doubts about religious meetings with people of other faiths.

To learn a little about the Reeves Report and its implications in their lives.

The evaluations were positive and most asked for further opportunities to meet and share with young people of other faiths.

Follow-up gatherings were held in Suva and at the end of the second, the participants recommended a youth committee be set up to co-ordinate a youth programme assisted by Sefarana Mario, the assistant co-ordinator for Interfaith Search and each religious groups submitted the name of their representative. This group met towards the end of the year. They drew up guidelines for the youth group and asked if one representative could be represented in the Interfaith Search Council. No further activities were planned for 1997 as most of the young people who were interested in interfaith activities were students and so caught up in exams and end of the year school programmes.

Because January is a holiday period here in Fiji, most voluntary organisations are non-active until February. The working committee met on the 21st. It identified areas of concern in the community and decided to participate in activities such as charity work and other activities in our society. Secondly they wanted to visit Religious Temples, Mosques and other sacred places which they believed would be a stepping stone towards respecting other traditions. In this meeting they also decided to prepare a questionnaire for the various youth groups of our organisation, because there is a lack of participation from some Religious groups. The committee thought that before planning further gatherings they should wait and evaluate the results of this questionnaire. Unfortunately there

was not a good response to the questionnaire and at present, our youth group is inactive -- A real disappointment after such a positive and enthusiastic start! Where we go from here we have not yet decided.

PUBLIC EDUCATION PAMPHLETS ON CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES (Part Two) - CCF

In its efforts to raise public awareness of the issues facing the country during the constitutional review process in Fiji a series of pamphlets were produced and distributed widely. They were designed to explain the current positions and the possibilities for change being discussed in the review process.

One pamphlet dealt with the Voting System of the 1990 Fiji Constitution. Under this system all parliamentary seats were communal and there were three separate electoral roles, one of each ethnic group. The composition of the House of Representatives was not based on population figures, but gave a higher proportion of seats to ethnic Fijians. There were other imbalances, such as undue number of seats for rural Fijians and very few for urban Fijians.

The pamphlets discussed the functions of any voting system and the issues involved. Fiji had always a first-past-the post system so alternatives were raised along with the question of the value of one's vote.

Because of Fiji's racial make-up, the idea of Power Sharing as a basis for government was the subject of another pamphlet. Reaching agreement through consensus is a well established method in Fiji society, so a form of power sharing had been suggested. Questions were raised in the pamphlet about adequate protection for the rights and interests of different communities, and the effect that power sharing might have on democratic processes, and what would be the benefits.

Religious freedom in Fiji's multi-religious society has been endangered in the years since 1987, and calls have been made for Fiji to be declared a Christian State in the constitution. The pamphlet on this subject dealt with the question of confusing politics and religion, of imposing on people of other faiths, as happened with the Sunday ban which was force for some time during the years after 1987, and which severely restricted movement and activity. The pamphlet discussed these questions in relation to fundamental human rights, and how to resolve this issue in a way which would enhance national unity.

One pamphlet considered the whole question of Our Fundamental Rights, describing what they should be, and what was contained in the 1990 Constitution which had many exceptions to the application of human rights, and the power that the state has to restrict or repress fundamental rights of citizens.

Citizenship is another issue on which it was felt necessary to raise public awareness, since there were some anomalies in the 1990 Constitution and a number of people who felt they were eligible for Fiji

citizenship found themselves denied it, including ethnic Fijians who has resided abroad. The pamphlet raised questions about the position of foreign spouses of Fiji citizens, dual citizenship, the different means by which citizenship can be acquired and the communal interests which are involved.

Two further educational pamphlets were produced after the adoption of the 1997 Constitution Amendment Act to explain the Voting System and Power Sharing. In both these areas there are radically new provisions in the new constitution. The Voting system has been adopted is the Alternative Vote which is requires voters to number the candidates in order of preference. From now on each voter will have two votes, as there will be two kinds of seats; communal and open, and another new feature is that voting will be compulsory. The new constitution provides for power sharing in the Cabinet which must be made up in proportion to the number of seats held by each political party. There is also provision for multi-party standing committees of the House of Representatives to help formulate government policy.

The CCF is now working in collaboration with the Supervisor of Elections to produce public material on the new Voting System in preparation for the general elections due to be held early in 1999.

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-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 15:47:32 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Cc: impress@slt.lk
Subject: pov-1: June Bulletin from Kingston
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Peace to the City Campaign -- Kingston, Jamaica
June 1998 Bulletin

Contents

1. Serendipity Happens
2. Easing the Tensions: Peace through Forgiveness
3. Bingo Party: Healing the Breach
4. Community Council and Video Update

1. Serendipity Happens

I was invited to attend a "Forum on Community-Based Strategies for Tackling Social Violence" organised by the Department of Sociology and Social Work at the University of the West Indies, to follow up a study on Poverty and Violence done two years ago by the Centre for Population, Community and Social Change for the World Bank. At the time, the World Bank was interested in establishing the Jamaica Social Investment Fund in association with the Government of Jamaica. Angela Stultz-Crawlle and I were two of the nine researchers who worked on that project

The forum was attended by representatives from a number of Non-Governmental and Community based organisations, Churches and Schools in the inner city communities. I was asked to share methodologies I have found effective and challenging, in my work in inner city communities and to facilitate a workshop discussion on this subject. One of the persons I met at the forum was Donna Parchment. Interestingly, she was also present at the inaugural meeting of the Peace to the City Campaigners which was held in Durban, South Africa. She is a mediation activist in Jamaica and also had some very profound things to share about the interventionist approach which she and the organisation she represents, the Council for Voluntary Social Services, (CVSS) utilise in their efforts to reduce the violence in relationships or in social even more peripheral encounters.

"In the last couple of months we did a deliberative forum in association with the Kedrick Foundation from Dayton in Ohio. We were looking at the question "Criminal Violence: the way to overcome crime now." We pulled in people from all the places we have been working with across the country. We are a national organisation and we have now created a context in which we can do our work. The Peace and Love in Schools

(PALS) programme in which the media has joined in creating in the school system has also benefitted us because it has raised peoples' awareness of the fact that the skill [of mediation] can be learned. We are trying to use that relationship with PALS to say to adults, "yes adults, you have to learn too; it's not good enough for you to say your children are learning."

"One of the challenges though", Ms. Parchment continued in the ROOTS 96.1 FM interview, "is that if we are going to do a training programme, it always has to be funded - for the venue, trainer, refreshments, the administration of just getting people there and so on; that is sometimes a constraining factor. But as long as people want the training we are willing so we have been into many NGOs. Although we have a standard rate, we are always willing to negotiate because people want to live."

"A lot of our potential remains unrecognised," Ms. Parchment said, "because there are many entrenched conflicts in a variety of communities and some of those conflicts that have been buried for years and years and years keep flaring up and cause us to define ourselves or view ourselves in certain negative ways. The combination of viewing ourselves in negative ways and the reality of the historical experience, combined together, too often, cripples us up."

"My vision is that the Dispute Resolution Foundation, working with all the multiple initiatives that are going on - and there are many many, many initiatives that are positive. [Note: repetition is a feature of emphasis in the Jamaican language]. Through this kind of networking, we can help people to realise their potential. It doesn't mean that people don't already have ways of resolving their conflicts but for some people, we have not been doing it so well."

2. Easing the Tensions: Peace through Forgiveness

In last month's Bulletin we outlined the gruesome encounter among friends turned rivals in a community gang in the S-Corner area; they seemed in dire need of the mediation skills like those offered by Ms. Parchment and the Resolution Foundation! This month we are heartened to bring news of forgiveness and peace where before anger and reprisals raged. In the first two weeks, the Peace Committee met with the two sets of youth and negotiated a dtente.

Angela Stultz-Crawlle, Director of the S-Corner Clinic and Community Development Organisation reported that "we spoke to them of forgiveness, placing emphasis on Matthew 18:22 which records Jesus as saying in response to Peter's question on how often one should forgive one's brother, 'I say unto thee... unto seventy times seven.'"

Angela went on to say that as a Committee, "we pointed out that the fact that they live within close proximity of each other, it was nothing short of stupid that they were endangering their lives thus. There was no way they could hide from each other because they were too close. We stressed that disagreement should not warrant life threatening reactions."

The day after the confrontation, the clinic staff left early in protest against the shooting episodes in which the youths were involved. One of the feuding leaders saw the local priest passing and stopped him; he later confessed that he had been trying without success to smoke a cigarette. His difficulty stemmed from the fact that he was disturbed by the thoughts which kept cycling in his head after the meeting with the S-Corner staff. He was also unsettled by the protest action of the staff members. He told the priest that he wanted to go and meet with the rival leader and requested that the priest facilitate this meeting.

"It is important to recall from our previous report," Angela went on, "that this man had been shot and injured in the dispute. The priest agreed and the meeting was convened. Simultaneously we were inspired to contract an artist to create a banner with words "Peace and Perfect Love: Stop the Hate" emblazoned on it in bold letters. The message also said "Jesus said, you must forgive thy brother seventy times seven." The outcome of these combined efforts was a reunited group and a relieved community. Again we at S-Corner were reminded of the sensitive role we always have to be prepared to play in the uncertain social atmosphere that oftentimes prevails, particularly when a catalyst is created to continue the cycle of feuding.

"Following the rapid spread of news of the success of our mediation efforts, the leaders of the other warring factions (which as we also mentioned in the last story, who are located on the outskirts of the Bennetland community), sent to request the Clinic's intervention in the ongoing dispute with the opposing aggressors. We sent word to them to advise that we could not operate without the commitment of the other members of the Peace Committee, namely the local Church and the School. We suggested that we would meet as a team with them the following day. However, when the full membership of the committee turned up the next morning for the appointment, we were informed that the men who had initiated the peace effort had fled the area because their opponents had ambushed them the night before, killing one of their men. That incident left a heavy pall over all concerned. However, there were some cynical responses from community members who mistrusted the sincerity of their peace overtures and saw their impromptu flight as a blessing in disguise. Six weeks later, they have still not reclaimed their abandoned abodes and there is an almost tangible hope that they will not."

3. Bingo Party: Healing the Breach

Following close on the heels of this tension, the therapy of the tremendous energy which was generated in the preparations leading up to the Bingo Party, the S-Corner's fundraiser, and the excitement and fun of the event itself, was therefore necessary medicine for the entire community as well as those concerned with the maintenance of the social security of the area.

"The Bingo party was an outstanding financial success which realised a net profit of over JA\$180,000," the S-Corner Director smiled proudly.

"The financial success was a desired objective which we achieved; however, much more significant was the full-fledged community participation which ensured that the Ranny Williams Centre was full that Saturday night while the community was empty. The young, the old, the middle aged and in between were all present and dressed in regalia ranging from tuxedos to ballroom gowns with the coloured hairstyles to match the outfits.

"We were most impressed," Angela enthused, "by the willingness of people from the don to the most destitute unemployed, to lend their positive energies to support this community development affair. Even the cigarette vendor packed up his stall to come and even for the fun of it, try his luck at the bingo table. The old women who had not dusted off their entertainment selves for the longest while, were all out in their numbers. Acknowledging this unique participation, the prize giver honoured the elders by having a special senior citizens contest. A seventy-two year old woman from the community won. At the end of the event, it was moving to experience the togetherness which was manifested in the clean up efforts; there was unmistakable enthusiasm on the part of the community members who spontaneously claimed ownership of the security and maintenance responsibilities."

Women on the Move

Mrs. Stultz-Crawlle went on to report that the inaugural women's meeting took place on May 27; eighteen women were in attendance and Parenting was the main item on the agenda. She recalled that "the discussion explored strategies to improve parenting practices in spite of the constraints imposed by women's domestic and work commitments. We resolved to make this encounter a monthly affair, given the urgent need for support in this area, expressed by a number of mothers to whom we have spoken."

She noted further that "the Member of Parliament, the Hon. Portia Simpson-Miller visited us and was so impressed by the burdens we were bearing that she decided to make our load a little lighter by generously donating much needed sports equipment for use by the youth in all the communities which comprise the Bennetland area. In response to our widespread pleas for financial assistance to boost our flagging resources, she used her influence to facilitate our meeting with UNICEF and UNFPA. As a consequence we have received a grant of US\$50000 from UNFPA and promises of medical supplies from UNICEF."

4. Community Council and Video Update

The regular Community Development Council meeting was held; this group organised the drafting of letters to the local business community, soliciting their support to purchase paints to give the rusty zinc-fenced area a much needed face lift. "We are optimistic about the success of this effort which should become clear in the coming weeks," Angela said.

Finally, the social activist who said candidly that she cannot help being emotionally affected by the work which she does, summarised that S-Corner has continued to facilitate meetings between the video crew and the area dons and community persons who have suffered trauma as a result of violent incidents in the community. "They have been recording the testimonies of these people whose resilience is underscored by their survival against the odds." We agreed that it is a singular relief to be able to conclude this Bulletin on a note of optimism!

By Imani Tafari-Ama

Local Coordinator for the Kingston Peace to the City Campaign:

Ms. Angela Stultz-Crawle
S-Corner Clinic and Community Development
18 St. Joseph Road
Kingston 13
Jamaica
Tel./Fax: +1-876-923-0672

----- End of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 10:06:03 -0400
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: Checks
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

Alas, in a fit of efficiency I've already mailed the IGC check to you and deposited both checks in the general fund. Since a church doesn't care about tax deductibility, that should be all right and give our general fund a needed shot in the arm.

I'm now planning to be gone only the first two weeks of July so we should have no problem paying routine bills in a timely fashion when we both return.

Phil

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
CC: abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 15:11:38 +0200
From: cesd <cesd@agoranet.be>
Organization: Centre for European Security and Disarmament
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: S Asian testing and Euro. Parliament
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id GAB15943

Dear friends,

Attached below is a copy of the resolution passed last week by the European Parliament regarding nuclear testing in India and Pakistan. I thought it might be useful in your work. Please disseminate it as widely as possible. For our purposes, I would highlight the mention of the ICJ, Canberra Commission and the term 'nuclear-weapon-free world'. The use of these concepts is significant, because they are a bit more difficult to get agreed as language in EP resolutions.

In its briefings with members of the EP prior to its last plenary, CESD used some of the information so plentiful on the Abolition server. So some credit for this resolution goes to all of you.

Thanks and keep up the good work!

Sharon Riggle

Centre for European Security and Disarmament
Centre de Securite Europeenne et Desarmement
115 rue Stevin
1000 Brussels
Belgium
tel: +32-2-230.07.32, fax: +32-2-230.24.67

As adopted by the European Parliament on 19 June 1998

Nuclear tests by India and Pakistan

B4-0604, 0619, 0638, 0647, 0657 and 0663/98

Resolution on nuclear testing by India and Pakistan

The European Parliament,

-having regard to its previous resolutions on nuclear non-proliferation, nuclear testing and the work of the Canberra Commission for a nuclear weapon-free world,

-having regard to the terms of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT),

-having regard to the terms of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT),

-having regard to the statements made by the Council of the European Union, the G7, the UN Security Council and the meeting of the five permanent members of the Security Council,

A. whereas the signatories of the Non-Proliferation Treaty have committed themselves to the objective of the elimination of all nuclear weapons,

B. whereas over the past decades the two main nuclear powers have reduced the number of their nuclear warheads and envisage continuing this reduction through a number of bilateral agreements,

C. whereas these reductions do not, as yet, point to rapid progress towards full elimination of these weapons,

D. noting with great concern that India carried out five nuclear tests during the period 11-13 May 1998,

E. noting with great concern that Pakistan then carried out six nuclear tests during the period 28-30 May 1998,

F. whereas on 6 June 1998 the UN Security Council unanimously condemned these tests and called for both countries to refrain from further testing and sign the CTBT and the NPT,

G. noting that these tests have caused a serious escalation in tension between the two countries and are an additional threat to peace and security on the continent as a whole; noting that this situation could deteriorate further if both countries continue to direct their nuclear capacity towards the manufacture of weapons,

H. noting that a number of countries, including some EU Member States, the United States and Japan, have decided to impose sanctions on both countries in response to these nuclear tests,

I. noting that both countries already allocate a disproportionate part of both their GNP and their budget on military spending and on military, nuclear research and development,

J. whereas the nuclear tests are likely to damage both the Pakistani and Indian economies, in view of their effect on foreign loans and investment, which in turn will affect the already low social condition of the population,

K. emphasizing that in order to strengthen stability and security in the region and in the world as a whole it is necessary for India and Pakistan on the one hand to adhere to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty without any modification thereof, and on the other hand to adhere

to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty immediately and unconditionally, thus facilitating its entry into force,

L. noting the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that there is an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict international control,

1. Condemns the recent nuclear tests carried out in May 1998 by India and then by Pakistan and expresses its deep concern about the danger to peace, security and stability in the region and in the world as a whole provoked by these tests; remains convinced that the NPT and the CTBT are the cornerstones of the global non-proliferation regime and the essential bases for progress towards nuclear disarmament;

2. Urges the Indian and Pakistani governments to refrain from any further nuclear tests, to adhere to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty without any modification of this Treaty and to adhere to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty immediately and unconditionally;

3. Calls on the Indian and Pakistani governments to give a commitment immediately not to assemble or deploy nuclear weapons and devices, and to halt the development of ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads;

4. Calls on the Indian and Pakistani Governments to start talks immediately to reduce tension in the region, to establish a framework for reconciliation and cooperation and thus to promote peace, security and stability in South Asia and throughout the continent; calls on the Council and the Member States to assist the Governments of India and Pakistan, where necessary and possible, in this process of reconciliation and cooperation, possibly by (co-)sponsoring a regional conference on security and confidence-building measures;

5. Calls on the Council and the Member States to prevent the export of equipment, materials and/or technology that could in any way assist programmes in India or Pakistan for nuclear weapons or for ballistic missiles capable of carrying such weapons;

6. Calls on Member States which have not yet done so to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty immediately, in order to facilitate its entry into force as soon as possible;

7. Calls on the five nuclear weapons states to interpret their Treaty obligations as an urgent commitment to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons;

8. Asks the Council and the Commission to examine ways and means to promote further progress towards the gradual elimination of nuclear weapons and calls on the Council to present a regular progress report to Parliament;

9. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Commission,

the Council, the UN Security Council, the governments of the Member States and the governments and parliaments of India and Pakistan.

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 09:45:01 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: letter to Editor
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: CTBT Organizers
From: disarmament
Subject: Letter to Editor
Here is a letter to the editor from Howard Hall, Methodists United for
Peace With Justice.

Washington Post, Sunday June 21

Nuclear Insecurity

A message to India and Pakistan: Welcome to the ranks
of the insecure.

Your nuclear tests, rather than enhancing national
security, have made you
vulnerable to nuclear attack as never before.

You join a distinguished group of vulnerable nations:
the United States,
Russia, China, Britain, France and their allies who
live under the leaky
nuclear umbrella. For under the accepted doctrine of
mutually assured
destruction, it is the possessors who are at greatest
risk to nuclear attack.

A second message to Indian and Pakistan: Renounce your
nuclear
weapons before it's too late. Cease all research,
development and testing.
Never deploy. This will make both of you much safer.

The same message to you hypocritical nuclear weapon
states, who
condemn the South Asian nations for following your
foolhardy example:
Renounce your nuclear weapons, both for deterrence and
war. Commit
yourselves unconditionally to no use against any
adversary under any
circumstance. Immediately take all your nuclear
weapons off hair-trigger
alert. Dismantle your entire nuclear arsenals with
open verification and
adequate safeguards.

So it is, Indian and Pakistan, by exposing the
futility of nuclear weapons,
you offer the world a valuable lesson if we have the
sense to apply it.

Howard W. Hallman, 70
Bethesda

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: <TGilley@bha.getty.edu>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 10:37:22 -0400
From: "Ted M. Gilley" <TGilley@bha.getty.edu>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: for: Howard Hallman

Dear Mr. Hallman,

I obtained your address from the internet Abolition 2000 site. I am interested in the addresses of religious groups working on nuclear weapon abolition issues. I am Catholic.

I'd appreciate any addresses you can send my way.

Thanks.

Ted Gilley
Tgilley@bha.getty.edu

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 12:09:14 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org> paexec@igc.org,
tcollina@uscusa.org, dculp@nrdc.org, jdi@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org,
btiller@psr.org, joe@fcnl.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Re: Proposed citizen hearings on the CTBT

Howard and others:

While I think this is a creative idea and this is the time to be creative, I don't think a citizens' hearing would address our main stumbling blocks and it would siphon off resources from other important tasks.

The focus of our work needs to be on the undecided Republican Senators, particularly back home. We also need to think about bringing in NEW allies to the effort. The "monday lobby" crowd will not be able to do the job by ourselves. Therefore, in whatever we do, we need to think about working with recognizably more mainstream and Republican-oriented groups.

One task that I would like to remind everyone about is our NGO outreach effort. Even with the religious leaders letter, there is more that can be done to bring in additional leaders and groups, and to promote action by these groups. No one has yet taken the time to conduct systematic outreach to labor, medical, or environmental groups.

I encourage everyone to consider what can be done and to bring their ideas to the next CTBT working group meeting on June 26 at 9:30 at UCS where we can discuss them further.

DK

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>If by mid-July Senator Helms has not committed the Senate Foreign Relations
>to hold hearings on the CTBT in this session of Congress, I believe that we
>should organize and announce a set of citizen hearings on the treaty. In
>outline, here are a few suggestions about such citizen hearings.

>

>1. Time: Starting Tuesday, September 8 and for several days thereafter.
>This is the day after Labor Day when Congress is just returning. There
>won't be much going on in Congress that day, so we might be able to attract

>C-Span, CNN, and other networks. If this succeeds in pressing the Senate to
>move, there still might be time to get the treaty approved before the end of
>the session.

>
>2. Place: (a) a church basement (fellowship hall), such as Capitol Hill
>United Methodist Church at 5th and Seward Square, SE (just off Pennsylvania
>Avenue) or Church of the Reformation (Lutheran), 222 East Capitol Street,
>NE; or (b) a hotel. There are pros and cons for each.

>
>3. Hearing officers: Among the possibilities would be four retired senators:
>Cranston, Exon, Hatfield, and Danforth, two from each party, respected,
>supportive of the CTBT but capable of holding fair hearings with opposition
>present. We could also have a retired military officer, a scientist, a
>religious leader, and other prominent persons.

>
>4. Sponsorship: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and our interfaith
>group, which would need a name, such as Interfaith (or Religious), Coalition
>(or Working Group, Task Force) for the CTBT. This would bring together most
>of the leading advocates of the CTBT.

>
>5. Witnesses: Invite the Clinton Administration (they might decline).
>Panels of (a) retired military officers, including former chairs of Joint
>Chiefs of Staff, (b) religious leaders (Catholic, Protestant, Jewish,
>Muslim, peace church), (c) professionals (scientist, physician, engineer,
>etc.), (d) citizen organizations (such as Peace Action, League of Women
>Voters), (e) treaty opponents (ex-officials of Reagan Administration, etc.)
>(f) rebuttal witnesses, such as on verification issues.

>
>6. Toward the end of July invite Senator Lott to testify so that he can
>detail his reasons why the CTBT should be put on the shelf because of the
>Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests.

>
>7. In the invitation letter to Lott, with copies all senators and released
>to the press, make the point that we are holding the citizen hearings
>because members of the Senate have allowed one-man rule (Senator Helms) to
>prevail in the Senate and have thereby defaulted on their obligation to hold
>hearings on and give floor consideration to a treaty supported by 73 percent
>of the American public.

>
>8. In sum, our intent to have citizen hearings may push the Senate to act.
>If so, we would cancel them. Otherwise, we will have an excellent
>opportunity to gain public attention on the CTBT and the Senate's neglect.

>
>Please let me know what you think of this approach. If you believe that
>something along these lines might be useful, I'll share this communication
>with other religious groups and find out if they would like to be involved
>collectively.

>
>Shalom,
>Howard

>
>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

>

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

>

>

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

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, abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de,
lforrow@IGC.APC.ORG

Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 09:16:28 -0700 (PDT)

From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: RE: Dates: Year 2000 NPT Review Conferenc

To: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org, mailbox@ipb.org

I think that perhaps the best place to start when considering activities around the NPT process is by looking back to our experience during the NPT extension conference in April 1995. This would be our best benchmark to gage effectiveness of NGO activities. The reason I say this is that the actual extension of the NPT was a much more pivotal issue than a review or prepcomm and was treated as such by the media. There was also a great deal of NGO attention on the issue.

As I recall there was a variety of press conferences, press packets, briefing papers, actions (I was locked to the front steps of the US Mission at the time and received the honor of spending 24 hours moving through the New York City jail system), hunger strikers, protests, and conferences about both the NPT and the need for disarmament. Greenpeace had several campaigners working the issue. The Stimpson Center's Coalition for the NPT also had put quite alot of effort and financial resources into events around the NPT. There was the 1995 Citizens Assembly to Stop the Spread of Weapons: from H bombs to Hand Guns. This event was organized by Peace Action and others and there were a few hundred folks there. And of course, the Abolition 2000 network was created.

As Janet wisely suggested, lets look back at that time, the work we did, and how it paid off both in terms of media attention and in terms of bringing new people into our network before we determine that organizing around the NPT prepcomm next year is the most effective use of our time.

Bruce

Janet wrote:

>
> Dear Friends,
> it's always good that people think and plan ahead around events like the
> NPT but I have a few questions I'd like up to consider about this
> particular conference.
> After the experience of the last NPT Prep Comm in Geneva and the
> India/Pakistan testing that immediately followed it I'd like to have a
> thorough evaluation of the effectiveness of A2000 activity at that time.
> An awful lot of time, effort, resource and good work was put into it
> but what did it really achieve?
> Lachlan seems to imply that people in general are aware of the NPT
> process. I'd be more than happy to be proved wrong but I suspect that
> the vast majority have never heard of the NPT Prep Comms and the Review
> Conference. There is probably a heightened awareness of the Treaty but

- > it's nothing compared to the awareness of the India/Pakistan tests...
- > I think we are starting from a very low point of public knowledge about
- > the NPT process in relation to our planning for 1999/2000.
- > Please therefore let us take into account these factors before we get into
- > organising things for the next couple of years.
- > India and Pakistan have shown that the nuclear weapons states cannot
- > carry on with "business as usual" when it comes to the NPT, neither
- > should we.
- > Yours in peace,
- > Janet Bloomfield.
- > p.s. I also suspect that people will sick of the Millenium by the middle
- > of 1999 too!
- >

Return-Path: <UUAWO@aol.com>
From: UUAWO@aol.com
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 13:06:52 EDT
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Hello Howard

Saw your "Backtalk" letter in Sunday's Outlook section in the Wash Post. Your directness and use of imperative sentences was a refreshing angle. Congrats on having your letter picked from among the hundreds received. And thanks for your continuing witness.

We head for Rochester tomorrow. The UUA General Assembly begins this week. We'll miss the meeting on the 25th. But be assured -- there are two handouts on our exhibit table on CTBT, and 20/20 Vision's exhibit table, to which our table will direct folks, offers the opportunity of writing postcards to legislators. Also, one of our four collage posters (designed to draw folks to our table), the one on "Peace" has several clips re CTBT.

Peace,
Theresa Kashin
UUA Washington Office

To: abolition-caucus
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Statement re India, Pakistan, and nuclear weapons states
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Friends:

Two weeks ago Sunday the Washington Post "Outlook" section had a long article on India, Pakistan, and nuclear non-proliferation. They ask readers to respond with 200 words or less for "Back Talk". My submission, reproduced below, appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, June 21. I was pleased that Post was willing to accept an abolitionist message.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Responding to Indian and Pakistani Nuclear Tests
A Submission to Back Talk
by Howard W. Hallman

A message to Indian and Pakistan: Welcome to the ranks of the insecure. Your nuclear weapons tests, rather than enhancing national security, have made you vulnerable to nuclear attack as never before.

You join a distinguished group of vulnerable nations: United States, Russia, China, United Kingdom, France, and their allies who live under the leaky nuclear umbrella. For under the accepted doctrine of mutually assured destruction, it is the possessors who are at greatest risk to nuclear attack.

A second message to Indian and Pakistan: Renounce your nuclear weapons before it's too late. Cease all research, development, and testing. Never deploy. This will make both of you much safer.

The same message to you hypocritical nuclear weapon states, who condemn the South Asian nations for following your foolhardy example: Renounce your nuclear weapons, both for deterrence and war-fighting. Commit yourselves unconditionally to no use against any adversary under any circumstance. Immediately take all your nuclear weapons off hear-trigger alert. Dismantle your entire nuclear arsenals with open verification and adequate safeguards.

So it is, Indian and Pakistan, by exposing the futility of nuclear weapons, you offer the world a valuable lesson if we have the sense to apply it.

Return-Path: <nde>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 14:04:41 -0700 (PDT)
From: Nevada Desert Experience <nde@igc.apc.org>
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Greetings!

Dear Howard, June 22, 1998

It was recommended to me back in 1996 by someone at MPN (now ANA) to contact you about our work at the Nevada Desert Experience (NDE). Have you heard of us? We have been leading people of faith to the Nevada Test Site since 1982.

Our largest gatherings in the '90s were in 1991 (600 folks came for the 10th anniversary of NDE protests; 1995 (500 came to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Hiroshima & Nagasaki) and 1997 (325 came to honor the 100th birthday of Dorothy Day-co founder of the Catholic Worker movement). Each year we host smaller gatherings during Lent and the Hiroshima & Nagasaki August anniversaries in Las Vegas and at the Nevada Test Site. Our next large event is scheduled for December 28, 1999 to January 1, 2000 in Las Vegas and the Nevada Test Site.

It is our hope to enlist the AB2000 network to help promote this event, at least, as one of the AB2000 events planned for that time. We are open to a smaller

or larger gathering, depending on interest. Would you be interested in helping to get the word out? Have you ever been out here before? Keep up the good work. We have had much Methodist representation here over the years--Bishop C. Dale White, Bishop Leotine Kelly and others.

Blessings,
David Buer, OFM
NDE Interim Director

Return-Path: <tcollina@ucsusa.org>
From: tcollina@ucsusa.org
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 98 17:15:56 -0500
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re:Proposed citizen hearings on CTBT
Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

Howard: I think this is a great idea if done well. We need to make them as similar to a real hearings as possible and use them as a media vehicle to pressure Lott. We could even produce a transcript. Lets discuss it more on Friday. Thanks, Tom.

Reply Separator

Subject: Proposed citizen hearings on CTBT
Author: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Date: 6/22/98 11:14 AM

Dear Tom:

I sent out the following communication this morning and got your address wrong.

Howard

Dear Colleagues:

If by mid-July Senator Helms has not committed the Senate Foreign Relations to hold hearings on the CTBT in this session of Congress, I believe that we should organize and announce a set of citizen hearings on the treaty. In outline, here are a few suggestions about such citizen hearings.

1. Time: Starting Tuesday, September 8 and for several days thereafter. This is the day after Labor Day when Congress is just returning. There won't be much going on in Congress that day, so we might be able to attract C-Span, CNN, and other networks. If this succeeds in pressing the Senate to move, there still might be time to get the treaty approved before the end of the session.
2. Place: (a) a church basement (fellowship hall), such as Capitol Hill United Methodist Church at 5th and Seward Square, SE (just off Pennsylvania Avenue) or Church of the Reformation (Lutheran), 222 East Capitol Street, NE; or (b) a hotel. There are pros and cons for each.
3. Hearing officers: Among the possibilities would be four retired senators: Cranston, Exon, Hatfield, and Danforth, two from each party, respected, supportive of the CTBT but capable of holding fair hearings with opposition present. We could also have a retired military officer, a scientists, a religious leader, and other prominent persons.
4. Sponsorship: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and our interfaith group, which would need a name, such as Interfaith (or Religious), Coalition (or Working Group, Task Force) for the CTBT. This would bring together most

of the leading advocates of the CTBT.

5. Witnesses: Invite the Clinton Administration (they might decline). Panels of (a) retired military officers, including former chairs of Joint Chiefs of Staff, (b) religious leaders (Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, peace church), (c) professionals (scientist, physician, engineer, etc.), (d) citizen organizations (such as Peace Action, League of Women Voters), (e) treaty opponents (ex-officials of Reagan Administration, etc.) (f) rebuttal witnesses, such as on verification issues.

6. Toward the end of July invite Senator Lott to testify so that he can detail his reasons why the CTBT should be put on the shelf because of the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests.

7. In the invitation letter to Lott, with copies all senators and released to the press, make the point that we are holding the citizen hearings because members of the Senate have allowed one-man rule (Senator Helms) to prevail in the Senate and have thereby defaulted on their obligation to hold hearings on and give floor consideration to a treaty supported by 73 percent of the American public.

8. In sum, our intent to have citizen hearings may push the Senate to act. If so, we would cancel them. Otherwise, we will have an excellent opportunity to gain public attention on the CTBT and the Senate's neglect.

Please let me know what you think of this approach. If you believe that something along these lines might be useful, I'll share this communication with other religious groups and find out if they would like to be involved collectively.

Shalom,
Howard

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

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

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 16:11:58 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Woolsey resolution
To: btiller@psr.org

Here is the full text of the resolution on a model nuclear weapons convention, introduced last week in the House of Representatives by Rep. Lynn Woolsey. Now we can begin to use it as an organizing vehicle.

Shalom,
Bob Tiller,
Physicians for Social Responsibility

105th CONGRESS

2d Session

H. RES. 479

Recognizing the security interests of the United States in furthering complete nuclear disarmament.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 18, 1998

Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. FURSE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FALCOMA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations.

RESOLUTION

Recognizing the security interests of the United States in furthering complete nuclear disarmament.

Whereas on February 2, 1998, former President Jimmy Carter and more than 100 former or current heads of state and civilian leaders from 46 nations issued a statement that 'the world is not condemned to live forever with threats of nuclear conflict, or the anxious fragile peace imposed by nuclear deterrence' and that 'the sheer destructiveness of nuclear weapons invokes a moral imperative for their elimination';

Whereas on December 5, 1996, General Lee Butler (U.S. Air Force Ret.) and more than 60 other retired generals and admirals from 17 countries issued a statement that 'the continuing existence of nuclear weapons in the armories of nuclear powers, and the ever-present threat of acquisition of these weapons by others, constitute a peril to global

peace and security and to the safety and survival of the people we are dedicated to protect,' and that 'the creation of a nuclear-weapons-free world' is both 'necessary' and 'possible';

Whereas the development and maintenance of nuclear arsenals are extraordinarily expensive;

Whereas the end of the Cold War and the current strategic environment provide an unprecedented opportunity to revise our national policies on nuclear weapons;

Whereas the United States has a vital security interest in promoting the nonproliferation and disarmament of nuclear weapons;

Whereas the only security from the threat of nuclear weapons is their elimination under strict and effective international control;

Whereas the United States has undertaken, under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to nuclear disarmament;

Whereas the long-term viability of the nonproliferation regime is at risk if the United States fails to implement the Article VI obligation;

Whereas the United States has successfully achieved nuclear arms reductions and other arms control measures through bilateral negotiations and reciprocal actions;

Whereas on July 8, 1996, the International Court of Justice, in response to a request for an advisory opinion from the United Nations General Assembly, concluded that 'the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict' and 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';

Whereas on December 9, 1997, the United Nations General Assembly adopted by an overwhelming majority Resolution 52/38 O following up on the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice and calling upon all states to fulfill their nuclear disarmament obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations in 1998 leading to the early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat, or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination, and requesting all states to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the efforts and measures they have taken on the implementation of the resolution and nuclear disarmament; and

Whereas on November 17, 1997, Costa Rica submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention as a 'work in progress setting forth the legal, technical, and political issues that should be considered in order to obtain an actual nuclear weapons convention,' and the Model Nuclear

Weapons Convention subsequently was translated into the 6 official United Nations languages and circulated as a United Nations document (A/C. 1/52/7): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives--

(1) welcomes the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention as a discussion document intended to further negotiations on complete nuclear disarmament;

(2) urges the President to initiate multilateral negotiations leading to the early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention; and

(3) requests the President to inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the efforts and measures the United States has taken on the implementation of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 52/38 O and nuclear disarmament.

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 22 Jun 1998 22:01:08 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: TEST BAN SUMMER
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: CTBT-Organizers
From: Disarmament
Subject: TEST BAN SUMMER

ACTION ALERT * ACTION ALERT * ACTION ALERT * ACTION ALERT

*****The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW! Summer*****

BUILD THE MOMENTUM FOR A CTBT

ENCLOSED in THIS E-MAIL, CTBT ACTIVITIES YOU CAN DO RIGHT NOW:

- 1> URGE YOUR SENATORS TO CO-SPONSOR THE SPECTER-BIDEN RESOLUTION
- 2> CONTACT & BIRD-DOG YOUR SENATORS DURING THE UPCOMING RECESS
- 3> PARTICIPATE IN JULY 16 ACTIVITIES -CALL-IN TO SENATORS & MEDIA WORK

Dear CTBT-Organizers: June 22, 1998

It's officially Summer, and in sweltering Washington, DC there's no question about it. This Summer the heat is definitely focused on nuclear testing. Our challenge is to focus that heat to generate positive Senate action for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW.

GOOD NEWS - Congratulations & THANKS!:

Many of you across the country have been doing a great job of relating the South Asian crisis to the need for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now more than ever. The May 28, National Day of Action calling for a CTBT was a great success with events at 19 Senators' Offices garnering great media coverage. (If you would like a summary of the day's activities, please contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse. The summary was delivered to U.S. Senators last week, and will be available on our Web Site by the end of the week: <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>) In addition, we have seen a flurry of letters-to-the-editor and other news coverage influenced by your hard work.

CHALLENGE:

Despite our work, the CTBT remains stuck in the Senate. We have not been able to move many Republican Senators to support the Treaty (with notable exceptions of Specter (R-PA) and Gregg (R-NH -who has at least

co-sponsored the Specter-Biden Resolution). In fact, key leading Republicans (Sens. Lott and Helms) have dug in their heels in opposition to the CTBT following the Indian and Pakistani tests.

This opposition will only be overcome with a massive groundswell from the pro-CTBT constituency -

that means we need your hard work now more than ever.

OPPORTUNITIES:

Think of this Summer as the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW Summer.

Right now is the time we turn the tide to achieve the hardest-fought, longest-sought Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Here are specific ACTIVITIES YOU CAN DO RIGHT NOW:

1> URGE YOUR SENATORS TO CO-SPONSOR THE SPECTER-BIDEN RESOLUTION

2> CONTACT & BIRD-DOG YOUR SENATORS DURING THE UPCOMING RECESS

3> PARTICIPATE IN JULY 16 ACTIVITIES -CALL-IN TO SENATORS & MEDIA WORK

1. SPECTER-BIDEN RESOLUTION

This Resolution, being circulated by Senator Specter (R-PA) and Biden (D-DE), needs more REPUBLICAN CO-SPONSORS NOW.

The Resolution calls for hearings, and consideration of the CTBT:

"A Sense of the Senate Resolution that the Foreign Relations Committee should hold hearings on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty and that the Senate should take up the treaty for debate and vote on ratification as expeditiously as possible."

The effort of this Resolution is to push the debate forward this year. The Resolution does not force Senators to declare their support for the CTBT. Thus, it is not technically a "referendum" on the treaty.

Please call your Senators' Washington DC Office:
(202) 224-3121 (capitol switchboard)

Tell Your Senators:

"Please co-sponsor the Specter-Biden Resolution on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Please urge Senate ratification of the CTBT this year."

UPDATE on the Resolution's progress:

Senator Specter has been out of the Senate recovering from heart surgery. The Senator is expected back, stronger than ever, immediately following the July recess. Senators Specter & Biden would like to introduce the Resolution in July, before the August recess. We don't know when or how the Resolution will be introduced, but we can and must focus our effort RIGHT NOW on persuading Republican Senators to co-sponsor this Resolution.

So far there are a large number of Democrat Co-Sponsors, but only 3 Republicans: (Specter (R-PA), Jeffords (R-VT), Gregg (R-NH). Please include reference to the Resolution in your work (calls, letters to your Senator and media work etc.) through this Summer.

We will keep you posted on the Resolution's progress.

* It is extremely crucial and urgent that we persuade more Republicans to co-sponsor this Resolution right now.*

2. YOUR SENATORS ARE COMING HOME

Next week, June 26 - July 6, your Senators are on recess. Many will be making public appearances, including town hall meetings, cable TV and Radio call-in shows, and campaign events, in their home states. Contact Marie Rietman, CTBT Coordinator for 20/20 Vision, (202) 833-2020 <ctbt@2020.org> for a list of Senate schedulers and tips to help you track your Senators' schedule.

3. JULY 16

Thursday, July 16 marks the 53rd anniversary of the first nuclear test, "Trinity," an 18.6 kiloton atmospheric test at Alamogordo, New Mexico. You know what followed: 2,057 known nuclear tests that have had devastating environment and health effects worldwide, and fueled a dangerous nuclear arms race.

NATIONAL SENATOR CALL-IN:

CALL YOUR SENATORS ON THURSDAY, JULY 16th

You are urged to spread the word and flood your Senators' offices with calls. Peace Action has produced camera-ready flyers and cards targeted for your State and Senators. Contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse for copies. (202) 898 0150 ext. 232, <disarmament@igc.org>

MEDIA FOCUS

TAKE YOUR MESSAGE TO THE AIRWAVES:

20/20 Vision's Roots on the Radio Call-In is focused on these key states: Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Nebraska, Tennessee, & Wyoming.

This is your chance to reach thousands of people with the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW message. For details on the key radio shows, and tips for successful call-ins, contact Nicole at 20/20 Vision (202)833-2020

LETTERS-TO-THE-EDITOR

We are seeing more and more letters to the editor - and we urge you to keep them coming. Some samples have been posted here, and some are on the CTBT Action Web Site: <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Use the July 16 date as a news hook. Sample letters with the July 16 focus are coming soon.

EDITORIAL WRITERS MEETINGS

Editorials are extremely persuasive with Senators. Contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse for tips on successful meetings with editorial writers. We can also provide you with up-to-date background information.

PLEASE CONTACT US, Let the Disarmament Clearinghouse and CTBT Organizers nationwide know about your activities.

You can send messages to CTBT Organizers nationwide, address this to: ctbt-organize@igc.org

For FURTHER INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE, CONTACT:

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

CTBT ACTION WEB SITE: <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

ACTION ALERT * ACTION ALERT * ACTION ALERT * ACTION ALERT

*****The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW! Summer*****

BUILD THE MOMENTUM FOR A CTBT

ENCLOSED in THIS E-MAIL, CTBT ACTIVITIES YOU CAN DO RIGHT NOW:

- 1> URGE YOUR SENATORS TO CO-SPONSOR THE SPECTER-BIDEN RESOLUTION
- 2> CONTACT & BIRD-DOG YOUR SENATORS DURING THE UPCOMING RECESS
- 3> PARTICIPATE IN JULY 16 ACTIVITIES -CALL-IN TO SENATORS & MEDIA WORK

Dear CTBT-Organizers:

GOOD NEWS - Congratulations & THANKS!:

Many of you across the country have been doing a great job of relating the South Asian crisis to the need for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now more than ever. The May 28, National Day of Action calling for a CTBT was a great success with events at 19 Senators' Offices garnering great media coverage. (If you would like a summary of the day's activities, please contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse. The summary was delivered to U.S. Senators last week, and will be available on our Web Site by the end of the week: <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>) In addition, we

have seen a flurry of letters-to-the-editor and other news coverage influenced by your hard work.

CHALLENGE:

Despite our work, the CTBT remains stuck in the Senate. We have not been able to move many Republican Senators to support the Treaty (with notable exceptions of Specter (R-PA) and Gregg (R-NH -who has at least co-sponsored the Specter-Biden Resolution). In fact, key leading Republicans (Sens. Lott and Helms) have dug in their heels in opposition to the CTBT following the Indian and Pakistani tests.

This opposition will only be overcome with a massive groundswell from the pro-CTBT constituency -

that means we need your hard work now more than ever.

OPPORTUNITIES:

Think of this Summer as the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW Summer.

Right now is the time *we* turn the tide to achieve the hardest-fought, longest-sought Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Here are specific ACTIVITIES YOU CAN DO RIGHT NOW:

1> URGE YOUR SENATORS TO CO-SPONSOR THE SPECTER-BIDEN RESOLUTION

2> CONTACT & BIRD-DOG YOUR SENATORS DURING THE UPCOMING RECESS

3> PARTICIPATE IN JULY 16 ACTIVITIES -CALL-IN TO SENATORS & MEDIA WORK

1. SPECTER-BIDEN RESOLUTION

This Resolution, being circulated by Senator Specter (R-PA) and Biden (D-DE), needs more REPUBLICAN CO-SPONSORS NOW.

The Resolution calls for hearings, and consideration of the CTBT:

"A Sense of the Senate Resolution that the Foreign Relations Committee should hold hearings on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty and that the Senate should take up the treaty for debate and vote on ratification as expeditiously as possible."

The effort of this Resolution is to push the debate forward this year. The Resolution does not force Senators to declare their support for the CTBT. Thus, it is not technically a "referendum" on the treaty.

Please call your Senators' Washington DC Office:
(202) 224-3121 (capitol switchboard)

Tell Your Senators:

"Please co-sponsor the Specter-Biden Resolution on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Please urge Senate ratification of the CTBT this year."

UPDATE on the Resolution's progress:

Senator Specter has been out of the Senate recovering from heart surgery. The Senator is expected back, stronger than ever, immediately following the July recess. Senators Specter & Biden would like to introduce the Resolution in July, before the August recess. We don't know when or how the Resolution will be introduced, but we can and must still focus our effort RIGHT NOW on persuading Republican Senators to co-sponsor this Resolution.

So far there are a large number of Democrat Co-Sponsors, but only 3 Republicans: (Specter (R-PA), Jeffords (R-VT), Gregg (R-NH)). Please include reference to the Resolution in your work (calls, letters to your Senator and media work etc.) through this Summer.

We will keep you posted on the Resolution's progress.

* It is extremely crucial and urgent that we persuade more Republicans to co-sponsor this Resolution right now.*

2. YOUR SENATORS ARE COMING HOME

Next week, June 26 - July 6, your Senators are on recess. Many will be making public appearances, including town hall meetings, cable TV and Radio call-in shows, and campaign events, in their home states. Contact Marie Rietman, CTBT Coordinator for 20/20 Vision, (202) 833-2020 <ctbt@2020.org> for a list of Senate schedulers and tips to help you track your Senators' schedule.

3. JULY 16

Thursday, July 16 marks the 53rd anniversary of the first nuclear test, "Trinity," an 18.6 kiloton atmospheric test at Alamogordo, New Mexico.

NATIONAL SENATOR CALL-IN:

CALL YOUR SENATORS ON THURSDAY, JULY 16th

You are urged to spread the word and flood your Senators' offices with calls. Peace Action has produced camera-ready flyers and cards targeted for your State and Senators. Contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse for copies. (202) 898 0150 ext. 232, <disarmament@igc.org>

MEDIA FOCUS

TAKE YOUR MESSAGES TO THE AIRWAVES:

20/20 Vision's Roots on the Radio Call-In is focused on these key states: Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Nebraska, Tennessee, & Wyoming.

This is your chance to reach thousands of people with the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW message. For details on the key radio shows, and tips for successful call-ins, contact Nicole at 20/20 Vision (202)833-2020

LETTERS-TO-THE-EDITOR

We are seeing more and more letters to the editor - and we urge you to keep them coming. Some samples have been posted here, and some are on the CTBT Action Web Site: <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Use the July 16 date as a news hook. Sample letters with the July 16 focus are coming soon.

EDITORIAL WRITERS MEETINGS

Editorials are extremely persuasive with Senators. Contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse for tips on successful meetings with editorial writers. We can also provide you with up-to-date background information.

PLEASE CONTACT US, Let the Disarmament Clearinghouse and CTBT Organizers nationwide know about your activities.

You can send messages to CTBT Organizers nationwide, address this to:
ctbt-organize@igc.org

For FURTHER INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE, CONTACT:

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

CTBT ACTION WEB SITE: <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

To: paprog@igc.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, dculp@nrdc.org, jdi@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org, btiller@psr.org, joe@fcnl.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Responses to hearings proposal
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

So far, I have received two positive, two negative comments on my proposal for citizen hearings on the CTBT. This is my response, starting with questions from Bob Tiller, who thinks "this is a fine idea" and wants to move it forward.

1. Budget? I can't offer a precise figure or source of funds, but I can outline some of the costs.

(a) Facility. If a church (which I favor for the symbolism of being shut out from the seat of power and having to have hearings in a church basement; also denoting religious support for the CTBT), we would need to pay a rental fee. We may need to hire security so that people aren't wandering around the church or to handle this ourselves with volunteer monitors. If a hotel, there would also be a rental fee, considerably higher than in a church.

(b) Sound system. Likely need to rent one for a church, or pay hotel for theirs.

(c) Transcription costs (if we produce a transcript, as Tom Collina suggests).

(d) Media consultant to help get TV, radio, and print coverage.

(e) Possible travel costs for one or more hearing panelists and a few key witnesses.

(f) I assume that a number of us would contribute our time to support the hearings.

(g) There may be other costs I haven't thought of.

2. Broader sponsorship? I suggested the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and the "religious coalition" as principal sponsors because we have a working relationship. I have no major problem with broader sponsorship if someone wants to suggest other sponsors. We CTBT advocates need to keep control, but we should also convey a sense of fairness by bringing in other views than our own at the hearings.

3. Will anyone besides hearing officers be asking questions? My view is that the hearing officers should be the only questioners, but I am open to an alternative. In some congressional hearings, committee counsel asks questions, sometimes grilling witnesses. I don't see this as that kind of hearing.

4. Which do you think is more important: to present our view heavily, or to have balance among the hearing officers and witnesses? I'm inclined to have hearing officers who are sympathetic to the CTBT (as are the four retired senators I suggested: Cranston, Exon, Hatfield, Danforth) but who are also known to be fair. As hearing officers, they wouldn't be articulating their own views. For pro-CTBT witnesses we should go beyond our own boards, drawing in retired generals, bishops, etc. We should have a fair portion of anti-CTBT witnesses but not necessarily half and half. It will be a delicate matter to achieve enough fairness to attract media but also to get a diverse set of witnesses favoring the CTBT. This needs very careful consideration.

5. Who will make the decisions about the witness list -- hearing officers or the sponsors? I suggest that the sponsors establish a steering committee with decision-making authority (though with appropriate consultation). The steering committee would select the hearing officers and would develop the witness list in consultation with the hearing officers.

6. Crowd control? In case of a church, the same security arrangement for building control would handle this: a contract security unit or our own monitors. A similar arrangement could be used for a hotel.

7. "We might get more media attention and desired response from Lott if the hearings were held before Labor Day, i.e., September 1-2-3-4." That's all right with me if the group feels that way. Congress would not be in session, so C-span and others covering Congress would be available. The down side is that some reporters and a hunk of the population will still be on vacation.

Tom Collina, who thinks "this is a great idea if done well", writes: "We need to make them as similar to real hearings as possible and use them as a media vehicle to pressure Lott." I agree. We would seek media coverage in Washington and also around the country through C-Span, CNN, etc. I've seen other "citizen hearings" that got into the C-Span network, include some re-runs in off-hours. Given that CNN has had a week on nuclear issues this month, we ought to be able to tap into an interested party. This gets back to how to convey our message and a sense of fairness. For the latter we will want to give opposition witness opportunity to be heard. It will also help us identify their concerns and anti-treaty arguments so that we can deal with them before Congress. But overall we want the hearings to convey that there is widespread public support for the CTBT from diverse interests.

On the negative side, David Culp doubts that citizen hearings in Washington are likely to have much impact on Lott and moderate Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee. He wants to concentrate on generating grassroots support for the CTBT in their states. My response is that we've got a lot of grassroots activity going on. What we need is to make CTBT ratification a more visible public issue that Lott has to respond to. That's why I suggested the hearings, not to replace our grassroots work but to magnify our efforts in Washington.

Daryl Kimball thinks that citizens hearings wouldn't address "our main stumbling blocks and it would siphon off resources from other important tasks." He wants to concentrate on undecided Republican senators back home and also to bring in more allies (labor, medical, environmental groups). I can't speak to the resources question because I'm not in control of CTBT campaign funds. We'll keep up our grassroots work, which has recently intensified with new grant money. Of course, we need other allies, and I've been disappointed that we haven't brought in others, especially environmental groups. We need to revisit our roster of commitments of who was supposed to contact whom. But our main stumbling blocks remain Lott and Helms. Helms is too obdurate to have much impact on, but Lott, as majority leader, a national figure, and possibly a presidential candidate, is susceptible to public pressure. I believe that well-organized, citizen hearings could help create that pressure.

I hope this idea can be discussed thoroughly at the CTBT Working Group on Friday. I'm sorry to say that I won't be there because I'll be heading for a family reunion in Texas that day and will be away until July 8. If the group decides to go ahead with this or a variation, I'm certainly willing to help work on it. I'll also seek involvement of religious organizations. I have a good relationship with Capitol Hill United Methodist Church if the group wants to consider it as a hearing site.

Shalom,
Howard

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Citizen hearings on CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

Yesterday I sent to several leaders of the CTBT Working Group a proposal to hold citizen hearings on the CTBT. I received two positive, two negative responses. My original message and reply to these responses is reproduced below.

Among other things, I suggested sponsorship by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and our interfaith group working for CTBT ratification. Would you favor this? If so, we might have to formalize ourselves to the extent of giving our meetings a name. I've avoided this because I haven't wanted us to be too structured. But as a cosponsor we would need a name. Choices include Interfaith (or Religious) Coalition (or Working Group, Task Force), for the CTBT.

What do you think of the idea of citizen hearings? Should our interfaith group be a cosponsor? What name should we give ourselves?

This matter will be discussed by the CTBT Working Group when it meets on Friday, June 26 at UCS, 1616 P Street at 10:30 a.m. (you're invited if you want to attend). I'm leaving town earlier that morning until July 8. If you have a response that you want me to convey to Tom Collina, chair of the working group, please let me know by early afternoon, June 25, or contact him directly at tcollina@ucsusa.org or phone: 202 332-0900.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Dear Colleagues:

If by mid-July Senator Helms has not committed the Senate Foreign Relations to hold hearings on the CTBT in this session of Congress, I believe that we should organize and announce a set of citizen hearings on the treaty. In outline, here are a few suggestions about such citizen hearings.

1. Time: Starting Tuesday, September 8 and for several days thereafter. This is the day after Labor Day when Congress is just returning. There won't be much going on in Congress that day, so we might be able to attract C-Span, CNN, and other networks. If this succeeds in pressing the Senate to move, there still might be time to get the treaty approved before the end of the session.
2. Place: (a) a church basement (fellowship hall), such as Capitol Hill United Methodist Church at 5th and Seward Square, SE (just off Pennsylvania Avenue) or Church of the Reformation (Lutheran), 222 East Capitol Street, NE; or (b) a hotel. There are pros and cons for each.
3. Hearing officers: Among the possibilities would be four retired senators: Cranston, Exon, Hatfield, and Danforth, two from each party, respected, supportive of the CTBT but capable of holding fair hearings with opposition present. We could also have a retired military officer, a scientist, a religious leader, and other prominent persons.
4. Sponsorship: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and our interfaith group, which would need a name, such as Interfaith (or Religious), Coalition (or Working Group, Task Force) for the CTBT. This would bring together most of the leading advocates of the CTBT.

5. Witnesses: Invite the Clinton Administration (they might decline). Panels of (a) retired military officers, including former chairs of Joint Chiefs of Staff, (b) religious leaders (Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, peace church), (c) professionals (scientist, physician, engineer, etc.), (d) citizen organizations (such as Peace Action, League of Women Voters), (e) treaty opponents (ex-officials of Reagan Administration, etc.) (f) rebuttal witnesses, such as on verification issues.

6. Toward the end of July invite Senator Lott to testify so that he can detail his reasons why the CTBT should be put on the shelf because of the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests.

7. In the invitation letter to Lott, with copies all senators and released to the press, make the point that we are holding the citizen hearings because members of the Senate have allowed one-man rule (Senator Helms) to prevail in the Senate and have thereby defaulted on their obligation to hold hearings on and give floor consideration to a treaty supported by 73 percent of the American public.

8. In sum, our intent to have citizen hearings may push the Senate to act. If so, we would cancel them. Otherwise, we will have an excellent opportunity to gain public attention on the CTBT and the Senate's neglect.

Please let me know what you think of this approach. If you believe that something along these lines might be useful, I'll share this communication with other religious groups and find out if they would like to be involved collectively.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Dear Colleagues:

So far, I have received two positive, two negative comments on my proposal for citizen hearings on the CTBT. This is my response, starting with questions from Bob Tiller, who thinks "this is a fine idea" and wants to move it forward.

1. Budget? I can't offer a precise figure or source of funds, but I can outline some of the costs.

(a) Facility. If a church (which I favor for the symbolism of being shut out from the seat of power and having to have hearings in a church basement; also denoting religious support for the CTBT), we would need to pay a rental fee. We may need to hire security so that people aren't wandering around the church or to handle this ourselves with volunteer monitors. If a hotel, there would also be a rental fee, considerably higher than in a church.

(b) Sound system. Likely need to rent one for a church, or pay hotel for theirs.

(c) Transcription costs (if we produce a transcript, as Tom Collina suggests).

(d) Media consultant to help get TV, radio, and print coverage.

(e) Possible travel costs for one or more hearing panelists and a few key witnesses.

(f) I assume that a number of us would contribute our time to support the hearings.

(g) There may be other costs I haven't thought of.

2. Broader sponsorship? I suggested the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and the "religious coalition" as principal sponsors because we have a working relationship. I have no major problem with broader sponsorship if someone wants to suggest other sponsors. We CTBT advocates need to keep control, but we should also convey a sense of fairness by bringing in other views than our own at the hearings.

3. Will anyone besides hearing officers be asking questions? My view is that the hearing officers should be the only questioners, but I am open to an alternative. In some congressional hearings, committee counsel asks questions, sometimes grilling witnesses. I don't see this as that kind of hearing.

4. Which do you think is more important: to present our view heavily, or to have balance among the hearing officers and witnesses? I'm inclined to have hearing officers who are sympathetic to the CTBT (as are the four retired senators I suggested: Cranston, Exon, Hatfield, Danforth) but who are also known to be fair. As hearing officers, they wouldn't be

articulating their own views. For pro-CTBT witnesses we should go beyond our own boards, drawing in retired generals, bishops, etc. We should have a fair portion of anti-CTBT witnesses but not necessarily half and half. It will be a delicate matter to achieve enough fairness to attract media but also to get a diverse set of witnesses favoring the CTBT. This needs very careful consideration.

5. Who will make the decisions about the witness list -- hearing officers or the sponsors? I suggest that the sponsors establish a steering committee with decision-making authority (though with appropriate consultation). The steering committee would select the hearing officers and would develop the witness list in consultation with the hearing officers.

6. Crowd control? In case of a church, the same security arrangement for building control would handle this: a contract security unit or our own monitors. A similar arrangement could be used for a hotel.

7. "We might get more media attention and desired response from Lott if the hearings were held before Labor Day, i.e., September 1-2-3-4." That's all right with me if the group feels that way. Congress would not be in session, so C-span and others covering Congress would be available. The down side is that some reporters and a hunk of the population will still be on vacation.

Tom Collina, who thinks "this is a great idea if done well", writes: "We need to make them as similar to real hearings as possible and use them as a media vehicle to pressure Lott." I agree. We would seek media coverage in Washington and also around the country through C-Span, CNN, etc. I've seen other "citizen hearings" that got into the C-Span network, include some re-runs in off-hours. Given that CNN has had a week on nuclear issues this month, we ought to be able to tap into an interested party. This gets back to how to convey our message and a sense of fairness. For the latter we will want to give opposition witness opportunity to be heard. It will also help us identify their concerns and anti-treaty arguments so that we can deal with them before Congress. But overall we want the hearings to convey that there is widespread public support for the CTBT from diverse interests.

On the negative side, David Culp doubts that citizen hearings in Washington are likely to have much impact on Lott and moderate Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee. He wants to concentrate on generating grassroots support for the CTBT in their states. My response is that we've got a lot of grassroots activity going on. What we need is to make CTBT ratification a more visible public issue that Lott has to respond to. That's why I suggested the hearings, not to replace our grassroots work but to magnify our efforts in Washington.

Daryl Kimball thinks that citizens hearings wouldn't address "our main stumbling blocks and it would siphon off resources from other important tasks." He wants to concentrate on undecided Republican senators back home and also to bring in more allies (labor, medical, environmental groups). I can't speak to the resources question because I'm not in control of CTBT campaign funds. We'll keep up our grassroots work, which has recently intensified with new grant money. Of course, we need other allies, and I've been disappointed that we haven't brought in others, especially environmental groups. We need to revisit our roster of commitments of who was supposed to contact whom. But our main stumbling blocks remain Lott and Helms. Helms is too obdurate to have much impact on, but Lott, as majority leader, a national figure, and possibly a presidential candidate, is susceptible to public pressure. I believe that well-organized, citizen hearings could help create that pressure.

I hope this idea can be discussed thoroughly at the CTBT Working Group on Friday. I'm sorry to say that I won't be there because I'll be heading for a family reunion in Texas that day and will be away until July 8. If the group decides to go ahead with this or a variation, I'm certainly willing to help work on it. I'll also seek involvement of religious organizations. I have a good relationship with Capitol Hill United Methodist Church if the group wants to consider it as a hearing site.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <skerr@clw.org>

X-Sender: skerr@[204.245.159.2]

Date: Tue, 23 Jun 1998 10:04:01 -0400

To: ncecd@igc.apc.org (ECD - Miriam Pemberton),
chellman@cdi.org (CDI - Chris Hellman),
vision@igc.apc.org (20/20 - Laura Kriv),
mfonte@clw.org (CLW - Mike Fonte), jdi@clw.org (CLW-John Isaacs),
CEP@echonyc.com (CEP - Jordana Friedman),
CLEVAN@HR.HOUSE.GOV (Carl LeVan, Rep. Conyers),
wjnsns@aol.com (NSNS - Wayne Jaquith),
pda@comw.org (PDA - Charles Knight),
cnp@igc.apc.org (CNP - Jon Lottman),
paecon@igc.apc.org (PA - Gordon Clark),
funcongov@aol.com (Conrad Martin), wand@world.std.com (Susan Shaer),
kschultz@mail.cdi.org (Kathryn Schultz),
msommer@igc.apc.org (Mark Sommer),
ploughshares@igc.apc.org (Naila Bolus, Sallie Lilienthal, Deborah Bain),
cspinney@erols.com (Chuck Spinney),
ncc_washington.parti@ecunet.org (Lisa Wright, NCC),
mpage@MACArthu.macfdn.org (Mary Page),
pogodef@mnsinc.com (Marcus Corbin),
teese@life.bio.sunysb.edu (NCPD - Paul Teese),
cdavis@clw.org (CLW - Chris Davis), bmusil@psr.org (PSR - Bob Musil),
adaction@ix.netcom.com (Darryl Fagin),
dege@taxpayer.net (Ralph De Gennaro), spusa@spusa.org (Sandy Iono),
tperry@ucsusa.org (Todd Perry),
hn0079@handsnet.org (HNC-Jennifer Vasiloff),
tsipis@mit.edu (MIT-Kosta Tsipis),
network@igc.apc.org (Richelle Friedman),
myriamm@aol.com (Gary Ferdman - BLSP),
washofc@aol.com (John Harvey, Brethren), joe@fcn.org (Joe Volk),
mccwjdb@erols.com (Daryl Byler, MCC),
meldredge@igc.org (Maureen Eldredge, MPN),
mupj@igc.apc.org (Howard Hallman),
paorgdev@igc.apc.org (Van Gosse, PA),
paexec@igc.apc.org (Gordon Clark, PA),
nbolus@igc.apc.org (Naila Bolus, Ploughshares), Jill@taxpayer.net,
network@igc.org, paprog@igc.apc.org

From: Suzy Kerr <skerr@clw.org>

Subject: DOD Appropriations Bill

Here is a copy of the letter "dropped" on the hill today. At the suggestion of several, a paragraph was added about military spending being to high to begin with... I am sure there are no objections to that. I never heard from Frank's office and when I called Dan he had not seen Barney yet this morning so I still have no idea whether we have a Republican co-sponsor. I will let you know when I know.

Here is the letter:

DOD APPROPRIATIONS BILL ON FLOOR ON WEDNESDAY

Attention: Defense Aide

June 23, 1998

Dear Representative:

The Defense Appropriations Bill is scheduled to be on the House floor on Wednesday and Thursday this week. The following organizations are writing to urge you to support the Freeze Amendment which would fund DOD at last year's level.

The fiscal year 1999 DOD Appropriations bill is nearly \$4.7 billion more than the budget agreement allows by using phony numbers insisted upon by the House leadership. Appropriations Committee Democrat David R. Obey calls the bill a "budget buster."

Congress should demand that the Department of Defense abide by the same budget rules that the domestic agencies have to follow. Furthermore, if the Pentagon requests more money for particular programs or activities, that spending should be offset in the DOD budget.

The military budget was already much too high. The current level is approximately 82 percent of what was spent during the Cold War. Now it is appropriate to have a significantly lower budget with the threat so much smaller. Iran's military budget is less than \$5 billion. The new government in India recently raised its military budget 14% -- to all of \$9.9 billion. Moreover, the United States spends more than twice as much on the military as the next six or eight likely "enemies" (China, Russia, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, North Korea and Cuba combined).

Please support the Freeze Amendment.

Sincerely,

Council for a Livable World

20/20 Vision

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Union of Concerned Scientists

Physicians for Social Responsibility

Women's Action for New Directions

United Church of Christ
Office for Church in Society

Network, a National
Catholic Social Justice Lobby

Peace Action

Women's International League for
Peace and Freedom

Friends Committee on National Legislation

The Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Tue, 23 Jun 1998 11:47:27 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Your proposals

Howard,

Thank you for sending me your two proposals. Both of them are thoughtful and comprehensive. You have done a great job of laying out some directions for the next few years. I urge you to circulate them.

I will limit my comments and questions to parts of the first proposal. I hope these thoughts are helpful.

(a) I was surprised that you made no mention of the WISC community's Foreign Policy and Military Spending Task Force -- is it still working?

(b) Option 3 looks very good if you can pull it off. However, you have a lot of structure and governance issues to consider. It may get sticky if you try to draw all of these components into the mix:

- denominational Washington offices
- denominational headquarters
- denominational regional (diocesan or conference) offices
- denominational peace fellowships
- ecumenical and interfaith bodies (e.g. NCC, also state councils)
- religious bodies based on different structural models than Protestants (e.g. Buddhists)
- religious-based (but nondenominational) national peace groups (e.g. FOR, Sojourners)
- local and regional religious-based peace coalitions
- retreat centers (e.g. Kirkridge) and journals

(c) Have you looked at the structure, governance and funding of the religious environmental coalition? It might provide some ideas and directions for you. I think the name of it is the Religious Partnership for the Environment, but I may have it wrong.

(d) You do not discuss how much effort you want to put into outreach and advocacy to religious bodies that may have no position on these issues, or a position that is far from abolition (e.g. Mormons, Southern Baptists, Seventh Day Adventists). Is that part of the vision?

(e) Will this be a 501(c)3 organization?

(f) How will the organization/coalition reach policy positions on specific issues?

Shalom,
Bob Tiller

To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Your proposals
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 11:47 AM 6/23/98 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard,
>
>Thank you for sending me your two proposals. Both of them are
>thoughtful and comprehensive. You have done a great job of laying out
>some directions for the next few years. I urge you to circulate them.
>
>I will limit my comments and questions to parts of the first proposal.
>I hope these thoughts are helpful.
>

Bob,

Thanks for your comments. They are very helpful. You raise some issues I haven't thought of. The "Religious Partnership" concept may be the right approach. I didn't mention the Foreign Policy and Military Spending Task Force because I don't know much about it (not being a denominational office I'm not permitted in WISC). They organize lobby visits, but I think not much else. That's why it was necessary to create this other mechanism for CTBT grassroots activities.

I'll keep you informed if anything develops and continue to turn to you for advice.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <clarkg2@rpi.edu>
X-Sender: clarkg2@mail1.its.rpi.edu (Unverified)
Date: Tue, 23 Jun 1998 13:37:34 -0500
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: clarkg2@rpi.edu (Marvin Clark)
Subject: Re: Statement re India, Pakistan, and nuclear weapons states

>Dear Friends:

>
>Two weeks ago Sunday the Washington Post "Outlook" section had a long
>article on India, Pakistan, and nuclear non-proliferation. They ask readers
>to respond with 200 words or less for "Back Talk". My submission,
>reproduced below, appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, June 21. I was
>pleased that Post was willing to accept an abolitionist message.

>
>Shalom,
>Howard

>
>###

>
> Responding to Indian and Pakistani Nuclear Tests
> A Submission to Back Talk
> by Howard W. Hallman

>=====

Dear Howard W. Hallman,

In regard to the above we thought you might be interested in the following.

Best regards,

Sue & Marvin Clark

=====

GLOBAL DEMILITARIZATION June 23, 1998

For those favoring Nuclear Weapons Abolition,

If you are interested in spending a few minutes to urge political leaders of the nuclear weapons nations, by Email, to disable all the nuclear weapons in the world by the year 2000, please continue below the *****'s.

If you want to DELETE your address from this mailing list, please send the following Email:

To: glodem@wizvax.net [Please execute your "REPLY" command so we will get your exact address which is on our mailing list]

Subject: delete

Message: [Please list all your other Email addresses and we will put them on our "permanent delete list" also.]

To change your address: Send message to 'delete' old address and 'add' new one.

Monthly reminder: please copy, paste and mail the following or similar Email, post or FAX messages to the President of the USA each month, with a copy to Benyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel, who is the only other Head of State &/or Prime Minister of a nuclear weapons nation with an Email address. Please advise us if there are others with Email.

If you are an officer of a peace, environmental or religious organization, in your next correspondence with your members, please urge them to also send these messages each month by Email, post card, letter, Fax or phone.

=====

To: president@whitehouse.gov
Subject: "pit-stuffing" technology available to disable thousands of nuclear weapons in just a few weeks.
Cc: Benyamin Netanyahu <likud1@likud.org.il>

Dear Mr. President,

The following quotes are taken from an article by Mathew Bunn, Assistant Director of the Science, Technology and Public Policy Program in the Belfar Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government, published in the Journal of Federation of American Scientists, Vol.51, No. 2, March/April 1998. Also on Web site: www.fas.org/whatnew.html

"Technology exists which makes it possible to disable thousands of nuclear warheads, rapidly, permanently, and verifiably -- and to verify their dismantlement with a minimum of cost and intrusion".

This technology, called "pit-stuffing", was originally developed by the Los Alamos National Laboratory. A tangled wire is stuffed in a tiny tube in a critical part of the explosive to permanently disable the nuclear weapons

so it will not explode. Dismantling the warhead could be done on whatever schedule was convenient, in complete privacy. Pit-stuffing would not require moving the warhead in question but could be done at its location.

"The only way to get the weapon to work again is to dismantle it, remove the pit, cut the pit open and take the wire out, remanufacture the pit, and reassemble the weapon - a long and costly process. [...it appears highly implausible that (nuclear weapons nations) would go to the enormous trouble of manufacturing thousands of hollow plutonium spheres.]"

"In the past, the rate at which the costly and time-consuming process of dismantling nuclear weapons could be accomplished posed a physical limit on how rapidly nuclear arms could be reduced. Pit-stuffing overcomes that problem; in principle, it would be possible to disable thousands of nuclear weapons in just a few weeks. The physical act of stuffing the pit takes only one or two minutes for one person, using a small device developed for the

"safing" mission at Los Alamos - though disabling "live" warheads would take somewhat longer, because of the necessary safety procedures involved in doing anything at all to a nuclear weapon".

"This approach would also make it possible to verify warhead dismantlement with minimal cost and intrusiveness. Since this disablement can be accomplished very rapidly, each inspection visit could witness the disablement of hundreds of warheads, so only a few inspection trips would be required".

"Pit-stuffing has the potential to be a remarkable new tool in the arms control toolbox, enabling fast dramatic reductions in nuclear arms - and verification that those arms have really been dismantled. This approach could make a huge contribution to the goal of ensuring the "transparency" and "irreversibility" of nuclear arms reductions, repeatedly agreed to by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin. This technology can offer policy-makers new options - and deprive them of excuses for not pursuing deep, transparent, and irreversible reductions in nuclear arms".

Richard L. Garwin, the Senior Fellow for Science and Technology at the Council on Foreign Relations, who is a talented and experienced assessor of nuclear weapons technology states, "I do think that this ["pit-stuffing"] is a good idea and that it should be discussed with urgency on a technical basis so that it could be available as a valuable tool for quick reduction in the nuclear threat".

Mr. President, we urge you to meet soon with the Heads of State of the nuclear weapons nations and take a strong leadership role to get an agreement to disable all the nuclear weapons in the world before your term of office is competed.

Sincerely yours,
[Your name, post address & country]

=====
More about the Federation of American Scientists' actions on this "pit-stuffing" disabling process:

"The editor of the Journal the Federation of American Scientists intends to follow up this Public Interest Report by urging the Department of Energy and the Russian MINATOM to give priority to talks on pit-stuffing either between their nuclear weapon laboratories on the two sides or through non-proliferation offices.

But interested official entities may have either less motivation or less agility than one might wish. Accordingly, FAS is planning to give special attention to pit-stuffing in its up-coming U.S.-Russian workshops on warhead-dismantlement. Recently funded by the W. Alton Jones Foundation, these talks are being organized by FAS Fund Chairman Frank von Hippel as part of FAS's decade-long dialogue with Russian scientists on warhead

dismantlement.

The March/April FAS Public Interest Report was delayed to confirm declassification of the lead article by Matthew Bunn on the application of pit-stuffing to arms control. But this requirement only confirms the importance of this article. And the two FAS-commissioned articles, by Bunn and Garwin, have already fully stirred Government thinking on the desirability of U.S. -Russian discussions of pit-stuffing".

Please do send a copy of the above message to the President to let him know we all want him to take his presidential actions soon.

Please also post this message broadly because many peace activists are convinced that, from a technological standpoint, it will take years to disable all the nuclear weapons in the world.

Best wishes,

Sue & Marvin Clark
Co-directors
Global Demilitarization
42 Maple Ave.
Troy, NY, 12180 USA
phone: +1-518-274-0784
Email: glodem@wizvax.net

Administrative Board Members

Oscar Arias, Nobel Peace Laureate, honorary member
Mary Evelyn Jegen, SND, Pax Christi International
Dietrich Fischer, Author, Professor, Pace University
Bill Price, Director, World Peacemakers
Bill Hartung, Author
Organizations are for identification only

Return-Path: <djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca>
X-Sender: djroche@pop.srv.ualberta.ca
Date: Tue, 23 Jun 1998 22:26:50 -0600
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: Doug Roche <djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca>
Subject: Re: Contact with Holy See

Dear Howard,

Sorry to have been delayed getting back to you due to the pressure of work here. I had a good meeting with the Pax Christi Bishops in Pittsburgh last week. 80 have now signed the statement (which I hope you have). And it would be wonderful if the Conference of Bishops would adopt the language used. As for the statement you are working on, I would encourage you to send it to: Msgr. Diarmuid Martin, Secretary, Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, The Vatican, Rome, Italy (His fax is: 39-6-698-87205). You might also copy Archbishop Renato Martino, Holy See Mission, 25 E. 39th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016. His fax is: 212-370-9622. Good luck in your important work. Keep in touch with me. Best wishes.

At 05:03 AM 6/22/98 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Doug:

>

>I'm leaving for a 12 day vacation this Friday morning, June 26. I'd like to
>get off a communication to an appropriate contact in the Holy See before
>then if possible. Please advise me who to contact, address, and suggested
>emphasis of a message.

>

>Shalom,

>Howard

>

>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

>

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

>

>

>

Doug Roche

Return-Path: <mccwjdb@pop.erols.com>
Comments: Authenticated sender is <mccwjdb@pop.erols.com>
From: "Daryl Byler" <mccwjdb@pop.erols.com>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Date: Wed, 24 Jun 1998 09:44:29 +0000
Subject: address change
Return-receipt-to: "Daryl Byler" <mccwjdb@pop.erols.com>
Priority: normal

Howard:

Greetings. Thanks for your continuing excellent work on the CTBT.

Will you change my email address from: mccwash@igc.apc.org

to: mccwjdb@erols.com

Many thanks.

Daryl

Daryl Byler
MCC Washington Office
(202)544-6564
mccwjdb@erols.com

To: crramey@igc.org, dave@paxchristusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to Holy See
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Clayton and Dave:

At Doug Roche's suggestion, I wrote the attached letter (on MUPJ letterhead) to the Holy See in Rome with copy to their UN mission in New York. You already have the attachments to the letter, so I'm not including them.

I'll let you know if I hear anything.

I'm going to be away from Friday morning, June 26 until Tuesday evening, July 7.

Shalom,
Howard

###

June 24, 1998

Msgr. Diarmuid Martin, Secretary
Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace
The Vatican
Rome, Italy

Dear Msgr. Martin:

These days many of us in the world religious community, including the Holy See, have a strong desire to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons. This need is made even more urgent by the spread of the nuclear arms race to South Asia. Because in unity there is strength, I would like to share some ideas on how the religious community might work together in the quest for nuclear abolition. I write as chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, an association of laity and clergy based in the United States. I also serve as a co-convenor of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which is part of the global Abolition 2000 network.

My basic proposal is that representatives of world religious bodies, along with regional and national bodies, join together and demand that all states possessing nuclear weapons unconditionally renounce the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes and that these states move expeditiously to achieve total nuclear abolition. Their commitment could be put in the form of a "Nuclear Abolition Covenant" to be signed by the nuclear weapon states (see attached draft). As a first step in implementation, these states should immediately take all nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and should promptly commence dismantling their nuclear arsenals under international inspection. My ideas are elaborated in the enclosed statement.

Last October at the United Nations Archbishop Renato Martino, speaking for the Holy See, noted, "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." He called for negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention and stated, "Those nuclear weapons States resisting such negotiations must be challenged, for, in clinging to their outmode rationales for nuclear deterrence, they are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world."

The World Council of Churches favors nuclear abolition. In 1983 its Sixth Assembly 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." The Assembly declared, "Nuclear deterrence, as the strategic doctrine which has justified nuclear weapons in the name of security and war prevention, must now be categorically rejected as contrary to the faith in Jesus Christ who is our life and peace."

This mutual view of the Holy See and the World Council of Churches that nuclear weapons cannot be justified and must be condemned is shared by many other religious bodies and religious leaders of other faiths throughout the world. The challenge is to translate this religious concern into concrete action by nuclear weapon states to make and carry out an unequivocal commitment to nuclear abolition.

As a step in this direction, this spring Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, joined with Godfried Cardinal Danneels, speaking as president of Pax Christi International, in submitting the attached statement on nuclear abolition to delegates of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee. They declared, "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 wrong." They called on the nuclear weapon states to act now for nuclear abolition, and they urged other states, acting as stewards of God's Earth, to push for a nuclear weapons convention.

Unfortunately the nuclear weapon states have refused to act. They blocked meaningful discussion of nuclear disarmament by the NPT Preparatory Committee. They are preventing the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva from establishing an ad hoc committee to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. They rightly condemned India and Pakistan for conducting nuclear weapon tests, but they have refused to take serious their obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty "to pursue in good faith and bring to conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control." (This is the language of the unanimous ruling of the International Court of Justice.)

The time has come for the world religious community, as my Quaker friends say, to speak truth to power. This might be a statement addressed to the nuclear weapon states and their supportive allies from world leaders of the major religious faiths, Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, and Buddhist, calling for renunciation and abolition of nuclear weapons and for concrete action for dismantling the nuclear arsenal. Or it could start with a joint statement by the Holy See and the World Council of Churches, the two largest ecclesiastical bodies in Christendom, or by Pope John Paul II and Dr. Konrad Raiser making simultaneous, parallel statements.

The world statement could be endorsed by religious leaders in the nuclear weapon states and in allied states, calling on their governments to renounce and abolish nuclear weapons.

Possible such statements could be released on a symbolic day, such as August 6, the anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima, or the day in September when the United Nations General Assembly is convening, or on some other occasion.

In the nuclear weapon states and allied states religious organizations could follow through with an earnest campaign to get their governments to adopt an abolitionist policy and move expeditiously to elimination of all nuclear weapons.

There are other ways to achieve this kind of interfaith cooperation to push for nuclear abolition. I offer my proposal as a point of departure for further discussion. I would be interested in your views.

When I was in Geneva in May attending the NPT Preparatory Committee, I had an opportunity to confer with Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and with Dr. Dwain Epps, executive secretary of the WCC's Commission of the Churches on International Affairs. They both expressed their commitment to nuclear abolition. Since then Dr. Epps has written me that "We have built this into our program for the coming year, and hope that we can encourage the Central Committee to adopt an aggressive stance. Of course, the Assembly in Harare will offer opportunities here as well." The latter refers to the Eighth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, which

meets in Zimbabwe in December.

From the statement that Archbishop Martino made at the United Nations last October, it is clear to me that the Holy See shares this commitment.

Therefore, I hope that there will be vigorous follow through. If I can be of assistance in forming linkages with others in the world religious community, please let me know. If the Holy See goes ahead on its own or jointly with the World Council of Churches without an outsider like myself involved, well and good. I will continue our work for nuclear abolition in other ways.

What's important is for the religious community to lead the world into the 21st century free from the insidious doctrine of nuclear deterrence and free from the threat of nuclear holocaust.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

cc. Archbishop Renato Martino
Dr. Dwain Epps

To: djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to Holy See
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Doug:

I have sent the attached letter to Msgr. Diarmuid Martin at the Holy See in Rome with a copy to Archbishop Martino in New York. You have the attachments so they aren't included here. Thanks for the leads. I'll let you know if I hear anything.

Shalom,
Howard

###

June 24, 1998

Msgr. Diarmuid Martin, Secretary
Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace
The Vatican
Rome, Italy

Dear Msgr. Martin:

These days many of us in the world religious community, including the Holy See, have a strong desire to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons. This need is made even more urgent by the spread of the nuclear arms race to South Asia. Because in unity there is strength, I would like to share some ideas on how the religious community might work together in the quest for nuclear abolition. I write as chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, an association of laity and clergy based in the United States. I also serve as a co-convenor of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which is part of the global Abolition 2000 network.

My basic proposal is that representatives of world religious bodies, along with regional and national bodies, join together and demand that all states possessing nuclear weapons unconditionally renounce the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes and that these states move expeditiously to achieve total nuclear abolition. Their commitment could be put in the form of a "Nuclear Abolition Covenant" to be signed by the nuclear weapon states (see attached draft). As a first step in implementation, these states should immediately take all nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and should promptly commence dismantling their nuclear arsenals under international inspection. My ideas are elaborated in the enclosed statement.

Last October at the United Nations Archbishop Renato Martino, speaking for the Holy See, noted, "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." He called for negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention and stated, "Those nuclear weapons States resisting such negotiations must be challenged, for, in clinging to their outmode rationales for nuclear deterrence, they are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world."

The World Council of Churches favors nuclear abolition. In 1983 its Sixth Assembly 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." The Assembly declared, "Nuclear deterrence, as the strategic doctrine which has justified nuclear weapons in

the name of security and war prevention, must now be categorically rejected as contrary to the faith in Jesus Christ who is our life and peace."

This mutual view of the Holy See and the World Council of Churches that nuclear weapons cannot be justified and must be condemned is shared by many other religious bodies and religious leaders of other faiths throughout the world. The challenge is to translate this religious concern into concrete action by nuclear weapon states to make and carry out an unequivocal commitment to nuclear abolition.

As a step in this direction, this spring Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, joined with Godfried Cardinal Danneels, speaking as president of Pax Christi International, in submitting the attached statement on nuclear abolition to delegates of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee. They declared, "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 wrong." They called on the nuclear weapon states to act now for nuclear abolition, and they urged other states, acting as stewards of God's Earth, to push for a nuclear weapons convention.

Unfortunately the nuclear weapon states have refused to act. They blocked meaningful discussion of nuclear disarmament by the NPT Preparatory Committee. They are preventing the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva from establishing an ad hoc committee to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. They rightly condemned India and Pakistan for conducting nuclear weapon tests, but they have refused to take serious their obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty "to pursue in good faith and bring to conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control." (This is the language of the unanimous ruling of the International Court of Justice.)

The time has come for the world religious community, as my Quaker friends say, to speak truth to power. This might be a statement addressed to the nuclear weapon states and their supportive allies from world leaders of the major religious faiths, Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, and Buddhist, calling for renunciation and abolition of nuclear weapons and for concrete action for dismantling the nuclear arsenal. Or it could start with a joint statement by the Holy See and the World Council of Churches, the two largest ecclesiastical bodies in Christendom, or by Pope John Paul II and Dr. Konrad Raiser making simultaneous, parallel statements.

The world statement could be endorsed by religious leaders in the nuclear weapon states and in allied states, calling on their governments to renounce and abolish nuclear weapons.

Possible such statements could be released on a symbolic day, such as August 6, the anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima, or the day in September when the United Nations General Assembly is convening, or on some other occasion.

In the nuclear weapon states and allied states religious organizations could follow through with an earnest campaign to get their governments to adopt an abolitionist policy and move expeditiously to elimination of all nuclear weapons.

There are other ways to achieve this kind of interfaith cooperation to push for nuclear abolition. I offer my proposal as a point of departure for further discussion. I would be interested in your views.

When I was in Geneva in May attending the NPT Preparatory Committee, I had an opportunity to confer with Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and with Dr. Dwain Epps, executive secretary of the WCC's Commission of the Churches on International Affairs. They both expressed their commitment to nuclear abolition. Since then Dr. Epps has written me that "We have built this into our program for the coming year, and hope that we can encourage the Central Committee to adopt an aggressive stance. Of course, the Assembly in Harare will offer opportunities here as well." The latter refers to the Eighth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, which meets in Zimbabwe in December.

From the statement that Archbishop Martino made at the United Nations last October, it is clear to me that the Holy See

shares this commitment.

Therefore, I hope that there will be vigorous follow through. If I can be of assistance in forming linkages with others in the world religious community, please let me know. If the Holy See goes ahead on its own or jointly with the World Council of Churches without an outsider like myself involved, well and good. I will continue our work for nuclear abolition in other ways.

What's important is for the religious community to lead the world into the 21st century free from the insidious doctrine of nuclear deterrence and free from the threat of nuclear holocaust.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

cc. Archbishop Renato Martino
Dr. Dwain Epps

To: dwain
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to Holy See
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dwain:

I want to share with you a letter I wrote to the Holy See at the suggestion of Doug Roche, the Canadian who attended the NPT PrepCom as a Holy See observer. I took the liberty of quoting you about the WCC's commitment to working for nuclear abolition. I hope that's all right. I'm not including the attachments because you already have them.

I'll let you know if I hear anything. If my letter leads to the Holy See contacting you, I would be interested in keeping up with what happens.

Shalom,
Howard

###

June 24, 1998

Msgr. Diarmuid Martin, Secretary
Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace
The Vatican
Rome, Italy

Dear Msgr. Martin:

These days many of us in the world religious community, including the Holy See, have a strong desire to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons. This need is made even more urgent by the spread of the nuclear arms race to South Asia. Because in unity there is strength, I would like to share some ideas on how the religious community might work together in the quest for nuclear abolition. I write as chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, an association of laity and clergy based in the United States. I also serve as a co-convenor of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which is part of the global Abolition 2000 network.

My basic proposal is that representatives of world religious bodies, along with regional and national bodies, join together and demand that all states possessing nuclear weapons unconditionally renounce the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes and that these states move expeditiously to achieve total nuclear abolition. Their commitment could be put in the form of a "Nuclear Abolition Covenant" to be signed by the nuclear weapon states (see attached draft). As a first step in implementation, these states should immediately take all nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and should promptly commence dismantling their nuclear arsenals under international inspection. My ideas are elaborated in the enclosed statement.

Last October at the United Nations Archbishop Renato Martino, speaking for the Holy See, noted, "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." He called for negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention and stated, "Those nuclear weapons States resisting such negotiations must be challenged, for, in clinging to their outmode rationales for nuclear deterrence, they are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world."

The World Council of Churches favors nuclear abolition. In 1983 its Sixth Assembly 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." The Assembly declared, "Nuclear deterrence, as the strategic doctrine which has justified nuclear weapons in the name of security and war prevention, must now be categorically rejected as contrary to the faith in Jesus Christ who is our life and peace."

This mutual view of the Holy See and the World Council of Churches that nuclear weapons cannot be justified and must be condemned is shared by many other religious bodies and religious leaders of other faiths throughout the world. The challenge is to translate this religious concern into concrete action by nuclear weapon states to make and carry out an unequivocal commitment to nuclear abolition.

As a step in this direction, this spring Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, joined with Godfried Cardinal Danneels, speaking as president of Pax Christi International, in submitting the attached statement on nuclear abolition to delegates of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee. They declared, "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 wrong." They called on the nuclear weapon states to act now for nuclear abolition, and they urged other states, acting as stewards of God's Earth, to push for a nuclear weapons convention.

Unfortunately the nuclear weapon states have refused to act. They blocked meaningful discussion of nuclear disarmament by the NPT Preparatory Committee. They are preventing the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva from establishing an ad hoc committee to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. They rightly condemned India and Pakistan for conducting nuclear weapon tests, but they have refused to take serious their obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty "to pursue in good faith and bring to conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control." (This is the language of the unanimous ruling of the International Court of Justice.)

The time has come for the world religious community, as my Quaker friends say, to speak truth to power. This might be a statement addressed to the nuclear weapon states and their supportive allies from world leaders of the major religious faiths, Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, and Buddhist, calling for renunciation and abolition of nuclear weapons and for concrete action for dismantling the nuclear arsenal. Or it could start with a joint statement by the Holy See and the World Council of Churches, the two largest ecclesiastical bodies in Christendom, or by Pope John Paul II and Dr. Konrad Raiser making simultaneous, parallel statements.

The world statement could be endorsed by religious leaders in the nuclear weapon states and in allied states, calling on their governments to renounce and abolish nuclear weapons.

Possible such statements could be released on a symbolic day, such as August 6, the anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima, or the day in September when the United Nations General Assembly is convening, or on some other occasion.

In the nuclear weapon states and allied states religious organizations could follow through with an earnest campaign to get their governments to adopt an abolitionist policy and move expeditiously to elimination of all nuclear weapons.

There are other ways to achieve this kind of interfaith cooperation to push for nuclear abolition. I offer my proposal as a point of departure for further discussion. I would be interested in your views.

When I was in Geneva in May attending the NPT Preparatory Committee, I had an opportunity to confer with Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and with Dr. Dwain Epps, executive secretary of the WCC's Commission of the Churches on International Affairs. They both expressed their commitment to nuclear abolition. Since then Dr. Epps has written me that "We have built this into our program for the coming year, and hope that we can encourage the Central Committee to adopt an aggressive stance. Of course, the Assembly in Harare will offer opportunities here as well." The latter refers to the Eighth Assembly of the World Council of Churches, which

meets in Zimbabwe in December.

From the statement that Archbishop Martino made at the United Nations last October, it is clear to me that the Holy See shares this commitment.

Therefore, I hope that there will be vigorous follow through. If I can be of assistance in forming linkages with others in the world religious community, please let me know. If the Holy See goes ahead on its own or jointly with the World Council of Churches without an outsider like myself involved, well and good. I will continue our work for nuclear abolition in other ways.

What's important is for the religious community to lead the world into the 21st century free from the insidious doctrine of nuclear deterrence and free from the threat of nuclear holocaust.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

cc. Archbishop Renato Martino
Dr. Dwain Epps

To: STEVEW@quaker.org.uk
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Ecumenical lobby of UK government
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 04:11 PM 6/24/98 +0000, you wrote:

>Dear Howard Hallman,

>

>I was given your name by Frances Connelly of Abolition 2000 UK who thought

>you might be interested in this action. I attach the letter about the first

>planning meeting and would appreciate any comments/observations you may have.

>

>In peace

>

>Stephen Whiting

>

>

Dear Stephen Whiting:

Thanks for your communication. Unfortunately I don't seem to be able to find or uncover your enclosure. Would you please send it as regular text? Thanks.

Shalom,
Howard

>From meldredge Wed Jun 24 15:47:13 1998

Return-Path: <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Date: Wed, 24 Jun 1998 15:46:51 -0700 (PDT)

X-Sender: meldredge@pop.igc.org

To: tomatompn+@igc.org, healls@aol.com, healthm@aol.com, ERFInSC@ix.netcom.com, allister@snakeriveralliance.org, mstewart@snakeriveralliance.org, kathy@fcnl.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@fcnl.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, syoung@basicint.org, billeisen@rocketmail.com, armsintern@ucsusa.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, panukes@igc.org

From: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Subject: Letter to Clinton on Subcritical Testing

Enclosed is the letter to Pres. Clinton calling for a moratorium on subcritical testing. I need your organizations sign on by July 15, NO LATER! Please get me your sign-on earlier if possible. Thanks,
M

DECLARE A MORATORIUM ON SUBCRITICAL TESTING

July 16, 1998

Dear President Clinton:

As national, regional, and local organizations working for the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, we urge you to declare a moratorium on the US subcritical testing program and seek agreement from Russia and China to halt activities at their test sites as well. The recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan highlight the precariousness of the nonproliferation regime. At this vitally important juncture, the US needs to take leadership in opposing all forms of nuclear testing and in de-legitimizing the role of nuclear weapons worldwide. Declaring a moratorium on the US subcritical nuclear testing program would be an important step in this direction. By contrast, should the US conduct a subcritical test at this tense moment in history, it would only serve to fuel the flames of nuclear frenzy in other nations.

The ongoing US investment in nuclear weapons, and the subcritical testing program, is provocative to nations with nuclear aspirations. India has stated the need to conduct nuclear tests was in part based on the desire to advance their computer codes in order to benefit from a subcritical testing program of their own. During sensitive CTBT negotiations in 1996, the US subcritical testing program generated great opposition and raised questions about the US commitment to the test ban. Subcritical testing, which includes site preparations that look almost identical to those of a full-scale nuclear test, also makes verification of the test ban more difficult. The US sets a dangerous precedent by continuing the subcritical program. Additionally, the entire stockpile stewardship program calls into

question the US commitment to its obligations under Article 6 of the Non-proliferation Treaty to work for nuclear disarmament.

The US has already conducted one subcritical test this year (Stagecoach) and anticipates conducting one or two more in the September. These tests are not needed for assuring the safety and reliability of the US nuclear weapons arsenal. Conducting more subcritical tests, especially at this dangerous moment in international relations, seems particularly foolhardy. Taking a strong leadership approach and declaring a moratorium on the US subcritical testing program would send a much better and much safer message to India, Pakistan, and other nuclear aspirants: that the US is willing to step out on the path against nuclear testing and nuclear weapons. US leadership on this issue is essential for progress on reducing regional and global nuclear dangers.

The US cannot hope to convince other nations to eschew nuclear weapons if it continues its massive investments in nuclear weapons research. The subcritical testing program only exacerbates an already difficult, dangerous, and inflammatory situation. We urge you to once again make the US a leader on these issues and declare a moratorium on the subcritical testing program.

Sincerely,

Maureen Eldredge
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Joe Volk
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Alice Slater
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment

Gordon Clark
Peace Action

Robert Tiller
Physicians for Social Responsibility

Edith Villastrigo
Women Strike for Peace

Betty Burkes
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

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.

To: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Letter to Clinton on Subcritical Testing
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 03:46 PM 6/24/98 -0700, you wrote:

>Enclosed is the letter to Pres. Clinton calling for a moratorium on
>subcritical testing. I need your organizations sign on by July 15, NO
>LATER! Please get me your sign-on earlier if possible. Thanks,
>M
>

Dear Maureen:

I'll sign your letter regarding a moratorium on subcritical testing. Thanks for do this.

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

To: STEVEW@quaker.org.uk
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Ecumenical lobby of UK government
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 09:46 AM 6/25/98 +0000, you wrote:

>Dear Howard,

>

>Sorry about the file attachment. It was a letter of invitation to those who
>may form a planning and working group for the lobby - as follows:

>

Dear Stephen:

Thanks for sending the copy of your letter of invitation. I want to keep up with what's happening in various countries within the religious community on nuclear abolition matters. Following up work I did at the NPT Preparatory Committee meeting in Geneva in April and May, I am seeking ways to mobilize the global religious community to work together for nuclear abolition. Attached is some ideas I am circulating. I would be interested in your comments.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Mobilizing the Religious Community for Nuclear Abolition
Ideas Offered by
Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

With the spread of the nuclear arms race to South Asia and the refusal of the established nuclear weapon states to make significant progress toward nuclear disarmament, we in the religious community should unite and advocate a dramatic, far-reaching approach to rid the world of nuclear weapons. We should seek to remove the legitimacy of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and the use of nuclear weapons in war. We should demand that all possessors of nuclear weapons renounce these instruments of mass destruction and abolish them. We should likewise demand that allies to nuclear weapon states renounce nuclear weapons and cease their support for the nuclear weapons regime. As a faith community we should make a commitment to work together and join with others in a global campaign for nuclear abolition.

Signs of Failure

The Indian and Pakistani nuclear weapon tests are the latest and most publicly visible sign that the still-prevailing Cold War approach to nuclear non-proliferation, arms control, and disarmament is bankrupt. Other signs include the following:

- The continued official commitment to nuclear deterrence by the United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, China, and Israel and their stated willingness to use nuclear weapons for war-fighting.
- The modest goals of START II and a prospective START III that would leave 2,000 deployed strategic warheads in the United States and Russia into the second decade of the 21st century, plus thousands more held in reserve.
- The resistance of the Russian Duma and the U.S. Senate to quite limited arms control measures, such as START II and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).
- Continued development of new nuclear weapons by nuclear weapon states, though without test explosions, and continued modernization of nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles.
- Refusal of the nuclear weapon states to fulfill their obligation under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

(NPT) "to pursue in good faith and bring to conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all aspects under strict and effective international control."

- Refusal of the nuclear weapon states even to allow multilateral discussion on nuclear disarmament by the NPT Preparatory Committee and the Conference on Disarmament.
- The readiness of military units in six "surrogate nuclear weapon states" to participate in nuclear war, including The Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Greece, Turkey.
- Participation in nuclear war planning and acceptance of a nuclear umbrella by allies of nuclear weapon states, including other NATO members, Japan, and South Korea..
- Support for nuclear weapon states by various nations around the world that allow basing of nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles on their territory.

Because of these failures of the existing nuclear non-proliferation and arms control regime to achieve significant nuclear disarmament, the world religious community should join together to advocate and work for a substantially different approach.

A Better Way

The place to start in offering an alternative approach should be an unequivocal declaration on the moral depravity of nuclear weapons. This idea has been expressed many times by numerous religious leaders and religious organizations. For instance, recently Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International addressed the 1998 session of the NPT Preparatory Committee as follows:

"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."

There is broad acceptance of this point of view by persons of many different faiths.

Based upon this belief, we should move to the heart of the matter and demand that all possessors of nuclear weapons unconditionally renounce the use and threatened use of nuclear weapons and move expeditiously to achieve their total abolition.

This demand for no use in any circumstance differs from the proposal for no first use offered by the Canberra Commission and other bodies. Although a no first use policy may have some interim value, it retains the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, the threat of mutually assured destruction (MAD), and the possibility of retaliatory use through launch on warning. We in the faith community should insist on a policy of no use whatever.

Realistically we should recognize that renunciation and abolition of nuclear weapons must occur reciprocally among nuclear weapon adversaries. One set is the United States (and allies United Kingdom and France), Russia, and China. Another set is India and Pakistan. Renunciation by Israel might occur unilaterally because it has no nuclear-armed adversary, or it might happen in the context of creating a Middle East zone free of all weapons of mass destruction.

Along with renunciation we should ask the nuclear weapon states to commence dismantling nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. This process can begin through reciprocal executive initiatives without the necessity of a formal arms control agreement, as has occurred in several past instances. But complete dismantlement will need to occur under a multilateral agreement, such as a nuclear weapons convention that outlaws and abolishes all nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control.

As an immediate step, we should call for all nuclear weapon states to take all nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and other methods. This task should be completed within twelve months, a pace that is considered feasible.

We should also demand that all states possessing nuclear weapons and those with nuclear weapons ambitions should cease all research, development, testing, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons and refrain from modernizing their existing nuclear arsenal.

We should call upon allies of nuclear weapon states that have military units ready for nuclear combat, engage in nuclear war planning, and provide bases for nuclear weapons to renounce nuclear weapons and sever all such connections with the nuclear weapon states.

We should advocate a system for control of all fissile material produced by various means with strict international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards.

Political Action

Beyond making these demands on the nuclear weapon states and their supporters, we in the religious community should join together and become actively engaged in decision-making processes related to nuclear weapon policies. We should place our collective demands before executive leaders and legislative bodies. We should build grassroots support for the policies we recommend. We should conduct an educational campaign on the moral depravity of nuclear deterrence and war-fighting and on our ideas for renunciation and abolition of nuclear weapons. We should engage in public debate on key public policy issues.

We should also ally ourselves with others who advocate nuclear abolition. This includes retired generals, admirals, national security officials, and scientists, and also the global network of citizen organizations that are part of Abolition 2000.

Working for complete nuclear abolition doesn't preclude us from working for acceptance of intermediate steps, such as ratification of CTBT and a future START III. These treaties have value and help prepare the way for more far-reaching measures. But we need to augment our advocacy of nuclear abolition.

Nuclear Abolition Covenants

One approach would be to write our demands into a "nuclear abolition covenant", to be signed and implemented by the nuclear weapons states. There could be a second covenant for allies of the nuclear powers. Drafts for this pair of covenants are offered in the Appendix.

A public campaign focused on the nuclear abolition covenants might have the following elements.

1. Religious leaders and religious organizations from around the world could join together in issuance of "A Call for Renunciation and Abolition of Nuclear Weapons." This call should incorporate ideas and beliefs from different religious faiths on the necessity for nuclear abolition and should advocate concrete steps toward nuclear abolition, such as those suggested above.
2. This call could be released by signers in a series of news conferences that would follow the sun around the globe, such as in United States, Canada, Mexico, Japan, China (if possible), New Zealand, Australia, India, Pakistan, Israel, Egypt, Russia, France, United Kingdom, elsewhere in Europe, South Africa.
3. Religious leaders in the nuclear weapon states and allied states could call upon governmental leaders and urge them to sign the covenant.
4. Citizen organizations could join in the campaign to "sign the covenant".
5. Copies of the covenants could be placed in the United Nations building in New York when the General Assembly is in session with the request that representatives of the nuclear weapons states and allied states sign it.

There are other ways for the religious community to promote renunciation and abolition of nuclear weapons. Others are

invited to comment on this proposal and to offer ideas of their own.

APPENDIX

Nuclear Abolition Covenant for States Possessing Nuclear Weapons

1. We renounce the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes.
2. We will never use any nuclear weapon against any adversary under any circumstance.
3. We will embark upon a program to systematically dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles as soon as possible with adequate safeguards and verification.
4. In the interim period when we still possess nuclear weapons, we will take all nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and other methods. We will complete this task no later than December 1, 1999.
5. We will cease all research, development, testing, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons and will refrain from modernizing our existing nuclear arsenal.
6. We will enter into a multilateral process to develop, adopt, and carry out a nuclear weapons convention that outlaws and abolishes all nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control.
7. We will cooperate in development and implementation of a system for control of all fissile material with international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards.

Nuclear Weapons Covenant for Allies of Nuclear Weapon States

1. We renounce the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes.
2. We will immediately withdraw from all agreements that allow basing of nuclear weapons within our boundaries and that provide for nuclear defense of our territory.
3. We will ratify and support a future nuclear weapons convention that outlaws and abolishes all nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control.
4. We will cooperate in development and implementation of a system for control of all fissile material with international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards.

Please offer your comments to Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. Phone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: mupj@igc.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 25 Jun 1998 07:59:24 -0700 (PDT)
From: Nevada Desert Experience <nde@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Franciscans Statement-Time to Abolish Nukes
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Dear Abolition Caucus

June 25, 1998

This is my first message to the Ab Caucus and it is my privilege to let you know that the World-Wide Franciscan leadership is issuing today at 2 1/2 page statement entitled "A Call to the leaders of the world for the end of nuclear weapon development and the total elimination of all existing nuclear weapons" This statement's primary author is Louie Vitale, OFM, co-founder in 1982 of the Nevada Desert Experience, here in Las Vegas, NV, 65 miles from the Nevada Test Site. This is a united statement of

fr. Giacomo Bini, OFM--Rome, Minister General of OFM Franciscans
fr. Agostino Gardin, OFMConv--Rome M.G. of all Conventuals
fr. John Corriveau, OFMCap--Rome M.G. of all Capuchins
fr. Bonaventure Midili, TOR--Rome M.G. of Third Order Regular
sr. Carola Thomann, FCJM--Rome President of Third Order Sisters
Emmanuela De Nunzio, SFO--Rome President of all Secular Franciscans

This is a significant statement. The text is as follows:

"Inspired by St. Francis of Assisi (1181-1226 A. D.) who wrote to his early followers that they were not to bear arms for any reason, Franciscan men and women throughout the world have continued to advocate peace and to challenge those caught up in the threatening arms race. The recent nuclear weapons tests in India and Pakistan make us aware once more how perilous are the threats to peace. A territorial war between these two countries could lead to desperate use of atomic weapons across the border. We are aware that other nations are attempting to develop or purchase nuclear arms. The decrease in the control of the tens of thousands of existing nuclear weapons makes the possibility of nuclear outbreak even more frightening.

It is abundantly clear that no power, neither an individual nation nor the United Nations, can prevent the widening spiral of proliferation, despite the fact that 148 nations have signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. World health professionals insist that the medical requirements of a nuclear exchange are unimaginable and unavailable. The cost in human suffering would be enormous. Yet the fateful day of such an exchange looms closer and closer. Although there are many signatories to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, we know that not all countries have signed. Even among those who have signed, the necessary ratification by proper government bodies is by no means certain. We are also aware that the treaty is interpreted by some as allowing for various forms of sub-critical tests and tests by simulation through new highly complex computer processes. Even with the signed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) the development of new more lethal nuclear weapons continues by the major powers while proliferation among formerly non-nuclear states continues.

It is striking that India, for example, so long an advocate of the abolition of all nuclear weapons, should be the most recent source of nuclear expansionism. India still insists that it is ready to

sign the CTB and to join the signers of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty if they see the major powers clearly moving towards the elimination of all nuclear weapons as required by Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Unfortunately, it is obvious that the major powers, while willing to negotiate some reductions in arms, plan to maintain sizeable nuclear forces well into the next millennium which provides India, and other countries, with the excuse not to sign the CTB.

We genuinely believe that there is an overwhelming desire among the people of the earth to remove the spectre of nuclear devastation from the face of the planet. The world's number one agenda should be how to safely rid the world of the instruments of evil and destruction. We urge all nations, especially the major nuclear powers, to respond positively to the challenge for the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

In October 1997 Archbishop Renato Martino spoke on behalf of Pope John Paul II to the United Nations:

"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 multibased challenge must be met by the application of our humanity...Let not the immensity of their task dissuade us from efforts needed to free humanity from such a scourge."

This statement reflects an earlier call by the International Court of Justice July 1996. The court said:

"The threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of International law applicable to armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of humanitarian law...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."

There was a period of time when it was considered acceptable for a nation to keep some nuclear weapons for deterrence while proceeding to remove them from existence. However, the nuclear powers do not intend to completely rid themselves of their huge stockpiles of massive and indiscriminate means of destruction. In fact they are proceeding to test and develop even more sophisticated nuclear weapons.

Again we call for the total abolition of nuclear weapons. The number and disbursement of nuclear weapons throughout the world makes their sudden use dangerously imminent. We also draw attention to the drastic impact that the nuclear weapons industry has on the poor, especially children. It is not only the destruction caused in the event of their use, but we protest the vast amounts of resources invested in research, development and production of these weapons of mass destruction.

INSTRUMENTS OF PEACE

Inspired by St. Francis of Assisi, we work for peace, the rights of every human being, especially the most marginalised, as well as the respect for all of creation. In our International gatherings we have reiterated our abhorrence of war and have especially condemned the building, stockpiling research and the use of nuclear weapons.

As we enter the Third Millennium, we address this letter to you in the same spirit as St. Francis had when he addressed his "Letter to the Rulers of the People." He wrote out of concern, both for the Rulers and for the people. So too, we write to you with sincere concern for all the nations of the world. We Franciscans urge you to abolish all nuclear weapons and to commit our resources to the material and spiritual needs of the world community. Unless we do this, the horrendous dangers that threaten the human race are unthinkable.

Peace and Good!

signed by the above mentioned six Franciscan world wide leaders.

Please forgive me for any gramatical/spelling errors. I want to get this out to you. Thanks again to the Abolition Caucus and the work of Abolition 2000.

Sincerely,

David Buer, OFM
Interim Director
Nevada Desert Experience
(and proud to be a Franciscan!)

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Next CTBT meeting: July 8
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

The next meeting of the interfaith group working for CTBT ratification will take place from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Wednesday, July 8, 1998 at the Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC. Because I will be out of town from June 26 to July 7, this will be the only announcement. Please put the meeting on your calendar and join us then.

At our last meeting we decided to stage a breakfast meeting on the CTBT in the week after July 4, invite a senator to meet with us, and draw in wider participation from the religious community. I invited Senator Jeffords, and it took us nearly two weeks to obtain a negative reply. I started the process of inviting Senator Biden and then realized that we were running out of time to await his answer, get out invitations, and make the necessary follow-up calls. Therefore, I reviewed the situation with Kathy Guthrie and Bridget Moix at FCNL, who would have to pick up arrangements when I left town, and we decide we should cancel the event for practical, logistical reasons. However, we might want to consider something like it in September.

Meanwhile, we should all keep working to build support for the Specter-Biden resolution calling for hearings on the CTBT. It is likely to be proposed as an amendment to some bill in July. We may have a few days notice. If so, we'll let all of you know so that you can get out a quick alert for last minute grassroots pressure.

Shalom,
Howard

To: ctb@2020vision.ig.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Mississippi contacts
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Marie:

The contacts in Mississippi are:
Don Fortenberry, Executive Director
Mississippi Religious Leadership Conference
P.O.Box 68123
Jackson, MS 39286
(He signed the religious leaders statement.)

Rev. Richard Henricks
United Methodist Peace with Justice Coordinator
St. Andrew's Mission
821 A. 1a Branch Street
McComb, MS 39648
(He distributed 20/20 cards in April.)

When I get back in town, I'll try to find some black church leaders for your conference call.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 26 Jun 1998 03:45:28 -0700 (PDT)
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de
X-Sender: geowcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org

Dear Abolitionists

I'm posting and encouraging piece from the Guardian (London) for 26 June 1998

George Farebrother
.....

AUSTRIAN PACT AT ODDS OVER NUCLEAR NATO

Stephen Bates in Vienna sees a row erupt at the start of the EU presidency

Friday June 26, 1998

Nato's nuclear policy has driven a wedge into Austria's coalition government, with Chancellor Victor Klima distancing himself from his conservative foreign minister yesterday, insisting that Austria will never join Nato unless it abandons the nuclear strike option.

His comments, stressing Austria's policy of neutrality, came a week before the country asserts itself on the international stage for the first time in nearly a century, when it takes over the six-month rolling presidency of the European Union from Britain.

The chancellor, a Social Democrat, told a weekly magazine: "Unless Nato changes substantially, there will be no entry. It still has a nuclear doctrine, still has the option of a nuclear first-strike and in the event of war we would have to station nuclear weapons on our territory, as well as foreign troops.

"We can do more for Austria's and Europe's security if we continue our current path."

Wolfgang Schussel, the foreign minister and leader of the Austrian People's Party, the junior partner in the government elected last year, argues that Austria should join Nato, as it joined the EU, to influence an organisation whose policies affect what happens within the country.

Austria's membership of the EU remains controversial with its citizens, but its forthcoming presidency is being touted as a chance to play a leading role in an international body for the first time since the collapse of the Hapsburg Empire at the end of the first world war.

Austria, which joined the EU with Sweden and Finland in 1995, has so far made little impression. Some EU officials question whether

its government has the authority or experience of modern international affairs to make a success of the presidency.

(continues on general European Union matters)

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: Fri, 26 Jun 1998 12:44:15 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org, Jsmith@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: news: Conference on Disarmament

June 26

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: news report on end of session of Conference on Disarmament

The world's only standing forum on nuclear disarmament is still at a standstill.

The following article sums up the ongoing saga of the CD: The United States and the other "original" nuclear weapon states continue to repeat their same old refrain on nuclear matters, while India continues to beat a dead horse by calling for disarmament negotiations according to a time-bound framework. Result: very little.

When you speak with reporters and/or policy-makers on this matter, you may want to refer to the Coalition's April 1998 letter to NPT PrepComm delegations and members of the CD on breaking the roadblocks to disarmament (attached below).

Reuters 06/25 0924

UN arms body ends session overshadowed by nuke tests

By Stephanie Nebehay

GENEVA - The Conference on Disarmament (CD) on Thursday ended a seven-week session overshadowed by nuclear blasts in South Asia and deadlocked over how to tackle the nuclear issue and landmines.

U.S. Ambassador Robert Grey said India and Pakistan's nuclear tests should galvanise the conference's 61 member states to launch negotiations to halt production of bomb-making fissile material when the final 1998 session opens on July 27.

But he reiterated that the United States would not enter into talks aimed at total nuclear disarmament within a fixed timeframe -- the central demand of non-aligned countries including India and Pakistan.

The United Nations body has tried for two years to launch the talks but has been stymied by a row between non-aligned nations and the five official nuclear powers -- Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States -- over negotiating priorities.

"Along with a ban on the export and transfer of anti-personnel landmines, a fissile material cutoff treaty remains the top priority for the United States in the CD," Grey said in a speech.

He accused India and Pakistan of "moving in the wrong direction while the nuclear weapon states are moving in the right direction."

Grey cited decisions by Russia and the United States to halt production of plutonium and highly enriched uranium for weapons and said the two were "almost two years ahead of schedule in implementing" the START strategic nuclear arms reduction treaty.

He made no direct reference to START-2, which has stalled. The U.S. Senate has ratified the 1993 pact -- which would reduce U.S.- and Russian-deployed nuclear warheads from about 6,000 each to no more than 3,500 each -- but the Russian parliament has not.

Canadian Ambassador Mark Moher criticised what he called a "standstill" in the START process and suggested it should be widened to cover the stockpiles of Britain, France and China.

"The promising START process is at a standstill and START-2, six years later, is continuously being held hostage to other issues," Moher said in a speech.

"We should all urge the USA and the Russian Federation to reinvigorate the START process and call upon the other three nuclear weapon states to directly associate themselves with the next phase of that process."

Moher also said Canada would not take part in any negotiations aimed at reaching a global ban on transfers of anti-personnel landmines.

Major producers -- including China, the United States and Russia -- have not signed the Ottawa Convention banning landmines, leading to moves in the U.N. talks to negotiate a fresh ban on transfers.

"Should, at any time, a move within the CD develop to move toward a CD treaty instrument that confuses or undermines in any way the clear global prohibition on (landmines) entrenched in the Ottawa Convention, Canada will formally withdraw from any such negotiation process," Moher said.

"And we would, in those circumstances, not sign any final product. Our commitment to comprehensive action to deal with (landmines) is defined and implemented through the Ottawa Convention."

The Ottawa accord, clinched last December and signed by 126 states, bans the weapons blamed for killing or maiming more than 25,000 people a year, mainly civilians.

China has stated it still needs landmines to defend its long land border. The United States says it must maintain mines along the border between North and South Korea.

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS LETTER

April 13, 1998

Robert T. Grey
Permanent Representative to the Conference on Disarmament
Permanent Mission of the United States of America
Route de Pregny, 11
1292 Chambesy
SWITZERLAND

Dear Mr. Grey,

The upcoming Preparatory Committee meeting for the 2000 Review Conference of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) offers an important opportunity to help advance Article VI goals and reduce the threats posed by nuclear weapons. The success of the NPT's new review process is vital to maintain and enhance the Treaty's integrity. To attain that goal, we call on all states attending the 1998 Preparatory Committee meeting to take concrete steps to strengthen the Treaty regime as well as to avoid negative steps that would increase nuclear dangers.

At critical moments, when a cherished goal is in sight, the establishment of deadlines to achieve results can be extremely helpful. At other times, timetables can be counterproductive. At this time, we call for strenuous efforts to establish the political conditions necessary for a long-term process of phased reduction and elimination of nuclear danger.

In the near-term, we call on you to help remove three roadblocks to reducing and eliminating nuclear dangers. The first roadblock relates to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We call on all states to facilitate entry-into-force of the CTBT by promptly signing and ratifying the Treaty. The CTBT is a central part of the 1995 NPT "Statement of Principles and Objectives" and is essential for the phased reduction and elimination of nuclear dangers.

The second roadblock relates to the stalled START process. We call upon NPT states parties to urge Russia to ratify the START II Treaty without further delay, and urge the United States to approve the protocols for START II and the ABM Treaty signed in 1997. Further, the United States and Russia should promptly initiate negotiations on START III, which should achieve deeper reductions in strategic nuclear forces than those provisionally accepted at Helsinki. We call upon states parties to urge the United States and Russia to change their current, dangerous postures of maintaining thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert.

The third roadblock that must be broken relates to the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. We call on all states to support discussions at the CD on the political conditions needed for the phased reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons. This Committee would not have a negotiating mandate. At the same time, we call on all states to support the initiation and prompt completion of negotiations on another feature of the 1995 NPT "Statement of Principles and Objectives" -- the fissile material production cut-off in accordance with the statement of Special Coordinator Shannon and

the mandate contained therein. In conjunction with the fissile material cut-off effort, we urge the nuclear weapon states to achieve greater transparency and security in existing nuclear stockpiles, convert fissile materials from weapons-usable forms, and declare more fissile material as excess and place this material under IAEA safeguards.

Finally, we call on all states to support the negotiation of legally binding security assurances to non-nuclear members of the NPT.

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers was founded in 1995 to coordinate the largest and most active arms control and disarmament groups in the United States in a common effort to strengthen national and international security by promoting a step-by-step program toward the elimination of the nuclear threat by reducing nuclear arsenals and by preventing new nuclear threats from emerging.

Sincerely,

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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: <aslater@igc.apc.org>

Date: Fri, 26 Jun 1998 14:58:28 -0700 (PDT)

X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

To: A.Malten@net.HCC.nl, allison1@leland.Stanford.EDU, assar@york.cuny.edu,

amsmith@gol.com, alichterman@igc.apc.org, anitas@ieer.org,
abeier@igc.apc.org, appel100@worldnet.fr, arjun@ieer.org,
s-sia3@jura.uni-tuebingen.de, armsintern@ucsusa.org,
apiersma@citizen.org, BFinamore@nrdc.org, srabb@igc.apc.org,
plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca, bweida@igc.apc.org, bnl-nukes@ibix.com,
bobschaeffer@igc.org, btiller@psr.org, FBOYLE@LAW.UIUC.EDU,
bmorse@igc.org, erfinsc@ix.netcom.com, ippnwbos@igc.apc.org,
panukes@igc.apc.org, bplumley@igc.org, Carola_B@compuserve.com,
carrie@noradiation.org, ccrist@igc.apc.org, cesd@agoranet.be,
chs2-2@idt.net, peacecentre@glas.apc.org, cmalecka@igc.org,
cbrosconscious@igc.apc.org, cnic-jp@po.ijnet.or.jp,
una@mcr1.poptel.org.uk, cnd@gn.apc.org, srfnyusa@igc.apc.org,
happycows@geocities.com, DanO@twbg.com, daveandrewswxm@email.msn.com,
dave@paxchristiusa.org, neis@forward.net, fff@tln.net, DCulp@nrdc.org,
dhhorowitz@hotmail.com, dmorgan@web.net, DavidMcR@aol.com,
DBRUBAK@aol.com, can@shaysnet.com, deling@igc.apc.org,
sfcny@igc.apc.org, 102464.1110@compuserve.com, disarmament@igc.org,
dpflanz@cedar.alberni.net, sric@igc.apc.org, dm4stand@igc.apc.org,
dhunt@igc.org, djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca, jsimons@HASimons.com,
earthnet@terra.ecouncil.ac.cr, Eddarnold@aol.com, elie@highlands.com,
fawcett@physics.utoronto.ca, esalzman@aba.org, eugene@iris.mipt.ru,
nonukes@foesyd.org.au, forum@vredesaktie.ngonet.be, ialana@antenna.nl,
fharriga@cdi.org, fbarker@gn.apc.org, fredpax@online.no,
foesydney@peg.apc.org, gkarlsson@igc.apc.org, geowcpuk@gn.apc.org,
globenet@afn.org, capli@igc.apc.org, FGoulart@liebertpub.com,
neconaok@igc.apc.org, gdaniell@wt.com.au, lasg@igc.apc.org,
hcaldic@ibm.net, HELAINELER@aol.com, CXJ15621@niftyserve.or.jp,
hisham@ieer.org, worldpeace@gn.apc.org, mupj@igc.apc.org,
billing@igc.org, ike@swva.net, IPPNW@vlberlin.comlink.de,
ishgooda@tdi.net, nukeresister@igc.org, wslf@igc.apc.org,
JHamilton@nrdc.org, jbloomfield@gn.apc.org, jcoghlan@igc.apc.org,
jrussow@coastnet.com, jncarey@westnet.com, jklotz@walrus.com,
jloretz@tiac.net, johnpike@fas.org, afscamb@igc.org, JSELENDY@aol.com,
kwood@igc.org, kate@mail.chch.planet.org.nz, kathy-s@k2nesoft.com,
lforrow@igc.apc.org, larry@strategygroup.org, LMoss@Moss-Law.com,
LCNP@aol.com, fresh@igc.apc.org, ramana@juno.com,
Maria_Figueroa/Student/KSG@ksg.harvard.edu, mmp@humboldt1.com,
dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.DE, meldredge@igc.apc.org, pfarm@igc.apc.org,
MChrist809@aol.com, datan@igc.org, Michael@twbg.com,
nirsnet@igc.apc.org, Morten.Bremer.Maerli@nrpa.no,
mustard@cal.vsnl.net.in, nbianchini@psr.org,
marc_wiemers@vlberlin.comlink.de, qf2k-stu@asahi-net.or.jp,
wagingpeace@napf.org, winrun@naonet.fr, ieer@ieer.org,
pwalker@globalgreen.org, panukes@igc.apc.org, petweiss@igc.org,
peterz@erols.com, pol@motherearth.org,
pwalker@twentybird.spharbor.jhu.edu, acronym@gn.apc.org,
regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de, salvador@hawaii.edu,
robwcpuk@gn.apc.org, eenergy@spectra.net, Ronin@Hamptons.com,
rwilcock@execulink.com, brockway@macronet.org, ippnwbos@igc.apc.org,

swv1@ctaz.com, shundahi@intermind.net, a2000@mail.silcom.com,
susangordon@igc.org, spearce@igc.apc.org, damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de,
scheetz@mail.retina.ar, tinabell@walrus.com, paintl@igc.apc.org,
magoo@giasdl01.vsnl.net.in, wilpf@iprolink.ch, zia@Princeton.EDU,
IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org, cblaw@us.net, helppro@us.net,
shapnyc@classic.msn.com, sfraser@igc.apc.org, scott@noradiation.org,
mccoy@pc.jaring.my, cfpa@cyberenet.net, 73523.151@compuserve.com,
pmeidell@igc.apc.org, tinabell@walrus.com, warpeace@interport.net,
kcantw9473@aol.com, lcnp@aol.com, eenloe@afsc.org, falvo@nymc.edu,
garyblsp@aol.com, sfraser@igc.org, cmtinnitus@aol.com,
gkarlsson@igc.apc.org, nypaxchristi@igc.apc.org, jklotz@walrus.com,
troderick@igc.org, wrl@igc.apc.org, jem@igc.apc.org, icjpnyc@aol.com,
paintl@igc.apc.org, crramey@igc.apc.org, wedo@igc.apc.org,
psrnyc@igc.apc.org, paz4jus@aol.com, troderick@igc.org,
eleventhhr@msn.com, msingsen@aol.com, hap99@igc.apc.org,
disarmtimes@igc.apc.org, ptasso@pipeline.com, lcnp@aol.com,
srfnyusa@igc.apc.org, johanne@ctconverge.com, chel@glas.apc.org,
mmckinzie@nrdc.org, cunnane@ibm.net,
maria_figueroa@alumni.ksg.harvard.edu, mvtpaix@globenet.org,
kilali@igc.apc.org, kgrossman@Hamptons.com, 73530.2350@compuserve.com,
schellj@hotmail.com, JGG786@aol.com, JShea@suffolklaw.com,
JayMGould@aol.com, HAJIME-Y@msn.com, hititau@mail.pf, npc@gn.apc.org,
flick@igc.apc.org, esalzman@aba.org, paz4jus@aol.com, cjm009@yahoo.com,
Huaifan@hotmail.com, fcpj@afn.org, Fishunl@aol.com, amsmith@gol.com

From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>

Subject: Change of Address

Hello all, sorry for the list of addresses in the TO: column.

This is a short email to let you know that Alice Slater's new email is:

aslater@gracelinks.org

Please use this email address in the future.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Chris West
System Admin
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
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, 26 Jun 1998 18:18:24 -0700 (PDT)
From: Pamela Meidell <pmeidell@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Movement in India for Nuclear Disarmament (MIND)
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id SAA18632

/* Written 4:15 PM Jun 25, 1998 by aiindex@mnet.fr in igc:alt.india.prog */
/* ----- "Movement in India for Nuclear Disar" ----- */

Dear Friends,

Pasted below is a blurb describing a newly formed Movement in India for Nuclear Disarmament (MIND). Pass it on.

in Solidarity

Harsh Kapoor
SOUTH ASIANS AGAINST NUKES
<http://www.mnet.fr/aiindex/NoNukes.html>

Movement in India for Nuclear Disarmament (MIND)

Preamble

After the five nuclear weapon tests of May 11 and 13, the BJP-led government has declared India a nuclear weapons power. This decision in no way increases India's security and is not in the interest of its people. By qualitatively escalating the arms race in the subcontinent, it makes a war with our neighbours likelier and the possibility of mutual annihilation through a nuclear exchange very real. The tests and the consequent rhetoric by senior government leaders introduce a new spiral of suspicions and tensions with our neighbours which will increase, not decrease, nuclear insecurities all around.

These tests were a complete departure from a settled national consensus. There was a national consensus in favour of elimination of all nuclear weapons; there was a national consensus that in the absence of any tangible movement towards global disarmament, India must keep its nuclear option open. This consensus has now been breached in the pursuit of narrow political ends and in the name of a fake national consensus supporting nuclear weapons that is now belied in Parliament and on the streets. These decisions by the Government to move towards nuclear weapons are therefore reprehensible and deserve to be unequivocally condemned. The Indian Government's dangerous move towards nuclear weaponsation has now brought forth a similar Pakistani response which also needs to be condemned.

The tests and the dynamic that they have initiated will also adversely affect the prospect for global disarmament which had improved with increasing public opinion against nuclear weapons. India, which always called for nuclear disarmament and did not wish to be a party to a

discriminatory global nuclear regime, is now seen to be only demanding to join the Nuclear Weapons Club. According to the current strategic thinking of the BJP, nuclear apartheid is acceptable as long as we are among the discriminators: the Select Six as opposed to the Select Five! We strongly condemn the hypocritical behaviour associated with the attainment of nuclear weapon status by the Indian government. We believe that nuclear weapons are not safe in the hands of any nation. We also deplore sanctions imposed by nuclear weapons-states which show no commitment to genuine nuclear disarmament. But this does not exonerate the BJP in any way.

The BJP-led coalition has also reversed India's long-standing policy of denying legitimacy to nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons are uniquely evil and have no legitimate role to play as strategic armaments or as deterrents. They are weapons of mass destruction. The sheer scale of their impact, even if only a few such weapons are ever used, is simply unconscionable.

Hiroshima and Nagasaki are horrific examples of the destructive potential of nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons cannot distinguish between combatants and civilians. They impose suffering of the most horrible kind on their victims, including on the yet-unborn through trans-generational effects. Civil and medical defence against them is impossible. They are uniquely evil in their capacity to exterminate all life on this planet.

The International Court of Justice has unequivocally condemned nuclear weapons. Calling them 'the ultimate evil,' its President pronounced the decision of the Court on July 8, 1996, declaring the threat and use of nuclear weapons 'generally contrary to rules of international law applicable in armed conflict.' In its historic decision, the Court unanimously called on all states to 'bring to a conclusion' negotiations leading to 'disarmament in all its aspects.'

Our Principles and Objectives

1. We are deeply and firmly committed to universal nuclear disarmament.

We reject the argument that we must live forever with such weapons or that the nuclear genie cannot be put back into the bottle. We, as ethical and rational human beings can make this choice: the responsibility is ours. There is a special obligation on the nuclear weapons-states and nuclear-capable states to rapidly move towards universal nuclear disarmament.

2. Nuclear weapons, possessed no matter by which country or government, do not increase, but reduce, national security.

The Club of nuclear weapons-states has always been a collection of hypocrites who claim that their possession of these weapons is the best insurance for global peace, while their acquisition by others would be a threat! India has now put in its application for joining this Club, albeit as a junior member.

The Cold War era has conclusively shown that national nuclear posturing aggravates existing rivalries and hostilities and creates new ones. It is

dangerous to use external threats as diversionary tactics, as the present government seems to be doing through nuclear weaponisation.

A nuclear weapons regime is by its very nature secretive and elitist, and thus profoundly anti-democratic. It further promotes and deepens the ugly militarisation of everyday life and thinking that is already taking place in India. The ideology of nuclearism which is currently being touted as nuclear nationalism is inseparable from the promotion of an ideology of masculinist aggressiveness. Today, this can be identified as the hallmark of communal nationalism. This has nothing in common with India's pluralist tradition.

National nuclear arming creates a false sense of pride and imposes continuing and rising economic, social and political costs. The social and economic costs of nuclearisation, both through missed opportunities and direct weapons manufacture and deployment, can be crippling. Nuclear weapons are incompatible with rational development goals. They represent a wasteful diversion from the true and fundamental security needs of ordinary people. In India the high costs of development of a nuclear arsenal, of its maintenance, storage, constant upgradation and expansion, will impair our ability to redress our basic ills such as sharp inequalities, casteism, communalism and sexism.

3. India must declare that it will never use nuclear weapons under any circumstances.

The government's initial position that it will only use such weapons for defence, not for aggression, allows their first use. The vague claim for defence purposes can justify any act, and does not distinguish between nuclear and non-nuclear conflicts. The government's subsequent contradictory offer of conditional no-first-use is inadequate. The use of nuclear weapons is wholly immoral and unacceptable and indefensible under all circumstances. India must also seek no use pledge from all nuclear weapon states.

4. India and Pakistan must put an end to all nuclear testing.

There is no justification for any further testing by either India or Pakistan. The Pakistani retaliatory tests must not be used to rationalise more Indian tests, let alone open deployment of nuclear weapons.

5. No production and no deployment of nuclear weapons, either by India or Pakistan. Above all, no arming of planes, missiles and other delivery vehicles with nuclear weapons, and no deployment of such delivery vehicles.

Unlike in 1974, the 1998 tests are connected to a programme of weaponisation of bombs of different sizes and yields. They suggest that India is even thinking of producing battlefield nuclear weapons like nuclear-tipped artillery shells, etc. This raises the chances of their being used, leading to dangerous nuclearisation of conventional military exchanges, possibly triggering a full-scale nuclear exchange.

There must be complete transparency in the nuclear-related regime. In

order to decide about its own security, the public must always know fully what is done by the powerful who talk in the name of the people but are determined to keep information and power to themselves alone.

If India and Pakistan do not deploy nuclear weapons, we may still escape a nuclear arms race. Maintaining the firebreak between tests and open deployment or operationalisation of India's nuclear capability has become crucial. If this firebreak is established and holds we can still prevent a futile descent into headlong nuclear hostility, tension and rivalry and therefore into a spiral of ever-growing insecurity.

India can still salvage some credibility as a serious campaigner for global nuclear disarmament if it refrains from open deployment.

6. It is imperative that India returns sincerely, seriously and energetically to the nuclear disarmament agenda. Our real security lies in a world free of nuclear weapons.

Movement in India for Nuclear Disarmament (MIND)

Address for
Correspondence:

Prabir Purkayastha
B-1 2nd Floor, LSC, J Block
Saket, N.D. 17
Ph.: 6862716, 6524324
Fax: 6862716
email. ctdds@viasdl01.vsnl.net.in

Praful Bidwai
1, Jaipur Estate,
Nizamuddin East, ND- 13
Ph. 469 7278. Fax. 4642886.

Kamal Mitra Chenoy
39 Dakshinapuram,
JNU Campus, N.D. 67.
Ph. 6177492, 616 4330
email:chenoy@nda.vsnl.net.in

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>
Date: Sun, 28 Jun 1998 13:46:35 -0400
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)
Subject: Nuclear Calendar
Content-Description: MS-DOS text file
Content-Disposition: inline; filename="calendar.txt"
To: "undisclosed-recipients:;"

NUCLEAR CALENDAR
June 28, 1998

Revised the first Monday of each month (and more frequently when warranted) by David Culp, Plutonium Challenge, (202) 547-6000, ext. 105, dculp@igc.org.

Changes from last month are marked with an asterisk (*).

- June 25-July 3 President Clinton visits China
- June 26-July 13 House of Representatives July 4th recess
- June 27-July 5 Senate July 4th recess
- June 29 U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, State of New Mexico vs. Peđa, hearing on WIPP (N.M.) opening, 10 a.m., Courtroom 4, Federal District Court Building, 355 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
- *June 29-30 Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) meeting, Brussels, Belgium
- *June 30 DOE Environmental Management Office, final national 2006 cleanup plan released
- June 30 DOE Richland Operations Office, report to Congress on the privatization contract for the Tank Waste Remediation System, Hanford Site (Wash.)
- June 30 Energy Secretary Federico Peđa leaves office
- June 30-July 3 International Atomic Energy Agency, Conference on the Radiological Situation at the Atolls of Mururoa and Fangataufa, Vienna, Austria
<<http://www.iaea.or.at/worldatom/thisweek/preview/1998meet/cn74-2.html>>
- July 1 30th anniversary of the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty at Washington, Moscow and London
- *Week of July 6 Senate floor action on the defense appropriations bill, S. 2132
- *July 9-10 DOE-Russian Minatom meeting on Nuclear Cities Initiative, Washington
- *July 9-10 Consultative meeting on Creation of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan
- July 10 U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, State of New Mexico vs. Peđa, ruling on WIPP opening

July 10 Russian Duma adjourns for summer recess

*July 15 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, markup of foreign operations appropriations bill

*July 15 House Appropriations Committee, markup of Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill

July 16 53rd anniversary of the first nuclear test, "Trinity," at Alamogordo, N.M.

*July 21 House Appropriations Committee, markup of foreign operations appropriations bill

July 22 Japanese Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto visits Washington

*July 23 Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, hearing on the nomination of Bill Richardson to be Energy Secretary (tentative)

*July 23-27 Peace Action National Congress, Purchase College, West Chester, N.Y.

*July 24-25 Gore-Kiriyenko Commission meeting, Moscow

July 25 Senate Select Intelligence Committee, hearing on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (closed) (tentative)

July 27-Sept. 9 Conference on Disarmament, third session, Geneva

*July 29-31 South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) summit, Colombo, Sri Lanka (India's and Pakistan's prime ministers will attend.)

July 31 Senate adjourns for summer recess

July 31 DOE Richland Operations Office, privatization contract awarded for the Tank Waste Remediation System, Hanford Site (Wash.)

July House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, markup of Superfund reauthorization bill, H.R. 2727 (Boehlert bill) (tentative)

*July House-Senate conference committee on the budget resolution, H.Con.Res. 284 and S.Con.Res. 86

*July House-Senate conference committee on the defense authorization bill, H.R. 3616 and S. 2057

*July House-Senate conference committee on the energy and water appropriations bill, H.R. 4060 and S. 2138

*July House-Senate conference committee on the defense appropriations bill, H.R. 4103 and S. 2132

*July House and Senate override vote on the veto of the Iran Missile Proliferation Sanctions Act of 1998, H.R. 2709 (includes the Chemical Weapons Convention Implementation Act)

July DOE Environmental Management Office, receipt of the first shipment of foreign research reactor spent nuclear fuel at the Concord Naval Weapons Station (northeast of San Francisco), to be shipped to INEEL (Idaho)

- *July DOE report to Congress on interagency, nonproliferation review of tritium production in commercial reactors (Conference Report on the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, H.R. 1119, House Report 105-340, p. 911)
- *July DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Calif.), National Ignition Facility supplemental EIS notice of intent
- *July DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium draft EIS
- *July DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) draft remedial action EIS and land use plan
- July DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) spent nuclear fuel management draft EIS
- July DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, draft study on the nonproliferation impact of reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.)
- July DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, public hearings on the surplus plutonium disposition draft EIS (Includes the preferred site for the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility and the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility), Amarillo, Texas; Idaho Falls, Idaho; North Augusta, S.C.; Portland, Ore.; and Richland, Wash. (tentative)
- July DOE Defense Programs Office, public meetings on the commercial reactor for tritium draft EIS
- *July DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL (Idaho) advanced mixed waste treatment project draft EIS
- *July DOE Environmental Management Office, Rocky Flats (Colo.) plutonium residues final EIS
- July DOE Savannah River Operations Office, accelerator for the production of tritium at the Savannah River Site (S.C.) final EIS
- July DOE Environmental Management Office, records of decision from the waste management PEIS on the treatment sites and storage sites for hazardous waste
- *July United Kingdom Ministry of Defense, completion of Strategic Defense Review
- August 1 DOE and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, report to Congress on continuing or modifying the Price-Anderson Act (42 U.S.C. 2210(p)(1))
- August 5 35th anniversary of the signing of the Limited Test Ban Treaty by the United States, Soviet Union and United Kingdom at Moscow
- August 6 Hiroshima Day
- August 7 House of Representatives adjourns for summer recess
- August 9 Nagasaki Day

August 14 DOE Chicago Operations Office and Fissile Materials Disposition Office, proposals due for MOX disposition of plutonium
<<http://www.ch.doe.gov/business/mox/mox.htm>>

August 17-21 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, Sixth PrepCom meeting, Vienna, Austria

Aug. 29-Sept. 3 Non-Aligned Movement summit meeting, Durban, South Africa

August 30 35th anniversary of the "hot line" between Washington and Moscow going into operation

August 31 Senate returns from summer recess

August DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Bagpipe"

August DOE Fissile Materials Office, shipment of MOX nuclear fuel from the Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) to the Chalk River Nuclear Laboratory (northwest of Ottawa) for the "Parallax Project" test burn, using U.S. and Russian plutonium (estimate)

August Institute of Medicine, review and recommendations of the National Cancer Institute's studies on radioactive fallout from nuclear testing (tentative)

*August DOE Environmental Management Office, Rocky Flats (Colo.) plutonium residues EIS record of decision

August DOE Savannah River Site (S.C.), accelerator for the production of tritium EIS record of decision

*Late August Energy Secretary makes a decision on whether to develop a consolidated contract for the Nuclear Weapons Industrial Complex

September 1 DOE Nonproliferation and National Security Office, report to Congress on safeguards and security at U.S. nuclear weapons facilities (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3162)

September 4-12 100th Inter-Parliamentary Union conference, Moscow

September 5-7 Senate Labor Day recess

September 9 House of Representatives returns from summer recess

September 9 Conference on Disarmament, third session ends, Geneva

*September 14 International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Board of Governors meeting, Vienna, Austria

September 15 U.N. General Assembly, 53rd session convenes, New York

September 21 Congressional Rosh Hashanah recess

September 21 U.N. General Assembly, general debate begins and President Clinton addresses the General Assembly, New York

*September 21 International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) General Conference, Vienna, Austria

September 21 Russian Duma returns from summer recess

September 24 Second anniversary of the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty at New York

September 24 35th anniversary of the U.S. Senate approval of ratification of the Limited Test Ban Treaty

September 27 German Federal Assembly (Bundestag) elections

September 29-30 Congressional Yom Kippur recess

September 30 DOE Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Office, report to the President and Congress on a viability assessment of the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository (42 U.S.C. 10134 note) [Energy Secretary Federico Peña has announced the decision will be delayed until December.]

September President Clinton visits Russia (estimate)

September Chinese Chairman Jiang Zemin visits Moscow

*September Russian Duma, hearings on START II ratification

October 1 Federal budget year begins

October 1 Defense Department, Defense Threat Reduction Agency, consolidating several offices, begins operations

October 7 15th anniversary of the DOE Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management

October 9 Congressional adjournment target date

October 9 Nobel Peace Prize announced, Oslo, Norway (estimate)

October 15 DOE Environmental Management Office, report to Congress on land use plans for Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Rocky Flats (Colo.), and Savannah River Site (S.C.) (42 U.S.C. 7274k note, amended by Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3141; extended by DOE)

October 15 U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, trial begins on contempt charges in NRDC et al. v. Peña, concerning DOE's waste management PEIS, 10 a.m., Courtroom 6, Federal District Court Building, 355 Constitution Avenue, N.W.

Week of October 24 NGO Committee on Disarmament, Disarmament Week symposium, United Nations, New York

October 26 15th anniversary of the termination of the Clinch River Breeder Reactor (Tenn.) by Congress

October DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Sandia National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide draft EIS

Fall DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Cimmaron" (estimate)

*Fall Russian Duma, possible ratification of START II

November 3 U.S. congressional elections

November 9-13 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, Seventh PrepCom meeting, Vienna, Austria

November 30 DOE Chicago Operations Office and Fissile Materials Disposition Office, contract awarded for MOX disposition of plutonium

<<http://www.ch.doe.gov/business/mox/mox.htm>>

- November DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide final EIS
- *November DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Calif.), National Ignition Facility draft supplemental EIS
- November DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium final EIS
- *November DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL (Idaho) advanced mixed waste treatment project final EIS
- November President Clinton visits Bangladesh, India and Pakistan (tentative)
- December 7 Fifth anniversary of former Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary announcing her "Openness Initiative" and releasing previously classified records on human radiation experiments
- December 10 Nobel Peace Prize awarded, Oslo, Norway
- December 31 DOE Defense Programs Office, report to Congress on the technology to be used for tritium production (Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3135(a))
- *December DOE Defense Programs Office, request for proposals (RFP) issued for a consolidated contract for the Nuclear Weapons Industrial Complex (proposed)
- December DOE Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Office, report to the President and Congress on a viability assessment of the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository [See also September 30 above.]
- December DOE Chicago Operations Office and Fissile Materials Disposition Office, contract award for design of the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility at either Hanford Site (Wash.), Idaho National Environmental Engineering Laboratory, Pantex Plant (Texas), or Savannah River Site (S.C.) (estimate)
- December DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste program draft EIS
- December Energy Secretary decision of whether to use the Fast Flux Test Facility at the Hanford Site (Wash.) for tritium production
- December DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium EIS record of decision
- December DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide EIS record of decision
- December DOE Environmental Management Office, record of decision from the waste management PEIS on storage sites for the high-level nuclear waste now at Hanford Site (Wash.), INEEL (Idaho), Savannah River Site (S.C.) and West Valley

Demonstration Project (N.Y.); and on treatment sites and disposal sites for low-level radioactive waste and low-level mixed radioactive waste at numerous sites

*December DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL (Idaho), advanced mixed waste treatment project EIS record of decision

December NATO foreign ministers meeting

December NATO defense ministers meeting, Brussels, Belgium

December Russian President Boris Yeltsin visits India

1999

January 3 6th anniversary of START II, signed in Moscow by Presidents Bush and Yeltsin

January 5 Congress convenes (estimate)

*January 11-12 Carnegie Endowment, International Nonproliferation Conference, Washington

January 26 3rd anniversary of START II ratification by the U.S. Senate

January DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition final EIS

January DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) spent nuclear fuel management final EIS

January DOE Arms Control and Nonproliferation Office, final study on the nonproliferation impact of reprocessing research reactor fuel at the Savannah River Site (S.C.)

Winter DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Accordion" (estimate)

February 1 President Clinton submits the annual federal budget to Congress

February DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL (Idaho) high-level waste and facilities disposition draft EIS

*February DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Calif.), National Ignition Facility final supplemental EIS

February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition EIS record of decision

February DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) spent nuclear fuel management EIS record of decision

March 3 DOE Environmental Management Office, third Baseline Environmental Management Report (BEMR) submittal to Congress (42 U.S.C. 7274k(d)(1)(B), amended by Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3160)

March 15 Commission on Maintaining U.S. Nuclear Weapons

Expertise, report to Congress (42 U.S.C. 2121 note, amended by Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, Pub.L. 105-85, sec. 3163(b))

- March 24 Deadline for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by 44 specific countries to allow the treaty to enter into force at the earliest possible date
- March 28 20th anniversary of the Three Mile Island nuclear accident, near Harrisburg, Pa.
- March DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Sandia National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide final EIS
- *March DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Calif.), National Ignition Facility supplemental EIS record of decision
- April 12-23 Third PrepCom for the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, United Nations, New York
- April 22 Earth Day
- April 24-25 NATO 50th anniversary summit, Washington
- April 26 Chernobyl Commemoration Day
- April DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Sandia National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide EIS record of decision
- April or May U.N. Disarmament Commission annual meeting, New York (Dates will be set in December 1998. Agenda items will be 1) nuclear-weapon-free zones and 2) conventional arms control.)
- Spring Tennessee Valley Authority, experimental tritium-producing rods at the Watts Bar Nuclear Plant (Tenn.) removed and shipped to a DOE laboratory for tests
- May 7-10 Healing Global Wounds, spring gathering, Nevada Test Site, Nev.
- May 11 First anniversary of the recent Indian nuclear tests
- May 11-16 Hague Appeal for Peace 1999 Conference, The Hague, Netherlands <<http://www.haguepeace.org>>
- May 18 25th anniversary of the first Indian nuclear test at Pokaran, India
- June 6 10th anniversary of the FBI raid on DOE's Rocky Flats Plant (Colo.) for environmental violations
- June 18-20 G-8 summit, Cologne, Germany
- June DOE West Valley Demonstration Project (south of Buffalo, N.Y.), closure or long-term management draft EIS
- June DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.), solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste program final EIS

Copyright (c) 1998 by Plutonium Challenge. Permission (and encouragement) is given to citizens groups to reproduce this calendar. Proper credit is appreciated.

Return-Path: <DCulp@nrdc.org>
Date: Sun, 28 Jun 1998 18:11:41 -0400
From: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)
Subject: New Coordinates E-K
To: DCulp@nrdc.org (David Culp)
Content-Description: cc:Mail note part

Effective July 1, my address, phone, fax and e-mail will be:

David Culp
Plutonium Challenge
245 Second St., N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002-5795

Tel. (202) 547-6000, ext. 105
Fax (202) 547-6019
E-mail: dculp@igc.org

(The telephone number will change again at the end of the summer to a direct line.)

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: ippnwbos@igc.org, basecln@skyinet.net,
ABOLITION-EUROPE@vlberlin.comlink.de
Date: Mon, 29 Jun 1998 09:36:34 -0700 (PDT)
From: Alice Slater <aslater@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: on the NAM working group
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: aslater@pop.igc.org

Dear Friends,

Do any of you want to work with Myrla Bandonado from the Phillipines on the Abolition 2000 NAM Working Group? Also, can Brian Rawson or someone at IPPNW make sure she hooks up properly to the abolition-caucus? Thanks.

Alice Slater

>Return-Path: <basecln@skyinet.net>
>Date: Mon, 29 Jun 1998 08:11:39 -0700
>From: "People's Task Force for Bases Clean Up" <basecln@skyinet.net>
>Reply-To: basecln@skyinet.net
>To: aslater@igc.apc.org
>CC: pmeidell@igc.apc.org
>Subject: on the NAM working group

>

>Hi Alice!

>

>I've been doing a lot of catching up here in the Phils. after being gone
>for quite awhile. I had to stay more than a week in US to get my
>computer fixed.

>

>Anyway, I've been back for more than a month now so I have
>re-integrated. Though I've been busy doing media and organizing work on
>the bases cleanup issues identifying more contaminated sites for Clark
>and Subic, I've been also monitoring the news on the India and Pakistan
>nuke testing. I have a problem getting on the majordomo listserve
>though.

>

>I wrote to ask about the NAM. I think that's where regional alliances
>can concentrate in terms of lobbying. So, I am following up in the hope
>that I can help facilitate a NAM working group. A week ago, there was a
>forum here in Manila. NGOs are preparing for the Asian Regional Forum
>meeting here and there will be parallel actions by NGOs. I brought up
>the idea of having them come up with a resolution on the India and
>Pakistan nuke tests as well as to start lobbying NAM members long before
>the NPT meeting or in relation to what is being discussed on the UN
>level now and our positions. I encouraged to do this because this is one
>area where we can really make a difference. Philippine and Asian NGOs
>are very interested with my proposition to work more on lobbying the
>NAM. Of course, I told them about the NAM positions and openness to NGO
>positions at the Geneva Conference.

>

>My question is, can you help me get hooked up to somebody who is working
>on this or one who is really knowledgeable about the NAM if it's not

>you? I'm trying to make a little contribution here. In September, the
>ARF meeting will be held in Manila and it would be a good time to bring
>this up with governments and NGOs.

>

>I wish to also mention that when a delegation of Asian women went to
>visit Aung Sang Suukyi of Burma they gave her an Abolition 2000 pin and
>a Filipina colleague asked her to make a position on the issue. It's
>just too sad that I wasn't able to send papers along. Maybe I can do a
>followup.

>

>All for now. I know how busy you must have been. I've not been hearing
>much because I am not hook to the Majordomo thing.

>

>Love,

>

>Myrla

>

>

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@gracelinks.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 29 Jun 1998 16:29:54 +0100 (BST)
From: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: EUROPE/How to subscribe to Abolition-Europe listserver
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
cc: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org

Dear Friends,
we have now established a European listserver for those working on
abolition. If you wish to subscribe please send a message to:
listserv@vlberlin.comlink.de with
"subscribe abolition-europe" in the subject line. Do not write anything in
the message text space. Once you have subscribed you will receive messages
about Europe and ones with global relevance. I am filtering the main
abolition listserver to make sure key messages get through to the European
list.
This listserver is being supported by IPPNW in Germany and Sweden.
Yours in peace,
Janet Bloomfield

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: kpaluzzi@jps.net, Roberta.Brooks@mail.house.gov
Date: Wed, 1 Jul 1998 11:22:03 -0700 (PDT)
From: Jacqueline Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Joint Appeal of the "Peace 5" to the P-5
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, tomatompn+@igc.org, abeier@igc.org,
jburroughs@igc.org, alichterman@igc.org, veiluvawslf@igc.org,
psutton@igc.org, olins@pacbell.net, dnesbitt@idiom.com, wslf@igc.org
X-Sender: wslf@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: July 1, 1998 (2 pages)

CONTACTS: *Jacqueline Cabasso, *John Burroughs (ICC Peace Caucus)

Tel. Rome (NGO Coalition for ICC): (+) 39 6 570 50 202

*Lysiane Alezard, Mouvement de la Paix, France, Tel: (+) 33 1 40 12 09 12

JOINT APPEAL OF THE "PEACE 5" TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE P-5

Rome, Italy/Paris, France -- Today, July 1, 1998, 30 years after the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was opened for signature, peace movements in all five of the "declared" nuclear weapon states issued an historic joint appeal to their governments, urgently calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. The appeal of the "Peace 5," non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the United States, Russia, France, the United Kingdom, and China, was issued in response to the recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan. It is addressed to the heads of states of the "P-5," the "official" nuclear weapons states that make up the permanent membership of the United Nations Security Council.

This is the first time that NGOs in all of the P-5 have joined together to issue such a joint declaration. As such, according to Lysiane Alezard of Le Mouvement de la Paix in France, the initiator of the appeal, it is an "historic text." Le Mouvement de la Paix will celebrate the event with a late afternoon rally in Paris, on the Opera Square, where they will launch an international petition calling for completion of a Nuclear Weapons Convention by the year 2000.

The "Peace 5," in their appeal, call on their own governments to take leadership in preventing a new nuclear arms race and increasing global security: "The recent Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests are evidence that progress towards nuclear disarmament has been insufficient and fragile. We believe that governments in the five nuclear powers have a specific responsibility to prevent a new race towards nuclear destruction and work for global security." The appeal calls for "initiatives in order to speed up disarmament and nonproliferation agreements" and recognizes the need to "rapidly examine conditions to complete a treaty or a convention to abolish and eliminate all nuclear weapons."

The NPT requires non-nuclear states parties to forswear nuclear weapons. In exchange, Article VI of the Treaty requires the P-5 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." India and Pakistan have not signed the NPT, claiming that it is "discriminatory."

In July 1996, the International Court of Justice rendered an authoritative interpretation of Article VI, declaring unanimously: "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects."

But according to Jacqueline Cabasso, Executive Director of the U.S. Western States Legal Foundation (WSLF), a signer of the "Peace 5" appeal: "No negotiations on nuclear disarmament are even underway. The nuclear weapon states are in violation of their NPT obligations. Contrary to public pronouncements, the U.S. and the other nuclear weapon states are modernizing and upgrading their nuclear forces and renewing their commitment to reliance on nuclear weapons for the foreseeable future. They flaunt nuclear weapons as the basis of their own national security while declaring that nuclear weapons will make other nations less secure. It's become all too clear that the world cannot sustain a two-tier system of nuclear 'haves' and 'have nots.'"

Ms. Cabasso and WSLF attorney John Burroughs, also representing the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, are in Rome, attending negotiations on the establishment of a permanent International Criminal Court (ICC). The NGO Peace Caucus at the negotiations is urging adoption of a provision in the statute that would identify use of nuclear weapons, as well as chemical and biological weapons, as a war crime.

JOINT APPEAL OF THE "PEACE 5" TO THE GOVERNMENTS OF THE P-5

To Heads of State from China, France, Russia, UK, and US:

We represent associations working for peace and disarmament in the five "official" nuclear weapon states. As such, we would like to turn to the governments of our countries.

The recent Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests are evidence that progress towards nuclear disarmament has been insufficient and fragile.

We believe that governments in the five nuclear powers have a specific responsibility to prevent a new race towards nuclear destruction and work for global security.

We believe it would be appropriate to take initiatives in order to speed up disarmament and nonproliferation agreements (START, NPT, CTBT). We particularly find it necessary to rapidly examine conditions to complete a treaty or a convention to abolish and eliminate all nuclear weapons.

The only solution against nuclear proliferation is their elimination. It is also the only solution to build a new global security for peoples, and to build a world of peace and justice. The peaceful coexistence of human kind is incompatible with nuclear weapons."

*China : Chinese Association for Peace and Disarmament

*France : Mouvement de la Paix

*Russia : International Association of Peace Foundations

*UK : Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

*US : Nuclear Age Peace Foundation; Western States Legal Foundation

* Jacqueline Cabasso *

***** WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION *****

* 1440 Broadway, Suite 500 *

* Oakland, California USA *

* Tel: +(510)839-5877 *

* Fax: +(510)839-5397 *

* E-mail: wslf@igc.apc.org *

***** Part of ABOLITION 2000 *****

* A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons *

Return-Path: <owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com
Date: Wed, 01 Jul 1998 17:16:07 -0700
To: sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Subject: (sunflower-napf) The Sunflower, No. 14, July 1998
Sender: owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com

=====
THE SUNFLOWER
=====

ISSUE NO. 14, July 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

Eight Nations Call for Nuclear Weapons Abolition
Britain Plans to Cut Trident Warheads by Up to Half
Helms Opposes ABM Treaty and Supports SDI
Former New York Times Editor Regrets Support of Nuclearism
Woolsey Resolution Asks for Nuclear Weapons Convention

*ABOLITION 2000 - GOOD NEWS FROM THE GRASSROOTS

Petition Signatures
Organizations Signing On
Outreach
Support for the Municipalities Resolution
Religious Groups

*NUCLEAR WASTE

Spanish Steel Mill Releases Cloud of Radioactive Cesium
U.S. Navy Discovers Radioactive Cooking Pots
Foreign Nuclear Waste to be Shipped Through S.F. Bay

*START II

Russian Duma Again Delays Ratifying START II

*LINKS TO INTERESTING STORIES

ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE

DATES TO REMEMBER

EVENTS

RESOURCES & DOCUMENTS

FEEDBACK
=====

QUOTE
=====

"It is simply not acceptable that some states keep subjecting the international community to the continuous dangers of a possible nuclear weapons launch by mistake." Swedish Foreign Minister Lena Hjelm-Wallen (Reuters 980608)
=====

NUCLEAR WEAPONS ABOLITION

BREAKTHROUGH:

Eight Nations Call For Nuclear Weapons Abolition

On June 9, eight nations, calling themselves The New Agenda Coalition, called for the elimination of nuclear weapons worldwide. In a joint declaration the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa and Sweden called on the nuclear-weapons states to move towards nuclear disarmament. The nuclear disarmament initiative has been given added impetus by India and Pakistan's recent weapons tests. The Foundation sent Action Alert messages to the subscribers of The Sunflower as well as subscribers to its action alert Act Now! asking them to encourage other governments to join.

--> The action alert can be found at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/aa_9806_mpi.html

Britain Plans to Cut Trident Warheads by up to Half

Britain has announced plans to unilaterally cut the number of nuclear warheads on its Trident submarines by up to half. Apparently at least one member of the original Nuclear Five is acting in the spirit of the commitment made in 1968 and again in 1995 by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty members to pursue the goal of nuclear disarmament. Britain and France have long insisted they would cut their arsenals after significant progress had been made by Washington and Moscow.

Britain has also offered to provide on-the-record information about warhead numbers and fissile materials. This could be a first step towards establishing an international nuclear arms register, which British Foreign Minister Robin Cook has supported in the past.

While Britain still maintains the validity of nuclear deterrence and always has at least one Trident on 24-hour patrol, it is to be hoped that Britain's Labour government will take a leading role in encouraging global reductions. (G 980618)

--> Email British Foreign Minister Cook and ask him to pursue an international nuclear arms and material register <mailto:robin.cook@geo2.poptel.org.uk>

Helms Opposes ABM Treaty and Supports SDI

In an op-ed piece for the Washington Post, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-NC) argued for abrogation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and for resurrection of Pres. Reagan's Star Wars program. In a letter to the editor Alice Slater, the executive director of GRACE wrote: "It is intellectually dishonest to assert that a Star Wars defense would protect America against the growing threat of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons attack. Even if the extraordinary technical difficulties in perfecting a missile defense system could be overcome, what protection would that offer from weapons delivered by airplanes, ships, trucks -- the so-called suitcase bomb -- or even small vials of toxic substances dispersed in public places from a shopping bag?"

Former New York Times Editor Regrets Support of Nuclearism

In an article entitled "Nuclear Reactions," Max Frankel, former executive editor of the New York Times wrote: "Even as we campaigned against every other kind of segregation and discrimination, we rarely questioned the perverse logic of nonproliferation: that exclusion was a benefit for the excluded.... As Americans, we should have insisted that 'I've got mine, Jack' is not a formula for communal safety. Precisely because we give the world so much reason to admire our politics, our economics and our culture, it also desires our weaponry.... If I and other observers had resisted the nuclear club's double standard and exposed its hollow assumptions about human nature, the world might by now have devised more effective international controls over atomic weapons.... Instead we have wasted the half century since Hiroshima and provoked a chain reaction that is truly prolific." (NYTM 980621)

--> For a response to Frankel by David Krieger, see: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/news/frankel98.html>

Woolsey Resolution Asks for Nuclear Weapons Convention

On June 18, Representative Lynn Woolsey (D-CA) introduced House Resolution 479, cosponsored by Representatives

Filner, Stark, Towns, McGovern, Furse, Slaughter, Kennedy (Mass.), Hinchey, Oliver, Faleomavaega, Norton, Lofgren, Sanders, Owens and Frank (Mass.), urging the President to initiate multilateral negotiations leading to the conclusion of a Nuclear Weapons Convention. Lynn Woolsey is seeking further cosponsors. Please encourage your representative to support this resolution. For a copy of the resolution please go to:
http://www.wagingpeace.org/res_a2000_woolsey.html; Or contact Mark Dooley, Office of Lynn Woolsey Phone 202 225 5161.

=====
ABOLITION 2000 - GOOD NEWS FROM THE GRASSROOTS
=====

Petition Signatures

Signatures are reaching us daily from all over the world. On one day recently we received 17 signatures from South Africa, news from New Zealand of 833 signatures to date and a bundle of 160 signatures from East Bay Peace Action with the promise of many more to come. We have a long way to go in the U.S. compared with the certified 13,016,586 signatures from Japan.

Organizations Signing On

The Jammu Kashmir Democratic Freedom Party (JKDFP) in India has decided to sign and support the Abolition 2000 International Petition. In addition to the numerous French labor unions that signed on last year, a new group, the Federation Syndicale Unitaire with over 200,000 members, signed on recently. We have a total of 1083 network organizations as of June 25.

--> For organizations categorized by nations, see: http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/organizs_index.html

Outreach

Good news arrived recently from Africa where an NGO Coalition of women's organizations has agreed to make Abolition 2000 part of their agenda. This follows a visit to Santa Barbara by a member, Ramatu Achmed, who is active in the Accra coalition. We have also recently approached the League of Women Voters in the US at their National Convention in San Diego and are asking that the Abolition 2000 Resolution be included in the agenda of the International Federation of University Women at their conference in Austria in August.

Support for the Municipalities Resolution

Three New Zealand Councils have just endorsed the Municipalities Resolution - Auckland Regional Council, Hawkes Bay Regional Council and Waikato District Council. The Wellington Shire Council in Sale, Victoria, Australia, also signed up last week, bringing our total to 198.

--> For the current status, see: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/municlist.html>

Religious Groups

We applaud the action of The World-Wide Franciscan Leadership who recently issued a statement entitled "A call to the leaders of the world for the end of nuclear weapon development and the total elimination of all existing nuclear weapons." Abolition 2000 recently sent a request to the Assembly of the Unitarian Universalists meeting in Boston, asking that they adopt the A2000 Resolution.

--> For the resolution, see: http://www.wagingpeace.org/res_a2_ofm.html

=====
N U C L E A R W A S T E
=====

Spanish Steel Mill Releases Cloud of Radioactive Cesium

In May, a capsule filled with cesium 137 was added to scrap metal which was melted down in a Spanish steel plant

(Acerinox) in Algeciras, Cadiz. Radioactive smoke escaped and was first detected between May 25 and June 2 by the nuclear authorities in France, Germany, Italy and Switzerland. The Spanish Nuclear Security Council (CSN) became active only after it had been alerted by authorities from other European states. The levels of radioactivity measured up to 2,400 microbequerel which is 1,000 times higher than usual ground reading. Apparently the cesium capsule that was burned was part of an instrument used in paper production or in the sterilization of blood donations. (EP/EM 980613)

U.S. Navy Discovers Radioactive Cooking Pots

In the United States, a batch of 38 slightly radioactive cooking pots delivered to the Navy has sparked an investigation by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The Navy determined the metal to be cobalt-60, a radioactive form of the metal and a component of industrial equipment used to check the strength of welds and pipes. It is also used in cancer therapy. According to EPA investigator Bill Steuteville, seventy percent of all the steel produced in America is recycled from scrap metal, meaning that multiple sources of metal may go into each batch of finished steel. (AP 980607)

Foreign Nuclear Waste to be Shipped Through S.F. Bay

In July the first of five shipments of highly radioactive nuclear waste from Asia will arrive in the San Francisco Bay. On its 918 mile journey to a federal storage site in Idaho, the waste will be transported through the steep canyons lining the Feather River, where in May 1998 two train cars were swept off the tracks by rock slides. The shipments are part of the Atoms for Peace program. Launched in the 1950s, the program supplied foreign nations with nuclear research reactors and fuel in exchange for a promise not to develop atomic weapons. Part of the deal, federal officials say, was that the United States would take back spent fuel. While the government is downplaying the public dangers of the shipments, anti-nuclear activists argue that the waste should be secured in Asia. The federal government hasn't "demonstrated that it's any more dangerous to leave it there than to bring it here," said Jacqueline Cabasso, executive director of the Western States Legal Foundation in Oakland, Calif. California Attorney General Dan Lungren refused to file a lawsuit on behalf of the Coastal Commission challenging the shipment. (LAT 980623/31)

=====

START II

=====

Russian Duma Again Delays Ratifying START II

On June 10, Russia's lower house of parliament, which last month delay debates on the START II nuclear arms reduction treaty until September, dealt a new blow to U.S. and Kremlin hopes that it will soon be ratified. A proposal by ultra-nationalist Vladimir Zhirinovsky to delay the June 16 hearing was approved by 235 to 39 deputies with no abstentions. Zhirinovsky has made clear he wants no hearing before the autumn session.

Arguments that help to explain the decision include:

- the high cost of carrying out the terms of the treaty;
- fears that Washington is developing defense systems that may violate the 1972 ABM treaty;
- the Duma is in no mood for compromise after a bruising battle with Yeltsin over his nomination of former regional banker Sergei Kiriyenko as prime minister. (WP 980611)

=====

LINKS TO INTERESTING STORIES

=====

Hackers get into Turkish nuclear facility <http://www.deccanherald.com/deccanherald/jun11/milwo.htm>
Our flawed nuclear policy By Prof. Michael T. Klare <http://www.bergen.com/morenews/nukes04199806058.htm>
Plutonium concerns bedevil cleanup plan for a Colorado landfill. By Jillian Lloyd, Christian Science Monitor Search for it at: <http://www.csmonitor.com/archive/archive.html>

=====

ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE

=====

1) ==> URGE YOUR REPRESENTATIVE TO SUPPORT NEGOTIATIONS FOR A NUCLEAR WEAPONS CONVENTION. Ask your representative to support Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey's resolution, HR 479, calling for a Nuclear Weapons Convention. Also, ask them to co-sponsor Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton's bill, HR-827, the "Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Act."

** The Woolsey Resolution can be found at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/res_a2000_woolsey.html

** For more on HR-827, please go to <http://www.prop1.org/anukelst.htm#827>

A complete list of all Congressional phone and fax numbers and e-mail addresses can be found at: <http://www.vote-smart.org>

2) ==> SEND A THANK YOU MESSAGE TO THE NEW AGENDA COALITION

==> ASK OTHER COUNTRIES TO JOIN THE NEW AGENDA COALITION

==> For addresses, see: http://www.wagingpeace.org/aa_9807_mpi.html or write to the Foundation for appropriate e-mail addresses

3) ==> WRITE A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF YOUR LOCAL NEWSPAPER

Express the urgency of nuclear weapons abolition now that the recent tests in South Asia have brought this issue back to the forefront of people's attention.

4) ==> 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

Body: subscribe act-now-napf your-email@here

5) ==> SIGN THE ABOLITION 2000 INTERNATIONAL PETITION

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

6) ==> FORWARD THIS NEWSLETTER TO A FRIEND

=====
D A T E S T O R E M E M B E R
=====

July 1 World Nuclear Free Zones Day.

July 1, 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) signed.

July 10, 1991 South Africa accedes to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

July 13, 1942 Manhattan Project to develop nuclear weapons begins.

July 16, 1945 World's first Atomic Bomb, "Trinity" is exploded in Alamogordo, New Mexico.

July 28, 1945 U.S. Senate approves the United Nations Charter by a vote of 98 to 2.

July 31, 1991 START Agreement for reductions in nuclear arsenals is signed.

=====
E V E N T S
=====

July 3-11

International Peace Action Camp, Brussels

Including action at NATO Headquarters on July 8th

For information, contact Mother Earth International office (Belgium), phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39; E-mail

<mailto:international@motherearth.org>

July 5-8

Annual Peace Retreat in Santa Barbara, CA. Sponsored by the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and La Casa de Maria.

This year's retreat, "Disarming Our Hearts, Disarming Our World," is led by Bishop Thomas Gumbleton. For further

information, contact the Foundation at <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>

July 12 - August 9

The Walk for Nuclear Disarmament

>From NATO/Brussels (NATO Headquarters) to Faslane, Scotland (Trident nuclear submarine base)

For information, contact: Mother Earth International office (Belgium), phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39; E-mail <mailto:international@motherearth.org>

July 21

One day symposium "The Case for Nuclear Weapons Abolition" in Washington D.C. sponsored by Center for Defense Information, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and Fourth Freedom Forum. For further information, contact the Foundation at <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>

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: <mailto:R.Braun@lilly.ping.de>

July 24-27

11th Annual Peace Action National Congress

Purchase College/SUNY, Westchester, New York

Registration: \$50 (student \$15); Housing & Meals: \$180; Single day plans

Available; Featuring: Jayantha Dhanapala, UN Under Sec. Gen. for Disarmament;

Congressman Ron Dellums; Peace Action Exec. Dir. Gordon Clark; workshops and strategy sessions.

For more info: contact Matt Walsh at 212-870-2304 or <mailto:mateo@rmci.net>

July 24-26

INES Council meeting, Boston, MA.

For information contact Reiner Braun at: <mailto:R.Braun@lilly.ping.de>

July 27-28

INES Seminar on Sustainability, Boston, MA.

For information contact Reiner Braun at: <mailto:R.Braun@lilly.ping.de>

August 6

Sadako Peace Day ceremony commemorating the 53rd anniversary of the first use of nuclear weapons at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The program includes music, poetry and reflection at Sadako Peace Garden at La Casa de Maria Retreat Center in Montecito, California from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. For further information, contact the Foundation at <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>

August 9-25

Trident Ploughshares 2000 Disarmament Camp, Faslane, Scotland

For information, contact: Mother Earth International office (Belgium), phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39; E-mail <mailto:international@motherearth.org>

August 15 to 21

Vermont Walk for Nuclear Abolition. From Montpelier, VT to Springfield, VT

For further information contact: <mailto:afscvt@together.net> or <mailto:efarns@together.net>

For a current list of more events, please visit our web at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/events_current.html

=====

RESOURCES & DOCUMENTS

=====

All issues of The Sunflower are on the web at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/the_sunflower.html

BOOKS, REPORTS, STUDIES

*** "Atomic Audit: The Costs and Consequences of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Since 1940. Ed. by Stephen Schwartz and nine co-authors, incl. Bruce Blair, Arjun Makhijani, Stan Norris, John Pike and Bill Weida.
Highlight: The total cumulative cost of U.S. nuclear weapons since 1940 is between \$5.5-6.0 trillion (in constant 1996 dollars).
Cost is \$59.95 cloth, \$24.95 paper.
Available from Brookings bookstore at 1-800-275-1447.
The web site for the book is <http://www.brook.edu/pub/books/atomic.htm>

*** Resisting the Bomb: A History of the World Nuclear Disarmament Movement, 1954-1970 [vol. 2 of The Struggle Against the Bomb]. By Lawrence S. Wittner (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997).
Helen Caldicott wrote a favorable review in the June 1998 issue of THE PROGRESSIVE <http://www.progressive.org/>
Cost is \$52.00 cloth, \$24.95 paper.
Available from Cambridge University Press: 1-800-872-7423.

*** The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) released its annual publication, the SIPRI Yearbook 1998: Armaments, Disarmament, and International Security. This book, among other topics, contains statistics on world military and arms spending.
Highlights:
- World military expenditures declined by about one-third from 1988 to 1997 and were approximately \$740 billion in 1997.
- Russia's military expenditures in 1997 were less than 10 percent of what the Soviet Union spent a decade earlier.
- While the U.S. share of deliveries of major conventional weapons has grown to 43%, Russia's share has fallen to 14%.
For more see: <http://www.sipri.org>

*** The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: A Report on Safety in America's Nuclear Power Industry. By David Lochbaum, 1998. 20 pp. Available through Union of Concerned Scientists for \$6.00
Go to: <http://www.ucsusa.org>

FREE OF CHARGE

*** "Open letter to President Clinton." By David Krieger.
Can also be found at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/let_mpi_napf.html

*** India's Press Release Regarding its Nuclear Testing
Can also be found at http://www.wagingpeace.org/pr98_in_in.html

*** Live interview with David Krieger on: "U.S. Trying to De-Escalate Nuclear Tensions." Don Rush investigates the options for U.S. policy in Asia: is there anything the US should - or can do - to de-escalate nuclear tensions between India and Pakistan.
RealAudio file at: <http://www.webactive.com/webactive/audio/pacifica/pac980603d.ram>

F E E D B A C K

I appreciate your Newsletters and your hard work and dedication as an organization trying to Produce World Peace. Your cause and your time are much desired to me and many more people. As a 15 year old child, growing up in today's modern world, I have a concern in the world I am to grow up in. I entered your [Swackhamer Peace Essay] contest and wish that you find an extraordinary essay that gives suggestions for constructive approaches to the problems of war and peace. I thank you for your hard work and wish you well in your quest for what you live for. I hope to do the same in life, and will also one day dedicate my life in the profession of ensuring world peace. Your organization has been a light unto my feet, and a very good example on how we all shall live our lives. Thank you.
Sincerely,

Joey Irwin <saveferrispunk@hotmail.com>

-->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.
Lori Beckwith, Susan Broidy

=====
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

To subscribe, please send an e-mail, leaving the Subject line empty,
To:Majordomo@lists.xmission.com
Body: subscribe sunflower-napf youremail@here

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: <paexec>

Date: Thu, 2 Jul 1998 21:02:08 -0700 (PDT)

From: "Gordon S. Clark" <paexec@igc.apc.org>

To: adaction@ix.netcom.com, bmusil@psr.org, cdavis@clw.org, CEP@echonyc.com, chellman@cdi.org, cnp@igc.apc.org, cspinney@erols.com, dege@taxpayer.net, hn0079@handsnet.org, jdi@clw.org, Jill@taxpayer.net, joe@fcn1.org, kschtz@mail.cdi.org, mccwjdb@erols.com, meldredge@igc.org, mfonte@clw.org, mpage@MACArthu.macfdn.org, msommer@igc.apc.org, mupj@igc.apc.org, myriamm@aol.com, nbolus@igc.apc.org, ncc_washington.parti@ecunet.org, ncecd@igc.apc.org, network@igc.org, network@igc.apc.org, paecon@igc.apc.org, paexec@igc.apc.org, paorgdev@igc.apc.org, paprog@igc.apc.org, pda@comw.org, ploughshares@igc.apc.org, pogodef@mnsinc.com, skerr@clw.org, spusa@spusa.org, teese@life.bio.sunysb.edu, terry@ucsusa.org, tsipis@mit.edu, uncongov@aol.com, vision@igc.apc.org, wand@world.std.com, washofc@aol.com, will@wand.org, wjnsns@aol.com

Subject: Re: a hill staffer's comments

Dear Suzy and colleagues -

While Rep. Frank decided to pull his military budget freeze amendment, there are a couple of comments I wanted to share in response to Suzy's original memo.

It's no secret to any of us that efforts to cut the military budget have not borne a lot of fruit in the past few years, and it seems to be getting even more difficult. Pundits, media and the general public alike seem to have bought the absurd contention that the military budget has fallen dramatically in the past 10 years, and the apparent achievement of a balanced budget (whether it's reality or spin) undercuts our current line of argument even more. Certainly there needs to be a comprehensive analysis of this area of our work. Nonetheless, some quick reactions to the Frank amendment, why it didn't work on almost any level, and what this might mean for our future organizing.

1) Lack of Strategy - for Congress and for us

What exactly is a "freeze" building toward legislatively? The lack of any apparent strategy or next steps after such an amendment is one reason why grassroots activists are not excited about working for it.

To make an analogy to our work for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and nuclear abolition, many grassroots activists are dissatisfied with the CTB: some have grown tired of working for it, (they have been doing it not just for years, but for decades) and others see it as only the most limited progress toward our eventual goal of nuclear abolition. Nonetheless, most of them can still see that the CTB IS a clear step toward our goal - even if they think

it is just a half-step - and that's a major reason why we can mobilize people on it. By contrast, the lack of any strategy on military budget is probably why most grassroots activists (and Members of Congress, apparently) do not see the freeze amendment as a politically effective piece of legislation to work on. I would tend to agree.

(Which raises an important question -- what IS our goal with military spending work?? Nuclear abolition may sound far-fetched to some, but its clarity and the general consensus around it allow activists to debate different strategies and focus their efforts. We have no such agreement on the military budget, and if we have no idea where we are going we are unlikely to get anywhere fast.)

Also, what have we in the peace/arms control community here in DC been doing for the past six months on this issue? Compared to nuclear-oriented groups, which seem to meet every 15 minutes or so in this town, there has been very little planning or discussion going on in our community on the military budget. This is primarily not our fault, of course - one can only do so much planning if there is nothing happening in Congress to plan around - but it is a sure sign that we are not going to be able to mobilize any significant numbers of people if by some chance something worthwhile does come up.

Activists ARE "overissued," but even so they will still step up to the plate and mobilize when there is a compelling goal and some semblance of strategy. We have seen this already this year, when we stopped the bombing of Iraq, or with the increasing numbers who are working to halt the repression in Chiapas.

2) Lack of Leadership on the Hill - While I firmly believe in the bumpersticker maxim that "when the people lead the leaders will follow," there still needs to be at least a pulse up on the Hill for people to get engaged on an issue. When the Congressional staff themselves describe members of Congress as "listless" and "not engaged in any issue" (as quoted in Suzy's email), then I would guess that there is not much of a chance that NGOs are going to rush in at the last minute and make something happen.

Lack of leadership on the Hill, for me, means first and foremost a failure to organize other members of Congress. If a Congressional staffer has to find out from US about the amendment because even the bill's author is declining to work on it, what good will a few last minute calls from constituents do? For that matter, I think it's reasonable to question why we should have even asked our activists to do anything on this amendment: we would not ask a member of Congress to work on a piece of legislation that we had no intention of fighting for, so why should we do the reverse? Given the circumstances, Rep. Frank may have been wise to withdraw the amendment, but it might have been wiser still to not even float it in the first place unless there was a clear commitment from folks (Congress as well as us) to follow through.

Of course, the lack of leadership on the Hill is merely the

symptom of a much larger problem, namely that the Democratic party leadership in Congress and the Democratic Administration seem to be perfectly content with a military budget of \$260-odd billion a year. They also seem perfectly content to take money from weapons contractors, to abandon conversion planning, and to get righteous about "lost jobs" whenever a base or plant in their district/state might be threatened.

Historically speaking this would hardly be the first time that a social change struggle had to work against the vested interests of both major political parties, so it's certainly not the end of the road for us. All I'm saying is that it is much, much harder to get grassroots folks involved in any issue when there isn't even a debate going on in Washington.

3) Unappealing Legislation with No Populist Hook - While specific legislation should, one hopes, emerge organically from a larger strategy, I still think it's interesting to do a moment of tactical analysis with this freeze amendment.

A freeze concept worked to mobilize people around nukes in the 1980s because we had a nuclear weapons race out of control and a President threatening to use them. "STOP" was a perfect message at the time.

By contrast, the military budget has leveled off (compared to the dramatic increases of the early 80's or even the token decreases of the late 80's), so what sense does a freeze make? If the R's go ahead as they are threatening and try to add big bucks to it again next year it would make a little more sense, but even so a freeze amendment sounds as if we're trying to preserve the status quo on the military budget, which is the last thing any grassroots activist is going to work for.

On the populist hook note, who is the target we're going after with a freeze amendment? How does it sharpen the lines of debate on the issue, or create a big bad Pentagon/weapons contractor vs. Joe and Jane paycheck dynamic? Amendments on issues such as the layoff-payoff, weapons contractor CEO salaries, or even one of those classic blue ribbon pork barrel, outrageously expensive, never-works-when-you-test-'em weapons systems would all work better than a freeze amendment to get grassroots juices flowing. None of these would win the day absent the larger strategy, of course, but at least these are the types of legislation which activists in the field can much more readily sink their teeth into, precisely because they help us stigmatize our opponent's behavior. What does a freeze do in this regard?

These are some of the reasons why Peace Action will, for the immediate future, continue to emphasize military waste, fraud and abuse as themes in our work, along with the money the politicians take from the weapons PACs. It is not a complete strategy yet, but it does allow us to more effectively hit the bad guys (and girls!) over the head, score points in the arena of public opinion, and make the politicians more accountable to their votes... all things which can only help with a larger strategy, whatever that might be.

I still think there is plenty of success to applaud here due to the hard work of folks like Suzy and the rest of our community: to paraphrase Ron Dellums at our 40th anniversary party, if they wanted to build 132 B-2s and we stopped them at 21, we must be doing something right. We just need to figure out the path from where we are now. I heartily endorse Suzy's call for a meeting of the minds on this subject, a process which I know Meg Gage has taken an initial crack at. Peace Action will certainly participate. Perhaps a foundation or major funder would help subsidize a weekend retreat on the issue?

Best Regards,

Gordon S. Clark
Executive Director, Peace Action

Return-Path: <LWYolton@prodigy.com>
From: LWYolton@prodigy.com (REV L WILLIAM YOLTON)
Date: Fri, 3 Jul 1998 20:44:18, -0500
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Citizen hearings on CTBT

How about an event at the National Press Club? Do it in a press conference style.

Return-Path: <GELN38A@prodigy.com>
From: GELN38A@prodigy.com (MS JO K PETERSON)
Date: Mon, 6 Jul 1998 11:20:48, -0500
To: mupj@igc.apc.org

Hello Howard,

Please add me to your reliious Working group e-mail
listserver.

My name is Jo Peterson, Omaha Coordinator of Nebraskans
for Peace, a statewide P&J org. My e-mail address is:
geln38a@prodigy.com

Thanks for your good work.

Peace - Jo

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 06 Jul 1998 14:33:37 -0400
From: aslater@gracelinks.org (Alice Slater)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Abolition 2000 Working Group Convenors
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-UID: 000d70a5

Dear Friends,

Here is a list of current Abolition 2000 Working Group Convenors since our Annual Meeting in Geneva during the PrepCom. If you or anyone in your organization wishes to participate, contact numbers are also listed below.

Regards, Alice Slater

Abolition 2000 Working Group Convenors

Nuclear Weapons Convention:

Co-Convenor,

Alyn Ware, Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy
666 Broadway, room 625, New York, N.Y. 10012, USA
tel: +1212-674-7790, fax: +1-212-674-6199, email: lcnp@aol.com

Co-Convenor,

Jurgen Scheffran, INESAP, Institut fuer Kernphysik,
Schlogartenstrae 9, D-64289, Darmstadt, Germany
tel: +49-6151-163016, fax: +49-6151-166039, email:
scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de

Religious Organizations:

Co-Convenor,

Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace With Justice
1500 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, USA
tel: +1-301-896-0013, fax: same, email: mupj@igc.apc.org

Co-Convenor

Dave Robinson, Pax Christi
532 West 8th Street
Erie PA 16502
tel: 814-453-4955
fax: 814-452-4784
email: Dave@paxchristiusa.org

Co-Convenor

Clayton Ramey, Fellowship of Reconciliation
Nyack NY 10960
tel: 914-358-4601
fax: 914-358-4924
email: crramey@igc.apc.org

To subscribe to the Religious Working Group E-Mail list server, contact Howard Hallman.

Overcoming Nuclear Threats/Legal Issues:

Convenor,
Rob Green, WCP UK
2 Chiswick House, High Street, Twyford, Berks, RG10 8AG, England
tel: +44-734-340-258, fax: same, email: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org

Non-Nuclear Security Model for Europe:

Convenor,
Solange Fernex, (WILPF and Greens, France)
F-68480, Biederthal, France
tel: +33-1-89-407183, fax: +33-1-89-407804

NATO:

Co-Convenor,
Ben Cramer, Des Appel Cent pour la Paix
17-19 place de Argonne, 75019, Paris, France
tel: +33-0-1-42-09-23-78, fax: +33-0-1-42-09-23-50, email:
Appel100@worldnet.fr

Co-Convenor,
Karina Wood,
43 Nisbet Street, 3rd floor, Providence, RI, 02906, USA
tel: +1-401-751-8172, fax: +1-401-751-1476 (call first), email:
kwood@igc.org

To subscribe to the NATO Working Group email listserver, send an email message to:
majordomo@igc.org,
leave subject area blank,
write in body of message: <your email> sign-on start3-europenwfz@igc.org

Sustainable Energy

Co-Convenor
Alice Slater
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 E. 26th Street, Rm. 915, New York, N.Y. 11215
tel: +1-212-726-9161, fax: +1-212-726-9160, email: aslater@gracelinks.org

Co-Convenor

Claire Greensfelder
Plutonium Free Future
2267 Summer Street, Berkeley, CA 94709
tel: +1-510-849-1342, fax: +1-510-849-2549, email:
greensfelder@igc.apc.org

CTBT and Beyond:

Convenor,
Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation
1440 Broadway, Suite 500, Oakland, CA 94612, USA
tel: +1-510-839-5877, fax: +1-510-839-5397, email: wslf@igc.apc.org

Radiation Health Effects:

Convenor,
Pamela Meidell, Atomic Mirror
P.O. box 220, Port Hueneme, CA 93044, USA
tel: +1-805-985-5073, fax: +1-805-985-7563, email: pmeidell@igc.org

Abolition Days Direct Action:

Convenor
Pol Huyvette
For Mother Earth
Lange Steenstraat 16/D
Gent, B-9000, Belgium
tel: + [32] (9) 233 73 02, fax: + [32] (9) 233 84 39, email:
fme@int.knooppunt.be

Weapon Usable Radioactive Materials:

Convenor,
Martin Kalinowski, INESAP, Institut fuer Kernphysik,
Schlogartenstrae 9, D-64289, Darmstadt, Germany
tel: +49-6151-163016, fax: +49-6151-166039, email:
scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de

Grassroots:

Convenor
David Krieger
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
tel: +1- 805-965-3443, fax: +1- 805-568-0466, email: wagingpeace@napf.org

Depleted Uranium Working Group:

Convenor
Tara Thornton
Military Toxics Project
60 Pine Street, Suite 2
Lewiston ME 04240
tel: 207-783-5091
email: miltoxpr@ime.net

Nuclearization of Space:

Convenor
Bill Sulzman
Citizens for Peace in Space
PO Box 915 Colorado Springs, CO 80901
tel: +1- 719-389-0644, fax: +1- 719-481-3793

Communications:

Co-Convenor
Richard Salvador
AFSC Pacific Program, Univ of Hawaii
2424 Maile Way
Porteus #640
Honolulu HI 96822
tel: 808-956-8141
fax: 808-956-6877

salvador@hawaii.edu

Co-Convenor

Roger Smith

NGO Committee on Disarmament

777 UN Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017

tel: +1- 212-6875340, fax: +1- 212-687-1643, email: disarmtimes@igc.apc.org

Annual Meeting Working Group:

Co-Convenor

Felicity Hill

Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom

Case Postale 28 , 1 Rue de Varemb, Geneva, CH1211, Switzerland

tel: +41-22-733-6175, fax: +41-22-740-1063, email: womensleague@gn.apc.org

Co-Convenor

Frances Connelly

Abolition 2000 UK

c/o National Peace Council

88 Islington High Street

London N1 8EG

England

tel: 011-44-171-354-5200

fax: 011-44-171-354-0033

email: npc@gn.apc.org

Co-Convenor

Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation

1440 Broadway, Suite 500, Oakland, CA 94612, USA

tel: +1-510-839-5877, fax: +1-510-839-5397, email: wslf@igc.apc.org

Finance:

Convenor

David Krieger

Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794

tel: +1- 805-965-3443, fax: +1- 805-568-0466, email: DKrieger@napf.org

Alice Slater

Global Resource Action Center for the Environment

15 E. 26 St.

New York, NY 10010

212-726-9161(tel)

212-726-9160(fax)

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 06 Jul 1998 16:51:16 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: CTBT Dates & Letters
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: CTBT-Organizers
From: Kathy
Date: July 6
Subject: CTBT Dates, Sample Letters
Dear CTBT-Organizers:

I hope you all had a great July 4th.

Now back to CTBT- related dates: July 16, August 6 and August 9.

July 16,

The 53rd Anniversary of Trinity - the first nuclear weapons explosion:
http://www.webcom.com/peaceact/call_in_day.html

The date of the ***National Call-In***.

Call your Senators, and urge others in your community to call too. For
Flyers see:

or contact Kathy Crandall at the Disarmament Clearinghouse,
<disarmament@igc.org> Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

or Bruce Hall, Peace Action
<panukes@igc.org> Tel: 202 862-9740 ext. 3038

Roots on the Radio

If you are in Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Nebraska, Oregon,
Tennessee, Washington, or Wyoming, participate in 20/20 Vision's Roots
on the Radio.

Contact Marie or Nicole at 20/20 Vision Tel: (202) 833-2020,
<ctbt@2020vision.org> for details on key radio stations and other
assistance.

*** Letters-To-The-Editor ***, (& Op-Eds, Editorial Board Meetings)
July 16, and August 6 (Hiroshima Day) and August 9 (Nagasaki Day)
all provide useful dates to mention as a "hook" in your media work.
Below is a recently published letter and a sample letter.
For more samples and assistance, contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

*** August 6 (Hiroshima Day)& August 9 (Nagasaki Day)**

Are events planned in your community around Hiroshima/Nagasaki Days?
Please send information (Location, time, organizations, brief

description of event/s) to Lisa Ledwidge at Physicians for social Responsibility: Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 222 <ledwidge@psr.org>

For a current listing of known events see: <http://www.psr.org/hirnag.htm>

If you need CTBT materials (Flyers, Buttons, Brochures) or assistance, please contact Kathy at the Disarmament Clearinghouse Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 <disarmament@igc.org>

Letters To the Editor

Wyoming Tribune-Eagle
June 21, 1998

Wyoming Senators Should Back Test Ban Treaty

The recent nuclear weapons tests by India and Pakistan underscore the importance of U.S. Senate Ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) a treaty that would ban all nuclear test explosions.

The CTBT is the most effective means available now to stem the spread of nuclear weapons, but the Senate has not acted on it. Two other nuclear weapons states, Great Britain and France, ratified the treaty in April. Our ratification would serve as a catalyst for other nations to follow our lead.

The CTBT is supported by the former and present Joint Chiefs of Staff chairmen and 73 percent of the American people (according to a national poll taken a few days after India's test.) However, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C., continues to stand in the way of Senate Consideration.

Our senators are currently undecided about how to vote on this issue. Sen. Craig Thomas has an especially important role to play as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. It will take the support of two-thirds of the Senate to ratify the CTBT.

That is why I believe that Sens. Thomas and Mike Enzi should act to make sure the CTBT is ratified by the U.S. Senate this year and spare the world the further threats that nuclear weapons and testing pose.

I urge every like-minded Wyoming citizen to call, contact, or write and urge our senators to vote yes on ratification of the CTBT.

Enzi: 290 Russell Senate Office Bldg., Washington DC 20510; (202) 224-3424 senator@enzi.senate.gov

Thomas: 109 Hart Senate Office Bldg., Washington DC 20510; craig.thomas@thomas.senate.gov

Don Stoen
Cheyenne, Wyoming
-Wyoming Peace Initiative

To the Editor:

The United States Senate must take a stand!

On July 16, 1945 the United States planted the seed of destruction when it detonated the first nuclear weapon test in New Mexico. Now, after more than 2,000 nuclear tests which have inflicted devastating health and environment effects and fueled a dangerous nuclear arms race, the decision to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) should be simple.

The CTBT would help curb the spread of nuclear weapons, and aid in the effort to detect and deter testing with global monitoring systems including seismic stations and on-site inspections. In contrast, the United States' failure to ratify the treaty would send a message around the world that would encourage nuclear testing and development of nuclear arsenals. Learning from India and Pakistan, foreign nations would develop their own nuclear weapons programs.

American public support for the treaty has remained strong following the Indian and Pakistani tests. Polls show that over 70% of the public favors the treaty. [In some states specific state polls can be used]. Unfortunately there are a few Senators who refuse to support the treaty. Republican Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC), Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is holding the treaty hostage by refusing to hold hearings on the issue. Republican Senate Majority leader Trent Lott (R-MS) has stated that the treaty is irrelevant and should be shelved.

Senators Specter (R-PA), and Biden (D-DE) have initiated a Resolution calling for scheduling of CTBT hearings and a prompt floor vote. I urge Senator(s)_____to co-sponsor the Specter-Biden Resolution and vote on the ratification of CTBT. Senate leadership has the power to make the world more secure.

Written by: Daniel Alberdeston, Jr.,
Intern for the Disarmament Clearinghouse
For additional sample letters see: <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm> or
contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

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-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 6 Jul 1998 11:51:21 -1000
From: Richard Salvador <salvador@hawaii.edu>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: URGENT: Re: Abolition 2000 Working Group Convenors
To: Alice Slater <aslater@gracelinks.org>
X-Sender: salvador@uhunix1
cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Dear Alice and everyone,

Thank you for posting the names of working group members. Please note (including the whole abolition caucus list membership) that I am no longer with the AFSC Pacific Program and all identifying references should immediately be crossed out. I have made arrangements with Gaby Tetiarahi to be tentatively associated with the Pacific Islands Association of NGOs (PIANGO), possible a Abilition 2000 section of PIANGO. We as a Pacific region will meet during parallel to the South Pacific Forum in August and will make necessary changes to reflect the changes. Thank you very kindly for your help in this matter.

Richard

On Mon, 6 Jul 1998, Alice Slater wrote:

> Dear Friends,
> Here is a list of current Abolition 2000 Working Group Convenors since our
> Annual Meeting in Geneva during the PrepCom. If you or anyone in your
> organization wishes to participate, contact numbers are also listed below.
> Regards, Alice Slater
>
>
> Abolition 2000 Working Group Convenors
>
>
>
> Nuclear Weapons Convention:
> Co-Convenor,
> Alyn Ware, Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy
> 666 Broadway, room 625, New York, N.Y. 10012, USA
> tel: +1212-674-7790, fax: +1-212-674-6199, email: lcnp@aol.com
>
> Co-Convenor,
> Jurgen Scheffran, INESAP, Institut fuer Kernphysik,
> Schlogartenstrae 9, D-64289, Darmstadt, Germany
> tel: +49-6151-163016, fax: +49-6151-166039, email:
> scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de
>
> Religious Organizations:
> Co-Convenor,
> Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace With Justice

> 1500 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, USA
> tel: +1-301-896-0013, fax: same, email: mupj@igc.apc.org
>
> Co-Convenor
> Dave Robinson, Pax Christi
> 532 West 8th Street
> Erie PA 16502
> tel: 814-453-4955
> fax: 814-452-4784
> email: Dave@paxchristiusa.org
>
> Co-Convenor
> Clayton Ramey, Fellowship of Reconciliation
> Nyack NY 10960
> tel: 914-358-4601
> fax: 914-358-4924
> email: crramey@igc.apc.org
>
> To subscribe to the Religious Working Group E-Mail list server, contact
> Howard Hallman.
>
> Overcoming Nuclear Threats/Legal Issues:
> Convenor,
> Rob Green, WCP UK
> 2 Chiswick House, High Street, Twyford, Berks, RG10 8AG, England
> tel: +44-734-340-258, fax: same, email: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org
>
> Non-Nuclear Security Model for Europe:
> Convenor,
> Solange Fernex, (WILPF and Greens, France)
> F-68480, Biederthal, France
> tel: +33-1-89-407183, fax: +33-1-89-407804
>
> NATO:
> Co-Convenor,
> Ben Cramer, Des Appel Cent pour la Paix
> 17-19 place de Argonne, 75019, Paris, France
> tel: +33-0-1-42-09-23-78, fax: +33-0-1-42-09-23-50, email:
> Appel100@worldnet.fr
>
> Co-Convenor,
> Karina Wood,
> 43 Nisbet Street, 3rd floor, Providence, RI, 02906, USA
> tel: +1-401-751-8172, fax: +1-401-751-1476 (call first), email:
> kwood@igc.org
>
> To subscribe to the NATO Working Group email listserver, send an email
> message to:
> majordomo@igc.org,
> leave subject area blank,
> write in body of message: <your email> sign-on start3-europenwfz@igc.org
>
> Sustainable Energy
> Co-Convenor

- > Alice Slater
- > Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
- > 15 E. 26th Street, Rm. 915, New York, N.Y. 11215
- > tel: +1-212-726-9161, fax: +1-212-726-9160, email: aslater@gracelinks.org
- >
- > Co-Convenor
- > Claire Greensfelder
- > Plutonium Free Future
- > 2267 Summer Street, Berkeley, CA 94709
- > tel: +1- 510-849-1342, fax:+1- 510-849-2549, email:
- > greensfelder@igc.apc.org
- >
- > CTBT and Beyond:
- > Convenor,
- > Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation
- > 1440 Broadway, Suite 500, Oakland, CA 94612, USA
- > tel: +1-510-839-5877, fax: +1-510-839-5397, email: wslf@igc.apc.org
- >
- > Radiation Health Effects:
- > Convenor,
- > Pamela Meidell, Atomic Mirror
- > P.O. box 220, Port Hueneme, CA 93044, USA
- > tel: +1-805-985-5073, fax: +1-805-985-7563, email: pmeidell@igc.org
- >
- > Abolition Days Direct Action:
- > Convenor
- > Pol Huyvette
- > For Mother Earth
- > Lange Steenstraat 16/D
- > Gent, B-9000, Belgium
- > tel: + [32] (9) 233 73 02, fax: + [32] (9) 233 84 39, email:
- > fme@int.knooppunt.be
- >
- > Weapon Usable Radioactive Materials:
- > Convenor,
- > Martin Kalinowski, INESAP, Institut fuer Kernphysik,
- > Schlogartenstrae 9, D-64289, Darmstadt, Germany
- > tel: +49-6151-163016, fax: +49-6151-166039, email:
- > scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de
- >
- > Grassroots:
- > Convenor
- > David Krieger
- > Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
- > 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
- > tel: +1- 805-965-3443, fax: +1- 805-568-0466, email: wagingpeace@napf.org
- >
- > Depleted Uranium Working Group:
- > Convenor
- > Tara Thornton
- > Military Toxics Project
- > 60 Pine Street, Suite 2
- > Lewiston ME 04240
- > tel: 207-783-5091

> email: miltoxpr@ime.net
>
> Nuclearization of Space:
> Convenor
> Bill Sulzman
> Citizens for Peace in Space
> PO Box 915 Colorado Springs, CO 80901
> tel: +1- 719-389-0644, fax: +1- 719-481-3793
>
> Communications:
> Co-Convenor
> Richard Salvador
> AFSC Pacific Program, Univ of Hawaii
> 2424 Maile Way
> Porteus #640
> Honolulu HI 96822
> tel: 808-956-8141
> fax: 808-956-6877
> salvador@hawaii.edu
>
> Co-Convenor
> Roger Smith
> NGO Committee on Disarmament
> 777 UN Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017
> tel: +1- 212-6875340, fax: +1- 212-687-1643, email: disarmtimes@igc.apc.org
>
> Annual Meeting Working Group:
> Co-Convenor
> Felicity Hill
> Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom
> Case Postale 28 , 1 Rue de Varembe, Geneva, CH1211, Switzerland
> tel: +41-22-733-6175, fax: +41-22-740-1063, email: womensleague@gn.apc.org
>
> Co-Convenor
> Frances Connelly
> Abolition 2000 UK
> c/o National Peace Council
> 88 Islington High Street
> London N1 8EG
> England
> tel: 011-44-171-354-5200
> fax: 011-44-171-354-0033
> email: npc@gn.apc.org
>
> Co-Convenor
> Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation
> 1440 Broadway, Suite 500, Oakland, CA 94612, USA
> tel: +1-510-839-5877, fax: +1-510-839-5397, email: wslf@igc.apc.org
>
> Finance:
> Convenor
> David Krieger
> Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
> 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794

> tel: +1- 805-965-3443, fax: +1- 805-568-0466, email: DKrieger@napf.org

>

>

>

> Alice Slater

> Global Resource Action Center for the Environment

> 15 E. 26 St.

> New York, NY 10010

> 212-726-9161(tel)

> 212-726-9160(fax)

>

>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 7 Jul 1998 02:06:50 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: news: CQ on CTBT in Senate; Senators on sanctions

July 6, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: news: CQ article on CTBT prospects in Senate; WP article on
India-Pakistan sanctions

The following Congressional Quarterly article is does not provide any new or extraordinary information on the status of the CTBT, but is the best and most up to date summary of the current situation.

Also, note that a bipartisan group of Senators is now engaged in an effort to come up with proposals for modifying the sanctions now in force against India and Pakistan. What the attached Washington Post article does not mention is that an 18 member bi-partisan task force of Senators has been convened to "make recommendations to the Senate leadership by July 15, 1998 on sanctions relating to ... India and Pakistan." (See Congressional Record, June 26, page S7297 for more details.)

DK

"Can Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Put Nuclear Genie Back In Bottle?
Democrats Exhort Senate To 'Take The Lead,' But GOP Says Recent Blasts By
India And Pakistan Show Such Pacts Are Irrelevant"

CQ Washington Report, by Chuck McCutcheon, July 4, 1998

Five months before his assassination, President John F. Kennedy delivered a commencement address at American University in Washington and called for a worldwide ban on the testing of nuclear weapons.

"It would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards that man faces in 1963, the further spread of nuclear arms," Kennedy said that June. "It would increase our security. It would decrease the prospects of war."

Exactly 35 years later, Edward M. Kennedy rose in the Senate chamber and beseeched his colleagues to ratify the agreement that evolved from his late brother's vision -- the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that President Clinton submitted to Congress in September.

"The Senate can take the lead in creating a more secure world," said the

Massachusetts Democrat, "by putting the United States in front of the international effort to achieve a comprehensive test ban."

Considered by some the Holy Grail of arms control, the test ban treaty (Treaty Doc 105-28) has been touted by proponents as the most effective means of halting a global arms race. It has drawn increased attention in recent months because of nuclear tests by India and Pakistan, and because Clinton, the first of 149 world leaders to sign the treaty, has joined Kennedy and a number of senators in pressing for its ratification.

"If we are calling on other nations to act responsibly, America must set the example," Clinton said in a June 3 speech.

Such talk also comes at a time when new details about nuclear weapons spending are coming to light. On June 30, the Brookings Institution released a study showing that since 1940, the United States has spent \$5.8 trillion, in constant 1996 dollars, on nuclear weapons and related programs, more than any area of the budget except non-nuclear defense and Social Security.

Despite the stepped-up pleas, studies and allusions to events of decades past, the test ban treaty stands virtually no chance of coming to a vote in the Senate this year, especially as the legislative calendar grows increasingly tight. It is unlikely to even get a hearing in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Conservative Republicans have remained unyielding in their resistance to the pact, renewing their questions about the effects of a test ban on the long-term effectiveness of the nation's nuclear arsenal. To bolster their arguments, they say the nuclear tests conducted by India and Pakistan in May show such international agreements are irrelevant.

"It now appears likely that the administration's push for [the treaty] actually accelerated the greatest proliferation disaster in decades, two new nuclear powers emerging in the last few weeks," Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., said in a May 29 statement denouncing the pact.

"American policy should shift from a misguided focus on an unverifiable and ineffective treaty that precludes maintaining the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear deterrent to a sustained effort to build international support for de-escalating the nuclear arms race in Asia," Lott said.

NUCLEAR ABSTINENCE

The United States, which has test-fired more nuclear weapons than any other country, has refrained from any testing for the past six years. Some critics of the treaty contend that as a result, Clinton's desire to set an example for other countries by ratifying the pact is misguided.

"The U.S. hardly needs to be permanently prevented from . . . [testing] in the future to establish that its behavior is inconsequential to others determined to obtain and retain nuclear weapons," the Center for Security Policy, a conservative defense and foreign policy group, said in a

statement in June.

Test ban supporters dismiss such arguments and say the treaty's ratification will help prevent an arms race on the Asian subcontinent. They point to recent opinion polls showing that a vast majority of Americans support the pact, as do four former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The treaty cannot enter into force until it is approved by 44 nations that have either nuclear power plants or nuclear research reactors. Of the 149 that have signed the treaty since 1996, 13 have ratified it. Of those, only six are on the list of 44 with some nuclear capability.

Neither India nor Pakistan has signed the treaty. India has contended that it would perpetuate the advantage held by the United States, Russia, France and other nations that already have had the chance to determine the effectiveness of their nuclear arsenals.

If enough nations have not ratified the pact by September 1999, a conference of signatories will determine if there is another way of putting the agreement into action.

"If we want India and Pakistan to stop testing and keep others from starting, [approving the treaty] is the most basic, minimal, obvious step we can take," Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright said in a June 3 speech.

GRADUAL LIMITS

The treaty is the result of a half-century of thinking about how to stop the proliferation of nuclear arms.

Shortly after President Kennedy's June 1963 speech, the Limited Test Ban Treaty committed the United States to halting tests in the atmosphere, oceans and outer space. In 1974, President Richard M. Nixon signed a treaty limiting the size of nuclear blasts, although it was not ratified until 1990.

Two years later, President George Bush reluctantly signed a moratorium on underground tests that Congress tacked onto the fiscal 1993 energy and water spending law (PL 102-377). After taking office in 1993, Clinton extended the moratorium and began substantive negotiations on the test ban treaty.

Those talks culminated in United Nations General Assembly approval of the test ban treaty by a 158-3 vote in 1996.

In addition to the test ban treaty, Clinton in 1995 helped get an extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Signed by 185 countries, that treaty promotes the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and establishes international safeguards to ensure such activities will not be diverted to making nuclear weapons.

But in order to get the extension, Clinton had to promise non-nuclear nations he would expeditiously deliver a test ban. Those nations

repeatedly have insisted that nuclear powers give up testing in exchange for their own promise to forgo nuclear weapons development.

PRESSURE FOR A VOTE

The test ban treaty is designed to ban underground tests, using an international network of 320 monitoring stations to verify compliance. It would allow tests of nuclear weapons components, including the high explosives used to trigger the weapons, as long as no radioactivity is released. It would also allow on-site inspections -- on short notice, in some cases -- where testing was suspected to have occurred.

Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, D-S.D., recently promised to try to force a vote on the treaty this year. Given the time crunch, however, many supporters say a more realistic goal is to secure an agreement for a vote sometime in 1999.

Lott, who controls the Senate agenda, contends that lawmakers should instead devote their attention to such issues as sanctions against countries that test weapons, the development of a defense against ballistic missile attack, and a reappraisal of export and arms controls.

In addition, Foreign Relations Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C., has called on Clinton to submit to the Senate the global warming treaty that arose out of last year's Kyoto summit and changes to the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile pact before he will consider the test ban in his committee.

In a strongly worded Jan. 21 letter, Helms said the ABM pact and the global warming agreement are far more urgent than the test ban treaty, which, he said, "has no chance of entering into force for a decade or more."

In a June 18 op-ed column in The Wall Street Journal, Helms dismissed the treaty as "toothless" and said the administration's hope of persuading India and Pakistan to sign the treaty now "would amount to nothing more than closing the stable door after the horses have galloped away."

FRIENDLY PERSUASION

Such statements have not deterred administration officials. Last week, after one of a recent series of news media events aimed at galvanizing public support for the treaty, Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott contended in an interview that "there's a real interest" among many senators in seeing the treaty come to a vote.

"The net effect of India and Pakistan has been to educate a lot of people about the stakes here," Talbott said. "There are some key individuals [in the Senate] who need to be persuaded, and Secretary Albright is working on that. She can be very persuasive."

But Republican members of Foreign Relations, such as Indiana's Richard G. Lugar, have shown little interest in publicly defying Helms. In recent weeks, the chairman's unwavering opposition has led some treaty supporters to attempt to circumvent him.

Senate Armed Services Committee members Carl Levin, D-Mich., and Jeff

Bingaman, D-N.M., have asked Chairman Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., to hold hearings on the treaty in his committee.

Meanwhile, Sens. Arlen Specter, R-Pa., and Joseph R. Biden Jr., D-Del., have been collecting signatures from colleagues in support of a proposed resolution calling for a vote on the test ban.

The effort has been slowed by Specter's absence for much of June after undergoing double-bypass heart surgery. Before his departure, he and Biden collected about 35 signatures.

Biden, ranking Democrat on Foreign Relations, acknowledged in an interview that the effort "has served most of its purpose already" by raising the profile of the issue.

In citing the difficulty of moving the treaty through the Senate, Biden pointed to Helms' adamant refusal last year to hold hearings on Clinton's nomination of former Massachusetts Gov. William F. Weld to be ambassador to Mexico. Weld eventually asked that his nomination be withdrawn.

"There's no way, as we know from going through our exercise with the governor, . . . that anyone can legislatively force a chairman to hold a hearing," Biden said. "So we're just going to keep pushing so that you [reporters] keep writing and so the pressure keeps building. But whether it ever gets to the point that it breaks out, I don't know."

Other senators take issue with the Biden-Specter approach, saying they see no need to rush into a debate over the merits of the test ban treaty.

"Sure, we should debate the treaty and get India and Pakistan to go in on it," said Foreign Relations member Chuck Hagel, R-Neb. "But we need to really examine it and give it some thought and focus. I don't think the urgency of this is that critical."

Sen. Pete V. Domenici, R-N.M., agreed. "I think we ought to wait a while," said Domenici, whose support is seen as crucial.

As chairman of the Appropriations Energy and Water Subcommittee, Domenici is the Senate's leading backer of a costly and ambitious alternative to nuclear testing known as science-based stockpile stewardship -- replacing large-scale tests with micro-explosions and supercomputer simulations.

Much of the work will be done at two nuclear weapons laboratories in Domenici's home state, Sandia and Los Alamos, that have been searching for new missions since the end of the Cold War. Domenici has been assiduous in steering funding for stockpile stewardship work to the two labs.

"In order to get [the treaty] through, we've got to get stockpile stewardship going so we don't need testing," Domenici said. "There are three or four senators who say we still need testing. Then the administration and Congress have to develop some kind of strategy in reference to proliferation that we don't have today. If that gets working, we ought to jump on that treaty then."

Washington Post, Friday July 3, 1998 page A32

"Senators Seek to Ease Nuclear Test Sanctions"

by Thomas W. Lippman

Negotiations are underway among key members of the Senate on a measure that would soften the impact of mandatory economic sanctions that the United States slapped on India and Pakistan after they tested nuclear weapons in May.

Under current law, the sanctions were mandatory and automatic, with no provisions for a presidential waiver or termination, because Congress assumed they would deter potential nuclear testers and never have to be invoked.

But now that the tests have occurred and the sanctions are in place, some senators and officials of the Clinton administration fear that their inflexibility ties the administration's hands diplomatically and, in the case of economically feeble Pakistan, could provide an incentive to sell nuclear technology and materials to raise money.

"We not only believe but know that in its policy on transferring material to other countries, Pakistan has been very restrained," Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott told reporters at a meeting Wednesday sponsored by the Union of Concerned Scientists. "They have told us in recent days this restraint will continue."

But, he added, it is essential to head off further bomb and missile tests in South Asia because "vertical" proliferation -- enhancement of nuclear weapons capabilities within a country -- would be followed by "horizontal" proliferation to other countries.

Sen. Sam Brownback (R-Kan.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on the Near East and South Asia, and Sen. Charles S. Robb (D-Va.), the ranking minority member, returned from a trip to South Asia earlier this week convinced that the sanctions law must be modified, Brownback said.

The sanctions, which in combination with other moves by the United States and its allies have virtually shut off access to international financing for India and Pakistan, "hurt Pakistan much more than India, and Pakistan is much less culpable" because India tested first, Brownback said. He said Pakistan "wants to be a strong ally of the United States and we're pushing them away. We've got to provide the president with some waiver authority."

Robb is more sympathetic to India, Democratic staff aides said, but generally shares Brownback's view that some modification of the sanctions would increase U.S. diplomatic flexibility in trying to persuade the South Asian rivals not to escalate further.

"The trick is to find a face-saving way out that makes the sanctions short-term but doesn't look like you've caved in" on nuclear proliferation,

one staff member said.

Sen. Slade Gorton (R-Wash.) said in a radio appearance June 2 that he and Sen. Pat Roberts (R-Kan.) "will do everything we can at an early time in the Senate to end the India and Pakistan embargoes ... We will do everything we can to end these absurd sanctions."

Other senators also are looking for legislative vehicles -- probably spending bills -- to which they can add modifications of the sanctions, staff aides said.

"We have a pretty good head of steam" in support of modification, Brownback said. But he also said he returned from the region fearful that both countries are preparing for a new round of flight tests of their ballistic missiles, a development he said could shut off momentum in Congress in favor of modifying the sanctions.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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: <tinabell@walrus.com>

X-Authentication-Warning: walrus1.walrus.com: tinabell owned process doing -bs

Date: Tue, 7 Jul 1998 11:40:03 -0400 (EDT)

From: Tina Bell <tinabell@walrus.com>

To: mupj@igc.apc.org

Subject: RE: Ab 2000 religious WG listserver

Dear Howard Hallman;

Please add my email address to the list server for the Abolition 2000 religious working group.

Many thanks,

Tina Bell

[Coordinator; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (NY Metro).]

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 7 Jul 1998 12:09:30 -0700 (PDT)
From: Tracy Moavero <paintl@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: New Agenda Coalition Sign On Letter
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: paintl@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Dear Abolition 2000 activists:

In an effort to show support for the New Agenda Coalition, the following letter has been opened for signatures by organizations. Once we have collected signatures, we will send the letter to each of the eight New Agenda foreign ministers. Disarmament Clearinghouse (USA) will send copies of the New Agenda declaration and a copy of our letter to key figures in Washington DC. Organizations in other countries may wish to use the signed letter as well - let us know.

If your organization wishes to sign, please notify Disarmament Clearinghouse at disarmament@igc.apc.org. Kathy Crandall is the contact there. Either she or I can answer any questions you have.

We look forward to receiving your signatures.

Cheers,

Tracy Moavero
Peace Action International Office Coordinator

Dear (Foreign Minister) ,

As citizens' organizations worldwide working to end the menace of nuclear war, we thank and congratulate your government on the release of the June 9, 1998 Joint Declaration entitled "Towards a Nuclear-weapon-free World: The Need for a New Agenda".

We applaud your government's leadership on the urgent matter of nuclear weapons abolition. We agree that we cannot enter the next century with nuclear war hanging over our heads, and that negotiations leading toward nuclear weapons elimination must begin now.

We have intensified our efforts for nuclear disarmament progress leading to a nuclear weapons-free world in response to the recent nuclear tests in South Asia. While we have condemned the tests, we see the ultimate problem being the lack of progress on nuclear abolition.

One tool which we encourage you to consider using is the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention. Prepared by scientists and lawyers in the Abolition 2000 network, this convention, an official UN document, can provide the basis for discussion on progress toward the elimination of nuclear

weapons.

We are pleased to learn that you plan to pursue a United Nations General Assembly resolution based on your statement. We will support that effort through lobbying our national governments.

Looking beyond that resolution to further steps, we encourage you to strengthen this initiative through high-level demarches to the nuclear weapon states' capitols, sending a signal that the New Agenda Coalition is determined to provide the missing global leadership to make rapid progress to complete nuclear disarmament.

We encourage you to involve us in your work, drawing on our expertise and public outreach. We look forward to learning more about how your initiative will move forward. Once again, thank you and congratulations.

Sincerely,

Tracy Moavero
Peace Action International Office
866 UN Plaza, Room 4053
New York, NY 10017-1822
USA
Tel.: +1-212-750-5795
Fax: +1-212-750-5849
Email: paintl@igc.apc.org
Web: www.webcom.com/peaceact

Peace Action is a member of the International Peace Bureau & Abolition 2000:
A Global Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

To: disarmament
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to New Agenda Coalition
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Kathy:

I'll sign the letter that Tracy Moavero put on abolition-caucus.

Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 7 Jul 1998 18:41:11 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: CTBT Wkg. Grp. Mtg/Poll results brief, 6/17

July 7, 1998

TO: Coalition members
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: Briefing on Results of STATE-WIDE POLLING PROJECT ON THE CTBT on June 17

Mark Mellman will brief Coalition member organizations and friends on the results and analysis of the Coalition's state-specific CTBT polling effort at the start of the next CTBT Working Group meeting on Friday, July 17 which will begin at 9am and last until 11am. It will be held at the UCS 7th floor conference room at 1616 P Street NW.

The early results on our polling surveys in Oregon, Utah, Kansas, Nebraska, and Tennessee are looking very, very good.

In the next two weeks, the Coalition will conduct one-on-one briefings with relevant Senate offices and executive branch officials and then release the polling results to the media and general public.

If you have any suggestions about the polling effort and/or would like to help in disseminating the results of the surveys, please contact me as soon as possible.

Thanks, DK

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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, 8 Jul 1998 10:34:44 -0400
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: A model NWFZE treaty
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 ["Dr. Renoldner" <RENO@wvnet.at>]
From: "Dr. Renoldner" <RENO@wvnet.at>
To: <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Subject: A model NWFZE treaty
Date: Tue, 7 Jul 1998 16:21:01 +0200

[Draft circulated by Vienna Peace Bureau, K=94lbgasse 18/1, A-1030 Wien,
Austria, Tel+Fax (+431) 796 50 21]

Dear friends of nuclear abolition!

This draft has been elaborated by prof. Thomas Schoenfeld, chairperson of the NGO - committee on peace at the UN Vienna and others. We invite you to discuss it and to mail comments, critics and suggestions.

Klaus Renoldner, M.D., IPPNW Austria

Introductory Note to Draft for a Treaty on a Nuclear -Weapon-Free Zone in Europe

Proposals for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Europe (NWFZE) were first put forward several decades ago. Since three nuclear-weapon states were (and are) located in Europe (France, Great Britain, USSR/Russian Federation) and a fourth state (USA) deployed nuclear weapons in Europe on the territory of its NATO allies, all of the proposals had the aim to make parts of Europe free of nuclear weapons. In contrast to NWFZs in other parts of the world (e.g. Latin America and Africa) the proposals for a NWFZ in Europe did not call for making the whole European continent nuclear-weapon free. In particular, they aimed for a NWFZ located geographically between the nuclear-weapon states of the two military alliances, NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

The disintegration of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty Organization have not made such proposals less significant - as contributions to peace building and as steps towards nuclear disarmament.

Since the successor states of the USSR, with the exception of the Russian Federation, have become nuclear-weapon-free and the new situation in Europe has generally increased the possibility of agreeing on measures of confidence building and disarmament, a NWFZE can now be envisaged which will

cover a greater area than that aimed for in the earlier proposals.

At a Symposium held recently in Vienna it was suggested to intensify discussions on setting-up a NWFZE and to prepare a draft Treaty as a contribution to these discussions. The draft, which has been prepared taking up this suggestion, is attached. Explanations of some provisions of this draft Treaty will be presented first.

Which states are to be the parties to the Treaty on a NWFZE? The text of the Treaty could list the states forming a North-South corridor in Europe, roughly to the West and South-West of the Russian Federation. This option would have the following draw-backs. The extent of the zone would be definitely fixed and there would be no orientation towards further European states to adhere to the Treaty, which would enlarge the NWFZE in a step by step process. Also the entry-into-force provision of a Treaty formulated in this way would probably require ratification by all state parties. This may lead to considerable delay till the Treaty becomes a binding obligation for the state parties.

Therefore, the draft foresees that any non-nuclear-weapon state having territory in Europe can become a party to the Treaty and will thus bring its territory into the NWFZE. The Treaty would enter into force when a certain number of signatory states have ratified it. Similar entry-into-force provisions are contained in the Chemical Weapons Convention and in the Ottawa Treaty on the prohibition of anti-personnel land mines. Such provisions facilitate more rapid entry into force and later expansion of Treaty membership.

The question has to be taken up whether such provisions will not make many states decide against signing and ratifying the Treaty because of fear that other European states, in particular those in their neighborhood, which have not yet adhered to the Treaty, are making plans for deploying nuclear weapons. Taking into consideration the present general security situation in Europe, such mistrust is not likely to arise. Rather, it seems justified to expect a positive trend. Even if states that could be parties should not sign the Treaty as soon as possible, they are likely to recognize its benefits as it enters into force and verification is carried out, and will become participating states later.

Verification of compliance with Treaty obligations is taken up in some articles of the draft. It should be pointed out that verification under a comprehensive safeguards agreement with the IAEA (see Article 7) concerns nuclear energy activities carried out by the state parties. IAEA verification procedures are not directed at detecting nuclear explosive devices brought into the territory of a signatory state, e.g. by a state deploying other armaments or troops on such territories or making use of transit rights for military purposes. It may be advisable to include in the Treaty more specific provisions for the detection of such violations of the Treaty. In the present draft, there are only the general formulations of Articles 4 and 6:

"Each Party undertakes to prohibit in its territory the stationing or any other presence of any nuclear explosive device " (Article 4). "Each Party shall take all appropriate legal, administrative and other measures ... to

prevent and suppress any activity prohibited to a state Party under this Treaty undertaken by persons on its territory.." (Article 6).

In the discussion of the draft suitable verification procedures and techniques for detecting nuclear explosive devices on the territory of signatory States in violation of Treaty obligations should be considered. It is recommended to evaluate the possible role of international cooperation and of international organizations in the realization of such verification measures.

Draft for a Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Zone in Europe (NWFZE)
[circulated by Vienna Peace Bureau, K=94lblgasse 18/1, A-1030 Wien,
Austria, Tel+Fax (+431) 796 50 21]

The Parties to this Treaty

Guided by the Charter of the United Nations, which calls for effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace (Article 1 of the Charter, San Francisco 1945), also

Guided by the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki 1975), in which the participating States have declared that they will refrain in their mutual relations, as well as in international relations in general, from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State , ...have recognized the interest of all these States in efforts aimed at lessening military confrontation and promoting disarmament, ..have expressed conviction of the necessity to take effective measures which would constitute steps towards the ultimate achievement of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control,

Recalling the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly (New York 1978), in which measures designed to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war and to lessen the danger of the threat or use of nuclear weapons are called for (Paragraph 20) and nuclear-weapon-free zones established on the basis of agreements or arrangements freely arrived at among the states of the zone concerned and respected by nuclear-weapon States are seen to constitute an important disarmament measure (Paragraph 33),

Noting the important interrelationship between the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (1968) and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, clearly expressed by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to this Treaty, which reaffirmed in its decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament" that the establishment of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones will enhance global and regional peace and security" and stated that the establishment of additional nuclear-weapon-free zones by the time of the Review Conference in the year 2000 would be welcome,

Noting the important role of existing NWFZs in restricting the spread of

nuclear weapons and thus of nuclear confrontation ,

Convinced that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Europe will be an important contribution to strengthening peace on this continent and to regional and global disarmament efforts,

Have decided to establish the Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Europe and hereby agree as follows :

Article 1 / Definitions

1. "Nuclear-weapon -free zone in Europe" means the territory of the state Parties of this Treaty in Europe and in adjacent parts of other continents.
2. "Territory" means the land territory, internal waters, territorial seas and archipelagic waters and the airspace above them as well as the sea bed and the subsoil beneath.
3. "Nuclear explosive device" means any nuclear weapon or other explosive device capable of releasing nuclear energy, irrespective of the purpose for which it could be used. The term includes such a weapon or device in unassembled and partly assembled forms, but does not include the means of transport and delivery of such a weapon or device if separable from and not an indivisible part of it.
4. "Stationing" means implantation, emplacement, transport on land or inland waters, stockpiling, storage, installation and deployment.
5. "Nuclear installation" means a nuclear power reactor, a nuclear production reactor, a nuclear research reactor, a critical facility, a fabrication plant for nuclear reactor fuel, a reprocessing plant for irradiated nuclear fuel , an isotope separation plant , a storage installation for nuclear materials, and any other installation or location at which fresh or irradiated nuclear material or significant quantities of radioactive materials are present.
6. "Nuclear material" means any source or processed fissionable material as defined in Article XX of the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

Article 2 / Renunciation of nuclear explosive devices

Each Party undertakes

- (a) Not to conduct research on, develop, manufacture, stockpile or otherwise acquire, possess or have control over any nuclear explosive device by any means anywhere;
- (b) Not to seek or receive any assistance in the research on, development, manufacture, stockpiling or acquisition, or possession of any nuclear explosive device;

(c) Not to take any action to assist or encourage the research on, development, manufacture, stockpiling or acquisition, or possession of any nuclear explosive device anywhere.

Article 3 / Prevention of stationing of nuclear explosive devices

Each Party undertakes to prohibit in its territory the stationing of any nuclear explosive device.

Article 4 / Prohibition of testing nuclear explosive devices

Each Party undertakes

(a) Not to test any nuclear explosive device anywhere,

(b) To prohibit in its territory the testing of any nuclear explosive device;

(c) Not to assist or encourage the testing of any nuclear explosive device by any State anywhere.

Article 5 / Prohibition of armed attack on nuclear installations

Each Party undertakes not to carry out, to assist, or to encourage armed attack by conventional or other means against nuclear installations in the Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Europe.

Article 6 / National implementation measures

Each Party shall take all appropriate legal, administrative and other measures, including the imposition of penal sanctions, to prevent and suppress any activity prohibited to a State Party under this Treaty undertaken by persons on its territory or under its jurisdiction or control.

Article 7 / Verification of Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy

Each Party undertakes

(a) To conduct all activities for the peaceful use of nuclear energy under strict measures that provide assurance of exclusively peaceful use;

(b) To conclude a comprehensive safeguards agreement with the IAEA for the purpose of verifying compliance with the undertaking in subparagraph (a) of this article; **

(c) Not to provide source or special fissionable material, or equipment or material especially designed or prepared for the processing, use or production of special fissionable material to any non-nuclear-weapon State unless subject to a comprehensive safeguards agreement concluded with the

IAEA.

Article 8 / Physical protection of nuclear materials and facilities

Each Party undertakes to maintain the highest standards of security and effective physical protection of nuclear materials, facilities and equipment to prevent theft or unauthorized use and handling. To that end each Party, inter alia, undertakes to apply measures of physical protection equivalent to those provided for in the Convention on Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and in recommendations and guidelines developed by the IAEA for that purpose.

Article 9 / Conference of State Parties

1. The Conference of all Parties to the Treaty shall be convened by the Depositary as soon as possible after entry into force. Further meetings of the Conference of State Parties shall be held as necessary and at least once a year .
2. The Parties to Protocol 1 shall have observer status at the Conference of State Parties.
3. The State Parties shall have the right to address questions relating to compliance with or possible circumvention of the provisions of the Treaty as well as any other issue relating to the Treaty at meetings of the Conference of State Parties.
4. The meetings of the Conference of State Parties shall take place in Vienna, unless the Conference decides otherwise.
5. The Secretariat of the Conference of State Parties, which is to work under the guidance of the Chairman, shall be established within the Conflict Prevention Centre of the OSCE.
6. The Chairmanship of the Conference of State Parties shall be assumed by State Parties in rotation, the period of Chairmanship to be one year.
7. The meetings of the Conference of State Parties are to consider:
 - (a) The operation and status of the Treaty;
 - (b) Matters arising from the reports submitted under the provisions of the Treaty;
 - (c) Requests for clarification and fact-finding missions under Article 11.

** Such agreements will be obligatory for all state parties, no matter whether they operate nuclear power plants or not, but the specific verification measures, will of course, differ.

Article 10 / Annual Reports

Each Party shall submit an annual report to the Secretariat of the Conference of State Parties on its nuclear activities as well as other matters related to the Treaty, including national implementation measures, in accordance with the format for reports to be developed by the Conference of State Parties in consultation with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Each Party shall include in its annual report a copy of the overall conclusions of the most recent report by the International Atomic Energy Agency on its inspection activities in the territory of the Party concerned, and give notification promptly of any change in those conclusions. The first report is to be submitted three months after entry into force of the Treaty.

Article 11 / Procedures for considering complaints and for settlement of disputes

1. The Parties agree to consult and cooperate with each other regarding the implementation of the provisions of the Treaty, and to work together in a spirit of cooperation to facilitate compliance by States Parties with their obligations under the Treaty.
2. A Party which wishes to clarify matters of compliance with another Party or which considers that there are grounds for a complaint that another Party to the Treaty or to Protocol I is in breach of its obligations under the Treaty shall submit a request for clarification to that Party, at the same time informing the Chairperson of the Conference of State Parties. A Party receiving such a request for clarification shall provide a reply within 30 days, giving all information which would assist in clarifying the matter, at the same time informing the Chairperson of the Conference of State Parties of this reply.
3. If the requesting Party does not receive a response or deems the response to be unsatisfactory, it may submit the matter to the Conference of State Parties, to be considered at its next meeting. In case the requesting Party considers the matter urgent, it may ask for a special meeting of the Conference of State Parties. The Chairperson will then inform all Parties of such a request, and in the event that within 14 days from the date of such a communication at least one-third of the Parties favour such a special meeting, he will convene this meeting within a further 14 days. A quorum for the special meeting shall consist of a majority of State Parties.
4. Pending the convening of a meeting of the Conference of State Parties, any of the Parties concerned may request the Secretary-General of the OSCE or the Chairperson of the Conference of State Parties to exercise his or her good offices to facilitate the clarification requested. By agreement of the requesting and the requested Parties the matter may also be submitted to one of the conflict resolution procedures which have been adopted in the framework of the OSCE.
5. The meeting of the Conference of State Parties shall first determine whether to consider the matter further, taking into account all information submitted by the States Parties concerned. At the meeting of the Conference of State Parties every effort should be made to reach a decision by

consensus. If no agreement can be reached in this way, the decisions shall be taken by a majority of States Parties present.

6. If the meeting of the Conference of State Parties, after considering any explanation given to it by the representatives of the requested Party, considers that there is sufficient substance in the complaint it may request the International Atomic Energy Agency to conduct an inspection as soon as possible. A representative of the Conference of State Parties may be designated to accompany the IAEA inspectors. The request to the IAEA shall indicate the tasks and objectives of the inspection.

7. Each Party shall give the inspection team full and free access to all information and places within its territory that may be deemed relevant by the inspectors.

8. The Party receiving the inspection team shall take appropriate steps to facilitate its work, and shall accord them the same privileges and immunities as those set forth in the relevant provisions of the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the IAEA.

9. The IAEA shall report the findings of the inspection team as quickly as possible to the Chairperson of the Conference of State Parties. The meeting of the Conference of State Parties will then have to discuss and decide whether there has been a breach of obligations under the Treaty. It may request the State Party to which the complaint was addressed to take measures to establish compliance with the Treaty obligations. The Party so requested shall report on the measures taken in response to this request.

10. The meeting of the Conference of State Parties may suggest to the State Parties involved ways and means to further clarify or resolve the matter under consideration. If the Conference of State Parties concludes by a two-thirds majority that a serious breach of Treaty obligations has occurred, it may refer the matter to the United Nations Security Council.

Article 12 / Signature, ratification and entry into force

1. This Treaty shall be open for signature by any non-nuclear-weapon State having territory in Europe. It shall be subject to ratification.

2. The Treaty shall enter into force on the date of deposit of the (tenth) instrument of ratification.

3. For a signatory State which ratifies the Treaty after the date of entry into force, the Treaty will enter into force on the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification.

Article 13 / Reservations

This Treaty shall not be subject to reservations.

Article 14 / Duration and withdrawal

1. This Treaty shall be of unlimited duration and shall remain in force indefinitely

2. Each State Party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this Treaty. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to all other State Parties, to the Depositary and to the United Nations Security Council. This notification shall include a full explanation of the reasons for the withdrawal.

3. A withdrawal shall take effect only six months after the notification of withdrawal is received by the Depositary. If, however, on the expiry of that six-month period, the withdrawing State Party is engaged in an armed conflict, the withdrawal shall not take effect before the end of the armed conflict.

Article 15 / Review Conferences

Five years after entry into force of the Treaty a conference of the States Parties shall be convened to conduct a review of the operation of the Treaty. Further Review Conferences shall be convened in five-year intervals.

Article 16 / Amendments

1. Any proposal for an amendment to the Treaty submitted by a Party to the Depositary shall be circulated to all Parties.

2. Decision on the adoption of such an amendment shall be taken at a meeting of the Conference of State Parties by a three-fourths majority. A special meeting of the Conference of State Parties can be convened for deciding on an amendment within 30 days if a majority of Parties thus requests.

3. An amendment so adopted shall enter into force for all parties after receipt by the Depositary of the instruments of ratification of three-fourths of the Parties.

Article 17 / Depositary

The Secretary-General of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is designated as the Depositary of this Treaty.

The Depositary shall register the Treaty and its Protocols pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

The Depositary shall transmit copies of the Treaty and its Protocols to all Parties and to all States eligible to become Parties to the Treaty or to the Protocols, and shall notify them of signatures and ratifications of the Treaty and of the Protocols.

Article 18 /Authentic texts

The English, French, Russian and Spanish (.....)texts of this Treaty are equally authentic.

Annex I / Safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

The safeguards referred to in Article 5 shall in respect to each Party be applied by the IAEA as set forth in an agreement negotiated and concluded with the IAEA on all source or special fissionable material in all nuclear activities within the territory of the Party, under its jurisdiction or carried out under its control anywhere. A Party that has already entered into a safeguards agreement with the IAEA is deemed to have already complied with the requirement. Any other Party shall ensure that the safeguards agreement with the IAEA is in force for it not later than one year after the date of entry into force of this Treaty for that Party.

For the purpose of this Treaty, the safeguards referred to above shall have as their purpose the verification of the non-diversion of nuclear material from peaceful nuclear activities to nuclear explosive devices or for purposes unknown.

Protocol I

The Parties to this Protocol,

Convinced of the need to take steps towards the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and of the obligation of all States to contribute to this end, also Convinced that the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Europe constitutes an important measure towards enhancing regional and international peace and security and will promote regional and global disarmament,

Desirous of contributing in an appropriate manner to the effectiveness of the Treaty, have adopted this Protocol:

Article 1

Each Protocol Party undertakes

1. Not to station nuclear explosive devices on the territories of the State Parties to the Treaty,
2. To accept for its citizens all legal and administrative measures undertaken by any State Party, including the imposition of penal sanctions, to prevent and suppress any activity prohibited under the Treaty on the territory of that State Party,
3. To declare as invalid any relevant provisions in agreements with any State Party of the Treaty concerning the status of forces of that Protocol Party which limit jurisdiction of a State Party to the Treaty in matters of

legal and administrative measures referred to in paragraph 2,

3. Not to use or threaten to use nuclear explosive devices against any Party to the Treaty,

4. Not to carry out, to assist, or to encourage armed attack by conventional or other means against nuclear installations in the Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Europe,

5. Not to contribute to any act that constitutes a violation of the Treaty or of this Protocol.

Article 2

Each Protocol Party undertakes to indicate its acceptance, by written notification to the Depositary, of any alteration to its obligations under this Protocol that may be brought about by extension of the territory of the Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Europe, due to entry into force for further State Parties to the Treaty, or by entry into force of an amendment to the Treaty.

Article 3

This Protocol shall be open for signature by China, France, India, Israel, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

Article 4

This Protocol shall be subject to ratification.

Article 5

This Protocol is of a permanent nature and shall remain in force indefinitely, provided that each Party shall, in exercising its national sovereignty, have the right to withdraw from this Protocol if it decides that extraordinary events related to the subject matter of this Protocol, have jeopardized its supreme interests. It shall give notice of such withdrawal to the Depositary twelve months in advance. A statement of the extraordinary events which are regarded as jeopardizing the supreme interests of the withdrawing State are to be included in this notification.

Article 6

This Protocol shall enter into force for each State on the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification with the Depositary or the date of entry into force of the Treaty, whichever is later.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized by their

Governments, have signed this Protocol.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 08 Jul 1998 11:31:09 -0400
From: Bill Robinson <plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>
Organization: Project Ploughshares
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: UK Strategic Defence Review results
To: Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,
Abolition list <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id IAB07092

>From the UK Strategic Defence Review
(<http://www.mod.uk/policy/sdr/index.htm>), released 8 July 1998:

NUCLEAR DETERRENT

– The SDR has confirmed that in a changing and uncertain world, Britain continues to require a credible and effective minimum nuclear deterrent based on the Trident submarine force. This has provided Britain's only nuclear system since the withdrawal of the last of the RAF's free-fall nuclear bombs earlier this year, performing both the strategic and sub-strategic role.

– We will therefore continue to maintain a posture of continuous deterrent patrols with a total force of four Trident ballistic missile submarines. The last Trident submarine, VENGEANCE, will enter service as previously planned around the turn of the century.

– Our Trident force will continue to be allocated to NATO in both the strategic and sub-strategic roles. It will however remain operationally independent and available for use by the United Kingdom alone in a case of supreme national need.

– But continuing improvements in the overall international environment allow us to maintain our nuclear forces at reduced readiness and to make reductions in warhead numbers.

– The SDR has concluded that we can maintain a credible deterrent while making the following changes in our nuclear posture:

the single Trident submarine on deterrent patrol at any time will carry 48 warheads (the same number as deployed on each Polaris submarine when they

entered service);

we will maintain a stockpile of fewer than 200 operationally available warheads;

the submarines will routinely be at a "notice to fire" measured in days rather than the few minutes quick reaction alert that we sustained throughout the Cold War;

submarines on patrol will carry out a variety of secondary tasks, without compromising their security, including hydrographic data collection, equipment trials and exercises with other vessels;

we plan over time to reduce to single crews for each submarine, reflecting reduced operational tempo and reducing operating costs.

– We have also taken an initiative to increase openness about our nuclear capabilities by releasing details of our defence stocks of plutonium and highly enriched uranium.

– In parallel, the Government will press for multilateral negotiations towards mutual, balanced and verifiable reductions in nuclear weapons. British nuclear weapons will be included in such negotiations when the Government is satisfied with verified progress towards the goal of the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

The "supporting essay" on DETERRENCE, ARMS CONTROL, AND PROLIFERATION, containing considerably greater detail, can be found at:

<http://www.mod.uk/policy/sdr/essay05.htm>

--
Bill Robinson, Project Ploughshares,
Conrad Grebel College, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G6
Phone: 519 888-6541 x264 Fax: 519 885-0806
E-mail: plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca
<http://watserv1.uwaterloo.ca/~plough>

Project Ploughshares is a member of the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (<http://watserv1.uwaterloo.ca/~plough/cnanw/cnanw.html>)

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 08 Jul 1998 14:47:16 -0400
From: Stephen Young <syoun@basicint.org>
Organization: BASIC
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Outcome of the UK Strategic Defence Review
To: Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

Thanks to Bill Robinson for the quick posting of the outcome of the British defence review.

A brief analysis by BASIC follows:

The British Government today released the outcome of its year-long Strategic Defence Review. On nuclear issues, the results are overall encouraging. The key failure is the lack of recognition of the role that continued reliance on nuclear weapons plays in proliferation in South Asia and elsewhere. The key disappointment is that little new was said on no-first use, despite a high level of interest in this from Robin Cook, the Foreign Secretary.

With that said, there are several important and praiseworthy steps that should be highlighted.

Key steps:

Trident submarines will carry 48 warheads each, with only one on patrol at any time. This is a reduction from the 96 warheads per sub under previous policy. The UK highlights this as the same number of warheads as were on the Polaris, the first British nuclear-missile sub, when it was deployed. This ignores the fact that the Polaris' warheads were not MIRVed; Trident's are.

Total stockpile will be less than 200 "operationally available" warheads. This is a reduction from the 300 warheads under previous policy, and from a peak of around 450 (which does not include US nukes that operated under dual key arrangements). It is unclear if there is a "hedge" set aside above the 200. It does not include the WE-177 gravity bombs withdrawn from service but not yet dismantled.

On de-alerting: "submarines will routinely be at a 'notice to fire' measured in days rather than the few minutes quick reaction alert that we sustained throughout the Cold War" This certainly appears to be a good step, worthy of emulation, but operational details are not available, at least to me. Information from our de-alerting experts as to what this means would be appreciated.

More openness on stocks of plutonium and highly enriched uranium are also included: 7.6 tonnes of PU, 21.9 tonnes of HEU, and 15,000 tonnes of other forms of uranium. A portion of this stock is being declared excess and will be placed under EURATOM safeguards and liable to inspection by the IAEA.

Good language:

"The Government wished to see a safer world in which there is no place for nuclear weapons." (Chapter Four, "Deterrence and Disarmament", para 60)

"the Government's aim is to take forward the process of nuclear disarmament to ensure that our security can in future be secured without nuclear weapons." (Supporting Essay Five, "Deterrence, Arms Control, and Proliferation", para 14)

On CTBT: "Britain ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty on 6 April this year, alongside France. We were the first two Nuclear Weapon States to do so, and hope the others will soon follow; this is a prerequisite for the Treaty to enter into force."

Other points:

The Review states that other de-alerting steps, specifically ending permanent patrols and removing warheads from missiles, were considered but rejected as "incompatible in current circumstances with maintaining a credible minimum deterrent with a submarine-based nuclear system."

The UK will undertake an 18-month study to develop capabilities to verify reductions in nuclear weapons.

BASIC will continue to analyze the Review, and provide more details as appropriate.

Stephen Young
BASIC

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 09 Jul 1998 09:34:32 -0400
From: peace through reason <prop1@prop1.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Nuclear Crisis: Arjun Makhijani letter, 7/9/98 Washington Post
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, nukenet@envirolink.org
X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org

Steps Back From Danger

By Arjun Makhijani
The Washington Post Thursday, July 9, 1998; Page A19

The nuclear crisis in India and Pakistan was among President Clinton's top agenda items during his "strategic partnership" discussions with President Jiang Zemin in Beijing. Unfortunately, that agenda was too narrow to help defuse the crisis, and may actually aggravate it.

The United States and China now will be seen in India, the world's most populous democracy, as partners that are variously involved in lectures, sanctions and export controls against it. This terrible result is all the worse since the United States and China took only one cosmetic measure on reducing the dangers from their own arsenals. They instead should have focused on disarmament measures that would improve everyone's security.

Both Chinese and U.S. actions have directly and indirectly contributed to the South Asian nuclear arms race. China's decision to go nuclear did not involve India, but its 1964 nuclear test led directly to India's decision to develop nuclear explosives. China provided assistance to Pakistan, notably after the U.S.-Chinese rapprochement in 1971-72, highlighted by President Nixon's trip to China in 1972.

The U.S. "tilt" toward Pakistan during the December 1971 South Asian war was also a major factor in the 1974 Indian nuclear test. President Nixon ordered a nuclear-armed aircraft carrier battle group led by the Enterprise into the Bay of Bengal to show U.S. support for Pakistan. This implicit threat, and the shift in the strategic balance it implied, did not go unnoticed in New Delhi. Pakistan put its own nuclear program on an urgent footing in reaction to India's 1974 test.

Given this history, South Asian leaders are unlikely to respond to sanctions and calls for disarmament, even though their recent escalation of the nuclear arms race has been a grave setback to their own regional security. Indians are angrily contrasting U.S. sanctions against

democratic India with U.S. support for a nuclear-armed China that does not allow a free press (President Clinton's Chinese TV air time notwithstanding).

By not constructively reaching out to India and choosing instead to stress export controls and nonproliferation, the United States and China have further inflamed the situation. Their actions may increase pressures in India for the development of long-range missiles. Pakistan's reaction can easily be imagined.

Both the United States and China face serious nuclear dangers themselves that call for action. In the Middle East, U.S. sanctions against Pakistan and its support for Israel are intensifying resentment in Arab countries and increasing proliferation pressures. The Israeli-Palestinian peace process is stuck. The Asian economic crisis is spreading to Russia, the largest potential source of fissile materials for nuclear black markets. A nuclear crisis in the world's oil patch fed by those black markets would have devastating consequences that neither the United States nor China could remedy. Both are oil importers.

Given the immensity and seriousness of the regional and global nuclear crises, President Clinton missed a major opportunity by not joining nuclear disarmament to the issue of nonproliferation in his discussions with Jiang. China continues to make bold statements about its "no-first-use" policy and its desire to see complete nuclear disarmament, even as it modernizes its nuclear arsenal. President Clinton should have put China to the test and set forth a program to bring all eight nuclear weapons states to the table in an urgent manner based on the self-interest of all parties.

The goals of such a meeting would be clear: (1) Eliminate (so far as technically possible) the danger of accidental nuclear war, and secure nuclear materials and nuclear warheads against diversion. (2) Prevent regional nuclear conflict in South Asia and the Middle East.

The technical measures to accomplish these goals involve various ways of deactivating nuclear weapons, which go under the rubric of "de-alerting." Specific de-alerting techniques range from pinning open switches of missile motors to removing warheads from their delivery systems and storing them separately under multilateral monitoring. De-alerting does not require a prior commitment to a time-bound framework for disarmament, but it would constitute solid progress toward it by being a sort of moratorium on nuclear threats and first strikes.

By contrast, President Clinton proposed to China (and got) only a "de-targeting" agreement -- an essentially cosmetic measure that can be reversed in seconds. Complete de-alerting would vastly reduce the danger of accidental nuclear war and be seen as a giant step toward a nuclear weapons moratorium.

If China does not agree to de-alerting, which is compatible with second-strike deterrence, it will indicate that it is not willing to give substance to its professions of "no-first-use" of nuclear weapons.

On the basis of a U.S. de-alerting commitment, President Clinton could invite the other nuclear weapons states, including India, Israel and Pakistan, to an urgent nuclear summit where an eight-power de-alerting agreement in principle would be signed and a process for accomplishing it would be set in motion. The agenda of the summit would include a multilaterally verified commitment by India, Israel and Pakistan not to mount their weapons on delivery systems and to remove any that have been mounted. India and Pakistan would also agree to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. (Israel has already signed the treaty.)

In this process, the nuclear arsenals of India, Israel and Pakistan would not be treated as legitimate instruments of defense but as dangers to be addressed along with those posed by the arsenals of the five NPT-recognized nuclear weapons states.

Nuclear dangers today are at least as great as they were in 1991, when President Bush made a unilateral decision to remove most tactical nuclear weapons from deployment. President Clinton urgently needs to take the bold step of proposing a program that will greatly reduce regional as well as global nuclear dangers.

The writer is president of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research.

* Peace Through Reason - <http://prop1.org> - Convert the War Machines! *

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Thu, 9 Jul 1998 17:00:10 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org, Jsmith@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: news: Senate eases sanctions; Indian missiles; U.S. India talks

July 9, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: S. Asia back in the headlines

Today the Senate voted 98-0 to approve S.2282, the "Farmer Export Relief Bill," which exempts Agriculture Dept. assistance from nuclear non-proliferation sanctions imposed on India and Pakistan after their nuclear test in May and June. The bill would also temporarily allow the President to waive other sanctions if he determines he should.

While the motivation for much of the support for the bill had more to do with agricultural special interests in states such as Washington, Kansas, Nebraska, and Iowa, the bill was advertised as an attempt to provide the Administration more flexibility in its dialouge with India and Pakistan over the nuclear testing-related crisis on the sub-continent. That dialouge is now underway (see news story, below).

In my view, it the NGO non-proliferation community must still actively work to ensure that fundamental nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament principles are upheld and that key benchmarks for the eventual lifting of sanctions (i.e. test ban, nuclear non-deployment agreement, fission ban, etc.) are maintained and achieved.

The following are three stories related to the South Asian nuclear situation:

- * Indian parliament committee approves development of extended range Agni missile
- * update on U.S.-India dialogue
- * and Senate considers bill to ease India-Pakistan sanctions (from ealier today)

DK

Reuters

07/09 0901

India parliament panel pushes for more missiles

NEW DELHI- An Indian parliamentary panel on Wednesday urged the government to press ahead with development of a full range of missiles, including new versions of the controversial ballistic missile, Agni.

The multi-party Standing Committee on Defence said in a report that both Pakistan and China had missiles which could reach any part of the country, and India had no credible deterrent against China.

"...the government should go ahead full steam in a time-bound manner to develop a full range of missiles, in addition to the variants of the Agni currently under development, as a deterrent to potential enemies from using their ballistic missile capabilities against any of our assets," it said.

The Agni missile, with a planned range of 2,500 km (1,500 miles), is part of India's indigenous missile development programme and is seen as a potential deterrent to its giant nuclear-armed neighbour, China.

"China has also developed a large number of missile systems which can target any part of our country against which we have no credible missile deterrent," the committee said in its report, which was presented to the lower house of parliament.

To India's west, Pakistan was continuing with a missile development programme aimed primarily against its neighbour, the committee said.

The intermediate-range Agni was last tested in February 1994. Lawmakers have accused successive Indian governments of mothballing the missile under Western pressure.

The United States has renewed calls on both India and Pakistan to freeze their missile development programmes in the wake of their tit-for-tat nuclear tests in May.

But the Hindu nationalist-led coalition government which launched the nuclear tests has given permission for work to go-ahead on an extended-range Agni, the 43-member panel said.

"The committee welcomes the clearance of the extended range version of Agni missile by the government," the report said.

But it did not elaborate on the range of the missile, which defence experts say is nuclear-capable.

In a separate report, the committee said the defence allocation in the fiscal budget for 1998/99 (April-March) was not enough to meet the demands for modernisation of the armed forces and said the government must raise it.

Defence expenditure in the budget presented to parliament last month was set at 412 billion rupees (\$9.88 billion), a 14-percent increase over actual spending in fiscal 1997/98.

But the standing committee said the increase would only take care of rising manpower costs.

"The low level of funding is totally insufficient to meet crucial requirements, including modernisation of the armed forces," the lawmakers said.

Defence spending, which as a ratio of the country's gross domestic product has stagnated at 2.4 percent, must be raised to three percent of GDP, the report said.

Reuters

07/09 0415

Scant progress expected in US-India nuclear talks

By John Chalmers

NEW DELHI - The United States and India are unlikely to see eye-to-eye on the question of New Delhi's accession to the global nuclear test ban pact when their envoys meet in Frankfurt on Thursday, a senior Indian official said.

"I think what we are going to say is that, for the time being, it is impossible to sign the CTBT (Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty)," the official, a key policy-making aide, told Reuters.

The aide, who asked not to be named, said New Delhi's emissary, deputy chairman of the Planning Commission Jaswant Singh, would seek to justify India's controversial nuclear tests in his meeting with deputy secretary of state Strobe Talbott.

Indian officials declined to give details of the agenda or even the venue for the closed-door meeting, the second between Singh and Talbott since India's bold and defiant nuclear step in May and tit-for-tat testing by its arch-foe, Pakistan.

The Asian Age daily said the two men were expected to continue their quiet diplomacy at a third meeting in Manila on July 23.

The United States and its allies, concerned that the India and Pakistan could fuel a regional arms race or even spark conflict, have demanded that the two rivals back off.

They have called on New Delhi and Islamabad to refrain from further testing and from equipping weapons with nuclear warheads, and to sign the CTBT.

State Department spokesman James Rubin said on Monday there would be discussion of how India could "make the wise decision" to join the CTBT, but added: "...we are not there yet by any stretch of the imagination."

Brajesh Mishra, principal secretary to India's prime minister, Atal Behari Vajpayee, told reporters on Wednesday that there could be no question of India signing the pact immediately and unconditionally.

India has refused to sign the CTBT, arguing that it would permit the five recognised nuclear powers to fine-tune their arsenals with non-explosive techniques such as computer simulation while holding others in check.

It has also kept out of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which it says legitimises nuclear arms in the hands of a few countries, does not commit them to disarmament in a specified time-frame and forces other nations to renounce nuclear weapons.

However, the Indian aide said Singh would make offers to close the diplomatic rift with Washington, which has imposed economic sanctions on India and Pakistan for their nuclear tests.

He said India would offer to turn its self-imposed moratorium on further tests into a binding obligation and make overtures for joining Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT) negotiations.

The aide said media reports had overplayed the possibility of India signing the CTBT in exchange for access to U.S. dual-use technologies. Controls on such technology, which could be used for civilian nuclear and space programmes, have been imposed on India because of its potential military spin-offs.

"There is a lot of opposition in parliament to signing the CTBT," the aide said. "It is a question of changing opinion in the country."

However, analysts say India and the United States are serious about moving closer on the thorny CTBT question.

New Delhi wants sanctions lifted and U.S. President Bill Clinton is anxious to bring India into the non-proliferation regime to persuade the U.S. Senate to ratify the CTBT, which has languished in the face of opposition from key Republicans since he submitted it in September 1997.

Mishra said India's envoy would mention the document drawn up at the China-U.S. summit in Beijing last month which called on India and Pakistan to curb their nuclear and missile programmes.

India responded sharply to the summit call, accusing China and the United States of hypocrisy and a "hegemonistic mentality."

Reuters 07/08 2149

US Senate panel reaches nuclear sanctions compromise

By Adam Entous

WASHINGTON - Leaders of a U.S. Senate task force set up to review sanctions against nuclear rivals India and Pakistan agreed Wednesday on compromise legislation that would allow the harshest penalties to be lifted.

Kentucky Republican Sen. Mitch McConnell, the panel's chairman, and Delaware Sen. Joe Biden, its senior Democrat, said they would introduce legislation to exempt agricultural export credits and trade financing from the India-Pakistan sanctions, and give President Bill Clinton the authority to

waive other penalties imposed against New Delhi and Islamabad.

The proposal may also clear the way for international lending agencies to restart loan payments stalled because of U.S. sanctions.

A ban on military sales would remain in place.

Aides said the legislation had broad support from lawmakers on the 18-member task force. "There was agreement that we had a consensus to move forward," a spokesman for McConnell said. "We hope to be able to move very quickly on this."

McConnell and Biden were expected to introduce the sanctions reform measure in the Senate Thursday.

As required by U.S. law, Washington slapped broad economic sanctions against India and Pakistan in May for their defiant nuclear tests. Washington suspended foreign assistance and trade financing, and has held up non-humanitarian lending by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

Current law provides no method for lifting the nuclear sanctions.

But in recent weeks, agricultural and business groups have put pressure on members of Congress to curtail the sanctions, arguing that they do not work and only clear the way for competitors from Japan and Europe.

The Clinton administration also complained that its hands were tied by tough sanction laws.

"It's all sticks and no carrot.... We must do something about it because sanctions that have no flexibility, no waiver authority, are just blunt instruments, and diplomacy requires us to have some finesse," U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said last month.

In response, Senate Republican Leader Trent Lott and Democratic Leader Tom Daschle appointed the task force to review existing sanctions and proposals to roll them back.

Lott set a July 15 deadline for the panel to issue its recommendations for India and Pakistan, and said the group would prepare a report by Sept. 1 on overall sanctions policy.

Under the compromise legislation, the United States could support all types of IMF and World Bank loans to both countries, McConnell's office said.

If the bill becomes law, the U.S. Export-Import Bank and the U.S. Overseas Private Investment Corporation would be able to resume lending critical to U.S. trade in the region.

Biden, ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the legislation, by letting the White House waive penalties, would also help the United States negotiate with New Delhi and Islamabad to ease tensions.

The United States and its allies, concerned that the Indian and Pakistani

tests could fuel a regional arms race or spark conflict, have demanded that the two rivals take measures to head off that prospect.

They called on the rival states to refrain from further testing and from equipping weapons with nuclear warheads and to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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: Fri, 10 Jul 1998 12:00:01 +0100 (BST)
From: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT/Strategy ideas
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de,
abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca
cc: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org

Dear Abolition Friends,

It is a few weeks now since there were a number of contributions on the listserver about what we should be planning/thinking about in relation to the NPT Prep Comm in 1999 and the Review Conference in 2000.

I've been thinking about all the contributions and I have come up with the following ideas. Bearing in mind that the Hague Appeal for Peace events will be taking place almost immediately after the 1999 NPT Prep Comm I think that a smaller more focussed effort in New York of the key people/groups who really want to be there with the grassroots gathering in the Hague may well be the most effective use of our collective resources. The lesson I draw from what we have done at the two Prep Comms so far is that intensive lobbying of the capitals in the two or three months prior to the meeting would be the most useful thing to do; backed up by well presented material and dialogue at the time of the meeting. You don't need hundreds of people to do that.

The only problem there might be with that approach is that the delegations at the NPT might think that we were losing some momentum and not keeping the pressure on...what do people think?

For the 2000 Review Conference I think we really need to be developing a strategy now based on what we want to get out of it, which is a commitment to abolition is it not?

The question is how. I would like to see a thorough discussion of Zia Mian's idea for an amendment conference. How would this fit in with the New Agenda Coalition and the Middle Power initiative? What are people planning to do next with the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention? From a number of recent discussions I have been involved in I sense that the India/Pakistan tests have woken up a number of arms controllers to the idea of the Convention...

I really hope we can get a good discussion going on this.

Yours in peace,
Janet Bloomfield.

p.s. ideas about mobilising the grassroots welcome to!

Janet Bloomfield, 25, Farmadine, Saffron Walden, Essex, CB11 3HR. England.
Phone/fax: +44 (0) 1799 516189.
e-mail: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org

To: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de, abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: NPT/Strategy ideas
Cc: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 12:00 PM 7/10/98 +0100, Janet Bloomfield wrote:

>Dear Abolition Friends,
>It is a few weeks now since there were a number of contributions on the
>listserver about what we should we planning/thinking about in relation to
>the NPT Prep Comm in 1999 and the Review Conference in 2000....

Dear Friends:

I'm glad that Janet Bloomfield is reopening the NPT PrepCom discussion. I was too busy earlier to respond.

The 1998 PrepCom session was frustrating because the U.S. and other nuclear weapon states blocked significant discussion. However, NGO representatives accomplished a lot in working through our ideas and bonding. Furthermore, we received praise for our substantive input from the NAM chair and an invitation to provide our material to their delegates prior to the next session.

Among other things I suggest that we respond to this invitation, beginning this fall by offering workshops in New York where most of the NAM members have missions. They have a voice in international gatherings. We have technical knowledge they could draw upon. We need to bring this combination together.

I agree with Janet that we need stronger lobbying in capitols several months prior to the PrepCom session. I know in the United States that we can do better than we did in 1998. I hope that our colleagues in NATO nations can lobby their governments in an attempt to break into subserviency to the United States. Likewise for other nations where Abolition 2000 is active.

It seems very unlikely that the PrepCom will create an intersessional working group to start drafting a nuclear weapons convention. So I doubt that we should make that a major focus of our efforts. An alternative might be to push the PrepCom to adopt the platform of the New Agenda Coalition. In that way we can relate to what some member delegations are already advocating.

The value of the NPT PrepCom is to serve as a sounding board of world opinion to pressure the nuclear weapon states to fulfill their Article VI obligation for nuclear disarmament. It is the one forum in which NGOs have access, so we should continue to be a strong presence in 1999. Maybe we don't need as many people in New York in 1999 as we had in Geneva in 1998, but as Janet says, we need focussed effort.

The 2000 Review Conference is another matter, for it is likely to have a more substantive focus. We need discussion to look ahead to 2000 but not neglect the 1999 Preparatory Committee in the meantime.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 10 Jul 1998 07:39:03 -0400
From: peace through reason <prop1@prop1.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Media List
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org

For those who want to join Karina in writing the press, we've just posted the Washington Peace Center's Media Guide '98 -- "local" means Washington DC-area, but there are also national newspapers, TV and radio

Here's how you get to it: go to our website <http://prop1.org> and click on "E-Z Lobby," scroll to bottom of page -- or click on "Calendar" -- or go directly to <http://prop1.org/2000/media98.htm>

Anyone who has other addresses to add to the list (including e-mail and websites), or knows of other posted lists to link to, let me know?

Ellen Thomas
prop1@prop1.org

At 09:23 AM 7/9/98 -0700, Karina Wood <kwood@igc.apc.org> wrote:

>Excellent op-ed! well done Alice and Mr. Sheinbaum!
>
>A priority of our Abolition 2000 Network is to get PUBLICITY and MEDIA
>EXPOSURE for our message. If your local newspaper and the magazines/journals
>you subscribe to have not run an article like this one, please get one
>submitted by you and/or the most print-worthy person you know locally.

* Peace Through Reason - <http://prop1.org> - Convert the War Machines! *

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 9 Jul 1998 10:58:37 -0700 (PDT)
From: Jonathan Parfrey <psrsm@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Music: information please
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, rherried@roxy.sfo.com, nukenet@envirolink.org
X-Sender: psrsm@pop.igc.apc.org

Hi:

I'm looking for nuclear weapon-related songs/music.

Familiar with the "Atomic Cafe" soundtrack . . . but what else is out there?

Have any Classical pieces been written on Hiroshima?

Thank you.

Jonathan Parfrey
Executive Director
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Los Angeles
1316 Third Street Promenade, Suite B1
Santa Monica, California 90401-1325
310.458.2694/phone * 310.458.7925/fax * psrsm@psr.org *
<http://www.labridge.com/psr/>

To: Jonathan Parfrey <psrsm@igc.apc.org>, abolition-caucus@igc.org, rherried@roxy.sfo.com, nukenet@envirolink.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Music: information please
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 10:58 AM 7/9/98 -0700, Jonathan Parfrey wrote:
>Hi:
>
>I'm looking for nuclear weapon-related songs/music.

Dear Jonathan:

When I was in college in the late '40s someone wrote a song, "Atomic Showers May Come Your Way", using the tune of "April Showers", and another called "I'm Radioactive But I'm in Love with You." However, I've lost the words and the tune for the latter.

Although Pete Seeger's "Where Have All Flowers Gone" is generic against all wars, it is applicable to nuclear war. Peter Yeager sang it at the Hard Rock Cafe in New York on September 24, 1996 at an abolition-oriented citizens pledge signing ceremony the day heads of states signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty at the UN.

There is a hymn, "This is My Song", words by Lloyd Stone, set to the music of Sibelius' Finlandia, that states
"My country's skies are bluer than the ocean,
and sunlight beams on cloverleaf and pine;
but other lands have sunlight too, and clover,
and skies are everywhere as blue as mine.
O hear my song, thou God of all the nations,
a song of peace for their land and for mine."

There is another hymn with words "Let there be peace on earth, and let it begin with me." Words and music by Sy Miller and Jill Jackson.

On the classical music front Benjamin Britten's "War Requiem", composed during World War II, has been performed as protest. During the Gulf War Leonard Bernstein conducted Haydn's "Mass in Time of War" (I'm not certain of the title) at the National Cathedral in Washington, D.C.

Shalom,
Howard

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Meeting notes from July 8, 1998
Cc: ctbt
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

Here are some notes from the meeting of religious organizations on CTBT, held on July 8, 1998.

The CTBT is still stalled in the Senate. Two strategies are under consideration to get it moving: (1) the Specter-Biden resolution, calling for hearings and floor action and (2) a possible unanimous consent agreement setting a date certain for a vote on the CTBT in 1999.

Senator Specter is expected to return to his office soon, following his heart surgery. He may offer the Specter-Biden resolution as an amendment to an appropriations bill or some other measure before the August recess. The resolution has about 35 co-sponsors, all Democrats except Senators Specter, Jeffords, and Gregg. There is a need to get more Republican co-sponsors, such as Collins, Frist, Lugar, Hagel. Specter may negotiate some change of language to bring in other co-sponsors. We agreed that we would ask our contacts in Maine to urge Senator Collins to become a co-sponsor. Contacts in other states remain desirable.

In September some Democrats may push for a unanimous consent resolution to set a date certain, such as in March 1999, for a vote on the CTBT. In practical terms the United States must have ratified by then in order to participate in a signatories' conference in September 1999 to consider changes in the entry-into-force provisions (now requiring ratification by 44 specific nations, including India and Pakistan). The leverage for this U.C. resolution would be to hold up legislation on the Republican agenda. Stay tuned.

In the meantime we need to keep up grassroots pressure on senators to support the Specter-Biden resolution. As part of this effort several organizations are sponsoring a call-your-senator day on July 16; for information, call Bruce Hall at Peace Action, 202 862-9740. 20/20 Vision is sponsoring a "roots on radio" call-in to local talk radio in nine key states; for information contact Marie Rietmann at 202 833-2020. Marie is also organizing a conference call for Mississippi on August 13 and wants names of contacts in those states. Lisa Ledwidge at PSR is compiling a list of local Hiroshima-Nagasaki events on August 6 & 9; if you know of any, please get in touch with her at 202 898-0150 or ledwidge@psr.org.

Through a special grant field organizers have been hired in Washington, Oregon, Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas, Indiana, Tennessee, and Maine to work for the next six weeks in CTBT grassroots organizing. Kathy Crandall of the Disarmament Clearinghouse (202 898-0150, ext. 232) would like contact names in these states to pass on to the organizers. As an alternative, you can get the organizers' names from Kathy and send them to your contacts, asking them to get in touch with the organizers.

An opinion poll by Mark Mellman in some of these states reveals strong support for the CTBT. Poll results will be released on July 17. We can provide this information to our contacts in these states and ask them to share this information with their senators.

We agreed to try a second time to have a breakfast meeting with a senator and invite a broader group of religious representatives. Tuesday, September 15 was picked as a tentative date. David Culp will help with the details. Walter Owensby suggested that we arrange for an audio connection with activists in the key states. This will be explored. Would your organization be willing to be listed as a co-sponsor of this breakfast? If so, please call me. There will be a meeting on plans for the breakfast event on Tuesday, August 4 at 1:00 at FCNL.

There is discussion of staging some kind of event, such as a debate on the CTBT between two senators, pro and con,

that could attract C-Span coverage. Religious organizations may be asked to be co-sponsors. If so, I'll get in touch with you.

We had brief discussion of the possibility of sustaining an interfaith coalition to work together on other aspects of nuclear disarmament but came to no conclusions.

The next meeting of religious organizations working together for the CTBT will be on Wednesday, September 9 from 1:00 to 2:30 at FCNL.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 10 Jul 1998 07:22:40 -0700 (PDT)
From: Tracy Moavero <paintl@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: USA LISTSERVER IS READY!
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: paintl@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Dear A2000 activists,

Yes, Abolition-USA is finally ready! Sorry for the delay. The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation was able to set up a free listserver for us, and they have agreed to manage it (thanks go to Sue Broidy).

Abolition-USA is intended for US-specific messages which would not be appropriate for a list which reaches activists all over the world. It is intended to:

- strengthen the US abolition network through planning nationally and regionally coordinated actions
- share nuclear-related information and news which is relevant for US-based groups
- coordinate initiatives related to the work of the US Congress, the Administration and the Department of Energy.

To subscribe to the abolition-usa listserver, send the following message to majordomo@xmission.com

Leave the subject line blank.

In the body of the message put `subscribe abolition-usa youremail@here`

Once you have signed on you can post a message to the list by sending your message to abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Please don't double post to both lists. We want this listserver to make our work more efficient, not more overloaded.

I look forward to seeing our new listserver in action.

Cheers,
Tracy Moavero

Tracy Moavero
Peace Action International Office
866 UN Plaza, Room 4053
New York, NY 10017-1822
USA
Tel.: +1-212-750-5795
Fax: +1-212-750-5849
Email: paintl@igc.apc.org
Web: www.webcom.com/peaceact

Peace Action is a member of the International Peace Bureau & Abolition 2000:

A Global Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

To: majordomo@xmission.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject:
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

subscribe abolition-usa mupj@igc.org

Return-Path: <majordomo-owner@lists.xmission.com>
To: mupj@igc.org
From: majordomo@lists.xmission.com
Subject: Confirmation for subscribe abolition-usa
Reply-To: majordomo@lists.xmission.com
Date: Fri, 10 Jul 1998 09:28:20 -0600

--

Someone (possibly you) has requested that your email address be added to or deleted from the mailing list "abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com".

If you really want this action to be taken, please send the following commands (exactly as shown) back to "majordomo@lists.xmission.com":

```
auth 83d4866b subscribe abolition-usa mupj@igc.org
```

If you do not want this action to be taken, simply ignore this message and the request will be disregarded.

If your mailer will not allow you to send the entire command as a single line, you may split it using backslashes, like so:

```
auth 83d4866b subscribe abolition-usa \  
mupj@igc.org
```

If you have any questions about the policy of the list owner, please contact "abolition-usa-approval@lists.xmission.com".

Thanks!

majordomo@lists.xmission.com

Return-Path: <majordomo-owner@lists.xmission.com>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: majordomo@lists.xmission.com
Subject: Majordomo results
Reply-To: majordomo@lists.xmission.com
Date: Fri, 10 Jul 1998 09:28:20 -0600

--

>>>> subscribe abolition-usa mupj@igc.org
**** Your request to majordomo@lists.xmission.com:

**** subscribe abolition-usa mupj@igc.org

**** must be authenticated. To accomplish this, another request must be
**** sent in with an authorization key, which has been sent to:
**** mupj@igc.org

**** If the message is not received, there is generally a problem with
**** the address. Before reporting this as a problem, please note the
**** following:

**** You only need to give an address to the subscribe command if you want
**** to receive list mail at a different address from where you sent the
**** command. Otherwise you can simply omit it.

**** If you do give an address to the subscribe command, it must be a legal
**** address. It should not consist solely of your name. The address must
**** point to a machine that is reachable from the list server.

**** If you have any questions about the policy of the list owner, please
**** contact "abolition-usa-approval@lists.xmission.com".

**** Thanks!

**** majordomo@lists.xmission.com
>>>>
>>>> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
**** Command 'howard' not recognized.
>>>> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
**** Command 'methodists' not recognized.
>>>> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
**** Command '1500' not recognized.
>>>> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org
**** Command 'phone/fax:' not recognized.
>>>>
>>>> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
**** Command 'methodists' not recognized.
>>>> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.
**** Command 'laity' not recognized.
>>>>
>>>>
**** Help for majordomo@lists.xmission.com:

This help message is being sent to you from the Majordomo mailing list management system at majordomo@lists.xmission.com.

This is version 1.94.4 of Majordomo.

If you're familiar with mail servers, an advanced user's summary of Majordomo's commands appears at the end of this message.

Majordomo is an automated system which allows users to subscribe and unsubscribe to mailing lists, and to retrieve files from list archives.

You can interact with the Majordomo software by sending it commands in the body of mail messages addressed to "majordomo@lists.xmission.com". Please do not put your commands on the subject line; Majordomo does not process commands in the subject line.

You may put multiple Majordomo commands in the same mail message. Put each command on a line by itself.

If you use a "signature block" at the end of your mail, Majordomo may mistakenly believe each line of your message is a command; you will then receive spurious error messages. To keep this from happening, either put a line starting with a hyphen ("-") before your signature, or put a line with just the word

end

on it in the same place. This will stop the Majordomo software from processing your signature as bad commands.

Here are some of the things you can do using Majordomo:

I. FINDING OUT WHICH LISTS ARE ON THIS SYSTEM

To get a list of publicly-available mailing lists on this system, put the following line in the body of your mail message to majordomo@lists.xmission.com:

lists

Each line will contain the name of a mailing list and a brief description of the list.

To get more information about a particular list, use the "info" command, supplying the name of the list. For example, if the name of the list about which you wish information is "demo-list", you would put the line

info demo-list

in the body of the mail message.

II. SUBSCRIBING TO A LIST

Once you've determined that you wish to subscribe to one or more lists on this system, you can send commands to Majordomo to have it add you to the list, so you can begin receiving mailings.

To receive list mail at the address from which you're sending your mail, simply say "subscribe" followed by the list's name:

```
subscribe demo-list
```

If for some reason you wish to have the mailings go to a different address (a friend's address, a specific other system on which you have an account, or an address which is more correct than the one that automatically appears in the "From:" header on the mail you send), you would add that address to the command. For instance, if you're sending a request from your work account, but wish to receive "demo-list" mail at your personal account (for which we will use "jqpublic@my-isp.com" as an example), you'd put the line

```
subscribe demo-list jqpublic@my-isp.com
```

in the mail message body.

Based on configuration decisions made by the list owners, you may be added to the mailing list automatically. You may also receive notification that an authorization key is required for subscription. Another message will be sent to the address to be subscribed (which may or may not be the same as yours) containing the key, and directing the user to send a command found in that message back to majordomo@lists.xmission.com. (This can be a bit of extra hassle, but it helps keep you from being swamped in extra email by someone who forged requests from your address.) You may also get a message that your subscription is being forwarded to the list owner for approval; some lists have waiting lists, or policies about who may subscribe. If your request is forwarded for approval, the list owner should contact you soon after your request.

Upon subscribing, you should receive an introductory message, containing list policies and features. Save this message for future reference; it will also contain exact directions for unsubscribing. If you lose the intro mail and would like another copy of the policies, send this message to majordomo@lists.xmission.com:

```
intro demo-list
```

(substituting, of course, the real name of your list for "demo-list").

III. UNSUBSCRIBING FROM MAILING LISTS

Your original intro message contains the exact command which should be used to remove your address from the list. However, in most cases, you may simply send the command "unsubscribe" followed by the list name:

```
unsubscribe demo-list
```

(This command may fail if your provider has changed the way your address is shown in your mail.)

To remove an address other than the one from which you're sending the request, give that address in the command:

```
unsubscribe demo-list jqpublic@my-isp.com
```

In either of these cases, you can tell `majordomo@lists.xmission.com` to remove the address in question from all lists on this server by using "*" in place of the list name:

```
unsubscribe *  
unsubscribe * jqpublic@my-isp.com
```

IV. FINDING THE LISTS TO WHICH AN ADDRESS IS SUBSCRIBED

To find the lists to which your address is subscribed, send this command in the body of a mail message to `majordomo@lists.xmission.com`:

```
which
```

You can look for other addresses, or parts of an address, by specifying the text for which Majordomo should search. For instance, to find which users at `my-isp.com` are subscribed to which lists, you might send the command

```
which my-isp.com
```

Note that many list owners completely or fully disable the "which" command, considering it a privacy violation.

V. FINDING OUT WHO'S SUBSCRIBED TO A LIST

To get a list of the addresses on a particular list, you may use the "who" command, followed by the name of the list:

```
who demo-list
```

Note that many list owners allow only a list's subscribers to use the "who" command, or disable it completely, believing it to be a privacy violation.

VI. RETRIEVING FILES FROM A LIST'S ARCHIVES

Many list owners keep archives of files associated with a list. These may include:

- back issues of the list
- help files, user profiles, and other documents associated with the list
- daily, monthly, or yearly archives for the list

To find out if a list has any files associated with it, use the "index" command:

index demo-list

If you see files in which you're interested, you may retrieve them by using the "get" command and specifying the list name and archive filename. For instance, to retrieve the files called "profile.form" (presumably a form to fill out with your profile) and "demo-list.9611" (presumably the messages posted to the list in November 1996), you would put the lines

```
get demo-list profile.form
get demo-list demo-list.9611
```

in your mail to majordomo@lists.xmission.com.

VII. GETTING MORE HELP

To contact a human site manager, send mail to majordomo-owner@lists.xmission.com. To contact the owner of a specific list, send mail to that list's approval address, which is formed by adding "-approval" to the user-name portion of the list's address. For instance, to contact the list owner for demo-list@lists.xmission.com, you would send mail to demo-list-approval@lists.xmission.com.

To get another copy of this help message, send mail to majordomo@lists.xmission.com with a line saying

```
help
```

in the message body.

VIII.COMMAND SUMMARY FOR ADVANCED USERS

In the description below items contained in []'s are optional. When providing the item, do not include the []'s around it. Items in angle brackets, such as <address>, are meta-symbols that should be replaced by appropriate text without the angle brackets.

It understands the following commands:

```
subscribe <list> [<address>]
```

Subscribe yourself (or <address> if specified) to the named <list>.

```
unsubscribe <list> [<address>]
```

Unsubscribe yourself (or <address> if specified) from the named <list>.

"unsubscribe *" will remove you (or <address>) from all lists. This may not work if you have subscribed using multiple addresses.

```
get <list> <filename>
```

Get a file related to <list>.

```
index <list>
```

Return an index of files you can "get" for <list>.

```
which [<address>]
```

Find out which lists you (or <address> if specified) are on.

who <list>

Find out who is on the named <list>.

info <list>

Retrieve the general introductory information for the named <list>.

intro <list>

Retrieve the introductory message sent to new users. Non-subscribers may not be able to retrieve this.

lists

Show the lists served by this Majordomo server.

help

Retrieve this message.

end

Stop processing commands (useful if your mailer adds a signature).

Commands should be sent in the body of an email message to "majordomo@lists.xmission.com". Multiple commands can be processed provided each occurs on a separate line.

Commands in the "Subject:" line are NOT processed.

If you have any questions or problems, please contact "majordomo-owner@lists.xmission.com".

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Fri, 10 Jul 1998 11:38:55 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: CTBT Ratification #14: Tajikistan

July 10

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Tajikistan ratifies

There are now 149 signatories and 14 ratifiers. Six of the 44 states who must ratify before entry into force have done so. For a complete list of CTBT Signers and Ratifiers, see:

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

CTBT Ratifiers:

State	Date of Signature	Date of Ratification
Tajikistan	7 October 1996	10 June 1998
France*	24 September 1996	6 April 1998
United Kingdom*	24 September 1996	6 April 1998
Austria*	24 September 1996	13 March 1998
Slovakia*	30 September 1996	3 March 1998
Turkmenistan	24 September 1996	20 February 1998
Peru*	25 September 1996	12 November 1997
Czech Republic	24 September 1996	12 September 1997
Mongolia	1 October 1996	8 August 1997
Micronesia	24 September 1996	25 July 1997
Japan*	24 September 1996	8 July 1997
Uzbekistan	3 October 1996	29 May 1997
Qatar	24 September 1996	3 March 1997
Fiji	24 September 1996	10 October 1996

TOTAL Ratifications: 14

*among group of 44 states whose ratification is necessary for CTBT entry into force

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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, 10 Jul 1998 11:59:02 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Re: Meeting notes from July 8, 1998

Thanks for the summary Howard. Please note that the recent polling in 5-states was conducted by The Mellman Group (democratic pollster) and the Withlin Group (republican pollster) for the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

Thanks,

DK

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>Here are some notes from the meeting of religious organizations on CTBT,
>held on July 8, 1998.

>

>The CTBT is still stalled in the Senate. Two strategies are under
>consideration to get it moving: (1) the Specter-Biden resolution, calling
>for hearings and floor action and (2) a possible unanimous consent agreement
>setting a date certain for a vote on the CTBT in 1999.

>

>Senator Specter is expected to return to his office soon, following his
>heart surgery. He may offer the Specter-Biden resolution as an amendment to
>an appropriations bill or some other measure before the August recess. The
>resolution has about 35 co-sponsors, all Democrats except Senators Specter,
>Jeffords, and Gregg. There is a need to get more Republican co-sponsors,
>such as Collins, Frist, Lugar, Hagel. Specter may negotiate some change of
>language to bring in other co-sponsors. We agreed that we would ask our
>contacts in Maine to urge Senator Collins to become a co-sponsor. Contacts
>in other states remain desirable.

>

>In September some Democrats may push for a unanimous consent resolution to
>set a date certain, such as in March 1999, for a vote on the CTBT. In
>practical terms the United States must have ratified by then in order to
>participate in a signatories' conference in September 1999 to consider
>changes in the entry-into-force provisions (now requiring ratification by 44
>specific nations, including India and Pakistan). The leverage for this U.C.
>resolution would be to hold up legislation on the Republican agenda. Stay
>tuned.

>

>In the meantime we need to keep up grassroots pressure on senators to
>support the Specter-Biden resolution. As part of this effort several
>organizations are sponsoring a call-your-senator day on July 16; for
>information, call Bruce Hall at Peace Action, 202 862-9740. 20/20 Vision is
>sponsoring a "roots on radio" call-in to local talk radio in nine key
>states; for information contact Marie Rietmann at 202 833-2020. Marie is
>also organizing a conference call for Mississippi on August 13 and wants

>names of contacts in those states. Lisa Ledwidge at PSR is compiling a list
>of local Hiroshima-Nagasaki events on August 6 & 9; if you know of any,
>please get in touch with her at 202 898-0150 or ledwidge@psr.org.
>
>Through a special grant field organizers have been hired in Washington,
>Oregon, Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas, Indiana, Tennessee, and Maine
>to work for the next six weeks in CTBT grassroots organizing. Kathy
>Crandall of the Disarmament Clearinghouse (202 898-0150, ext. 232) would
>like contact names in these states to pass on to the organizers. As an
>alternative, you can get the organizers' names from Kathy and send them to
>your contacts, asking them to get in touch with the organizers.
>
>An opinion poll by Mark Mellman in some of these states reveals strong
>support for the CTBT. Poll results will be released on July 17. We can
>provide this information to our contacts in these states and ask them to
>share this information with their senators.
>
>We agreed to try a second time to have a breakfast meeting with a senator
>and invite a broader group of religious representatives. Tuesday, September
>15 was picked as a tentative date. David Culp will help with the details.
>Walter Owensby suggested that we arrange for an audio connection with
>activists in the key states. This will be explored. Would your
>organization be willing to be listed as a co-sponsor of this breakfast? If
>so, please call me. There will be a meeting on plans for the breakfast
>event on Tuesday, August 4 at 1:00 at FCNL.
>
>There is discussion of staging some kind of event, such as a debate on the
>CTBT between two senators, pro and con, that could attract C-Span coverage.
>Religious organizations may be asked to be co-sponsors. If so, I'll get in
>touch with you.
>
> We had brief discussion of the possibility of sustaining an interfaith
>coalition to work together on other aspects of nuclear disarmament but came
>to no conclusions.
>
>The next meeting of religious organizations working together for the CTBT
>will be on Wednesday, September 9 from 1:00 to 2:30 at FCNL.
>
>Shalom,
>Howard
>
>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
>
>Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
>laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.
>
>

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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: majordomo@lists.xmission.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Confirmation for subscribe abolition-usa
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

auth 83d4866b subscribe abolition-usa mupj@igc.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
To: mupj@igc.org
From: majordomo@lists.xmission.com
Subject: Welcome to abolition-usa
Reply-To: majordomo@lists.xmission.com
Date: Fri, 10 Jul 1998 14:37:41 -0600

--

Welcome to the abolition-usa mailing list!

Please save this message for future reference. Thank you.

If you ever want to remove yourself from this mailing list,
you can send mail to <majordomo@lists.xmission.com> with the following
command in the body of your email message:

unsubscribe abolition-usa

or from another account, besides mupj@igc.org:

unsubscribe abolition-usa mupj@igc.org

If you ever need to get in contact with the owner of the list,
(if you have trouble unsubscribing, or have questions about the
list itself) send email to <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com> .
This is the general rule for most mailing lists when you need
to contact a human.

Here's the general information for the list you've subscribed to,
in case you don't already have it:

WELCOME TO ABOLITION-USA!

To post to the list, mail to:
abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

For subscribing, unsubscribing, and so on:
abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com

WELCOME TO ABOLITION-USA!

Abolition 2000 was founded in 1995 as a global campaign to eliminate nuclear
weapons.

PURPOSE OF ABOLITION-USA! "ABOLITION-USA" is a community of
PURPOSE OF ABOLITION-USA! "ABOLITION-USA" is a list intended to serve the
community of peace-minded and action-oriented citizens and citizen initiatives
concerned with promoting grassroots action for the abolition of nuclear weapons.
This list is intended to help in the coordination and discussion of citizen
initiatives in the United States which will change the course of U.S. nuclear
policy and enable us to secure a treaty by the year 2000 for the elimination of
nuclear weapons.

We invite you to share information about local activities, upcoming events, exemplary actions, political strategies, media strategies, and other ideas which will forward the action and strengthen the network of citizens and grassroots organizations committed to securing a nuclear weapons convention before the next millennium.

ABOUT ABOLITION 2000: In April 1995, during the first weeks of the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference, activists from around the world recognized that the issue of nuclear abolition was not on the agenda. Activists met together to write the Abolition 2000 Statement that has become the founding document of the Abolition 2000 Network. Over 1,000 organizations in 76 countries have now signed it and are actively working in ten working groups to accomplish the eleven points listed in it.

Abolition 2000 can be reached at:

<http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>

To view the Abolition statement go to:

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

To see who is participating in the network go to

http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/organizs_index.html

RESOURCES:

You are also invited to join other listserves of Abolition 2000:

INTERNATIONAL ABOLITION 2000 CAUCUS

To subscribe to the

International Abolition Caucus e-mail listserv,

send an email message

to: majordomo@igc.apc.org,

leave subject area blank,

write in body of message: subscribe abolition-caucus youremail@here

ABOLITION DAYS WORKING GROUP

To subscribe to the A-days Working Group

e-mail listserv, send an e-mail message

to: majordomo@xs4all.nl,

leave subject area blank,

write in body of message: subscribe motherearth-a-days youremail@here

NATO WORKING GROUP

To subscribe to the

NATO Working Group e-mail listserv,

send an email message

to: majordomo@igc.org,

leave subject area blank,

write in body of message:

subscribe start3-europenwfz@igc.org youremail@here

RELIGIOUS WORKING GROUP

To subscribe to the

Religious Working Group e-mail listserv,

contact Howard Hallman

at mupj@igc.apc.org

SUPPORT ABOLITION 2000!

Financial contributions for Abolition 2000 network support can be wired to us via:

Montecito Bank & Trust, 1000 State Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101 --
Routing No. ABA - 122 234 783, Account No. 192 036 100
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794

We look forward to hearing from you!

Abolition 2000
Susan Broidy, Coordinator

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123
Santa Barbara, California; 93108
Phone: (805) 965-3443;
Fax (805) 568-0466;
e-mail: a2000@silcom.com
web-site: <http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>

Sponsored by XMission <http://www.xmission.com>

Facilitated by the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
e-mail: wagingpeace@napf.org
web-site: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/>

To: Dringler@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Suggestion resolution change
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Robin:

Here is an e-mail version of suggestion changes in the resolution on "The United Methodist Church and Peace", which I've also sent by fax.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Suggested Changes in Resolution on "The United Methodist Church and Peace"
Offered by Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

1. Disarmament

3rd paragraph: rearrange and revise as follows

We support initiatives that move toward the goal of complete and general disarmament. In particular, we support the abolition of nuclear weapons. We affirm the prophetic position of our bishops who said in their statement In Defense of Creation: "We say a clear and unconditional NO to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing." Accordingly, we reject the possession of nuclear weapons as a permanent basis for securing and maintaining peace. Possession no longer can be tolerated, even as a temporary expedient. We call upon all possessors of nuclear weapons to renounce these vile instruments of mass destruction and to move expeditiously to dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles.

4th paragraph: replace as follows:

We support the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. We call upon all nations to become signatories of these important treaties and to abide by their provisions.

7th paragraph: add the following sentence:

We support universal application of the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention.

July 13, 1998

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>
Date: Mon, 13 Jul 1998 10:52:52 -0400
From: disarmament@igc.org
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org
Subject: Talking Nuke Issues - NAM, US SENATE
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Rtw 07/13 1037 Non-Aligned summit to discuss nuclear issue

By Christine Hauser

CAIRO, July 13 (Reuters) - South Africa's Deputy Foreign Minister Aziz Pahad said on Monday a Non-Aligned Movement summit in September would focus on how to tackle poverty and nuclear proliferation in the group's 115 member countries.

"This year's agenda, on the eve of the millennium, will look at the economic aspects of NAM...and how to break out of the spiral of poverty and achieve sustainable development," he said.

Pahad was speaking to Reuters during a visit to Cairo where he discussed with NAM founding member Egypt the agenda for the meeting of NAM leaders in South Africa on September 2 and 3.

"An important thrust of the meeting will be analysis of the Asian economic crisis and how to ensure the least developed countries enter the world economy in an equitable way."

He said the NAM summit in Durban would discuss conflicts in Africa, the gulf and the Middle East. "Sustainable development is linked to peace and stability," Pahad said.

NAM leaders will discuss the nuclear issue, which hit the spotlight when India conducted surprise nuclear tests in May and arch-rival Pakistan followed suit.

Last month Egypt and South Africa joined Sweden, Ireland, New Zealand, Slovenia, Brazil and Mexico in calling on India, Pakistan and Israel to help make the world free of nuclear arms.

The signatories have said the nuclear tests by India and Pakistan underscored the importance of the initiative but had not prompted the resolution, which they hope others will sign.

"We must try and convince other members of NAM to see whether they can sign and really bring to the fore the issue of mass destruction weapons," Pahad said.

India and Pakistan are both members of NAM.

"The whole issue of non-proliferation will be a topic and whether members can subscribe to it. We think it goes across ideological divides," Pahad said.

South Africa is the only country outside the former Soviet Union to have produced nuclear weapons and then destroyed them.

It said in 1993 it had built six nuclear bombs as part of its apartheid-era weapons programme, but destroyed them on the orders of former president F.W. de Klerk shortly after he came to power in 1989.

Cairo renewed its call for a regional nuclear-free zone after the Pakistani and Indian tests. Egypt and other Arab states say Israel's nuclear arsenal and refusal to join weapons treaties endangers countries in the Middle East and beyond.

Copyright, 1998. The Associated Press. All rights reserved.

By LAURA MYERS

Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) -- There's not a sign saying "check your politics at the door," but that's what a group of senators say they're doing in quiet meetings to discuss U.S. foreign policy minus the usual partisan rancor.

Sen. Max Baucus, a Montana Democrat, recruited the bipartisan group of senators with "their heads on straight, feet on the ground" to talk about trade and China, India and Pakistan nuclear tests and other contentious issues.

The goal, Baucus said, is to "clear out some of the political underbrush on a lot of foreign policy debates."

Nebraska Sen. Chuck Hagel is lead Republican in the group of around 20 senators, whose fourth meeting is scheduled for early this week.

"This is more important than partisan politics," Hagel said. He said most foreign policy debate in the Congress controlled by his party "sinks into the swamp of raw-meat politics" aimed at embarrassing President Clinton or bargaining with the Democratic Party.

"When the world needs U.S. leadership as much as it's ever needed it, I'm not sure we're providing that leadership," Hagel said.

He argued that allowing Clinton some foreign policy victories such as ratification of the chemical weapons ban treaty while denying him others -- example: money for the International Monetary Fund -- hurts America and its world stature.

"We're playing Russian roulette with the future of our country," Hagel said.

Partisan rhetoric in foreign policy has been particularly virulent this year, due largely to election-year maneuvering and President Clinton's legal problems.

"Some Republicans, leading up to Clinton's China trip, acted in what I could only describe as outrageous fashion," said Lawrence Eagleburger, secretary of state in the Bush administration. "It was partisanship at its worst. There's a real active dislike of this president."

Some lawmakers said Clinton should have canceled his trip because of congressional and Justice Department investigations into missile technology transfers to China and illegal campaign contributions.

Majority Leader Tom Daschle, D-S.D., vowed to tie up the Senate if critics continued their attacks while Clinton was overseas. Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., backed off.

But within days of Clinton's return, Lott said the Senate would have to take action to "repair the damage that has been done" by the president's comments on Taiwan, which Beijing claims as its own.

Clinton laid out long-standing U.S. policy: no support for Taiwan independence, no recognition of a separate government on the island and no help get Taiwan into international organizations. But, uttered in China, his words made Taipei nervous and gave GOP critics a fresh target.

Lott's resolution, repeating a U.S. pledge to help maintain Taiwan's defenses through arms sales, passed 92-0 with no debate Friday.

Democrats decided not to fight, saying it merely restated U.S. policy.

A lively partisan battle is expected, however, when a package of anti-China legislation opposed by the administration comes to the Senate floor. Already approved in the House, the bills were sponsored by Rep. Christopher Cox, R-Calif., chairman of a special House committee looking into administration policies involving satellites and China.

Sen. Joseph Biden, D-Del., a leader of the senators' group and ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said punitive bills and punching bag-style debate can result in bad foreign policy.

"It's bad manners, bad politics and bad governance," he said.

Baucus said reaction to the informal group has sometimes been, "I wonder what they're up to? Is there an ulterior motive?"

He claims none. But several of the senators come from farm states, whose business can be hurt by limits on foreign commerce and contacts.

The senators, mostly free-traders who oppose isolationism, say they aren't trying to undermine standing committees or Foreign Relations Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C. A Helms spokesman would not comment on the group, which was formed in June to discuss sanctions on India and Pakistan.

"Trade policy is part of foreign policy, national security, taxes," Hagel said. "It's growth, jobs, the economy. ... The day is gone when our leaders can talk about isolated issues. The dots now connect."

Whether the behind-the-scenes effort at bipartisanship will bear fruit is yet to be seen, but the Clinton administration is taking it seriously. Strobe Talbott, deputy secretary of state dealing directly with India and Pakistan, and Stuart Eizenstat, the State Department's top official on sanctions policy, have briefed the group.

Besides Hagel, a freshman, Republicans in the informal meetings include Sens. Richard Lugar, Indiana; John Chafee, Rhode Island; Craig Thomas, Wyoming; Gordon Smith, Oregon; and Rod Grams, Minnesota. Democrats, other than Biden and Baucus, include Sens. Dianne Feinstein, California; John Glenn, Ohio; Daniel Patrick Moynihan, New York; Carl Levin, Michigan; and Chris Dodd, Connecticut.

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: <ProPT@stones.com>
From: ProPT@stones.com
Date: Mon, 13 Jul 1998 19:06:58 +0200
Reply-To: <proPT@stones.com>
To: propt@stones.com
Subject: Vatican News <http://www.wrn.org/stations/vatican.html>

In the Philippines Catholic Bishops spoke up against a Treaty with the USA to be ratified by their Senate because it would give America the opportunity to station Nuclear Weapons.

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Tue, 14 Jul 1998 11:49:06 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Cc: impress@slt.lk
Subject: pov-1: June Bulletin from Durban, South Africa
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Durban Peace to the City Campaign
June 1998 Bulletin

D'Urban Network - Seeking the Peace of the City
by Stuart Talbot who coordinates the work of the D'Urban Network

Essentially a network of about twenty inner city ministries and churches, the D'Urban Network, in existence for about eight years, has crossed the path of peace-making and building in various ways. In our concern to see the Shalom of God manifest itself in the city, different parts of this network have contributed to peace in different ways.

"Seek the peace of the city for if it prospers you will prosper," was Jeremiah's injunction to the exiled community in Babylon. This has been a driving force that has spurred many a flagging worker on. South African cities, like many other cities world-wide, have begun to feel the pains of flight of both capital and church from the city. In the light of this flight, it has become important for the network to encourage church communities to remain in the city and contribute to the community fibre. The D'Urban Network attempts "to link Christian communities in the city in mission." This linking will often mean a much larger network and support base is used to resource those who are feeling lost and at sea in this ever-changing port city.

Below are some examples of how members have been involved in building peace in the inner city:

The Bridge and Brooke Street - This community of about 200 people in 70 dwellings has existed as an informal inner city settlement since 1982. Amidst ongoing struggles for recognition and legitimacy as city dwellers, and a struggle for piped water and ablution facilities, a number of the D'Urban Network's church communities have contributed to build a little shadow of Shalom in this area of the city.

Emmanuel Cathedral (Catholic) - The Cathedral has a designate pastoral worker who works well with community leaders and has been involved in negotiations with other civic organisations and taxi associations to secure the area against invasion by the taxi association for use as taxi rank. The groups now coexist peaceably and a concrete barrier has been erected by the city council to demarcate the area.

The Central City Mission (Methodist) - Working in partnership with a suburban church, the Central City Mission has developed a creche facility in the community for about 20 children. This facility is used daily and its bright rooster windvanes add a dash of life to the plaza where the community is based. It is also close to the transport node which allows some 500 000 people into the city daily.

St. Aidan's Church and Mission Hospital - St. Aidan's, working with Safmarine Shipping, has placed a disused shipping container in the community for use as a clinic and community facility. This facility is resourced by student nurses and volunteer doctors and sisters from the Mission Hospital, located about one kilometre away.

The Harbour -- our gateway to the world. The Durban port is one of the busiest in the southern hemisphere and is the busiest and largest in Africa, with a vibrant seafarers community. As Rev. Michael Julius of Mission to Seamen reports, the port is often an area for peace and mediation. Rev. Julius has related a number of incidents where the Mission to Seamen, also a D'Urban Network participant, has been involved in mediating on behalf of stranded sailors for employment equity and fairness. This is undertaken with shipping company ship owners, captains and others, and is an attempt to build the peace of Christ in the harbour and shipping world. Incidentally the harbour and a river flowing into it were named by early colonial "discoverers" as the Port of Christ and the River of Christ - a peaceable heritage we would like to see the city reclaim.

Anchor Club - Anchor Club is a YMCA-based programme carried out in partnership with local churches. It has developed a multi-faceted programme for children between the ages of seven to fourteen operating under the theme of "Helping Young Lives Grow Strong." This is in keeping with the YMCA's international focus of building strong kids, strong communities, and strong families. The part of this programme related to peace is training to help children be assertive in situations of danger and abuse and training in self-defence. Children are taught and encouraged to work through with councillors where they have been in a situation of violation. Non-violent responses such as SOS and STOP are taught:

S - Speak out - to the person abusing, or to a person in authority who can help

O - get Out - if it is dangerous

S - Seek solutions - stand firm against the problem, find support, analyse the situation thoroughly

STOP is merely a variation of the SOS model:

S - Speak out

T - Tell the person what is offensive

O - get Out

P - find other People to help you

In teaching these models of assertiveness in situations of abuse, Anchor

Club is hoping to give tools of peace to future leaders of the inner city of Durban.

These are merely some of the methods that members of the D'Urban Network have and will continue to use to build Shalom in the Port City of Christ - Durban. Other initiatives have been the weekly Prayer in the City for the City which is prayer on the streets in places where violence in all its forms have taken hold of communities.

Some of the D'Urban Network members are involved in shelter for the homeless of the city, creating employment, providing soup and bread - simple meals for the marginalised of the city, providing low cost meals for the elderly and disadvantaged of the city, and lobbying and networking with local council issues of peace and justice in our city.

Churches* Summit on Reconciliation

On 30 April 1998 church leaders and others involved in reconciliation work attended a summit on the outskirts of Durban on the topic of reconciliation. The summit came about at the request of the KwaZulu-Natal section of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) that the church should take seriously the need to engage on the ground with issues of reconciliation in the aftermath of the TRC. The fact that the TRC has not been able to bring about reconciliation has meant that the mandate of the church is all the more serious.

The aim of the summit was *not to start another organisation, but to acknowledge that there are a lot of initiatives already happening within the ecumenical movement* according to Siphso Sokhela of the KwaZulu-Natal Christian Council and one of the organisers of the summit. Various groups presented information on their work related to reconciliation and discussions were held on new challenges, threats and opportunities to reconciliation work. Possible new reconciliation initiatives discussed included:

- workshops for individual parishes on reconciliation;
- a special ecumenical rally on December 16, the Day of Reconciliation;
- ecumenical celebrations to end the work of the TRC; and
- work on *reparation and restitution* including monitoring the TRC*s reparations process and investigating the possibility of church land being sold to communities.

Copies of the summit report can be obtained by contacting the Diakonia Council of Churches.

Peace to the City! - Durban
Coordinator: Mike Vorster, Diakonia Council of Churches
coord@durbanpeace.org.za
Tel: +27-31-305-6001
Fax: +27-31-306-2486
<http://www.durbanpeace.org.za>

----- End of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 14 Jul 1998 12:32:01 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: CTBT ratification #16: Brazil

July 14

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Brazil ratifies CTBT; Clinton response

They didn't win the World Cup in soccer, but Brazil is making a good case for the title of nuclear disarmament world cup champion.

BBC article and President Clinton's statement follow.

DK

BBC Online, July 14

"Brazil makes 'no nukes' pledge"

President Henrique Cardoso: rid the world of nuclear weapons

The Brazilian President, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, has signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and ratified the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

At a ceremony in the capital, Brasilia, President Cardoso said: "Brazil will spare no effort to rid the world of nuclear weapons."

He added that real international power rested not with nuclear capability, but with economic, social and democratic values.

His comments have been seen as implicit criticism of recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan.

'Gift for future generations'

The United Nations Secretary General, Kofi Annan, who is at the start of a five-nation tour of Latin America, attended the signing ceremony. Mr Annan said it was "a gift for future generations that should be followed by other nations."

Brazil's ratification of the Test Ban Treaty was welcomed by United States President Bill Clinton, who urged the US Senate to do the same.

Last month the US Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, praised both Argentina and Brazil for the restraint she said they had shown over nuclear power.

Nuclear programme

An official investigation by the Brazilian Senate eight years ago showed that the then military regime had developed a nuclear weapons programme in the early 1980s and had been close to a nuclear test when the country returned to democracy in 1985.

When democracy was also restored in neighbouring Argentina, both countries signed an agreement allowing mutual inspections of nuclear sites, in a bid to halt a potential arms race in the region.

The BBC correspondent in Sao Paulo says the decision to sign the treaties during a visit by the UN secretary general is part of a Brazilian effort to guarantee a permanent seat at the UN Security Council in a possible shake-up of the Council's structure.

13 July 1998

TEXT: CLINTON ON BRAZIL'S RATIFYING NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

(President congratulates Brazil on ratification) (230)

WASHINGTON -- The following is the text of a July 13 statement by President Clinton, congratulating Brazil for ratifying the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

(begin text)

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

July 13, 1998

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Brazilian Ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

Today, Brazil ratified the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and acceded to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). I want to congratulate President Cardoso and the Government of Brazil for taking this historic step.

Brazil's decision renews momentum for the international effort to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and promote disarmament around the world. At a time when actions by India and Pakistan threaten a nuclear competition in South Asia, Brazil has chosen a different course -- to

invest in its people, not in a costly arms race.

Brazil's action today to ratify the CTBT makes it all the more important for the US to do the same. I call on our Senate to act expeditiously to approve the CTBT -- already signed by 149 nations and supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff -- so that the United States can lead in this vital endeavor.

(end text)

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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: <lmehall@ibm.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Did you receive
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 09:08 AM 7/14/98 -0000, LYNETTE MEHALL wrote:

>Dear Howard,
> This is short to see if you receive it....

Dear Lynette:

You can see that I received your message! Unfortunately I had an extra set of letters in the address I gave you, so no wonder it didn't go through. Thanks for trying anyway.

We had a really good time at the Grand Canyon and Lake Powell. One morning Beth, Joy, Matt, and I walked along the West Rim trail while Carlee took the shuttle bus between stops that were about a half mile apart. Joy and Matt went down on hour or so along both the South Kaibab and Bright Angel Trails on successive days. Beth went part way with them on the South Kaibab, and I went several hundred feet. We enjoyed various views of the canyon and hang out in the woods near our motel, which was within the park.

At Lake Powell we rented an 18', 135 hp boat for the day, went 40-45 miles up the lake from the dam, stopped three times to swim. The next day Joy, Matt, and I went 15 miles down the Colorado River in what was supposed to be smooth water, but a heavy rain blowing upstream made the first half of the trip seem like whitewater.

It was good to see you and all the other relatives in Austin.

With love,
Howard

To: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.apc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: HAP : hmmm mmmmm ????
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 08:55 AM 7/14/98 -0700, you wrote:

>Dear Pol and For Mother Earth colleagues:

>

>I am an organizer of Hague Appeal for Peace 1999 (HAP) in the United States.

>When I first heard about the Hague Appeal, I, like Pol, was fairly skeptical

>-- there are always so many campaigns and big conferences, and they can

>often take resources and focus away from the "real" day-to-day struggle.....

>

>

Dear Karina:

I wasn't going to respond to Pol's e-mail, but since you did, I would like to reply to you personally, not the whole network.

I have great respect for Colin Archer and others who are organizing the Hague Appeal. I have read the material and sat in for part of the planning session in Geneva the last day of the NPT PrepCom. I have come away with a couple of questions: Where's the action? What kind of follow-through will there be? As far as I can determine, these questions haven't been addressed. So I've made a personal decision to spend the next year working to change public policy in the United States and mobilize the global religious community into an action mode for nuclear abolition rather than spending much time preparing for a noble talkfest. I know you and others see more in it than speeches and resolutions, but that hasn't been apparent from the material I have seen and the discussion I heard that day in Geneva.

The other thing that bothers me is that participants in the planning session were overwhelmingly white European-American. They said that the organizations represented have contacts throughout the "South", but they didn't have them involved in this stage when the program is being shaped and decisions made. I noticed that quite a few American organizations had funds to send their staff to Geneva. Why wasn't some of that money directed toward bringing in more people of color?

I'll never knock the Hague Appeal publicly or even in e-mail list serve. We'll probably sign statements. But I do have these concerns that I want to share with you personally, and not for broadcast, because I know you are an action-oriented person and might try to build in a strong action component that would be directed at governmental policy makers and global citizen mobilization for follow-up activities.

Shalom,
Howard

>From kwood Tue Jul 14 14:36:25 1998
Return-Path: <kwood@igc.apc.org>
Date: Tue, 14 Jul 1998 14:36:18 -0700 (PDT)
X-Sender: kwood@pop.igc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: HAP : hmmmmmmmm ????

Dear Howard,

Thanks for your thoughtful message. It's always good to hear your views, which I have a great deal of time for, as you too are action-oriented & practical as well as having good ideas. I appreciate you sending me your thoughts privately.

So, the points you raise are good ones. First point:

Where's the action?

The "action" manifests itself in several ways:

1. the production of an Agenda for Peace & International Justice for the 21st Century -- a document developed and endorsed by hundreds of NGOs worldwide & presented to the governments of the world & the UN General Assembly.
2. the occurrence of the global conference is an action in itself, as a gathering of this size will attract media attention from all over the world & will become a powerful reference point when we are subsequently lobbying governments and the UN to take action on the Agenda of the conference. The Hague conference will focus global attention on the immorality & uselessness of war and will showcase the non-violent alternatives to armed conflict. We aim to have the same effect as the UN Rio conference which successfully focused world attention on the dangers of global warming, and the UN Beijing Women's conference which focused world attention on the continued economic and social gender inequalities and lack of adequate human rights protection, etc. for women.

As we know from our work on nuclear weapons abolition, a huge part of "the action" we try to do is simply getting public attention on our issue -- the Hague Appeal process is about doing things on a bold, grand scale in order to get the attention we desire on the global arms trade, human rights abuses, the risk of nuclear war, the economic waste of bloated military budgets worldwide, etc.

When Desmond Tutu launched the Hague Appeal for Peace at a press conference in The Hague in May, the room was packed to the brim with reporters and cameras -- standing room only. There were big photos and articles in many European papers the next day, and the AP distributed a photo of Tutu worldwide. Tutu commands enormous moral authority, and people listen to what he has to say. The same is true of Nelson Mandela. When they speak on the opening day of The Hague conference, we hope the world will pay attention -- and we will have instantly got our message across to millions, and got the ball rolling on making more progress on nuclear abolition, on banning

landmines, on setting up an International Criminal Court, etc.

Second point:

What kind of follow-through will there be?

The international follow through is to present the "Agenda for Peace & International Justice for the 21st Century" to the governmental meetings hosted by the Netherlands in The Hague, and by Russia in St. Petersburg, and have strong NGO lobbies at those meetings to ensure adoption/incorporation of our Agenda in their conference results. These results will then be presented for adoption to the winter 1999 UN General Assembly.

The follow-through in each country is not worked out in detail, which will differ from country to country I imagine, but the concept is that NGOs use the "Agenda for Peace & International Justice for the 21st Century" that is produced by the conference as a comprehensive vehicle to advance their work, and devise mini-campaigns to get the Agenda, or parts of it at least, adopted by their national governments.

Third point:

Involvement of the global south/non-Europe, N. America:

There are working regional Hague Appeal for Peace organizers for Africa, Asia, Latin America and Eurasia.

AFRICA:

An Africa-wide conference building for the Hague Appeal is being organized in Kenya for next February. Several HAP preparatory conferences are being held in Central & South America.

PACIFIC:

There is a Hague Appeal point person in the South Pacific, and IPPNW's international conference in Australia in December will have a focus on HAP and will bring participants from the Pacific islands.

RUSSIA/EURASIA:

There is a Eurasian Pilgrimage For A War-Free, Nonviolent New Millennium happening, organized by the buddhist order Nipponzan Myohoji Russia/Ukraine to raise awareness of issues of the HAP99 in Russia & former Soviet states. It goes from Yasnaya Poliana (Russia, home of Lev Tolstoy) to Lumbini (India, birthplace of the Buddha). The pilgrimage will pass through areas of conflict along the way. Many regional groups of the Committee of Soldier's Mothers of Russia is sending members to The Hague.

ASIA:

Our Asia HAP Organizer, Sharada, recently returned from a trip to Bangladesh, where she secured the endorsement of the Bangladesh government for the Hague Appeal for Peace and its objectives. Dr.S.A. Samad, Bangladesh's Principal Secretary agreed to present the Hague Appeal for Peace to the Prime Minister as a very important event deserving her attention. The Bangladeshi PM will likely be a speaker at the Hague conference. Sherada also went to New Delhi and met with he Director of the Third World Network, Dr.Vandana Shiva (India), who wants to be a speaker and resource person for the Hague Appeal.

A number of NGOs in Japan are building for the HAP. Peace Boat, a wonderful organization led by youth, is organizing HAP cruises on their boat which will sail participants to The Hague conference, and make other cruises around the southern hemisphere spreading the word & materials about HAP at

every port.

There are many many other HAP things happening in the global south -- these are just some examples for you.

Yes, funding is a REAL problem for the less affluent NGOs of the global south (with some exceptions like Japan & Australia). We are making fundraising for global south NGOs a priority.

>I noticed that quite a few American organizations had funds to send their staff >to Geneva. Why wasn't some of that money directed toward bringing in more >people of color?

Yes, those participating 30 NGOs on the HAP international Organizing Committee (OC) should have directed travel funds to enable their reps from poorer countries to attend. But not many did. This is not the fault of the HAP staff, but the fault of each participating organization. I found it funny/ironic that some OC attendees complained to me about this at the meeting, and yet they were themselves white people from the US and Europe sent by their international organizations which have national affiliates in global south countries! So their own organization didn't do the thing they were urging. As a HAP staffer, I can't make, let's say, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom send a delegate from their affiliate in India, when they would rather send the Europeans from their Geneva headquarters. Also, it's a practical matter that a lot of these international organizations on the HAP OC have staff in Europe that they can better afford to send to a HAP planning meeting in Geneva than their organizers from, say, Africa. OC meetings held in Europe are therefore by nature not going to be very reflective of the world. That's why preparatory meetings/conferences are being held over the coming 10 months in many countries beyond N. America & Europe, so people who can't travel to international OC planning meetings 3 times a year can provide substantive input in their own region -- all the input from these prep confs will be fed into the global conf. in The Hague, and lots of money is being raised to bring participants from NGOs in the global south to present their input & share their experiences at that conference.

Well, that was a long reply!! But I think your points were important enough to merit a detailed response. Please tell me what your thoughts are in light of what I have told you.

Thanks and best wishes,
Karina.

At 11:52 AM 7/14/98 -0700, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>At 08:55 AM 7/14/98 -0700, you wrote:

>>Dear Pol and For Mother Earth colleagues:

>>

>>I am an organizer of Hague Appeal for Peace 1999 (HAP) in the United States.

>>When I first heard about the Hague Appeal, I, like Pol, was fairly skeptical

>>-- there are always so many campaigns and big conferences, and they can

>>often take resources and focus away from the "real" day-to-day struggle.....

>>

>>

>Dear Karina:

>

>I wasn't going to respond to Pol's e-mail, but since you did, I would like
>to reply to you personally, not the whole network.

>

>I have great respect for Colin Archer and others who are organizing the
>Hague Appeal. I have read the material and sat in for part of the planning
>session in Geneva the last day of the NPT PrepCom. I have come away with a
>couple of questions: Where's the action? What kind of follow-through will
>there be? As far as I can determine, these questions haven't been
>addressed. So I've made a personal decision to spend the next year working
>to change public policy in the United States and mobilize the global
>religious community into an action mode for nuclear abolition rather than
>spending much time preparing for a noble talkfest. I know you and others
>see more in it than speeches and resolutions, but that hasn't been apparent
>from the material I have seen and the discussion I heard that day in Geneva.

>

>The other thing that bothers me is that participants in the planning session
>were overwhelmingly white European-American. They said that the
>organizations represented have contacts throughout the "South", but they
>didn't have them involved in this stage
>when the program is being shaped and decisions made. I noticed that quite a
>few American organizations had funds to send their staff to Geneva. Why
>wasn't some of that money directed toward bringing in more people of color?

>

>I'll never knock the Hague Appeal publicly or even in e-mail list serve.
>We'll probably sign statements. But I do have these concerns that I want to
>share with you personally, and not for broadcast, because I know you are an
>action-oriented person and might try to build in a strong action component
>that would be directed at governmental policy makers and global citizen
>mobilization for follow-up activities.

>

Karina Wood
U.S. Outreach Coordinator,
Hague Appeal for Peace 1999
43 Nisbet St, 3rd Fl.
Providence, RI 02906
Tel: 401 751-8172
Fax: 401 751-1476
Email: kwood@igc.apc.org

Come to the global conference in The Hague, Netherlands May 11-16 1999!

Return-Path: <mknolldc@igc.apc.org>
Date: Tue, 14 Jul 1998 15:04:10 -0700 (PDT)
X-Sender: mknolldc@pop.igc.org
To: mupj@igc.org
From: "Marie A. Dennis" <mknolldc@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Nuclear Abolition

Dear Howard,

Thank you for faithfully keeping our office in the loop on nuclear disarmament issues. We very much appreciated the clear proposal you drafted several weeks ago. Our Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns has been in re-formation all this year, but should have additional staff in place next month. I hope that we will be able to give more staff time to nuclear abolition issues, so please do keep us in touch.

Sincerely,

Marie Dennis
Director
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns
Marie Dennis

Return-Path: <a2000@silcom.com>
Date: Tue, 14 Jul 1998 15:23:33 -0700 (PDT)
X-Sender: a2000@mail.silcom.com (Unverified)
To: mupj@igc.org
From: Sue Broidy <a2000@silcom.com>
Subject: Grassroots Action for Abolition 2000

To; Howard Hallman, Convenor, Religious Working Group

Dear Mr Hallman,

I have been following with interest the exchange of ideas on the Internet about ways of pursuing the Abolition 2000 agenda. As part of the working team now, I am planning a campaign activists kit to send out to all organizations who are part of the Abolition 2000 network.

I would very much appreciate having your views on how to reach the congregations of the religious organizations in the US as apart from a few notable exceptions, we seem to be reaching the heads of churches, but not getting the petitions signed and returned in any significant numbers.

I would be grateful for your advice.

Sincerely,

Susan Broidy, Coordinator

Abolition 2000- A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

c/o Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

1187 Coast Village Road, Box 123

Santa Barbara, CA 93108

phone: +1(805) 965-3443; fax: +1(805) 568-0466

e-mail: a2000@silcom.com URL: <http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>

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

Date: Tue, 14 Jul 1998 23:11:22 +0100 (BST)

From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: CD update and UK Review

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host ah196.du.pipex.com [193.130.247.196] claimed to be Acronym

X-Sender: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org (Unverified)

I was saddened by the loss of Ike's news digests, as I had found them a useful source to skim (saved time trawling the net or the papers), so, Ike, a belated THANK YOU.

Although I also try to limit my messages to issues I can contribute something particular on, rather than just duplicating the wealth of perspectives and insights already provided by different voices, my CD updates are often also too long to be interesting to most of you, I suspect (especially when not a lot is happening, like now!).

This note is to let you know that the latest edition of Disarmament Diplomacy is up on the Acronym Institute website (address <http://www.gn.apc.org/acronym>).

It contains recent CD news and a summary of debates, which I did not this month send to you as text. DD also has good coverage on the Eight Nation New Agenda Coalition and the usual news review.

We have just put up some early commentary and documents related to the UK Strategic Defence Review, which was published on 8 July, and will be adding to this site over the next few months as the debate develops (likely to be slow). It is very clear that nuclear policy was a very small and (sad to say barely contested) part of the Review, so most of the debate among politicians, academics and the armed forces now is on issues of limited interest to nuclear disarmers or those outside the UK.

Since the nuclear tests our website has a fairly regularly updated special feature on the Indian and Pakistan tests, including key statements and documents and our analysis of the international and arms control implications of the tests.

The next Disarmament Diplomacy (due early August) will mainly cover the British Strategic Defence Review, with several short analyses of aspects of the SDR from different perspectives.

Hope this is helpful,
Rebecca

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>

To: Dringler@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: FW: Nestle', Nukes and Armageddon
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Robin:

Knowing that the UMGBCS has experience with Nestle, I thought you would be interested in this message.

Shalom,
Howard

>Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
>Date: Tue, 14 Jul 1998 19:25:13 +0200
>From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@execulink.com>
>Importance: Normal
>Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
>Subject: FW: Nestle', Nukes and Armageddon
>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 [Perline <perline@club-internet.fr>]
>Date: Tue, 14 Jul 1998 19:04:02 +0200
>To: perline@club-internet.fr
>From: Perline <perline@club-internet.fr>
>Subject: Nestle', Nukes and Armageddon
>
>Action Alert-Phone and Boycott Nestle' from Tri-Valley CAREs' July 1998
>newsletter, Citizen's Watch
>with thanks to Grandmothers for Peace, International, the organization
>spearheading the boycott
>Nestle', Nukes and Armageddon: Call 1-800-258-6728
>The movie "Armageddon" has a theme inspired by Livermore Lab - nukes to save
>us from asteroids. Further, Nestle' has decided to capitalize on the movie
>with a new "Nuclear Chocolate" candy bar for our children, complete with a
>"Chocolate Chain Reaction" logo. In a statement, Nestle' said: "The word
>'nuclear' is used in a fun, 'cool' manner to communicate the product's
>energy." Call and tell Nestle' that there is nothing fun or cool about
>nuclear weapons, nuclear fallout or nuclear waste. Join this boycott.
>Marylia Kelley
>Tri-Valley CAREs
>(Communities Against a Radioactive Environment)
>5720 East Ave. #116, Livermore, CA USA 94550
>
><www.igc.org/tvc/> is our website, currently under construction
>(925) 443-7148 - is our phone
>(925) 443-0177 - is our fax
>
>Working for peace, justice and a healthy environment since 1983, Tri-Valley
>CAREs has been a member of the nation-wide Alliance for Nuclear

>Accountability in the U.S. since 1989, and is a co-founding member of the
>international Abolition 2000 network for the elimination of nuclear weapons
>in 1995.

>
>
>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 15 Jul 1998 21:20:49 +0200
From: wilpf@iprolink.ch (wilpf)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: another NPT rave
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: wilpf@pop.iprolink.ch

Dear Janet and the Cyber Sunflower Field,

I would like to add a line or two about the NPT strategy of Abolition 2000 and ask one question. (I would appreciate answers to my question privately and I will then collect responses and reflect them to the list at a later date).

I see our particular power as a network lying in the joint pincer action of being a grassroots movement that is also carefully, but tactically, present at International Forums. From what I have seen we are getting better at this, but of course we need ongoing evaluation and discussion - so thanks for re-sparking this one Janet.

As I mentioned in Geneva during the PrepCom, I think that the Abolition 2000 Working Group on the NPT should become a Working Group on International Policy/International Forums. A better name could be found to describe a group that would ensure Abolition 2000 preparation, lobbying, materials and representation are visible, loud and dazzlingly well prepared at every International conversation about nuclear weapons - i.e. the Disarmament Commission, the Conference on Disarmament, the General Assembly, the NPT, the OSCE, NATO, NAM meetings, EU meetings as well as the NPT forums. Already we have a presence at these events, but it could be better coordinated or consistent and could solicit responses from the wider membership of Abolition 2000 in a more strategic way.

While I think that it is justifiable to devote significant energy to the NPT PrepComs, I agree with Janet, that putting all our eggs in the basket of numbers of people present is less important than lobbying pressure in the national capitals before the PrepComs.

My question is : How many groups on this list actually did write a letter, hold a demo, or visit their men in suits to discuss the PrepCom after all the prompting and pleading? I wonder how many miles away was the NPT process to grassroots activists on this list - several hundred million... very close?? If you have time, I think that a wider evaluation could take place. Of course if you want to send your comments to the whole lists, do. I offer to collate the response to merely redirect some traffic on the list.

Personally, I would like to see a large presence of Abolition 2000 at the more weighty Review Conference in 2000. It would be a good time to Review and Extend Abolition 2000. The Annual Meeting Working Group would appreciate feed back on the idea of holding the 1999 Annual Meeting at the Hague in 1999 and in New York at the NPT for 2000.

After some discussions in Geneva on the Amendment Conference idea - it is apparently not a new notion in the NGO Community, some of whom have been at this for over 40 years - the key has always been to find the government to trigger it and to convince the others that an amendment would promise more than Article 6. Zia, could you send me your paper at this address. I am exiled from my office, computer and papers and want to re-read.

In peace,

Felicity Hill
WILPF

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: <marissa@vi.org>
From: marissa@vi.org (marissa)
To: mupj@igc.apc.org ('mupj@igc.apc.org')
Organization: Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, 2001 'S' Street, NW, Suite 740, Washington, DC 20009
Date: Wed, 15 Jul 1998 17:56:30 -0400
Subject: NGO Sign-on Letter to Clinton

Friends-

The following is a sign-on letter to President Clinton from the USCBL. We would like to have as many organizations individually sign-on to the letter as possible. Listing organizations separately, rather than using the USCBL umbrella, is an extremely effective way to convey to Clinton the diverse types of organizations that support the prompt signature of the Mine Ban Treaty by the United States.

This letter is important because it could be the last time we get to lobby Clinton to leave behind the appropriate legacy on landmines.

If you would like to have your organization listed on this timely letter addressing the latest changes in US policy regarding landmines please notify me by Friday July 24, 1998. I look forward to hearing from everyone and making this a significant and powerful message to President Clinton and his administration.

Best regards,
Marissa

Marissa A. Vitagliano
Acting Coordinator, US Campaign to Ban Landmines
Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation
2001 S St., NW Suite 740
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: 202-483-9222
Fax: 202-483-9312 or 202-483-9314
Email: marissa@vi.org or banminesusa@vi.org
<http://www.vvaf.org/landmine/uscbl.htm>

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington DC 20500

Dear President Clinton:

We represent a sampling of the veterans, development, humanitarian relief, peace, women's, human rights, medical, children's, policy and research, environmental and religious groups who form the U.S. Campaign to Ban Landmines, a nationwide coalition of over 300 non-governmental organizations and one of over 75 country campaigns comprising the International Campaign to Ban Landmines.

We last wrote to you in November 1997 to urge you to abandon the policy

caveats which restrained you from joining over 120 governments of the world in signing the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and On their Destruction in Ottawa, Canada in December 1997 (otherwise referred to as the Mine Ban Treaty). This comprehensive treaty prohibits in all circumstances any use of antipersonnel landmines. It also requires that stockpiles be destroyed within four years of the treaty's entry into force, and that mines already in the ground be removed and destroyed within ten years.

We now write to first thank you for endorsing the Mine Ban Treaty with your new policy that the United States will sign this agreement. We know that this decision to join the world community in outlawing this insidious weapon was not one arrived at easily. We especially welcome the fact that the new policy acknowledges that the antipersonnel mines contained in US mixed munition systems must also be eliminated. We also welcome the completion of the planned destruction of over 3.3 million U.S. non-self-destructing antipersonnel mines.

We have, however, a number of serious concerns with current U.S. policy on antipersonnel mines and some concrete suggestions on how you can remedy them.

First, you delay signing until 2006 or later, and we believe that eight years is too late for the world to wait for U.S. signature on the Mine Ban Treaty. Landmines claim thousands of innocent victims every year-if every country waited eight years to sign, that could mean many thousands more victims. We support Senator Leahy who has said that "we can get there sooner." The governments that have signed to date have indicated their willingness to give up this weapon now-that includes every NATO ally save one, every member of the European Union save one, every other country in this hemisphere save one, and other major allies such as Japan. The U.S. can and should do the same.

Second, while we are pleased that the U.S. has destroyed three-fourths of its stockpile of non-self-destructing mines, we are concerned that the U.S. is retaining one million of these deadly "dumb" mines for use in Korea. If the U.S. insists that dumb mines, which can remain buried in the ground waiting for a victim for decades, are essential for certain wars, other nations will surely do the same. U.S. war plans call for these one million dumb mines to be planted over a large area of South Korea, not in the DMZ, and they are likely to cause the type of long-term humanitarian disaster we have seen in so many other places. Pentagon war games show that the U.S. and ROK win a war and do not lose Seoul with or without anti-personnel mines. We urge you to proceed with rapid destruction of the remaining dumb U.S. mines, and to establish a timetable for the destruction of the ten million U.S. "smart" self-destructing mines.

Third, we are concerned that the commitment to sign by 2006 is contingent on developing and fielding by that date alternatives to antipersonnel landmines. Former U.S. Commander in Korea, General James Hollingsworth (USA-Ret.) and many other military experts have said that alternative tactics and technologies already exist for antipersonnel mines. Two years ago, fifteen of the most senior and respected retired U.S. generals wrote to you saying, "Given the wide range of weaponry available to military forces today, antipersonnel mines are not essential. Thus, banning them would not undermine the military effectiveness or safety of our forces, nor those of other nations." Furthermore, the 126 governments

that have signed the Mine Ban Treaty did so without a lengthy and costly search for alternatives because they believe that alternatives to antipersonnel landmines already exist. The U.S. can and should do the same.

Fourth, we are concerned that following the opening of the Mine Ban Treaty for signature, the U.S. has pressured its NATO and other allies who have signed the treaty to allow continued U.S. stockpiling of antipersonnel mines on their territories. We believe that a State Party would be in violation of the treaty if it permitted the permanent stockpiling of US antipersonnel mines. We are also disturbed that the U.S. has pressured treaty signatories to narrowly define the meaning of the word "transfer" in the treaty to not include "transit" of antipersonnel mines. We believe it would be a violation of the treaty for a State Party to knowingly permit another nation to transit mines through its territory. The treaty prohibits State Parties from assisting anyone with an action prohibited by the treaty. It is certainly against the spirit of the treaty for signatories that have declared the weapon illegal to allow other nations to continue to stockpile them or transit them for use in battle. We urge you to order a halt to this lobbying of signatory nations to accommodate current U.S. plans for continued use of mines.

Fifth, we encourage you to begin using U.S. diplomatic influence to convince recalcitrant governments to commit to signing the treaty. The U.S. ability to bring other nations on board, and to encourage compliance with the treaty, could be a tremendous asset to the ban movement and save many lives and limbs in the long run.

Finally, we urge you in the strongest terms to instruct the Pentagon not to go ahead with the proposed \$210 million redesign of the remote anti-armor mine (RAAM) system to include ADAM antipersonnel mines. Even though the Pentagon has pledged not to make an acquisition decision until 2001, research on RAAM is unnecessary and costly and would provide yet another roadblock on the way toward U.S. signature of the Mine Ban Treaty under which such a system is banned. The proposed redesign conflicts with your stated policy to sign the treaty by 2006.

We believe it is of critical importance that the United States promptly sign the Mine Ban Treaty in order for other nations to take our leadership role seriously. The U.S. is making a serious commitment to helping demine the world, and the U.S. continues, through bilateral and international aid programs, to support mine victim assistance and development of mine-affected communities. A total ban now is required for these humanitarian measures to be fully effective. Your leadership in banning antipersonnel landmines now would leave a fitting disarmament legacy and would help to make the world a place where the children of the twenty-first century can walk the earth in safety. Thank you.

Yours sincerely

CC: General Henry H. Shelton, Chair, Joint Chiefs of Staff
Secretary of State Madeleine Albright
Secretary of Defense William Cohen
National Security Advisor Samuel Berger

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

Date: Wed, 15 Jul 1998 14:37:56 -0700 (PDT)

From: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Subcritical Letter

To: tomatompn+@igc.org, healls@aol.com, healthm@aol.com, ERFInSC@ix.netcom.com, allister@snakeriveralliance.org, mstewart@snakeriveralliance.org, abolition-caucus@igc.org, nuke-waste@igc.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org, paprog@igc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id OAB15154

X-Sender: meldredge@pop.igc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id OAA26235

Enclosed is the final letter on subcritical nuclear testing, calling for a moratorium on the program. Thanks to all who signed on and to those who worked to get such a long sign on list. As I was taking in sign-ons via fax, phone, and email, I think I managed to get all the names in, and spelled right. I apologize if I did not get it right. For those of you who forwarded this to other networks or chapters, could you please forward this final version to all signatories? Thanks. If you want a hard copy mailed, please let me know.

-Maureen

DECLARE A MORATORIUM ON SUBCRITICAL TESTING

July 16, 1998

Dear President Clinton:

As national, regional, and local organizations working for the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, we urge you to declare a moratorium on the US subcritical testing program and seek agreement from Russia and China to halt activities at their test sites as well. The recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan highlight the precariousness of the nonproliferation regime. At this vitally important juncture, the US needs to take leadership in opposing all forms of nuclear testing and in de-legitimizing the role of nuclear weapons worldwide. Declaring a moratorium on the US subcritical nuclear testing program would be an important step in this direction. By contrast, should the US conduct a subcritical test at this tense moment in history, it would only serve to fuel the flames of nuclear frenzy in other nations.

The ongoing US investment in nuclear weapons, and the subcritical testing program, is provocative to nations with nuclear aspirations. India has stated the need to conduct nuclear tests was in part based on the desire to advance their computer codes in order to benefit from a subcritical testing program of their own. During sensitive CTBT negotiations in 1996, the US subcritical testing program generated great opposition and raised questions about the US commitment to the test ban. Subcritical testing, which includes site preparations that look almost identical to those of a full-scale nuclear test, also makes verification of the test ban more difficult. The US sets a dangerous precedent by continuing the subcritical

program. Additionally, the entire stockpile stewardship program calls into question the US commitment to its obligations under Article 6 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty to work for nuclear disarmament.

The US has already conducted one subcritical test this year (Stagecoach) and anticipates conducting one or two more in September. These tests are not needed for assuring the safety and reliability of the US nuclear weapons arsenal. Conducting more subcritical tests, especially at this dangerous moment in international relations, seems particularly foolhardy. Taking a strong leadership approach and declaring a moratorium on the US subcritical testing program would send a much better and much safer message to India, Pakistan, and other nuclear aspirants: that the US is willing to step out on the path against nuclear testing and nuclear weapons. US leadership on this issue is essential for progress on reducing regional and global nuclear dangers.

The US cannot hope to convince other nations to eschew nuclear weapons if it continues its massive investments in nuclear weapons research. The subcritical testing program only exacerbates an already difficult, dangerous, and inflammatory situation. We urge you to once again make the US a leader on these issues and declare a moratorium on the subcritical testing program.

Sincerely,

National Groups

Maureen Eldredge
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Darryl Fagan
Americans for Democratic Action

Bill Capowski
Center for Campus Organizing

Clayton Ramey
Fellowship of Reconciliation (USA)

Joe Volk
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Maurice Paprin
Fund for New Priorities in America

Alice Slater
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment

Barbara Wiedner
Grandmothers for Peace International

National Groups, Continued....

Timothy Fuller
Gray Panthers, National Office

Tom Clements
Greenpeace

Alan Wayre
Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

Marie Dennis
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

Howard Hallman
Methodists United for Peace With Justice

Michael Marriotte
Nuclear Information and Resource Service

Dave Robinson
Pax Christi USA

Gordon Clark
Peace Action

Robert Tiller
Physicians for Social Responsibility

Ellen Thomas
Proposition One Committee

Anne Anderson
Psychologists for Social Responsibility

Paul Walker
Veterans for Peace

Susan Shaer
Womens Action for New Directions

Betty Burkes
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

Edith Villastrigo
Women Strike for Peace

Robin Caiola
20/20 Vision

Regional and Local Groups

Don Herriod
Abalone Alliance, CA

Jonathan M. Haber
Action Site to Stop Cassini Earth Flyby, MA

Michael J. Keller
Anne Arundel Peace Action, MD

Byron Plumley
American Friends Service Committee, CO

Peter Drekmeler
Bay Area Action, CA

Philip M. Klasky
Bay Area Nuclear Waste Coalition, CA

Alan Senauke
Buddhist Peace Fellowship, CA

Erica Harrold
California Peace Action

Harry Rogers
Carolina Peace Resource Center, SC

Tom O'Rourke
Catholic Peace Fellowship, Philadelphia, PA

Michael Closson
Center for Economic Conversion, CA

Chuck Johnson
Center for Energy Research, Salem, OR

Francis U. Macy
Center for Safe Energy, Earth Island Institute, CA

Sally Hindman
Chaplaincy to the Homeless, CA

John Hadder & Rick Neilson
Citizen Alert, NV

Harold Stokes
Citizens for Alternatives to Chemical Contamination, MI

Jami Caseber
Citizens Opposing a Polluted Environment, CA

Rev. Robert Moore
Coalition for Peace Action, NJ

Regional and Local Groups, Continued.....

Beryl Schwartz
Colorado Peace Action

Jay Coghlan
Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety, NM

Ron Swenson
EcoSystems, CA

Merle Malcheski
Elders for Survival, CA

Chuck Brocious
Environmental Defense Institute, ID

Don Finch
For A Clean Tonawanda Site, NY

Maria Mendez & Susan Lee Solar
Grandmothers (and M/Others)
Alliance for the Future, TX

Peg McIntire
Grandparents for Peace, FL

Doris Copperman
Gray Panthers of Central Costa County, CA

Carroll Webber
Greenville Peace Committee, NC

Paige Knight
Hanford Watch, OR

Jennifer O. Viereck
Healing Global Wounds, CA

Kevin Martin
Illinois Peace Action

Sherry Larsen-Beville
Livermore Conversion Project, CA

Greg Mello
Los Alamos Study Group, NM

Michael Niece
Magdalene House Catholic Worker, CA

Carol Wagner
Mt. Diablo Peace Center, CA

David Buer
Nevada Desert Experience, NV

Sean Donahue
New Hampshire Peace Action

Mary Beth Brangan
Nuclear Democracy Network, CA

Joanna Macy
Nuclear Guardianship Project, CA

Felice & Jack Cohen-Joppa
Nuclear Resister, AZ

Ralph Hutchison
Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance, TN

Doris Smith
Panhandle Area Neighbors and Landowners, TX

Tom Webb
Pax Christi- Bay Area, CA

Edouard & Francoise Rocher
Pax Christi Cape Cod, MA

Mary Lees
Pax Christi, Massachusetts

Eirik Harteis
Pax Christi Metro DC

Rachel Keeler
Pax Christi Metro New York

Mary & Bill Carry
Pax Christi Michigan

Frank Dworak
Pax Christi New Jersey

Jean Egan
Pax Christi New Orleans, LA

Merle Nolde OSB
Pax Christi St. Cloud, MN

Shirley Poore & Sheila O'Brian
Pax Christi, Tallahassee, FL

Kay Arnold
Pax Christi, TX
Regional and Local Groups, Continued....

Bob & Adele DellaValle-Rauth
Pax Christi, Virginia

Ellen R. Robinson
Peace Action Council of Youngstown, OH

Herbert Rothschild Jr
Peace Action - Greater Houston Chapter, TX

Wells R. Staley-Mays
Peace Action Maine

Ray Cary
Peace Action Milwaukee, WI

Jo Ann Fuller
Peace Action - Sacramento-Yolo, CA Chapter

Suzie Sherman
Peace Action, Santa Cruz, CA

Mavis Belisle
Peace Farm, TX

June Stark Casey
Peace Links, CA

Carol Jahnkow
Peace Resource Center of San Diego, CA

Bernice Fischer
Peninsula CTBT/Non Proliferation Coalition, CA

Paul George
Peninsula Peace and Justice Center, CA

Wayne Shandera, MD
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Houston TX

Jonathan Parfrey
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Los Angeles, CA

Wells R. Staley-Mays
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Maine

Herbert Perr, MD
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Nassau County, NY

Wendy Perron

Physicians for Social Responsibility, New York City

Dan Kerlinsky, MD
Physicians for Social Responsibility, NM

Donald Rucknagel, MD
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Southwest Ohio

Tim Keller, MD, MPH
Physicians for Social Responsibility, WA

Gail Snyder
Pikes Peak Justice and Peace Commission, CO

Melanie Okamoto
Political Ecology Group, CA

Bruce A. Drew
Prairie Island Coalition, MN

David R. Bassett
Religious Society of Friends, Ann Arbor, MI
Peace & Social Concerns Committee

Kathie Spallone
Religious Society of Friends, PA
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting,
Abolition 2000 Working Group

Tom Marshall
Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center, CO

Father Bill O'Donnell
St. Joseph the Worker Church, CA
Social Justice Committee

Sister Elizabeth Newman & Sister Leah Couvillion
School Sisters of Notre Dame, Dallas Province, TX

Reinard Knutsen
Shundahai Network, NV

Beatrice Brailsford
Snake River Alliance, ID

Elisabeth Anderson
Sonoma County Center for Peace & Justice, CA

Marylia Kelley
Tri-Valley Communities Against a Radioactive Environment, CA

Bob Kinsey

United Church of Christ, Peace & Justice Task Force
Rocky Mountain Conference, CO

Henry Clark
West County Toxics Coalition, Richmond, CA
Regional and Local Groups, Continued....

James Mang
Western New York Peace Center, Buffalo

Jaqueline Cabasso
Western States Legal Foundation, CA

Beth Wilson
Women for Peace, East Bay, CA

Lilliam Nurmela
Women's International League for Peace & Freedom, East Bay, CA

Tina Bell
Women's International League for Peace & Freedom, New York Metro
Stella Paton & Ethyl Von Hermann
Women's International League for Peace & Freedom, San Francisco Branch, CA

Mary Byrd Davis
Yggdrasil Institute, KY

Clint McClintic
20/20 Vision South Bay, CA

Dale Nesbitt
20/20 Vision San Francisco/East Bay, CA

International Groups

Lindis Percy & Anni Rainbow
Campaign for the Accountability of American Bases, United Kingdom

John Hallam
Friends of the Earth, Sydney, Australia

Lysiane Alezard
Mouvement de la Paix, France

Norm Abbey
Nanose Conversion Campaign, Canada

Dave Martin
Nuclear Awareness Project, Canada

Graham Daniell
People for Nuclear Disarmament, Australia

George Farebrother
World Court Project, United Kingdom

Cc:
Secretary of Energy Elizabeth Moler (Acting)
Secretary of State Madeline Albright

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.

To: wilpf@iprolink.ch (wilpf)
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: another NPT rave
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 09:20 PM 7/15/98 +0200, you wrote:

>Dear Janet and the Cyber Sunflower Field,

>

>I would like to add a line or two about the NPT strategy of Abolition 2000

>and ask one question.....

Dear Felcity:

Prior to the NPT Preparatory Committee meeting this year I wrote to President Clinton through his national security adviser and sent a copy to a contact on the First Lady's staff. However, I didn't try to get other religious organizations to write nor bring in grassroots. The Abolition 2000 network in the United States had no concerted action to influence US policy although some of the organizations did contact the Clinton Administration.

I agree with your proposal for an Abolition 2000 Working Group on International Policy/International Forums. It's membership should be international, which means that it would mostly function through e-mail and conference calls. National sub-groups should be encouraged to develop and carry out strategies for influencing their own governments. They should share their plans and experience with other national sub-groups and the international working group so that we can learn from one another.

I'm glad you are pursuing this.

Shalom,
Howard

To: marissa@vi.org (marissa)
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: NGO Sign-on Letter to Clinton
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 05:56 PM 7/15/98 -0400, you wrote:

>
>Friends-
>The following is a sign-on letter to President Clinton from the USCBL. We
>would like to have as many organizations individually sign-on to the
>letter as possible.....

Dear Marissa:

I'm inclined to sign the letter to President Clinton on land mines. However, we haven't been deeply involved in the land mines campaign and don't know all the nuances of the policy issues. Therefore, I would be helpful to know whether other religious organizations are signing this letter, such as FCNL and the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. Please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard

To: Sue Broidy <a2000@silcom.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Grassroots Action for Abolition 2000
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 03:23 PM 7/14/98 -0700, you wrote:

>To; Howard Hallman, Convenor, Religious Working Group

>

>Dear Mr Hallman,

>

>I have been following with interest the exchange of ideas on the Internet
>about ways of pursuing the Abolition 2000 agenda. As part of the working
>team now, I am planning a campaign activists kit to send out to all
>organizations who are part of the Abolition 2000 network.

>I would very much appreciate having your views on how to reach the
>congregations of the religious organizations in the US as apart from a few
>notable exceptions, we seem to be reaching the heads of churches, but not
>getting the petitions signed and returned in any significant numbers.

>I would be grateful for your advice.

>

>

>Sincerely,

>

>Susan Broidy, Coordinator

>

Dear Susan:

The best way to get petitions signed in local churches, synagogues, and mosques is to work through denominational peace/justice offices (they go by different names) and religious peace fellowships, for they have connections with grassroots networks. The denominational officers are multi-issue and therefore try to discipline themselves on how many actions they ask their grassroots to undertake at any given time. They get numerous requests to send out information, action alerts, petitions, etc. to their networks and tend to accept only the ones that relate to their current priorities. The peace fellowships are more single-minded and are more flexible in dealing with requests from outsiders. However, they have small staffs or work only with volunteers, so their capacity is limited.

As a general matter on petitions and other outreach strategies, religious organizations (and other organizations, too) are more willing to participate when they have been involved in the design of the activity. It is theirs to implement. They notice that quite a few organizations would like to tap into the extensive religious network with a pre-designed approach. Sometimes they will accept this, but their likelihood of participation greatly increases when they have been involved in the planning and design.

As far as Methodists United for Peace with Justice is concerned, our grassroots efforts are now concentrated on building support for CTBT ratification. As a mostly volunteer, low-budget operation, we don't have the capacity to take on this petition campaign.

If you want names of contacts in denominational offices, I can supply you with a list. For religious peace fellowships you might contact Clayton Ramey at the Fellowship of Reconciliation (crramey@igc.org).

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Thu, 16 Jul 1998 15:16:24 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Cc: impress@slt.lk
Subject: pov-1: June Bulletin from Belfast, N. Ireland
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id GAA20131

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Belfast Peace to the City Campaign
JUNE 1998 BULLETIN

Contents

1. Update on the Northern Ireland Political Situation: The June 25 Elections
2. An Article on Peace Building in Northern Ireland: Making Sense of the Agreement, and YOUTHLINK NI
3. A Story from Northern Ireland Interpreting Peacemaking: Corrymeela Community
4. News on Conferences and Publications
5. Suggestions from Our Readers

1. Political Update on the Northern Ireland Situation

Elections to the Northern Ireland Assembly, the final formal stage in the implementation of the new political arrangements for Northern Ireland, took place on 25 June. The results confirmed the overwhelming support for the Agreement among Catholics and nationalists in Northern Ireland and the deep divisions which the Agreement has caused among Protestants and unionists.

The system of election in Northern Ireland (Single Transferrable Vote) allows voters to choose with precision between individual candidates. As a result, local factors such as personality or specific local issues play a greater role than that allowed under party list systems or first-past-the-post. Each of the eighteen constituencies returned six members to the Assembly, allowing voters also to choose between individual candidates for election. Commenting on overall results also has to take into account variations in each of the constituencies.

The most spectacular result of the election was the splintering of the unionist vote among five different parties and among several independent individuals. As a consequence, the nationalist Social Democratic and Labour Party (SDLP) outpolled for the first time the once-dominant Ulster Unionist Party in terms of first preference votes. The coherence of nationalist voting produced two large blocks supporting SDLP and Sinn Fein while unionists ended up with their total vote distributed between two large and several small parties. In terms of seats the overall result was:

UUP - 28
SDLP - 24
DUP - 20
Sinn Fein - 18
Alliance - 6
UKU - 5
PUP - 2
Women's Coalition - 2
Ind. Unionist - 3

TOTAL 108

Prima facie, the results confirm the broad support for the Agreement recorded in the May referendum. Pro-Agreement candidates won at least 75 seats of the 108. In spite of coming second in first preference votes, the UUP retained its position as the largest party in terms of seats as a result of the complex workings of the Single Transferrable Vote system. The difficulty arises because the whole workings of the new Assembly rely on majorities among both Unionists and Nationalists in favour of the system over the long run.

In this regard, the shattering of Unionist unity was unmistakable in the results. In the new Assembly, the fundamental split is between those who support the Good Friday Agreement and those who oppose it. Within the bloc supporting the Agreement, the leading role will be taken by the Ulster Unionist Party (UUP) led by David Trimble. Nevertheless, the Party itself has been wracked by internal dissent since the Agreement was signed with many of its leading public figures rebelling against Trimble's leadership. Even in the new Assembly, the UUP contains a number of figures who are uneasy about crucial aspects of the Agreement. On the other hand, the UUP leadership will be supported by the two members of the Progressive Unionist Party who draw their support from the Protestant working class, particularly those close to the paramilitary Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF). On the most optimistic reading, these parties have a combined total of 30 seats in the new Assembly. Opponents to the Agreement, led by the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) under the Reverend Ian Paisley and the UK Unionist Party (UKU) led by Robert McCartney, can count on the support of the three independent Unionists and will hope to play on the fears of dissident and uneasy members of the UUP. With 28 certain votes, the anti-Agreement Unionists pronounced themselves confident that they could block the Assembly's progress on many issues.

On the nationalist side, voters overwhelmingly chose one of two parties. The SDLP has long been the leading nationalist party under John Hume. Without any spectacular change in its own performance, the SDLP found itself the largest party in terms of first preference votes (22%) and the pivotal party in the new Assembly if the Ulster Unionists are to survive. The rapid and impressive rise of Sinn Fein continued in this election. In 1992, Sinn Fein were winning 10% of the overall vote. In these elections Sinn Fein attracted a record 18%, much of it drawn from new voters who had previously abstained and from young Catholics who found the party more modern in its form and appeal than the SDLP. The ending of

direct IRA activity has apparently ended the inhibitions of many electors to vote for Sinn Fein's because they found their associations distasteful.

The size of the Sinn Fein presence in the Assembly suggests extra complications. Sinn Fein represents to many Unionists the unreconstructed political face of the IRA. At the same time, the very size of the Sinn Fein bloc means that the other nationalist group in the Assembly, the SDLP, cannot afford to ignore them. There are clearly limits to the extent to which the SDLP can make noises to help the Ulster Unionists if these gestures alienate Sinn Fein and are unpopular with the nationalist voters. The Agreement foresees Sinn Fein entering government through the new executive, although many Unionists find such a prospect nearly impossible to swallow, especially if the IRA do not formally renounce violence and/or hand in their weapons.

The political forces are therefore finely balanced. On the one hand, the huge support for the Agreement in the referendum means that there is no return to the status quo before the Agreement. On the other hand, the growth of Sinn Fein support within nationalism and the lack of confidence among more moderate Unionists suggest that a number of issues, especially around parades and the decommissioning of weapons could provide grounds for serious difficulties. Furthermore, at the elections one of the parties linked to a loyalist paramilitary organisation, the Ulster Democratic Party, failed to secure a seat. This leaves the process vulnerable should there be renewed violence, whether by renegade paramilitary groups or on the street as a result of controversial decisions about marching.

Peace, and the construction of a stable political future rooted in mutual respect and trust remains a goal to be reached and worked for, rather than an achievement already in the bag.

Duncan Morrow
School of History, Philosophy and Politics
University of Ulster

2. An Article on Peace-building in Northern Ireland

MAKING SENSE OF THE AGREEMENT MONDAY 18 MAY 1998

The period of time from Friday 10th April to Friday 22nd May was dominated in Northern Ireland by intense media debate and analysis of THE AGREEMENT secured through multi-party negotiations on 'Good Friday' - 10th April 1998. Voters were preparing and being prepared during this period to either accept or reject its terms in a Referendum scheduled for 22nd May. In this charged and somewhat frenetic context it was felt that there could or should be an opportunity provided for young adults to explore and better understand the agreement in a conducive and facilitating environment. Consequently the idea of an evening conference was conceived which came to be known as 'Making Sense of the Agreement.' The aim was not to advise young adults how to vote but to provide a safe and stimulating forum for discussion and analysis of the issues and to encourage the participants to use their vote

after careful consideration.

A number of organisations collaborated to make the event a success by circulating information to their constituent young adults, recruiting participants, identifying small group facilitators and assisting with the organisation of the event itself, these organisations were Youth Link: NI, City of Belfast YMCA, VSB (Voluntary Service Belfast) and the Corrymeela Community. City of Belfast YMCA kindly granted use of their conference facilities and resources and supplied refreshments during the evening. Youth Link handled the circulation of information to the media, the organisation of key speakers and panel members and the general coordination of the event. Advance information/news about the conference was carried in the local papers including the Belfast Telegraph and on BBC Radio Ulster. A television crew from the BBC were present on the night resulting in coverage the following morning on both TV news and radio.

Over 70 young adults attended the conference which was opened by Dr Duncan Morrow with input aimed to put the Agreement in context and give an overview of the main terms and issues within it. The participants then had an opportunity to discuss their feelings and perspectives and to hear from others in smaller groups of 15-16 people. The second part of the evening began with a 5 minute video presentation of three differing views on the Agreement. The final hour was devoted to a plenary question and answer session involving a panel speaking from different perspective. Panel members were: Alan McBride, a youth work student and a Member of the Management Committee of WAVE (a support group for those bereaved through 'the Troubles' (Alan's wife and father-in-law were both killed in an IRA bombing.) Rev John Dunlop, Minister of Rosemary Presbyterian Church, Ms Christine Bell, Director of Queen's University (Belfast) Centre for Human Rights Law and a member of the Committee on the Administration of Justice, Fiona McMahan, Community Relations Development Officer of the National Union of Students/Union of Students of Ireland, and Debbie Watters Development Officer of the Alternative Justice Project, Ex-Prisoners Interpretative Centre

The unanimous verdict of all the organisers, backed up by feedback from participants, was that the conference was a significant success with enthusiastic participation, stimulating input and debate and wide coverage of the important and pertinent issues.

For added interest and to gauge the impact of the dialogue and debate during the conference an Entrance and Exit Poll was conducted. The results are as follows, and speak for themselves:

'If you were able to vote on the Agreement NOW, which of the following would best represent your view?'

Entrance Exit

Yes 33 = 57% 48 = 83%

No 12 = 21% 9 = 15%

Don't know 13=22% 1 = 2%

Know

TOTAL 58 58

The organisers feel this was a worthwhile initiative involving the collaboration of agencies committed to involving, enabling and empowering young people/adults to play a full and active role in civic life, political processes and the rebuilding and reshaping of society.

YOUTH LINK:NI

Youth Link:NI was established in 1990 by the Roman Catholic, Church of Ireland, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, later joined by the Religious Society of Friends and the Non-Subscribing Presbyterian Church. It is an inter-church youth service which promotes the spiritual, social and personal development of young people throughout Northern Ireland. Its shared activities and programmes are a positive sign of reconciliation in this divided society. They include:

- Funding local church groups for single identity work and community relations contact work with those from other religious and political backgrounds;
- Sharing models of cross-community practice and facilitating the design of local cross-community projects;
- Producing new resource material to stimulate discussion on cross-community issues;
- Offering training to develop skills in cross-community practice and issues; and
- Offering a team of facilitators for cross-community work.

All of Youth Link's work is rooted in the values of the Christian faith. For further information about Youth Link training programmes, cross-community projects, or publications, contact:

Youth Link:NI
143a University Street
Belfast BT7 1HP
01232-323217 Fax 01232-323247

3. A Personal Story About Peacemaking in Northern Ireland From The Corrymeela Community

'Corrymeela is people of all ages and Christian traditions who, individually and together are committed to the healing of social, religious and political divisions that exist in Northern Ireland and throughout the world.'

Corrymeela has 180 members, Protestant and Catholic. It is a dispersed community. Members carry on the Community's work by becoming involved wherever they live and work, through their churches, and in social, political and their work settings.

Corrymeela runs two centres, one in Ballycastle and the other in Belfast. Both are resource centres providing 'neutral' meeting place for people

from both sides of the divide to meet each other.

The Ballycastle Centre runs over 200 programmes each year involving over 6,000 people for youth, schools, family, community and Church groups. The main emphasis of the programmes is to provide a safe place where people from different backgrounds can share their 'story'. The following account is about one particular group's experience of doing so.

Peace Walls, Sign of Security, Sign of Fear

In Belfast there are huge barriers 16-18 foot tall walls, erected to keep neighbours apart. They run down the interfaces where Catholic areas meet Protestant areas. These huge structures mean that some people have to keep the light on in their kitchen all year round because they live in the shadow of these 'Peace Walls', as they are called. At the one time they are symbols of security, and symbols of fear. We have been bringing families who live on both sides of the Peace Wall together at Corrymeela. They had decided to try to do something with the fear, and find a new way forward.

The dialogue started with a feelings box. Each person put a single word on a piece of paper representing what it felt like to live in the shadow of the Peace Wall and put them into a slot in the box. Then the pieces of paper were taken from the box and read out anonymously. People were free to add something if they wished. It was impossible to tell from which side of the wall they came. Whether they were Protestant feelings or Catholic feelings. Sadness was the most common. Sadness at the loss of loved ones, the lost childhood for their young people growing up with constant violence on the streets where they lived. Several people put in the word hatred. As 'hatred' came out of the box one woman said, I don't mean to say that I hate anyone. What I meant was that I don't wish to carry on knowing that I am hated, and that my children are hated. That's what we hear, as the young people yell abuse as they see if they can throw bricks over the massively high wall.

The group went on to discuss what they understood as 'community'. Both sides had no problem agreeing what was important for them. They talked about what they hoped for in the year two thousand. Both sides wanted peace, and better amenities for their children, and jobs. At the end of their residential the Catholic Group and the Protestant Group decided they needed to work together for the development of their area. One of their dreams was to have a common community centre where both communities could continue to meet and support each other. Despite the resumption of violence, the relationships between these two groups continues.

Meanwhile the children were meeting. They watched a clown as he came into the room, dressed in an outlandish costume. The more the children laughed at him, the sadder he got. Until he was crumpled up on the ground sobbing. They recognised that feeling, being laughed at because you were different, and both sides talked about their experiences of bullying in school.

They then began talking about their favourite pastime throwing bricks over the Peace Wall. Since they met a day ago on arriving at Corrymeela,

Paddy and William, A Catholic and Protestant had become the best of mates. Paddy was the best shot in the district.

'Paddy what if you hit William.'

'Oh I wouldn't.'

'How is that.'

'I'm a good shot. I wouldn't aim at Paddy.'

'But sometimes you can't see who you will hit, the wall is too high.'

Paddy thought long and hard. 'Yea, you're right. I'm going to have to climb up to the top of the derelict house where I can get a really good aim.'

'But Paddy, last weekend you could have injured William with a stone, because then you didn't know him. How would you feel about that now.'

'Bad!' said Paddy.

Eventually Paddy and the rest of the group decided that they would stop throwing stones.

The person who led that programme was passing through the area where they lived a couple of weeks later and saw some of the children hanging around opposite the one place where you could see through the wall. She was curious as to what was going on. So she stopped. The children said they wait there every day on the way back from school, to wave to their new friends on the Protestant side. Its the way they keep in touch with their new friends.

When we hear one another, a new reality is created between us.

Corrymeela Opens New 'House'

Corrymeela's Ballycastle site saw the opening on 2nd June of their new, purpose-built, main house to replace the 1930s timber building which Corrymeela inherited when it started in 1965. With 50 beds, this brings total accommodation on site to 120. The new building cost €1.5 million, a small proportion of which has still to be raised. Beautifully situated on a small cliff top overlooking Rathlin Island, the new building will see significant reconciliation work and meeting of many different kinds of people for many years to come. The opening included Corrymeela founder Ray Davey referring back to the opening of the original building in the mid-sixties, and he spoke about forgiveness, hope for the future and a new beginning.

Corrymeela seeks:

- to be a sign and symbol that Protestants and Catholics can share together in a common witness and ministry of reconciliation;
- to provide opportunities for meeting, dialogue and learning in

communities to dispel ignorance, prejudice and fear and to promote, mutual respect, trust and co-operation;

- to support victims of violence and injustice; to enable the healing of personal and social wounds and to promote new initiatives for social and political change;

- to address contemporary issues of faith and ethics and develop new expressions of Christian community, life and worship.

To keep in touch with what is happening at Corrymeela you can become a 'Friend' (minimum subscription œ15). Corrymeela, 8 Upper Crescent, Belfast BT7 1NT, Telephone 01232- 325008.

4. News on Conferences and Publications

Conferences

BURYING THE PAST

Justice, Forgiveness and reconciliation in the politics of South Africa, Guatemala, East Germany and Northern Ireland. A three-day conference at St Anthony's College, Oxford, 14-16 September 1998. Supported by the Faculty of Theology at Oxford University, the Catholic Institute for International Relations (London), and the Life & Peace Institute (Uppsala).

Contributors Include:

Opening Address: Garrett Fitzgerald is a former Taoiseach (Prime Minister) of the Republic of Ireland.

Terence McGaughey lectures in the Department of Irish Studies at Trinity College, Dublin and is author of 'Redemption and Memory: Church, Politics and Prophetic Theology in Ireland' (Gill & MacMillan 1993).

Duncan Morrow lectures in the Department of Politics at the University of Ulster.

For information contact the Conference Coordinator:

Dr Nigel Biggar

Oriel College Oxford OX1 4EW

Tel: 44(0)1865 276555 Fax: 44(0)1865 791823

TRANSFORMING CONFLICT TRAINING by the Mediation Network for NI

Course dates for 1998 - 1999 are:

Course A - 1998:

7 & 8 October, 10am - 4pm; 4 & 5 November, 10am - 4pm; 2 & 3 December, 10am - 4pm.

Venue: Ulster Peoples College, 30 Adelaide Park, Belfast BT9

Course B - 1999:

8 & 9 January, Fri 7.00pm - 9.30pm & Saturday 10.00am - 4.00pm; 5 & 6 February; 5 & 6 March (same times apply).

Venue: Ulster Peoples College, 30 Adelaide Park, Belfast BT9

For further information contact: Peter O'Reilly

The Mediation Network

128a Great Victoria Street
Belfast BT2 7BG
phone: 01232-438614

ECPCR FOR BELFAST IN OCTOBER: EMPOWERING LOCAL CAPACITIES FOR PEACE

The fourth European Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution (ECPCR) will take place in Belfast from 9-13 October with the major themes of After the War - Building the Peace, Designing Strategic Interventions, Transitional Partnerships and Identifying Strategic Players. ECPCR is an association of European based individuals and organisations active in the field of peacemaking, peacebuilding and the prevention, resolution and transformation of destructive conflict. Further information and registration material soon from the conference coordinators: Project Planning International, Montalto Estate, Spa Road, Ballynahinch, Co Down BT24 8PT. Tel (01238) 561993. Fax: (01238) 565073. E-mail 101455.1521@compuserve.com

INNATE CONFERENCE: LEARNING TO RIDE A NONVIOLENT CYCLE

Saturday and Sunday 13th and 14th June 1998 at Corrymeela House, Belfast. Starting 10.30am both days, finishing 5.30pm Saturday, not later than 5.00pm on Sunday.

This workshop will start by exploring nonviolent responses to violent situations that we may find ourselves in. They will also look at cycles and patterns of conflict and violence before moving on to methods and approaches within nonviolence. There will be time on Sunday to discuss and reflect on how these - and other - approaches can be shared in nonviolence training. Anyone interested welcome.

Fee: €5 waged; €3 unwaged/low waged. Bring or buy your own lunch!

Organised by INNATE, 16 Ravensdene Park, Belfast BT6 0DA.
Phone/fax: (01232) 647106. Bookings and enquiries to this address and number.

PAX CHRISTI INTERNATIONAL ROUTE 1998

Integrating the Past Re-imagining the Future

IRELAND/NORTHERN IRELAND - 1-9 AUGUST 1998

Experience a country in a way you might not have imagined. Deepen your understanding of peace and conflict. Travel and meet with others to probe beneath the surface as part of a multi-national group. Appreciate the past as a part of the present on a week of dialogue and discovery.

For further information contact:

International Route
c/o Richard Sheehy
House 27, Trinity College
Dublin 2
Ireland

Tel: xx353/1/608.12.60
E-mail: sheehyr@tcd.ie

Publications

"Imprisoned within structures? The Role of Believing Communities in Building Peace in Ireland" available at €5.99 from some book shops or direct from Glenree Centre for Reconciliation, 19/23 Exchequer Street, Dublin 2 (price includes postage.) This is a 200-page A-4 publication considering the contribution of Christian churches to the peace process in Ireland.

A Note About The Glenree Centre for Reconciliation

The Glenree Centre for Reconciliation is an autonomous organisation which seeks to work with all those trying to build peace, in whatever area of society. Uniquely in the Republic of Ireland, the Glenree Centre for Reconciliation, Enniskerry, Co Wicklow, provides facilities which are expressly devoted to peace-building and reconciliation issues. The resources of the Centre and those of Glenree's membership, staff and volunteers, are available to individuals and groups who wish to work in an atmosphere which is welcoming and inclusive.

Glenree offers space and programme possibilities in the belief that new ways can be found to deal with conflict in a democratic society. Glenree is firmly identified with the aspiration to build a truly pluralist Ireland.

Contact details: Glenree Centre for Reconciliation
The Centre
Glenree Co Wicklow
Tel: 01 282 9711
Fax: 01 276 6085

The Development Office
Exchequer Chambers
19/23 Exchequer Street
Dublin 2
Tel: 01 662 0355 or 679 7148
Fax: 01 679 8004

"Young People on the Interface," published May 1998 by The Belfast Interface Project, 6 Murray Street, Belfast BT1 6DN, Northern Ireland:

Under the auspices of the Belfast Interface Project a series of interviews was carried out during 1997 with groups of young people in interface or "peace-line" areas of Belfast. This report is a summary of

the responses given by those young people. The report underlines both the 'traditional' nature of inter-community violence in many areas, and the extent to which many young people's life-chances and opportunities are severely constrained by the boundaries, visible and invisible, which surround them.

5. Suggestions from our Readers

The Peace Blanket Project

The idea for the PEACE BLANKET began due to a frustration with the media and its inability to provide adequate coverage of the efforts of ordinary people who are trying to show a great desire for peace in Ireland. Local news coverage rarely goes out of its way to inform and promote all that is good and positive in individuals efforts to live at peace with their neighbours. While the media only concentrates on the violence in this situation it is, in effect, distorting the news and through doing so, fanning the flames of local sectarian feeling and hatred. The PEACE BLANKET is a reaction to the media's apathy and lack of accountability. It questions the media's monopoly on communication and is, in its own way, a form of dialogue between people. It attempts, with its own small voice, to debunk the myth that we cannot reach out to each other in love and a sincere respect for each other's cultural identity.

Plans are underway to display Peace Blankets created by seven groups in Whitehead, Co Antrim, in the keep of Carrickfergus Castle from the 1st to the 13th of July. The Presbyterian, Methodist, Roman Catholic, Baptist, Bethany Hall, and Salvation Army churches and the Whitehead Community Association are all represented by a Peace Blanket.

If any other individuals or groups would be interested in making a blanket or even drawing a picture or a two dimensional creation promoting the idea of peace, these may be able to be displayed within the grouping of the Peace Blanket Project.

For further details contact: Stephen Hall, Peace Blanket Project, 28 Cable Road, Whitehead BT38 9PX Telephone or Fax 01960-378583.

Belfast Peace to the City Campaign Local Coordinator: Doug Baker
Mediation Network
128A Great Victoria Street
Belfast BT2 7BG
Northern Ireland
Phone: +44-1232-438614
FAX: +44-1232-314430
Email: info@mediation-network.org.uk
<http://www.mediation-network.org.uk/>

----- End of message from list: pov-l ---->

Return-Path: <lmehall@ibm.net>
Reply-To: <lmehall@ibm.net>
From: "LYNETTE MEHALL" <lmehall@ibm.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Great trip!
Date: Thu, 16 Jul 1998 08:49:08 -0000
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

Dear Howard,

It sounds like you had a great trip! I would like to make that trip sometime. We had always thought we would take the boys on a week whitewater rafting trip, but it never materialized.

We are headed for Jamaica next week. I will attend the World Congress of Reading in Ochos Rios. Rick, Clint, and Dylan (Clint's friend) will accompany me.

I met Mom, Sara, and Nicole for blueberry picking yesterday. It was a not day, but it was nice to be able to visit for a few hours. We will go up there Sunday night to stay before our early flight out on Monday morning. We will celebrate Mike's birthday at Mom's house Sunday evening.

I need to write a presentation to give in Jamaica, so I had better get started. It is a gorgeous day, and I want to go out to the lake for the afternoon! It has been so wonderful out there the past couple of weeks. I must enjoy it now, only 2 1/2 more weeks until I begin my new job!!

Tell everyone hello! Maybe we can do better at E-mailing now! Love,
Lynette

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

> To: lmehall@ibm.net

> Subject: Re: Did you receive

> Date: Tuesday, July 14, 1998 6:52 PM

>

> At 09:08 AM 7/14/98 -0000, LYNETTE MEHALL wrote:

> >Dear Howard,

> > This is short to see if you receive it....

>

> Dear Lynette:

>

> You can see that I received your message! Unfortunately I had an extra set

> of letters in the address I gave you, so no wonder it didn't go through.

> Thanks for trying anyway.

>

> We had a really good time at the Grand Canyon and Lake Powell. One morning

> Beth, Joy, Matt, and I walked along the West Rim trail while Carlee took the

> shuttle bus between stops that were about a half mile apart. Joy and Matt

> went down on hour or so along both the South Kaibab and Bright Angel Trails

> on successive days. Beth went part way with them on the South Kaibab, and I

To: marissa@vi.org (marissa)
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: RE: NGO Sign-on Letter to Clinton
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 09:31 AM 7/16/98 -0400, you wrote:

>
>Howard,
>Thank you for your quick response. I'm sure many religious organizations
>will be singing on; Joe Volk of FCNL is the co-chair of the USCBL, Sr.
>Janice Ryan of the Catholic Bishops Conference is the co-chair of the
>government taskforce of the USCBL, Evangelical Lutheran Church of America
>and Lutheran World Relief/Church World Services are members of the USCBL
>Steering Committee. I hope you will be able to join this effort. Thank
>you.

Marissa:

If those persons are signing on, you can add our organization. If you want a name, you can use mine.

Thanks for what you're doing.

Howard

To: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball), dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Update: India-US dialogue/sanctions
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 09:00 AM 7/16/98 -0400, Daryl Kimball wrote:

>TO: Coalition members and friends
>FR: Daryl Kimball
>
>RE: Senate eases sanctions
>
>
>Yesterday the Senate passed by voice vote an amendment (#3155) that would
>unconditionally authorize the President to lift nuclear sanctions on India
>and Pakistan. The "India-Pakistan Relief Act of 1998" would authorize the
>President to waive all nuclear sanctions under both the Glenn/Symington and
>Pressler Amendments as well as under sec. 2-b-4 of the Export Import Bank
>Act. The waiver authority would last for a year and would not extend to
>exports of arms or dual-use goods.
>
>The Senate also debated amendment #3156 by Lugar which would have required a
>mandatory 45 day delay before imposing any "unilateral economic sanction"
>(broadly defined), regardless of the circumstances, and requiring the
>termination of the unilateral sanction after 2 year, regardless of whether
>or not it is working to achieve its objective. The legislation was tabled
>(i.e. killed) by a 53-46 margin on a motion from Senator Stevens.
>
>COMMENT: While the Coalition per se does not have an official position on
>the nuclear non-proliferation sanctions issue, I believe that our community
>needs to take careful note of the recent votes in the Senate on sanctions.
>The drive to give the President greater flexibility in applying sanctions
>may in fact provide the Executive Branch with more tools in its current
>discussions with India, but the Senate's motivation behind the easing of
>sanctions has much more to do with heavy lobbying from export business
>interests and the concern of certain Senators about homestate agricultural
>difficulties than it has to do with nuclear non-proliferation objectives.
>

Dear Daryl:

I hope that the Coalition will also pay attention to the concern of some in the religious community that some kinds of sanctions victimize poor people, children, and the elderly.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <chellman@cdi.org>

X-Sender: chellman@mail.cdi.org

Date: Thu, 16 Jul 1998 15:52:35 -0400

To: mw0771a@american.edu, washofc@aol.com, cwu_washington.parti@ecunet.org,
disarmament@igc.apc.org, tom.clements@green2.greenpeace.org,
laws@earthlink.net, dellberg@igc.apc.org, mccwjdb@erols.com,
mupj@igc.apc.org, meldredge@igc.apc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org,
hamiltoh@rtk.net, barbara_green@pcusa.org, uuawo@aol.com, unsc@idt.net,
mary@vi.org, wfa@igc.apc.org, vision@igc.apc.org,
adaction@ix.netcom.com, basicus@basicint.org, CEP@echonyc.com,
102375.413@compuserve.com, pdd@clark.net, funcongov@aol.com,
idds@world.std.com, info@natprior.org, ncc_washington.parti@ecunet.org,
ncecd@igc.apc.org, pda@comw.org, paecon@igc.apc.org,
ploughshares@igc.apc.org, spusa@spusa.org, wand@world.std.com,
wandwill@clark.net, wfpg@aed.org, wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org,
joseph@stimson.org, defense@pogo.org, rcowan@lesley.edu,
dculp@nrdc.org, cdavis@clw.org, dege@taxpayer.net,
71263.401@compuserve.com, mfonte@clw.org, hn5236@handsnet.org,
kvanderh@mail.clark.net, hultgren@taxpayer.net, jdi@clw.org,
skerr@clw.org, bmsil@psr.org, 73744.3675@compuserve.com,
mpage@MACArthu.macfdn.org, jparachini@stimson.org, tperry@ucsusa.org,
johnpike@mail.clark.net, aslater@igc.apc.org, mmp@humboldt1.com,
cspinney@erols.com, tsipis@mit.edu, hn0079@handsnet.org,
chellman@cdi.org, stevenraikin@delphi.com, btiller@psr.org,
jaquith@mindspring.com, joe@fcnl.org

From: Chris Hellman <chellman@cdi.org>

Subject: Invite to Nuclear Weapons Conference

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id MAA11673

CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION

invites you to a one day conference entitled:

"Can We Learn to Live Without Nuclear Weapons?"

Keynote speaker will be Jonathan Schell, author of "Fate of the Earth" and
most recently, "The Gift of Time: The Case for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons Now."

Joined by:

Admiral Stansfield Turner
former Senator Alan Cranston
David Krieger
Bishop Walter Sullivan
Admiral Noel Gayler
Ambassador Paul Warnke
Walter Pincus
Alice Slater

Tuesday, July 21, 1998
9:00AM to 4:30PM

at the Carnegie Endowment Building
Root Room, Second Floor
1779 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC

The speakers will address the legal, military, religious, arms control, national command and public opinion facets of nuclear abolition.

Registration will begin at 9:00AM with the program beginning at 9:30 and adjourning at 4:30PM. A Continental breakfast and lunch will be offered in the Root Room on the 2nd floor of the Carnegie Endowment Building.

Unfortunately, due to limited space CDI may not be able to accommodate all attendees. Please RSVP on or before Monday, July 20th by contacting Laura Payne at (202) 332-0600, x135, by Fax at (202) 462-4559 or lpayne@cdi.org.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 16 Jul 1998 12:52:38 -0700 (PDT)
From: Pamela Meidell <pmeidell@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: BUDDHA DOES NOT SMILE ON SOUTH ASIA ANYMORE
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

/* Written 5:59 PM Jul 15, 1998 by tedesco@uriel.net in igc:bpf.ineb */
/* ----- "BUDDHA DOES NOT SMILE ON SOUTH ASI" ----- */

>Return-Path: <himalmag@mos.com.np>
>From: himalmag@mos.com.np
>Comments: Authenticated sender is <himalmag@chulu.mos.com.np>
>To: Asian Human Rights Commission <ahrchk@HK.Super.NET>,
> hseverino@phil.gn.apc.org, tedesco@uriel.net
>Date: Wed, 15 Jul 1998 17:46:21 +0000
>Subject: BUDDHA DOES NOT SMILE ON SOUTH ASIA ANYMORE
>Priority: normal

>
>(Apologies if you have received this before.)

>
>HIMAL'S "ANTI-NUKE ISSUE" NOW AVAILABLE ON THE WEB

>
>The July 1998 issue of Himal (the South Asian magazine) is an
>exclusive compendium of the most persuasive articles to come out in
>the Subcontinental press questioning the rationale of the
>India-Pakistan nuclear blasts of May 1998. The issue can be viewed
>at Himal's website <www.himalmag.com>. (The editors write "...we did
>not feel a need to present the pro-nuke arguments for the simple
>reason that we did not agree with them.")

>
>The special issue includes the following:

>
>* commentaries from Himal editors in Kathmandu, Delhi and Lahore,
>including review of press and public opinion following the blasts. The
>lead commentary is titled "The Indo-Pak Bomb".

>
>* articles by Achin Vanaik, A.H. Nayyar, Ashis Nandy, Eqbal Ahmed,
>Giri Deshingkar, Kanti Bajpai, Pervez Hoodbhoy, Praful Bidwai, Shiv
>Vishwanathan, Sayed Rashid Naim, Zia Mian and others.

>
>* full listing and complete texts of the sixty-plus articles reviewed
>in making selections for the anti-nuke issue. (Articles received in
>hard copy are not included.)

>
>* a Cartoon Kiosk showing Himal cartoons on the nuclear competition.

>
>The website includes a form to order the anti-nuke issue as well as
>a copy of the specially prepared "BUDDHA DOES NOT SMILE ON SOUTH ASIA
>ANY MORE " poster.

>
>

Frank Tedesco, Ph.D.
Occasional lecturer, University of Maryland
Assistant Professor
Sejong University
98 Kunjadong, Kwangjin-gu
Seoul 143-747 KOREA
Tel/fax: 82-2-997-3954
E-mail: tedesco@uriel.net

"Life is a terminal disease, and it's sexually transmitted."
John Cleese, the Buddhist.

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

Date: Thu, 16 Jul 1998 14:44:18 -0700 (PDT)

From: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Final Subcritical letter, really

To: tomatompn+@igc.org, healls@aol.com, healthm@aol.com, ERFinSC@ix.netcom.com, allister@snakeriveralliance.org, mstewart@snakeriveralliance.org, abolition-caucus@igc.org, Taflo08@aol.com, dwoc@teleport.com, mknolldc@igc.apc.or, shandera@bcm.tmc.edu, shalom@internetMCI.com, nypaxchristi@igc.apc.org, pam@nlis.net, TORPHILA@aol.com, jmlees@capecod.net, caab.lindis_anni@virgin.net, wiednerb@aol.com, DelRauth@aol.com, ulan@capecod.net, Fdworak@aol.com, capazaction@igc.org, Mawebber@eastnet.educ.ecu.edu, MNolde@CSBSJU.EDU, Wjc1mbc2@aol.com, cco@igc.apc.org, peg@aug.com, cfpa@cyberenet.net, mkeller@mhec.state.md.us, HROthschild@UH.EDU, Kaygarnold@aol.com, okamoto@shudo-u.ac.jp, annacass@mindspring.com, kathy-s@k2nesoft.com, pamilw@execpc.com, wnypeace@buffnet.net, ilpeace@igc.org, Nhpeaceact@igc.org, johnsonc.dean.wosc@redbaron.wou.edu

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc3.igc.apc.org id OAA19171

X-Sender: meldredge@pop.igc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id OAA27385

Something about saying the word "final" seems to inspire people. Here is the real FINAL subcritical letter to Pres. Clinton. I've made a few corrections and added some names. No more names can be accepted, the letter has already been mailed to the President. However, I urge those who did not get a chance to sign on to cut and paste this letter into their word processing program (just the letter, not all the signatories!) sign it, and send your own. It would be helpful if several letters came in; even better if you could modify it slightly so we don't look like a cookie cutter campaign. I've also cc'd this to Sec. of Energy Elizabeth Moler (Acting) at 1000 Independence Ave, SW, Washington, DC 20585 and Sec. of State Madeleine Albright at 2201 C St., NW, Washington, DC 20520. I urge you to do the same if you are sending your own letter. Thanks again to all who helped out.
-Maureen

DECLARE A MORATORIUM ON SUBCRITICAL TESTING

July 16, 1998

Dear President Clinton:

As national, regional, and local organizations working for the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, we urge you to declare a moratorium on the US subcritical testing program and seek agreement from Russia and China to halt activities at their test sites as well. The recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan highlight the precariousness of the nonproliferation regime. At this vitally important juncture, the US needs to take leadership in opposing all forms of nuclear testing and in de-legitimizing the role of nuclear weapons worldwide. Declaring a moratorium on the US subcritical nuclear testing program would be an important step in this direction. By contrast, should the US conduct a subcritical test at this

tense moment in history, it would only serve to fuel the flames of nuclear frenzy in other nations.

The ongoing US investment in nuclear weapons, and the subcritical testing program, is provocative to nations with nuclear aspirations. India has stated the need to conduct nuclear tests was in part based on the desire to advance their computer codes in order to benefit from a subcritical testing program of their own. During sensitive CTBT negotiations in 1996, the US subcritical testing program generated great opposition and raised questions about the US commitment to the test ban. Subcritical testing, which includes site preparations that look almost identical to those of a full-scale nuclear test, also makes verification of the test ban more difficult. The US sets a dangerous precedent by continuing the subcritical program. Additionally, the entire stockpile stewardship program calls into question the US commitment to its obligations under Article 6 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty to work for nuclear disarmament.

The US has already conducted one subcritical test this year (Stagecoach) and anticipates conducting one or two more in September. These tests are not needed for assuring the safety and reliability of the US nuclear weapons arsenal. Conducting more subcritical tests, especially at this dangerous moment in international relations, seems particularly foolhardy. Taking a strong leadership approach and declaring a moratorium on the US subcritical testing program would send a much better and much safer message to India, Pakistan, and other nuclear aspirants: that the US is willing to step out on the path against nuclear testing and nuclear weapons. US leadership on this issue is essential for progress on reducing regional and global nuclear dangers.

The US cannot hope to convince other nations to eschew nuclear weapons if it continues its massive investments in nuclear weapons research. The subcritical testing program only exacerbates an already difficult, dangerous, and inflammatory situation. We urge you to once again make the US a leader on these issues and declare a moratorium on the subcritical testing program. If you have any questions, please contact Maureen Eldredge at 202-833-4668.

Sincerely,

National Groups

Maureen Eldredge
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Darryl Fagan
Americans for Democratic Action

Susan Segall
American Friends Service Committee

Bill Capowski
Center for Campus Organizing

Clayton Ramey

Fellowship of Reconciliation (USA)

Joe Volk
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Maurice Paprin
Fund for New Priorities in America

Alice Slater
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment

Barbara Wiedner
Grandmothers for Peace International

National Groups, Continued....

Timothy Fuller
Gray Panthers, National Office

Tom Clements
Greenpeace

Alyn Ware
Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

Marie Dennis
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

Howard Hallman
Methodists United for Peace With Justice

Michael Marriotte
Nuclear Information and Resource Service

Dave Robinson
Pax Christi USA

Gordon Clark
Peace Action

Betty Bumpers & Donnan Runkel
Peace Links

Robert Tiller
Physicians for Social Responsibility

Ellen Thomas
Proposition One Committee

Anne Anderson
Psychologists for Social Responsibility

Paul Walker
Veterans for Peace

Susan Shaer
Womens Action for New Directions

Betty Burkes
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

Edith Villastrigo
Women Strike for Peace

Robin Caiola
20/20 Vision

Regional and Local Groups

Don Herriod
Abalone Alliance, CA

Jonathan M. Haber
Action Site to Stop Cassini Earth Flyby, MA

Michael J. Keller
Anne Arundel Peace Action, MD

Byron Plumley
American Friends Service Committee, CO

Peter Drekmeler
Bay Area Action, CA

Philip M. Klasky
Bay Area Nuclear Waste Coalition, CA

Alan Senauke
Buddhist Peace Fellowshp, CA

Erica Harrold
California Peace Action

Harry Rogers
Carolina Peace Resource Center, SC

Tom O'Rourke
Catholic Peace Fellowship, Philadelphia, PA

Michael Closson
Center for Economic Conversion, CA

Chuck Johnson
Center for Energy Research, Salem, OR

Francis U. Macy
Center for Safe Energy, Earth Island Institute, CA

Sally Hindman
Chaplaincy to the Homeless, CA

John Hadder & Rick Neilson
Citizen Alert, NV

Harold Stokes
Citizens for Alternatives to Chemical Contamination, MI

Regional and Local Groups, Continued.....

Jami Caseber
Citizens Opposing a Polluted Environment, CA

Rev. Robert Moore
Coalition for Peace Action, NJ

Beryl Schwartz
Colorado Peace Action

Jay Coghlan
Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety, NM

Lynn Sims
Don't Waste Oregon

Ron Swenson
EcoSystems, CA

Merle Malcheski
Elders for Survival, CA

Judith Johnsrud
Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power, PA

Chuck Brocious
Environmental Defense Institute, ID

Don Finch
For A Clean Tonawanda Site, NY

Maria Mendez & Susan Lee Solar
Grandmothers (and M/Others)
Alliance for the Future, TX

Peg McIntire
Grandparents for Peace, FL

Gerda Miller

Gray Panthers of Berkeley, CA

Doris Copperman
Gray Panthers of Central Costa County, CA

Carroll Webber
Greenville Peace Committee, NC

Paige Knight
Hanford Watch, OR

Jennifer O. Viereck
Healing Global Wounds, CA

Kevin Martin
Illinois Peace Action

Sherry Larsen-Beville
Livermore Conversion Project, CA

Greg Mello
Los Alamos Study Group, NM

Michael Niece
Magdalene House Catholic Worker, CA

Carol Wagner
Mt. Diablo Peace Center, CA

David Buer
Nevada Desert Experience, NV

Sean Donahue
New Hampshire Peace Action

Mary Beth Brangan
Nuclear Democracy Network, CA

Joanna Macy
Nuclear Guardianship Project, CA

Felice & Jack Cohen-Joppa
Nuclear Resister, AZ

Ralph Hutchison
Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance, TN

Anna Cassilly
Orange County Peace Action

Doris Smith
Panhandle Area Neighbors and Landowners, TX

Tom Webb
Pax Christi- Bay Area, CA

Edouard & Francoise Rocher
Pax Christi Cape Cod, MA

Mary Lees
Pax Christi, Massachusetts

Eirik Harteis
Pax Christi Metro DC

Rachel Keeler
Pax Christi Metro New York

Mary & Bill Carry
Pax Christi Michigan
Regional and Local Groups, Continued....

Frank Dworak
Pax Christi New Jersey

Jean Egan
Pax Christi New Orleans, LA

Merle Nolde OSB
Pax Christi St. Cloud, MN

Shirley Poore & Sheila O'Brian
Pax Christi, Tallahassee, FL

Kay Arnold
Pax Christi, TX

Bob & Adele DellaValle-Rauth
Pax Christi, Virginia

Ellen R. Robinson
Peace Action Council of Youngstown, OH

Herbert Rothschild Jr
Peace Action - Greater Houston Chapter, TX

Wells R. Staley-Mays
Peace Action Maine

Ray Cary
Peace Action Milwaukee, WI

Jo Ann Fuller
Peace Action - Sacramento-Yolo, CA Chapter

Suzie Sherman
Peace Action, Santa Cruz, CA

Mavis Belisle
Peace Farm, TX

June Stark Casey
Peace Links, CA

Carol Jahnkow
Peace Resource Center of San Diego, CA

Bernice Fischer
Peninsula CTBT/Non Proliferation Coalition, CA

Paul George
Peninsula Peace and Justice Center, CA

Wayne Shandera, MD
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Houston TX

Jonathan Parfrey
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Los Angeles, CA

Wells R. Staley-Mays
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Maine

Herbert Perr, MD
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Nassau County, NY

Wendy Perron
Physicians for Social Responsibility, New York City

Dan Kerlinsky, MD
Physicians for Social Responsibility, NM

Donald Rucknagel, MD
Physicians for Social Responsibility, Southwest Ohio

Tim Keller, MD, MPH
Physicians for Social Responsibility, WA

Gail Snyder
Pikes Peak Justice and Peace Commission, CO

Melanie Okamoto
Political Ecology Group, CA

Bruce A. Drew
Prairie Island Coalition, MN

David R. Bassett
Religious Society of Friends, Ann Arbor, MI
Peace & Social Concerns Committee

Kathie Spallone
Religious Society of Friends, PA
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting,
Abolition 2000 Working Group

Tom Marshall
Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center, CO

Father Bill O'Donnell
St. Joseph the Worker Church, CA
Social Justice Committee

Sister Elizabeth Newman & Sister Leah Couvillion
School Sisters of Notre Dame, Dallas Province, TX

Reinard Knutsen
Shundahai Network, NV

Regional and Local Groups, Continued....

Beatrice Brailsford
Snake River Alliance, ID

Elisabeth Anderson
Sonoma County Center for Peace & Justice, CA

Marylia Kelley
Tri-Valley Communities Against a Radioactive Environment, CA

Bob Kinsey
United Church of Christ, Peace & Justice Task Force
Rocky Mountain Conference, CO

Stephanie Fraser
Welch Project on Social Change, NY

Henry Clark
West County Toxics Coalition, Richmond, CA

James Mang
Western New York Peace Center, Buffalo

Jaqueline Cabasso
Western States Legal Foundation, CA

Beth Wilson
Women for Peace, East Bay, CA

Lilliam Nurmela

Women's International League for Peace & Freedom, East Bay, CA

Tina Bell

Women's International League for Peace & Freedom, New York Metro

Stella Paton & Ethyl Von Hermann

Women's International League for Peace & Freedom, San Francisco Branch, CA

Mary Byrd Davis

Yggdrasil Institute, KY

Clint McClintic

20/20 Vision South Bay, CA

Dale Nesbitt

20/20 Vision San Francisco/East Bay, CA

International Groups

Mitsuo Okamoto

Article Nine Society Hiroshima, Japan

Lindis Percy & Anni Rainbow

Campaign for the Accountability of American Bases, United Kingdom

John Hallam

Friends of the Earth, Sydney, Australia

Lysiane Alezard

Mouvement de la Paix, France

Norm Abbey

Nanoose Conversion Campaign, Canada

Dave Martin

Nuclear Awareness Project, Canada

Graham Daniell

People for Nuclear Disarmament, Australia

George Farebrother

World Court Project, United Kingdom

Cc:

Secretary of Energy Elizabeth Moler (Acting)

Secretary of State Madeline Albright

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.

To: lpayne@cdi.org.
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Nuclear Weapons Conference
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

I accept your invitation to the conference on July 21. Thanks for the invitation.

Howard W. Hallman

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 16 Jul 1998 20:38:26 -0700 (PDT)
From: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Working with NAM
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: kwood@pop.igc.org

Dear Abolitionists,

A while ago, Alice Slater posted a message asking if anyone wanted to join Myrla Bandonado from the Phillipines on the Abolition 2000 NAM Working Group.

I don't know if this working group is now "working", but I think our network should organize an Abolition NGO presence at the September NAM meeting in S. Africa, and our members in NAM countries should give input to their governments in preparation for this meeting.

The NAM meeting will focus on how to _tackle poverty and nuclear proliferation_ in the group's 115 member countries.

The NAM meeting is a good opportunity to network and strategize with governments who are leading, and sympathetic to, the struggle for global nuclear abolition.

These NAM nations are our best governmental allies. Strengthening our relationships with them and tightening collaboration now, is great groundwork for the 1999 NPT PrepCom and 2000 Review conferences.

Best wishes,
Karina
Karina Wood
U.S. Outreach Coordinator,
Hague Appeal for Peace 1999
43 Nisbet St, 3rd Fl.
Providence, RI 02906
Tel: 401 751-8172
Fax: 401 751-1476
Email: kwood@igc.apc.org

Come to the global conference in The Hague, Netherlands May 11-16 1999!

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 12:41:52 +0100 (BST)
From: Janet Bloomfield <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: INDIA/PAKISTAN - more on materials needed
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de,
abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca
cc: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org, org@gn.apc.org, zia@Princeton.EDU

Dear Abolition Friends,
just to update you on where we are with sending materials to India and Pakistan. We are still awaiting confirmation of where to send material to. We have, however, drawn up a priority list of what is needed. First priority is general educational material, videos, books, etc. on effects of making and using nuclear weapons, especially for school children. Second priority is material on arms races, etc. Third priority is nuclear power. If you are in Europe and want to send material for transfer you can send it too the Abolition 2000 UK office 88, Islington High Street, London, N1 8EG. Mark it for the attention of Janet Bloomfield. The UK network had agreed to help cover postage/shipping costs. We will send out material in batches. I am away on holiday for the next two weeks and will get back to you all about this after I return. Thanks for your help. Yours in peace,
Janet Bloomfield.

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 16:49:24 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Subject: pov-1: July Bulletin from Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Rio de Janeiro Peace to the City Campaign July 1998 Monthly Bulletin

In this issue:

- 1) Viva Baby : Child care training, job creation and new skills for adolescent girls from the Acari shanty-town
- 2) "Carioquinhas" : A tour-guide training programme for youth in Rio s underprivileged communities
- 3) "Cease Fire" -- Lessons from the City of Boston : an article by Viva Rio Executive Secretary Rubem Cesar Fernandes on the work being carried out by our "Peace to the City" partners in one of Boston s most violent neighborhoods.

1) VIVA BABY

In the bustling metropolis of Rio de Janeiro where more and more mothers are working away from the home, finding a reliable and skilled baby-sitter or communal day care center has become a difficult and often costly endeavour. The lack of adequate child day care centers and trained personnel has reduced not only the quantity but also the quality of the attention being given to young children in the city.

In response to a request by several communities in Rio de Janeiro for skilled baby-sitters and child-care practitioners, Viva Rio launched in late 1996 its first " Viva Baby" project.

The aim of the project was to attempt to remedy this situation by providing training in child care for young women from the city s poorer communities who could then go on to find employment in a field where there is an increasing demand for skilled labour.

Everyone gained from the experience: the young trainees acquired professional qualifications and the know-how to find a job, the communities involved began taking a greater interest in child care, and many mothers were able to leave their children in safe, reliable hands while helping out young women from poorer communities.

Following the first experience which benefited 60 young trainees in three communities, the second phase of the project is now being launched in the Acari shanty town with sponsorship from the Federal Government aid agency Comunidade Solidaria. Acari, with a population of 70,000 inhabitants is one of the poorest shanty-towns in Rio de Janeiro, with few community services, schools, clinics and an inefficient sewage treatment and garbage collection system. What Acari does have are several church and neighborhood centers committed to improving the conditions of the community. These institutions will take part in the training process of the new Viva Baby recruits, establishing pedagogical centers within their headquarters, as part of a joint community effort seeking to create new opportunities for underprivileged youth.

During a 5-month training period 25 girls aged 16 - 21 will benefit from theoretical and practical courses in child care. They will study several topics related to child care, ranging from first aid and basic notions on health and hygiene, to nutrition and child psychology. The young apprentices will also carry out internships in several day care centers throughout the city. In addition, the young women will also acquire computer skills and participate in workshops on how to set up and manage a small business. Upon completion of the training course, the trainees will have a certificate of qualification which is recognized on the job market, and the know-how to seek employment or to start up their own day care centers.

For both Aline de Souza Rocha, 17, and Sara Souza Rosa da Silva, 18, the enrollment in the Viva Baby training course is an occasion for celebration. Both girls come from troubled family backgrounds and have had to struggle since childhood to survive. Aline's mother died from AIDS when she was 11 and since then she has lived on her own, eeking out a living doing odd jobs and occasionally working as a baby-sitter. Sara was abandoned by her mother and raised in an orphanage for several years until she was taken in by a foster family--only to be taken back into custody by her real father who spent years mistreating and beating her.

Both girls have endured hardships and say they are "mature and prepared to face adulthood." Not surprisingly, aside from the professional motivation to acquire new skills and hopefully a better job as a result of the Viva Baby training course, the main motivation for enrolling in the course is to become responsible and caring mothers in the future.

"I love children and I want to be able to raise my child in a healthy and happy atmosphere", says Aline. "I want to learn how to take care of a baby so that my child won't suffer as I did. I don't want my child to be a victim of violence," adds Sara.

Beyond the love and affection the girls hope to transmit to children, there is also the perk of the possibility of making a new start in the job market with a valid certificate. Aline dreams of working in a professional day care center and would like to study to become a teacher or even go into nursing to specialize as a pediatrician. "Enrolling in a University to get a medical degree is very expensive in Brazil, so I doubt I will ever be able to become a nurse," says Aline. "But now I hope I will be able to get a better job and learn a little bit about taking care of children."

"I have many plans for the future," says Sara. "I want to study, get a degree in computer sciences and work as a teacher with children and adolescents. I want to know everything about the internet and be able to pass this on to youngsters. This course is the first step towards that goal."

For Viva Rio coordinator, Virginia Gayoso, who will be working with the girls from Acari in the Viva Baby training course, the real motivation behind her involvement in the project is the commitment the young girls are demonstrating towards improving their lives. "When you see how enthusiastic these girls are, and how much they really want to care for children, then you know that the time and effort spent in this project are well worth it", says Virginia.

2) CARIOQUINHAS:

Rio de Janeiro is known world-wide as a prime tourist destination -- a tropical vibrant city famous for its picture-postcard natural beauty, sunny climate and stunning beaches. Within Brazil, Rio de Janeiro is the preferred destination for holidays, receiving yearly 842,000 foreigners and 3.2 million Brazilian visitors. The goal of the Municipal Secretariat for Tourism is that by the year 2000, Rio de Janeiro will attract 2 million foreigners and over 5 million national visitors to its shores.

The tourist industry is currently one of the most vibrant and dynamic sectors of the economy in Rio de Janeiro, with approximately 2,000 tourist agencies and firms working directly or indirectly in the field operating in the city. Tourism and its many related activities are seen by professionals as a potential source for employment in the future, as studies indicate that the sector is expected to rapidly expand to become the prime source of revenue and job creation in the city.

Viva Rio is launching in July 1998 a new project, Carioquinhas, which will provide training in the field of tourism for youth from three underprivileged communities. The project aims to provide 30 youth with the necessary training and qualifications required to enable them to find new employment opportunities in an expanding job market. Carioquinhas derives its name from the indigenous word "Carioca", which means an inhabitant of the city of Rio de Janeiro, followed by the Portuguese diminutive (inhas). Carioquinhas therefore means "young Cariocas" -- young inhabitants of Rio de Janeiro.

Traditionally tour guides and tour operators have followed formal training courses under union guidelines. Most of the personnel working in the tourist industry has already had access to secondary schooling and speaks at least one foreign language -- primarily English or Spanish. Until recently, few initiatives have been undertaken to include the less skilled and less professionally qualified inhabitants of the city within the major tourist trade endeavours or networks operating in Rio de Janeiro.

With the support of the Rio de Janeiro Municipal Tourist Authority, Rio-Tur, training courses in tourism management, history, geography,

Portuguese, English, Spanish, public relations and etiquette will be provided during the 5-month course. Basic computer training and accounting skills will also be taught during the course, so that the youth can acquire notions on how to manage and operate a small business. Field visits to the main tourist attractions of the city; Rio's main monuments, museums, theatres and landmarks will also be included in the training programme, providing the youth with a new approach to and vision of their city.

The youth will also work as interns with local tour operators participating in the programme to acquire a hands-on experience of the tourist industry. Several partnerships are already being established between Viva Rio and firms operating in airports, hotels, restaurants and the principal tourist venues. The programme coordinators expect that most of the trainees will be able to find employment in the tourist industry upon completion of the theoretical and practical training periods.

3) "CEASE FIRE" -- Lessons from the City of Boston (*) Rubem Cesar Fernandes, Anthropologist

Due to Viva Rio's involvement in the World Council of Churches' "Peace to the City Campaign", I've just returned from Boston in the United States. Whilst there, I could, therefore, find out a little about the city's public security policies and accompany the local police in their work against juvenile gangs. Informally organised, these gangs dispute territory and the commercial sale of drugs within poor neighbourhoods, usually inhabited by ethnic minorities. While noting the differences, it is clear that these gangs present a similar problem to the movement of drug dealers in the slums of Rio de Janeiro. Boston, previously known as one of the most violent cities in America, has made notable progress in the last decade. An important part of this progress has been the controlling of violence between minors: the number of juvenile homicides has come down from 200 in 1989 to 0 between the middle of 1995 and December 1997. The first homicide since December 1997 was that of a 17 year old youth who was murdered in January of this year, provoking some dismay after two and a half years without such fatal violence. The police interpreted this murder as a sign of the return of violent gang disputes, a result of the arrival in Boston of the most famous gangs from Los Angeles: the Crips, the Bloods and the Floods. Hence, a preventative strategy called "Cease Fire" has been developed to stop gang violence from increasing again. I accompanied one of "Cease Fire's" field visits.

"Cease Fire's" sessions with gang members are planned the previous night, at the headquarters of the NGO "10 Point Coalition", in the black neighbourhood of Dorchester. This NGO is run by the well known Pentecostal Pastor Eugene Rivers, who has co-ordinated a night street parish for ten years and has just won a grant from President Bill Clinton to create a foundation to promote his style of work. I attended one such meeting, which was held to plan the following day's session taking place in a state school in one of the most violent parts of the neighbourhood. Eugene headed the meeting, which included two other black pastors, some of Eugene River's staff members, the head of the Boston Police's Gang Unit and the Director of Dorchester and surrounding areas

probation service. They are a group of people who know each other well. They started working together in 1989 and are principally responsible for the stunning feat of reducing the juvenile homicide rate in Boston to zero.

The following day's session consisted of a meeting with juveniles, who according to the police, were involved with gangs in the area. There were around 30 of them in all and sitting in the lecture hall they appeared more childlike than when moving through the streets. At the front of the class room, the group from the previous night, somewhat larger than before, started the proceedings. The meeting was led by a muscular Irish policeman from the Gang Unit, whose job was done without jokes. What followed was a well thought out psycho-drama.

*An enormous black pastor with a marked accent spoke first: "I am tired of burying people...Why don't you choose life...?"

* Following him came the friendly policeman, mixed race: "My function is not to pretend. I don't pretend. I am here to help you get out. I will give you cover. Look for me. I will find you. I know it's not easy..."

* A tall black female pastor entered, sat down with the youths, passing her hand over their heads: "Listen to the Pastor..."

* Then came the turn of the bad policeman, white, head of the Gang Unit: "I command 75 men, active and well armed, of the highest competency in combat. They are specialists. You think you're hard, but you don't have a chance against me. The Crips, the Bloods and the Floods, will come to grief here in Boston. If I have to I can call on other police units from Boston and from the Feds. We already have 400 names on our database, and it grows every day. You all are on that list. I came here to warn you. It's better to get out while you can."

* A probation officer spoke next, black, young and good looking, but tough with it: "How many of you have been to prison?" Various hands were raised around the room. "So you know how it is, I don't have to explain. But do you know the probation rules? We have 39 men in the area, watching those of you on probation. Mess up and you'll go back to jail."

* A street worker entered, an Israeli that came to study in Boston and joined Eugene's team: "You know me. I may only be a small fish but I can help..."

* We came to the climax: a small black man, well dressed, walked to the middle of the room and tempted the crowd: "I'm looking for 3 or 4 people with good heads. I know that the majority of you are of no use to me. I need smart people. I want to talk about money! Legal money, which is real good. You think that cocaine gets you money? Pure illusion. How much do you make a week? Small change! The real money is with me, and I don't have to live on the run. The police work for me because my money is legit. I've got a contract with the city council to exploit the best street corners this summer. Simple things - hot dogs, popcorn, but at the best plots in the city. Whoever comes with me to do real work will earn more money than they've ever seen in their lives. Any volunteers?" For the first time the youth seem interested and participate. Nine hands are raised to enter into the legit summer program.

. Eugene Rivers closed the session with a blessing, using the skillful oratory style Baptist and Pentecostal preachers in America's black neighbourhoods are renowned for.

On leaving the session, the group returned to the NGO s headquarters to evaluate the evening and make further plans for the next session. They are going around all of the poor neighbourhoods of the city this month, repeating this routine as part of the preparatory phase for this summer s action, which will start in June. The script is simple: "PASTOR / GOOD COP / BAD COP"/ PROBATION OFFICER/STREET WORKER/ALTERNATIVE MONEY MAKING/PASTOR." As small groups at street level, these sessions exist within an overall plan that goes all the way up to a macro strategy from the Police Headquarters. The Gang Unit, officially called "Fire Command for Juvenile Violence", integrates both investigation and concrete action, and rarely has to use the fire which makes up part of its name. They attack to apprehend, yet do so selectively and with superior forces, and don't encounter resistance. The police rarely shoot and are almost never victims of gunfire. Prepared for each small confrontation, they work with other government services and community organisations in the area. That is how they have managed to stop the cycle of violence in Boston.

(*) Article published in Portuguese in the Brazilian daily O GLOBO on May 4, 1998.

Viva Rio
Ladeira da Gloria, 98 - Gloria
CEP: 22211-120
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
+55-21-556-5004
+55-21-558-1381 (fax)
vivario@ax.apc.org
<http://www.informe.simpleweb.com.br/vivario/rio>

----- End of message from list: pov-l ---->

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 16:28:11 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Subject: pov-1: July Bulletin from Belfast, N. Ireland
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Belfast Peace to the City Campaign
July 98 Bulletin

Contents

1. An Article on Peace Building in Northern Ireland: National Council of YMCAs of Ireland International Project on Conflict Resolution
2. A Story from Northern Ireland Interpreting Peacemaking
3. News on Conferences and Publications

(See the June bulletin for the June/July update on the political situation in N. Ireland.)

- 1) An Article on Peace-Building in Northern Ireland

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF YMCAs OF IRELAND
INTERNATIONAL PROJECT ON CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Introduction

For the past 8 years the National Council of YMCAs of Ireland has been implementing an anti-sectarianism development plan within the YMCA in Ireland (North and South).

Throughout this period the organisation has used its existing strengths to help embed the anti-sectarianism ethos in its structure and programmes. For example, the peer education method of working with young people, successfully developed by the YMCA for health education has been adapted and developed for the Reconciliation And Peace Peer Initiative for 16-25 year old leaders. Similarly the cross denominational nature of the organisation has made it possible for biblically based workshops on anti-sectarianism to be attended by Christians from diverse church traditions.

For some time we have recognised that the world-wide nature of the wider YMCA Movement is another strength which could be tapped to help embed anti-sectarianism and developmental community relations work at the local level. Indeed some of the inspiration for the Irish YMCA to take risks to change came from challenges from the international YMCA Movement. Some of the YMCA leaders who have developed this work had benefited from broadened horizons through experiences of very different YMCA Movements in other parts of the world.

As a result an international community relations project has been developed over the past 2 years.

The Project

The project aims to develop international links and learning that will enhance YMCA community relations work and contribute to the wider community relations field in Northern Ireland and the South of Ireland.

There are 4 distinct elements of the project :

1 Establishing a Network This was achieved by the hosting of a World Alliance of YMCAs Workshop on Conflict in Northern Ireland in November 1996. Future partnerships were identified at this workshop, and also it was an essential 'kick start' for the whole project. The Irish YMCA had the largest delegation at the workshop and some of these delegates are developing ongoing partnerships with participants from other countries experiencing community conflict. The National Council of YMCAs of Ireland hosted a planning meeting in March 1996 with representatives from YMCAs in Mexico, South Africa, India, USA and Canada. At this meeting the detailed programme for the conference was agreed and the following objectives were set :

- To raise participants' awareness of the nature and extent of conflicts around the world and taking into account socio-economic, political, religious, and cultural dimensions.
- To understand why the YMCAs are obliged to respond as Christian movements.
- To understand the root causes and manifestations of conflict and how they can be analysed and dealt with at cause and effect levels.
- To learn skills in conflict resolution.
- To establish a global network of YMCAs concerned about and involved in conflict resolution.

The workshop was attended by 65 practitioners from 33 different countries from all over the world, with the highest proportion of participants coming from the developing world. By the end of the workshop the National Council had identified 4 countries where YMCAs have experience in conflict situations and where the Irish Movement could learn most from an ongoing partnership and international exchanges. These were the YMCAs in East Jerusalem, Ecuador, Liberia and Sri Lanka.

2 International Exchanges

Following the partnerships established at the conference and building on the level of interest created by such a major event, the project moved into its next and most important phase. This is a series of international exchanges over a 2/3 year period.

The aim of this phase is to introduce YMCA leaders who are involved in community relations in Northern Ireland to YMCAs working in other conflict scenarios in different parts of the world. We hope to learn from and perhaps be challenged by how they have responded to their own

particular situations. By exposing key individuals in the Irish Movement to these experiences, and by inviting experienced trainers from other countries and cultures to share their experiences here, we hope to improve and develop innovative practice by community relations activists in local communities in Ireland.

12 people per annum are taking part in these exchanges from the Irish YMCAs. It is essential that this project has a lasting impact at all levels of the organisation and that it contributes to further embedding the anti-sectarianism policy and progressive community relations work in local communities. Therefore one exchange to each of the three partner countries is taking place in 1998.

There are 4 people in each exchange group. This consists of :

- a voluntary worker
- a staff person
- a management committee member- a young leader (18-25 year old)

These individuals are recruited from local YMCAs with a commitment and interest in community relations developments. Each group has a balance of representation from Protestant and Catholic, and male and female.

The selection of individuals for these exchanges is very important. This is not an exchange visit for someone interested in travelling. Substantial travel costs will be incurred and these must be seen as a wise investment. It is an important piece of work and so participants should be committed to community relations action in their local community and local YMCA. Therefore an application form, a set of selection criteria and a contract of expectations and preparatory residentials were developed to make clear the status of involvement in the exchanges. This stage of the project then leads to another vital stage, when the learning is implanted back home.

3 Implementing Innovative Methodologies from Other Countries

Following the overseas visits the groups of 4 will continue to work together to :

- produce a report on their visit, their learning and experience
- suggest useful practice and programmes which could be adapted for the Irish context
- decide how they can best put their learning into practice at local level
- organise the return exchange of 2 trainers from the country visited
- contribute to the wider discussion and evaluation of community relations methodologies and practice

The importance of this stage cannot be overstressed. The aim is to encourage creative thinking, a critical approach to our existing work and to suggest future ways of working in peace and reconciliation. The outcome should be the implementation of innovative methodologies from other countries into the Irish context.

4 Sharing Learning and Development with Wider Community Relations Network

The potential learning from this programme is too great to be limited to the YMCA network. Therefore, the work of Stage 3 will be disseminated

widely, and the return exchange of overseas trainers should be made available to all interested agencies and groups.

Two overseas trainers will be invited from each of the 3 partner countries each year (6 in total). They would be invited to this country to deliver training in specific areas identified by the exchange group as most useful in our context. This training and discussion of methodologies would be open to both the YMCAs and other agencies working in community relations. This international input should have an impact on the wider community relations field as well as the local YMCAs and local communities

2) A Personal Story on Peacemaking

My name is Maighread Kennedy. I serve on the Management Committee of Lisburn YMCA, Northern Ireland. Just before Easter this year I joined three other YMCA personnel on an international exchange visit to Sri Lanka. Our main task was to learn about the peace work carried out by seven local YMCAs supported by the Peace, Reconciliation and Reconstruction Committee of the National Council of YMCAs in Sri Lanka. On the second day, we travelled for eight hours across the country to the Eastern province. We were hot, tired, hungry and exhausted when we arrived at Ampara YMCA. However our spirits could not fail to be lifted by the enthusiasm of the Youth Peace Council whose membership was inclusive of Tamils, Sinhalese and Muslims. Through interpreters, they spoke earnestly about their desire for an end to the war and their determination to continue to be friends together. During the next couple of days we met similar groups of young people who longed to be free of the restraints of the high security presence. They were keen to be involved in youth exchanges organised by the YMCA and they dreamed of travelling to London or America. We were later told that the YMCA was running into problems with their exchange programmes because the parents of young people in the south and the west were too frightened to allow their sons and daughters to go to the east. One solution was to use a safe 'neutral' venue at the YMCA Camp and Conference Centre at Welimada. This reminded me of my own youth in Northern Ireland and how I encountered Protestants for the first time at the Corrymeela Centre of Reconciliation at Ballycastle (another safe, neutral venue).

In many ways, Northern Irish youth enjoy many advantages as a result of the worldwide publicity of our 'Troubles'. Large sums of money from Europe and USA have supported exchange visits and ongoing community relations projects in schools, youth clubs and with sporting and arts groups. The YMCAs in Sri Lanka do not have access to such generous funding but they do all in their power to unite the young people in sporting and cultural activities. The Sri Lankan government has also recently promoted national cricket team and netball team tours from the North and the East.

I have focussed on this need for communication between groups because my experience of life in Northern Ireland leaves me keenly aware of the fear and distrust which can grow and fester when people

do not have the chance to listen to each other's stories.

At each of the YMCAs we visited in Sri Lanka, I heard how the Peace Committees were actively seeking a coming together of the different groups in the locality. They used projects such as nursery schools, welfare and nutritional programmes, self-improvement programmes and a sharing in each other's cultural and religious celebrations to bring children, youth, parents and whole communities together. As a result, the YMCA in Sri Lanka seems to enjoy the respect of all sections of society, though not without some personal risk-taking. One general secretary, himself Sinhalese, had been instrumental in setting up a hostel for Tamil boys who had come to Colombo for education or work. He was arrested and questioned by the authorities because of his involvement with this project. He also told how the Sinhala community had come to protect the YMCA building (housing the Tamil hostel) at a time when a tense riot situation followed the bombing of a sacred shrine. He explained this wonderful loyalty because of YMCA projects for their children and youth.

The conflict in Sri Lanka is seventeen years old. The war is seriously affecting the financial stability of the country. Poverty is increasing - many families are reduced to one meal a day; malnutrition is a reality. The huge loss of life on both sides of the conflict means that women struggle to bring up children alone. The YMCAs help with small self-improvement grants but there is a growing social, educational and emotional deficit. We visited one uncontrolled area near Baticaloa, in the East, where the literacy rate is just 40% compared with a national level of 90% and in neighbouring Trincomalee, many Tamil families live in a transit refugee camp, waiting for a ship back to their homes in the northern province. There was no school for the children and some of the families had been there for four months. In Galle, in the southern province, a Buddhist monk expressed deep concerns about the problems facing the wives and children of the soldiers who would be absent for long spells at the war. In Northern Ireland we are beginning to listen to the pain of the victims of our conflict; so too, some of the members of the National Peace Council are reaching out to offer counselling to the widows of those killed in the war in Sri Lanka.

My three colleagues on the study visit Andy, Martin and Robert were very supportive throughout the trip. We spent many hours travelling together in the YMCA vehicle and generally decisions were made for the benefit of the whole group. Sometimes a discussion about an issue pertinent to Sri Lanka would prompt a disagreement about a similar issue in Northern Ireland. We were not always able to come to a resolution.

I look on the visit as a great blessing; a wonderful opportunity to connect with friendly, warm-hearted people who share our pain of being a divided society at war and who have a great hunger for peace.

3. News of Conferences and Publications

Conferences

BURYING THE PAST

Justice, Forgiveness and reconciliation in the politics of South Africa, Guatemala, East Germany and Northern Ireland. A three-day conference at St Anthony's College, Oxford, 14-16 September 1998. Supported by the Faculty of Theology at Oxford University, the Catholic Institute for International Relations (London), and the Life & Peace Institute (Uppsala).

Contributors Include:

Opening Address: Garrett Fitzgerald is a former Taoiseach (Prime Minister) of the Republic of Ireland.

Terence McGaughey lectures in the Department of Irish Studies at Trinity College, Dublin and is author of 'Redemption and Memory: Church, Politics and Prophetic Theology in Ireland' (Gill & MacMillan 1993).

Duncan Morrow lectures in the Department of Politics at the University of Ulster.

For information contact the Conference Co-ordinator:

Dr Nigel Biggar

Oriel College

Oxford OX1 4EW

Tel: 44(0)1865 276555 Fax: 44(0)1865 791823

TRANSFORMING CONFLICT TRAINING by the Mediation Network for NI

Course dates for 1998 - 1999 are:

Course A - 1998:

7 & 8 October, 10am - 4pm; 4 & 5 November, 10am - 4pm; 2 & 3

December, 10am - 4pm.

Venue: Ulster Peoples College, 30 Adelaide Park, Belfast BT9

Course B - 1999:

8 & 9 January, Fri 7.00pm - 9.30pm & Saturday 10.00am - 4.00pm; 5 & 6

February; 5 & 6 March (same times apply).

Venue: Ulster Peoples College, 30 Adelaide Park, Belfast BT9

For further information contact:

Peter O'Reilly

The Mediation Network

128a Great Victoria Street

Belfast BT2 7BG

phone: 01232-43861

ECPCR FOR BELFAST IN OCTOBER: EMPOWERING LOCAL CAPACITIES FOR PEACE

The fourth European Conference on Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution (ECPCR) will take place in Belfast from 9-13 October with the major themes of After the War - Building the Peace, Designing Strategic Interventions, Transitional Partnerships and Identifying Strategic Players.

ECPCR is an association of European based individuals and organisations active in the field of peacemaking, peacebuilding and the prevention, resolution and transformation of destructive conflict. Further information and registration material soon from the conference

co-ordinators: Project Planning International, Montalto Estate, Spa Road, Ballynahinch, Co Down BT24 8PT. Tel (01238) 561993. Fax: (01238)

565073. E-mail 101455.1521@compuserve.com

PAX CHRISTI INTERNATIONAL ROUTE 1998

Integrating the Past Re-imagining the Future

IRELAND/NORTHERN IRELAND - 1-9 AUGUST 1998

Experience a country in a way you might not have imagined. Deepen your understanding of peace and conflict. Travel and meet with others to probe beneath the surface as part of a multi-national group. Appreciate the past as a part of the present on a week of dialogue and discovery.

For further information contact:

International Route
c/o Richard Sheehy
House 27, Trinity College
Dublin 2
Ireland

Tel: xx353/1/608.12.60
E-mail: sheehyr@tcd.ie

Belfast Peace to the City Campaign Local Coordinator:

Doug Baker
Mediation Network
128A Great Victoria Street
Belfast BT2 7BG
Northern Ireland
Phone: +44-1232-438614
FAX: +44-1232-314430
Email: info@mediation-network.org.uk
<http://www.mediation-network.org.uk/>

----- End of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 18:41:50 +0200
From: wilpf@iprolink.ch (wilpf)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Annual General Meeting Minutes + More
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: wilpf@pop.iprolink.ch

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id JAB06915

Dear Abolition 2000 Members,

We apologise for the lateness of these minutes and reports.

Please find following:

1. Minutes of the Annual meeting including Working Group List & Coordinators Contact Details
2. Strategy, Goals and Tactics session
3. Minutes from the first Coordinators Meeting

These will be sent out to all organisations via snail mail.

In Peace

Coordinating Collective

Abolition 2000 Annual Meeting,
May 1-May 2, 1998, Geneva

Agenda

- * Where we've been and where we are now
- * Welcome and open the meeting
- * Intro to the Network; history and how it works
- * Go Around Who are you, where are you from and what organisations, what do you think Abolition 2000 has achieved and what are the difficulties, lessons learned
- * Report from Working Group convenors
- * Transition Team Report
- * Goals, visions and strategies
- * The next year; process and communication: how we will work

How Things are Operating (as best as we can remember most of the time)
(a paper presented by Alice Slater when introducing the network and outlining its history)

1. The Abolition 2000 Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons is composed of organisations which have endorsed the Abolition 2000 Statement.
2. The Abolition Statement is the founding document of the Network and is

the only document which has been endorsed by all of the network endorsers.

3. Amendments to the Abolition Statement require consensus.
4. As a functioning Network, we seek means to maintain communications among all our organisational endorsers.
5. Operating as a Network of the whole, our mission is to maintain communications with the endorsers of the statement and maintain the list of the endorsers.
6. Any organisational endorser of the Abolition Statement may have a copy of the contact list of the network, at cost, to encourage broad communications.
7. The Network is currently organised by region, working groups and projects.
8. No one can speak in the name of the Network as a whole, but working groups, projects, regions and other configurations of Abolition 2000 endorsers can issue statements, documents, etc. in the name of the Group or Project., which are consistent with the principles set forth in the Abolition 2000 Statement eg. Model Nuclear Weapons Convention Working Group of Abolition 2000.
9. Organisations are encouraged to identify themselves as endorsers of Abolition 2000 on their letterheads.
10. The Abolition 2000 Network may invite all endorsers to annual or special meetings.
11. At previous annual meetings, resolutions were adopted by the participants at the meeting, but the resolutions were issued only in the name of the participants at that meeting.
12. The Network is non-hierarchical and since it has not found a method to enable fully representative consensus decision, it does not make decisions on strategy for the whole network.

SUCSESSES OF THE NETWORK

* Common vision statement that has set out a widely agreed benchmark for nuclear disarmament * Our presence at the 1998 NPT PrepCom and contribution to excellent oral presentations * Improved relations with government UN delegations, especially in the Non-Aligned Movement

* The sunflower symbol! * We have created an international community of friends * We have grown to 1,000 signatory groups in a relatively short time

* A petition with 13 million signatures *

International Institute for Strategic Studies, a prestigious British think tank says abolition is now in "the mainstream of defense debate", we have helped to place abolition on the international agenda * Outreach to other organizations * A network of organizations, not a network of organizations * A marketplace of ideas and experience *

Allows for feedback into and from local campaigns

- * The Abolition Caucus list server
- * The consolidation of a central contact point and signatory list
- * Mobilisation of expertise and knowledge, as well as public opinion
- * Polls show that 87% of US, 87% of UK and 93% of Canadian public opinion support a treaty
- * Country contacts have formed Abolition 2000 networks/ mailing trees, especially in Europe
- * Has strengthened opposition to NATO expansion
- * A source of mutual inspiration
- * Region sharing of information and views
- * The Tahiti meeting was a significant step forward in strengthening South/North relations and solidarity
- * The Moorea Declaration
- * Assisting in ending French nuclear testing and closing their Pacific test site, and two plants containing highly enriched uranium
- * French defense Minister acknowledged contamination of lands around the Pacific test sites
- * Our information presented to twelve Heads of State in the Pacific region
- * Cost-effective; we have proved how much can be done with very little money
- * Remember that the network's successes are the successes of the PEOPLE directly involved

DIFFICULTIES

- * Division of labour - diplomatic versus movement building
- * Concept of working groups
- * Influencing public opinion and political process more sharply
- * Hard to understand "what is a network"?
- * Organisation comes from US
- * Not enough representation from South and East
- * We need an electoral campaign
- * The "social question" is critical - violence and justice
- * Re-allocation of resources
- * List server problems
- * Contacts and constituencies (eg youth, women, scientists, trade unions)
- * Rels?? not orientated enough to goals - not truly organised or mobilised
- * Regions? Relate our activities to the motives that make the Nuclear Weapon States retain Nuclear weapons
- * Greater attention to Middle East
- * Lost vote on NATO expansion in US.
- * We need to conceive and implement real strategies
- * Strong in North, weak in South, especially in Black Africa
- * Need cultural reality and presence. We need a canoe...
- * How do we get beyond the year 2000 and keep working together?
- * How to become sustainable?
- * Fears insecurities, hopes and passions
- * It's not an abstract entity that delivers the goods
- * Get in touch with all European members of A2000
- * Language. Problems for non-English 1st language speakers.
- * Document translation. Money to travel, for email access. Difficult to get people from some regions to meetings.
- * Get UN to help 3rd world nations establish disarmament officers
- * Who will tell the story of the Hibakusha? How will this profound witness continue?
- * Education not adequately focused on political leaders
- * More focus on those portions of our issues that are amenable to parliamentary remedies. Too much focus on UN.
- * Has not reached grass roots well.
- * Cross over to

environmental and human rights groups. * Raising money *
How to get strategic factions pulling together * Primary focus on
national groups; larger network maybe receiving too much effort - not ripe
yet * Outreach at various levels - media, government, grassroots,
youth * It's not just that the North is predominant - it's the
white North. * Involve more leaders from Pacific Nuclear Weapon
Free Zone and NGOs in Pacific and Asia. Pacific doesn't know much about
A2000.
* Need more money and professionals.

TASKS

* Eurobomb * Put A2000 material in Japanese press *
Solidarity with the South etc. * Expose US liberals *
Implement ICJ Opinion
* Denounce armies/nuclear weapons as violations of Human Rights
Conventions
* NATO and Trident * Empower to participate in the
political process
* Get France to recognise its responsibilities in the Pacific. *
Alternative non-nuclear sec? secular?? policies * School
strike * Build Peace Candle from old weapons * Total
disarmament after abolition.
* Get 2 - 5,000 sign-ups to Abolition 2000 statement *
Network is not an organisation but it needs to organise * Better
A2000 publicity materials
* INESAP link - technical work in partnership * Don't
exclude non-members
* Information to Black Africa. * Support Russian NGOs *
Work with nuclear victim groups. * Invite to Conference on
A and H bombs
* Citizen's Verification Teams and Citizen's Forums *
Hague Appeal for Peace.

WORKING GROUPS

Nuclear Weapons Convention:

Co-Convenor,

Alyn Ware, Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy

666 Broadway, room 625, New York, N.Y. 10012, USA

tel: +1212-674-7790, fax: +1-212-674-6199, email: lcnp@aol.com

Co-Convenor,

Jurgen Scheffran, INESAP, Institut fuer Kernphysik,

Schlogartenstrae 9, D-64289, Darmstadt, Germany

tel: +49-6151-163016, fax: +49-6151-166039, email:

scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de

Religious Organizations:

Co-Convenor,

Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace With Justice

1500 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, USA

tel: +1-301-896-0013, fax: same, email: mupj@igc.apc.org

Co-Convenor

Dave Robinson, Pax Christi
532 West 8th Street
Erie PA 16502
tel: 814-453-4955
fax: 814-452-4784
email: Dave@paxchristiusa.org

Co-Convenor

Clayton Ramey, Fellowship of Reconciliation
Nyack NY 10960
tel: 914-358-4601
fax: 914-358-4924
email: crramey@igc.apc.org

To subscribe to the Religious Working Group E-Mail list server, contact
Howard Hallman.

Overcoming Nuclear Threats/Legal Issues:

Convenor,
Rob Green, WCP UK
2 Chiswick House, High Street, Twyford, Berks, RG10 8AG, England
tel: +44-734-340-258, fax: same, email: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org

Non-Nuclear Security Model for Europe:

Convenor,
Solange Fernex, (WILPF and Greens, France)
F-68480, Biederthal, France
tel: +33-1-89-407183, fax: +33-1-89-407804

NATO:

Co-Convenor,
Ben Cramer, Des Appel Cent pour la Paix
17-19 place de Argonne, 75019, Paris, France
tel: +33-0-1-42-09-23-78, fax: +33-0-1-42-09-23-50, email:
Appel100@worldnet.fr

Co-Convenor,

Karina Wood,
43 Nisbet Street, 3rd floor, Providence, RI, 02906, USA
tel: +1-401-751-8172, fax: +1-401-751-1476 (call first), email:
kwood@igc.org

To subscribe to the NATO Working Group email listserver, send an email
message to:
majordomo@igc.org,
leave subject area blank,
write in body of message: <your email> sign-on start3-europenwfz@igc.org

Sustainable Energy

Co-Convenor
Alice Slater
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
15 E. 26th Street, Rm. 915, New York, N.Y. 11215

tel: +1-212-726-9161, fax: +1-212-726-9160, email: aslater@gracelinks.org

Co-Convenor

Claire Greensfelder

Plutonium Free Future

2267 Summer Street, Berkeley, CA 94709

tel: +1- 510-849-1342, fax:+1- 510-849-2549, email:

greensfelder@igc.apc.org

CTBT and Beyond:

Convenor,

Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation

1440 Broadway, Suite 500, Oakland, CA 94612, USA

tel: +1-510-839-5877, fax: +1-510-839-5397, email: wslf@igc.apc.org

Radiation Health Effects:

Convenor,

Pamela Meidell, Atomic Mirror

P.O. box 220, Port Hueneme, CA 93044, USA

tel: +1-805-985-5073, fax: +1-805-985-7563, email: pmeidell@igc.org

Abolition Days Direct Action:

Convenor

Pol D'Huyvetter

For Mother Earth

Lange Steenstraat 16/D

Gent, B-9000, Belgium

tel: + [32] (9) 233 73 02, fax: + [32] (9) 233 84 39, email:

pol@motherearth.org

Weapon Usable Radioactive Materials:

Convenor,

Martin Kalinowski, INESAP, Institut fuer Kernphysik,

Schlogartenstrae 9, D-64289, Darmstadt, Germany

tel: +49-6151-163016, fax: +49-6151-166039, email:

scheffran@hrzpub.th-darmstadt.de

Grassroots:

Convenor

David Krieger

Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794

tel: +1- 805-965-3443, fax: +1- 805-568-0466, email: wagingpeace@napf.org

Depleted Uranium Working Group:

Convenor

Tara Thornton

Military Toxics Project

60 Pine Street, Suite 2

Lewiston ME 04240

tel: 207-783-5091

email: miltoxpr@ime.net

Nuclearization of Space:

Convenor
Bill Sulzman
Citizens for Peace in Space
PO Box 915 Colorado Springs, CO 80901
tel: +1- 719-389-0644, fax: +1- 719-481-3793

Communications:
Co-Convenor
Richard Salvador
AFSC Pacific Program, Univ of Hawaii
2424 Maile Way
Porteus #640
Honolulu HI 96822
tel: 808-956-8141
fax: 808-956-6877
salvador@hawaii.edu

Co-Convenor
Roger Smith
NGO Committee on Disarmament
777 UN Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017
tel: +1- 212-6875340, fax: +1- 212-687-1643, email: disarmtimes@igc.apc.org

Annual Meeting Working Group:
Co-Convenor
Felicity Hill
Woman's International League for Peace and Freedom
Case Postale 28 , 1 Rue de Varem, Geneva, CH1211, Switzerland
tel: +41-22-733-6175, fax: +41-22-740-1063, email: womensleague@gn.apc.org

Co-Convenor
Myrla Baldonado,
People's Task Force For Bases Clean Up, Philippines
15D Unit 15, CASAL Building, Anonas Road, Project 3,
Quezon City, Philippines
Quezon City, Philippines,
tel/fax + 63 2 435 0387,
email basecln@gaia.psdn.org.ph

Co-Convenor
Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation
1440 Broadway, Suite 500, Oakland, CA 94612, USA
tel: +1-510-839-5877, fax: +1-510-839-5397, email: wslf@igc.apc.org

Finance:
Convenor
David Krieger
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794
tel: +1- 805-965-3443, fax: +1- 805-568-0466, email: DKrieger@napf.org

Reports: Each of the active working groups gave a report, Merav Datan &
Alyn Ware of the Nuclear Weapons Convention Working Group, Solange Fernex

of the Non-Nuclear Security Model for Europe, Jackie Cabasso for the CTBT and Beyond Working Group, Martin Kalinowski from the Weapons Useable Radioactive Materials group, Alice Slater from the NPT working group, Rob Green from the Overcoming Nuclear Threats group, Pamela Meidell from the Radiation Health Effects Working Group, Howard Hallam from the Religious Working Groups, Ben Cramer & Karina Wood from the NATO Working Group.

Note: The Chernobyl and Nuclear Power working group had folded due to lack of participation. The NPT Working Group has currently no convenor - there was some brief but inconclusive discussion of forming instead an International Policy Making working group to not only plan an Abolition 2000 presence at the NPT but also ensure participation at the Disarmament Commission, the Conference on Disarmament, NAM meetings, OAU meetings etc.

COMPOSITION OF THE CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

Decided to disband Transition team and replace with a Co-ordinating Committee
The goal is to build towards a Regional Structure of Abolition 2000, and there was a commitment to gender balance, North/South balance, white/people of colour balance and a balance between political and technically focused people.

Each person will serve a one year term. Half of committee replaced at each annual meeting
Monitors working groups and gather info from them.

Co-ordinating group roles

- * Build up regional structure
- * Identify one Abolition 2000 contact in each country of the world
- * Co-ordinating working groups and ask for regular reports or updates
- * Co-ordinate projects from regions
- * Develop timeline on web site
- * Decision making on issues that emerge
- * press media spokespersons? (not clarified)
- * enhance Abolition 2000 relationship to the wider disarmament movement

Members of the Coordinating Committee

Reine Braun INES, GutenbergstraSe 31, 44139 Dortmund, Germany, Ph + 49 231 57 5202/05 Fax: 49 231 575 210 email rbraun@lilly.ping.de

Jacqueline Cabasso Western States Legal Foundation, 440 Broadway, Suite 500, Oakland, California USA 94612, Phone: + (510) 839-5877, Fax: + (510) 839-5397, E-mail: wslf@igc.org

Frances Connolly Abolition 2000 UK 88 Islington High St, London, N18EG Tel + 44 171 354 9911 Fax: 354 0033 email npc@gn.apc.org

Pol D'Huyvetter For Mother Earth International, Lange Steenstraat 16/d, B-9000 Gent, Belgium Ph/fax 32 9 233 8439, Fax +32-9-233 73 02 email: pol@motherearth.org

Felicity Hill Women's International League for Peace and Freedom,
777 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017 Ph: 1 212 682 1265 Fax: 1 212 286 8211
email: wilpfun@igc.apc.org flick@igc.apc.org

Hiro Umabayashi Pacific Campaign for Disarmament and Security,
3-3-1 Minowa-cho Kohoku-ku, Yokohama, 223-0051 Japan Tel: 81 45 563 5101,
Fax 81 45 563 9907 email cxJi5621@niftyserve.or.jp

Bahig Nassar Coordinating Centre of Arab Peace Organizations,
16 Mohammed Shafik Str., El Mohandessein, 12411, Giza, Cairo, Egypt.
Tel: + 20 2 346 7892/355 5502 Fax + 20 2 578 6298 email acc@internetegypt.com

Alyn Ware Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, 666 Broadway, New
York, NY 10012, Ph: 1 212 674 7790 Fax: 1 212 674 6199 email
LCNP@aol.com

Lysiane Alezard Movement de la Paix, 139 bd Victor Hugo, F-93400
Saint-Ouen, Paris + 33 1 4012 0912 fax : 33 1 40 11 57 87 e-mail :
mvtpaix@globenet.org

Paul Saoke IPPNW, Box 19565 Nairobi, Kenya, Tel: 254 2 724
543/ 714 757 Fax 254 2 724 540 email psaoke@ken.healthnet.org

Michael Simmons American Friends Service Committee, 1501 Cherry St,
Philadelphia, PA 19102 Ph ! 212 241 7188, Fax ! 215 241 7177, email
MSimmons@afsc.org

Richard Salvador 2424 Maile Way # 640 Honolulu, Hawaii, 96822 Tel 1
808 956 8141 Fax 808 956 6877 email salvador@hawaii.edu

Strategy, Goals and Tactics session -
minutes drafted by Michael Simmons, AFSC

Convention: There was general agreement that the draft Nuclear Weapons
Convention should be a center piece of Abolition 2000.

Dealerting: Many felt that developing a program around dealerting would be
important work for A2000 during the next period. However, caution was
expressed that, while dealerting may be a good short term strategy, it
should not be confused with abolition. Some expressed concern that it
reflected acceptance to the nuclear reality. Rob Green wrote a brief paper
that attempts to address this issue. His points include: follow through on
the implications of the World Court Advisory Opinion; latest nuclear
threats, rebutting deterrence doctrine, and measures promoting real
stability, e.g. no first use, security assurances, de-alerting, separating
warheads from delivery systems.

No First Use: Some fet that this was a good issue to educate people about
nuclear policy because it put pressure on the US, as well as Germany and
Japan who couch their resistance under the US nuclear umbrella. Others
cautioned that no first use could concede the continual existence of
nuclear weapons.

Working Groups: There was general agreement that functioning working groups should stay in existence and appropriate new groups should be started. It was suggested that working groups establish a procedure for reporting to the larger body via the list serve during the year. This reporting could go beyond A2000 members and include policy makers and grassroots constituencies, unions etc.

Hague Appeal: Karina Wood presented a paper that included the suggestion that A2000 hold a meeting at the Hague Appeal for Peace, May 1999. Various views were expressed regarding this proposal, though it was received favourably without formal agreement. The group was reminded of an A2000 commitment to alternative annual meetings in the North and South. One response to this concern was that the Appeal was committed to have equal representation from the South.

Broadening A2000: There was discussion of broadening the network to include trade union, more religious participation and political parties. It was also felt that A2000 should begin to concentrate on engaging students in the work. There was general agreement to focus on developing a more grassroots constituency and the establishment of a grassroots working groups.

Intersessional Sessions: There were strong views regarding this issue. Some felt that it would provide a forum on the NPT between UN sessions while others felt that it would subvert the Convention Process. One member cautioned that some countries, particularly the NAM, would not be able to afford to attend intersessional sessions.

Other Information: a) a meeting is planned for A2000 members in Kenya, February, 1999, b) initiative focusing on the sunflower symbol, c) campus speaking tours, d) sustainable energy working groups, e) development of an A2000 timeline f) support for organising around the projected documentary being developed within the Middle States Initiative, g) Karina will staff the Hague Appeal for Peace, h) Forth Freedom will produce a packet on dealerting.

Minutes of the First Coordinating Committee Meeting

Attended by: Jackie Cabasso, Felicity Hill, Richard Salvador, Michael Simmons, Frances Connolly, Bahig Nassar, Hiro Umebayashi

This group got together to share ideas about the two day annual meeting, how we see the role/mandate of the Coordinating Committee, how we might communicate and what to do next.

The first message we wish to send out is THANK YOU for the wonderful work of the Transition Team and before them the Interim Management Group - Abolition is here, healthy and growing thanks to your work. We only hope we can continue to grow what what you sprouted and fertilised.

A summary of the Abolition 2000 annual meeting was given to those who were not present. The regional structure for Abolition 2000 committed to at that meeting was described as being the responsibility of the Coordinating Committee to develop. A summary discussion about the Working Groups was

also shared.

Who Are We, What Should We Do - Ideas From A Round Robin

- * we should gain contacts in each country
- * we must expand Abolition 2000 in regions like Asia, and possibly wider in the Pacific, Latin America and Africa
- * we must stay in touch with contacts in these regions
- * perhaps the transportation of nuclear waste is a point of unity and contact between the Pacific Islands and Japan and a model for other regions
- * Abolition 2000 has grassroots strength and also a visibility in policy making forums like the NPT - we need to balance and recognise the relationship between these parts of our movement.
- * Would like to see the Committee as a troubleshooting and facilitating role, to fill the gaps and to delegate but not to generate work
- * dissenting view on this expressed - we will be called upon to do quite a large amount of work!
- * we should coordinate with the fundraising committee, act as a clearing > house for the foundations and activities done
- * people from the South need to be AT our meetings - so we must fundraise for that
- * we should pay attention to the newly formed Communications Working Group as they hold many keys for us
- * we should act as the connective tissue for the network itself, and between the network and the wider NGO Community, there is some healing of our image to do
- * politically no one is entitled to speak on behalf of Abolition 2000, we need to provide clarity about who can do what on behalf of abolition and keep our eye on fundraising or use of the name and image
- * we need to retire the \$4000 debt, that is our responsibility
- * we need to expand but also maintain the network we have
- * agreed with the regional structure, but also wants to develop sub-regions
- * the issue of race is constantly missed, and Abolition can only gain credibility and support if it committed to bringing in a range of issues that the traditional white disarmament movement neglects. Abolition must be prepared to hear from a more diverse range of people.

Working Groups

One of the mandates we have is to keep the working groups working and encouraged and connected. We decided to ask each working group to submit some kind of report 2-3 times per year. Each person on the Committee is being encouraged to be the liaison point with one or more of the Working Groups.

Bahig takes on the NATO working group

Alyn was dubbed in for the NW Convention group which he is already on

Jackie took on Beyond the CTB and Finance

Felicity took on Chernobyl

Communication

Telephone hook ups, a method used extensively by the last Transition Team will not be feasible for this more international group. Email will be the preferred method of communication and we will try to test out a CHAT ROOM (where people logged into the same webpage at the same time can talk in

real time - WILPF has one)

We need to work with the Communications Working Group - one idea they had was to set up networks whereby those with emails filter information to those who do not in the cheapest way possible - via fax and post.

A commitment was made that we communicate at least once a month via email. The idea of a convenor is being tested for one month by Richard. The role of the convenor is to prompt and remind people of jobs to do and will summarize the work of the Coordinating Committee for the monthly report back to the whole List Serve.

Another idea was to contact local or national educational institutions, many of which have satellite communication that we might use.

Guidelines on Speaking for the Network

Although it has been stated many times that no one speaks for the network, there is still some confusion about this. Felicity said she would use as a basis the list read at the beginning of the annual meeting and will circulate something soon that we might want to make available to the membership and the list.

Need for a Mailing

There was agreement that all members should be informed of who is the new Coordinating Committee, the regional structure etc. Only half of the 1000 member organisations are on email, so we need to use snail mail too. The Grassroots Working Group wants to put a flier of ideas into this mailing.

Annual Meeting Report

Jackie and Felicity made a commitment to get the annual meeting minutes, these minutes I am writing now and Michaels minutes from the Goals and Strategies meeting to turn them into a report. Francis volunteered to type up the scrolls of paper from the Annual Meeting.

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: <ledwidge@psr.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 14:18:04 -0400
From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>
To: armsintern@ucsusa.org, paprog@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, ctbt@2020vision.org,
disarmament@igc.org, dkimball@clw.org, meldredge@igc.org
CC: panukes@igc.org, wandwill@clark.net, kathy@fcnl.org, bridget@fcnl.org,
btiller@psr.org
Subject: Non-traditional allies outreach on CTBT
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id LAA03286

July 17 1998

To: Select members of NWWG
Fr: Lisa

Thank you for agreeing to do outreach to non-traditional allies re:
CTBT. This is an update and a reminder.

Below I've attached :

- some talking points
- list of allies, those who volunteered to contact them, progress made thus far
- list of state organizers and DC contacts

Let's plan to report our progress at the next NWWG meeting (July *30*
(This means reporting names and contact info of local folks to the DC organizers so they can in turn forward it to the state organizers.)

Thank you very much for your help on this potentially extremely valuable outreach effort!

--

Lisa Ledwidge
Physicians for Social Responsibility
1101 14th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005 USA
tel. 202-898-0150 ext. 222
fax 202-898-0172
<http://www.psr.org>

Non-Traditional Allies Outreach
(*endorsers of CTBT)
PLEASE DO NOT DISTRIBUTE

*Business Executives for National Security - Daryl

*Lawyers Alliance for World Security- Daryl

*Federation of American Scientists - Michael

*Sierra Club & Audubon Society- Lisa (will ask Bob Musil to contact)

*LWV - Daryl

*Greenpeace - Fran (is making progress)

*Friends of the Earth - Maureen

USPIRG - Maureen

*Vets for Peace - Daniel

UNA - Michael

Native American groups - open

National Farmers Organization - Marie

South Asian groups - Indira

WFA - Daryl

Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities - Marie

Civil Rights Groups - Lisa (will contact Darryl Fagin, ADA)

African American Churches - Howard

College Dems - Michael

Green Group coalition - Michael (decided not to take up CTBT as an issue; Michael and Lisa/PSR still working on it with individual members)

Non-traditional allies outreach - some talking points
(PLEASE DO NOT DISTRIBUTE)

* Trying to enlist the support of non traditional allies at local level for CTBT

* Status of treaty: stuck in Senate (Helms); need Repubs.; India, Pakistan, now more than ever; want vote -- at least debate -- this year; etc.

* Broad base of support was crucial to success in April 1997 CWC ratification, will be crucial for CTB

* Summer field organizers in Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Nebraska, Oregon, Tennessee, Washington, & Wyoming. Alaska & Utah have already-existing networks of volunteers. Trying to expand visible CTBT support in these 11 states in order to have more effective and broad-based:

- meetings with Senators or staff
- sign-on letters to Senators

- events and media campaigns

*** Do you know anyone in these states who may be willing or interested in attending a meeting with the Senator/Senate staffers; signing on to a letter; attending an event; or otherwise, to a lesser or greater extent, engaged in a local campaign for a nuclear test ban?

Alaska
Colorado
Indiana
Kansas
Maine
Nebraska
Oregon
Tennessee
Utah
Washington
Wyoming

Give CTBT state contact person's info for them to pass along to local contact(s). Or, better yet, get their organization's chapter contact or potentially interested member info — be sure to relay this to CTBT state contact person.

Thank you for your help!

State Contacts in Key CTBT States for DC Organizers (updated 7-17-98)

STATE
DC Contact(s)
State Contact(s) (* indicates hired organizers working through July and August)

AK

Lisa Ledwidge, PSR
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 898-0150 ext. 222
Fax: 898-0172
ledwidge@psr.org

Cathy Schumaker, M.D.
3601 C Street, Suite 540
Anchorage, AK 99502-5932
Tel: 907-269-8036
Fax: 907-561-1896
schukalt@alaska.net

CO

Bruce Hall, Peace Action

1819 H Street, Suite 425
Washington DC 20006
Tel: 862-9740 ext. 3038
Fax: 862-9762
E-mail: panukes@igc.org
&
Lisa Ledwidge, PSR

*Dallas Gudgell
& Beryl Schwartz
Peace Action Colorado
PO Box 48058
Denver, CO 80204
Tel: 303-832-4789
Fax:
berylls@earthlink.net

IN

Lisa Ledwidge PSR

Mark Mebane (hired by Indiana Network)
Indiana Test Ban Network/ Hoosiers for
National Security
311 South Fifth Street
Goshen IN 46528
Tel: 219-534-3402
Fax: 219-534-4937
E-mail: dbc@TLN.NET
(Working Through Fourth Freedom Forum &
with Karen Jacob)

KS

Kathy Guthrie
FCNL
245 2nd Street NE
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 547-600 ext. 112
Fax: 547-6019
kathy@fcnl.org

*Wendy Pearlman

Bill Beachy
1248 SW Buchanan
Topeka, KS 66604
Tel: 785-232-4388
Fax: (same as phone - no need to call first)
topekacpj@aol.com

ME

Lisa Ledwidge, PSR
1101 14th Street NW #700

Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 898-0150 ext. 222
Fax: 898-0172
E-mail: ledwidge@psr.org
&
Michael Pancook, UCS
1616 P Street NW, #310
Washington, DC 20026
Tel: 332-0900
Fax: 332-0905
armsintern@ucsusa.org

Audrey Stewart
Peace Action/ PSR
PO Box 3842
Portland, ME 04104
Tel: (207) 772-0680
Fax: (207) 828-8620
pam@nlis.net

NE

Marie Rietman, 20/20 Vision
1828 Jefferson Place NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 833-2020
Fax: 833-5307
E-mail: ctbt@2020vision.org

Jo Peterson
(402) 596-7158
Nebraskans for Peace
4924 Chicago Street
Omaha, NE 68132-2903
Tel: 402-453-0776
Fax: Same as tel.
geln38a@prodigy.igc.org

Gregory Nipper (hired by Nebraskans for
Peace)
Tel: 402-551-5148
gnipper@creighton.edu

OH

Sheila Dormody, Peace Action
1819 H Street, Suite 425
Washington DC 20006
Tel: 862-9740 ext. 3006
Fax: 862-9762
E-mail: pafield@igc.org

Linda Kimball
Oxford Citizens for Peace and Justice

724 Melinda Drive
Oxford, OH 45056
Tel: 513-523-3640
Fax:
kimbaljp@muohio.edu

Francis Chiappa
Cleveland Peace Action
2997 Hampshire Rd.
Cleveland Heights, OH 44118
Tel: 216-321-1670
Fax: 216-845-9013
chiapski@aol.com

Ellen Robinson
Peace Council of Youngstown
204 Broadway
Youngstown, OH 44504
Tel: 216-742-6648
Fax:
djrobins@cc.ysu.edu

OR

Bruce Hall, Peace Action
1819 H Street, Suite 425
Washington DC 20006
Tel: 862-9740 ext. 3038
Fax: 862-9762
E-mail: panukes@igc.org
&
Marie Rietman, 20/20 Vision

Michael Carrigan, Oregon Peace Works
333 State Street
Salem OR 97301
Tel: 503-585-2767
Fax: 503-588-0088
opw@teleport.com
Ken Ferguson *

TN

Bruce Hall, Peace Action
1819 H Street, Suite 425
Washington DC 20006
Tel: 862-9740 ext. 3038
Fax: 862-9762
E-mail: panukes@igc.org
&
Michael Pancook, UCS

Bill Akin
Mid-South Peace & Justice Center

PO Box 11428
Memphis, TN 38111-0428
Tel: 901-452-6997

&

*Nell Levin
1611 Forrest Avenue
Nashville, TN 37206
Tel: 615 226 8070
Fa: 615.226.7202
nellrose@earthlink.net

UT

Kimberly Robson, WAND
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 205
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 543-8505
Fax: 675-6469
wandwill@clark.net

Deb Sawyer
Writing To Reduce Nuclear Dangers
549 Cortez Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84103
Tel: 801-364-2971
Fax: 801-595-0469
dsawyer@aros.net

WA

Marie Rietman, 20/20 Vision
1828 Jefferson Place NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 833-2020
Fax: 833-5307
E-mail: ctbt@2020vision.org

&

Kathy Crandall,
Disarmament Clearinghouse

Mary Hanson 20/20 Vision
4701 38th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98105
Tel: 206-528-0289
Fax: Same as Tel (Call First)
hansonmary@hotmail.com

&

Peace Action of Washington
5828 Roosevelt Way NE
Seattle, WA 98105
Tel: 206-527-8050
Fax: 206-527-9985
peaceact@scn.org

WY

Bruce Hall, Peace Action
&
Kathy Crandall,
Disarmament Clearinghouse

Dallas Gudgell in CO &
Don Stoen, Wyoming Peace Initiative
2740 Kelly Drive
Cheyenne, WY 82001
Tel: 307-634-3066

end

To: adam@rabinowitz.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Contacts in poll states
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Adam:

Here are the names of some religious leaders supportive of the CTBT in states where the polls were taken. They won't know about the poll, but reporters could tell them about the poll and ask them to comment on results.

OREGON

Rev. David A Leslie, Executive Director
Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon
0245 SW Bancroft Street, Suite B
Portland, OR 97201
Phone: 503 221-1054

NEBRASKA

Rev. Carol Windrum, Peace with Justice Coordinator
United Methodist Nebraska Conference
3735 North 39th Street
Omaha, NE 68111
Phone: 402 455-4281

KANSAS

Bishop Albert Frederick Mutti
United Methodist Kansas Area
4201 SW 15th Street
Topeka, KS 66604
Phone: 785 272--587

TENNESSEE

Bishop Kenneth L. Carder
United Methodist Nashville Area
520 Commerce Street, Suite 201
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: 615 742-8834

Carol E. Green, Peace with Justice Coordinator
United Methodist Holston Conference
411 Belle Beade Drive
Maryville, TN 37801
Phone: 423 983-0082

OHIO

Linda S. Sabin, Peace with Justice Coordinator
United Methodist West Ohio Conference
3591 Roselawn Drive
Beavercreek, OH 45430
Phone: 937 426-9316

Rich Aronson, Peace with Justice Coordinator
United Methodist East Ohio Conference
27869 Aberdeen Road
Bay Village, OH 44140
Phone: 440 871-7381

I hope these names are useful to you.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 14:56:08 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: <dkimball@clw.org>
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Draft sign-on ltr. to Clinton on n-weapons

July 17, 1998

TO: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers members groups and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: sign-on letter regarding steps toward nuclear weapons reduction and risk reduction

REPLY BY: Monday, July 20 by 5pm

[PLEASE NOTE: some of you may have received this draft letter via e-mail earlier today from John Isaacs or Jonathan Dean }

Attached is a draft letter to President Clinton containing suggestions for the Gore-Kiriyenko meeting starting July 23 that was originally discussed at our Deep Cuts Working Group meeting earlier this week. The text, prepared by Jonathan Dean of UCS (Chair of the Coalition's Deep Cuts Working Grp.), has been revised to reflect comments from a discussion held at the Stimson Center on the morning of July 17. BASIC, Council for a Livable World and UCS have already cleared the letter.

Please notify me by close of business Monday, July 20 of your willingness to endorse the letter so that it can be forwarded to administration officials before the Gore-Kiriyenko meeting begins. In replying, please give an organizational designation and indicate if you are responding for your organization or that the designation is for identification only.

DK

July 17, 1998

DRAFT LETTER

William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President,

Despite energetic action on the part of your administration, the administration - and the American public - may now be faced with the prospect of major failure in its efforts to control nuclear weapons and to prevent their spread.

Despite repeated commitments to you, President Yeltsin has been unable to bring the Duma to ratify the START II Treaty. Russian command and control over nuclear weapons is becoming more fragile. The May 1998 nuclear weapons tests by India and Pakistan have seriously undermined the authority of the non-proliferation regime and increased the risk of nuclear war in South Asia. Time is short in your administration to act to prevent the structure of nuclear arms control and non-proliferation from crumbling.

Your September summit with President Yeltsin provides an opportunity to reverse this trend. We have two suggestions:

First, we suggest you seek agreement with President Yeltsin that the START II treaty be amplified by a protocol lowering the permitted level of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 for each country and committing both governments to immediately begin negotiation on exchange of data on nuclear forces, warhead dismantlement, and transfer of fissile material to monitored storage. The two governments would also invite Britain, France and China to join them in discussion of the possibility of five power nuclear arms control, to include transparency and prevention of accidental or unauthorized launch.

We believe this proposal on your part would be welcomed by the Yeltsin government and could induce the Duma to ratify the amended START II; Defense Minister Sergeyev and other Russian leaders have pointed out that, by 2012, Russia will be unable to pay for deploying more than 500 warheads, while President Yeltsin has repeatedly urged drawing the other weapon states into negotiation. At the same time, this action could move toward meeting the desires of India, Pakistan and of many non-weapon countries belonging to the Non-Proliferation Treaty for some significant action by all five declared weapon states with regard to their own nuclear forces and open the way for agreement on various forms of international controls over Indian and Pakistani nuclear materials.

We believe Britain, France and China would all cooperate in the face of this substantial U.S. Russian reduction. However, as an alternative, the U.S. could propose a staged global program for de-alerting to be applied to the nuclear capabilities of the five NPT nuclear weapon states. This would strengthen the case for a separate system of monitoring Indian and Pakistani aircraft and missiles to prevent weapon deployment and provide warning when these systems are being moved.

With significant action by the weapon states and with extension of international monitoring over Indian and Pakistani nuclear capabilities, the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests can be converted into a net gain for the NPT regime. Without these developments, the long-term effect of the tests will be dangerous weakening of the cohesion of the NPT regime.

Second, to control quickly the many thousands of tactical and reserve strategic nuclear weapons not yet limited by the START process --which likely pose the greatest risks of possible theft of a nuclear weapon, and whose existence has given rise to Russian START II fears that the United States could rapidly reload weapons on its missiles - we suggest that you immediately initiate with Russia a set of unilateral-reciprocal initiatives similar to those undertaken by President Bush and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in 1991.

Specifically, we suggest that you indicate your willingness to place most of the remaining U.S. tactical warheads and nearly all strategic reserve warheads in secure storage, open to monitoring by the Russians, with a commitment that they will eventually be dismantled, if the Russians are willing to do the same with comparable proportions of their weapons in these categories. Such an initiative could ensure that, within months, some 70% of the Russian nuclear weapon stockpile not yet regulated by the START process was in secure,

monitored storage, and committed to dismantlement; U.S. security would be significantly improved. Indeed, technology is now available that would make it possible to permanently and verifiably disable all of these weapons in a matter of weeks. While Congress has placed limits on the Administration's ability to propose such reciprocal measures with respect to active-duty strategic forces, there are no limits on your authority to pursue such a productive initiative with respect to tactical and strategic reserve weapons.

We urgently suggest that Vice President Gore be authorized to advance these suggestions in his meeting with Prime Minister Kiriyenko on July 23-24. The circumstances call for extraordinary action.

Sincerely,

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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-usa@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 12:14:02 -0700
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Abolition 2000 Communications
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear member of the Abolition 2000 network,

During two days of meetings in Santa Barbara last week, members of the International Coordinating Group decided to make our communications more efficient by subscribing all Abolition 2000 network organizations in the United States to a new NATIONAL listserv: abolition-usa. The INTERNATIONAL listserv, abolition-caucus, will no longer accept posts regarding U.S. national events and news.

This will NOT duplicate the mail you will receive. Mail will be split into two: (1) international news and discussions and (2) national coordination. Members of the INTERNATIONAL listserv abolition-caucus will receive international news and discussions. Conversely, the NATIONAL list, abolition-usa, is intended for U.S.-specific messages which would not be appropriate for a list which reaches activists all over the world.

The new list is intended to:

- strengthen the U.S. abolition network through planning nationally and regionally coordinated actions
- share nuclear-related information and news which is relevant for U.S.-based groups
- coordinate initiatives related to the work of the U.S. Congress, the Administration and the Department of Energy.

If you do not wish to be on this national list, you may exercise your negative option and unsubscribe.

However, you will no longer receive U.S. national news about Abolition 2000 via abolition-caucus.

To unsubscribe send a message to
T0:majordomo@xmission.com
(leave the subject empty)
in the body of the message write
unsubscribe abolition-usa

To POST A MESSAGE to abolition-usa send a message
To:abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Please use this listserve to post messages about the US.
International news and events can be sent as usual to
abolition-caucus@igc.org.

As a second mailing you will receive the info file for abolition-usa.

Sincerely,

Susan Broidy, Coordinator

Abolition 2000- A Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

c/o Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

1187 Coast Village Road, Box 123

Santa Barbara, CA 93108

phone: +1(805) 965-3443; fax: +1(805) 568-0466

e-mail: a2000@silcom.com URL: <http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>

-

To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com" with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" 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-usa@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 12:15:01 -0700
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Abolition-USA Info File
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Info file of abolition-usa

WELCOME TO ABOLITION-USA!

Abolition 2000 was founded in 1995 as a global campaign to eliminate nuclear weapons.

PURPOSE OF ABOLITION-USA! "ABOLITION-USA" is a list intended to serve the community of peace-minded and action-oriented citizens and citizen initiatives concerned with promoting grassroots action for the abolition of nuclear weapons. This list is intended to help in the coordination and discussion of citizen initiatives in the United States which will change the course of U.S. nuclear policy and enable us to secure a treaty by the year 2000 for the elimination of nuclear weapons. We invite you to share information about local activities, upcoming events, exemplary actions, political strategies, media strategies, and other ideas which will forward the action and strengthen the network of citizens and grassroots organizations committed to securing a nuclear weapons convention before the next millennium.

ABOUT ABOLITION 2000: In April 1995, during the first weeks of the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference, activists from around the world recognized that the issue of nuclear abolition was not on the agenda. Activists met together to write the Abolition 2000 Statement that has become the founding document of the Abolition 2000 Network. Over 1,000 organizations in 76 countries have now signed it and are actively working in ten working groups to accomplish the eleven points listed in it.

Abolition 2000 can be reached at:

<http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>

To view the Abolition statement go to:

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

To see who is participating in the network go to

http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/organizs_index.html

RESOURCES:

You are also invited to join other listserves of Abolition 2000:

INTERNATIONAL ABOLITION 2000 CAUCUS

To subscribe to the

International Abolition Caucus e-mail listserv,

send an email message

to: majordomo@igc.apc.org,

leave subject area blank,

write in body of message: subscribe abolition-caucus youremail@here

ABOLITION DAYS WORKING GROUP

To subscribe to the A-days Working Group e-mail listserver, send an e-mail message to: majordomo@xs4all.nl, leave subject area blank, write in body of message: `subscribe motherearth-a-days youremail@here`

NATO WORKING GROUP

To subscribe to the NATO Working Group e-mail listserver, send an email message to: majordomo@igc.org, leave subject area blank, write in body of message: `subscribe start3-europenwfz@igc.org youremail@here`

RELIGIOUS WORKING GROUP

To subscribe to the Religious Working Group e-mail listserver, contact Howard Hallman at mupj@igc.apc.org

SUPPORT ABOLITION 2000!

Financial contributions for Abolition 2000 network support can be wired to us via:

Montecito Bank & Trust, 1000 State Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101 --
Routing No. ABA - 122 234 783, Account No. 192 036 100
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794

We look forward to hearing from you!

Abolition 2000
Susan Broidy, Coordinator

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123
Santa Barbara, California; 93108
Phone: (805) 965-3443;
Fax (805) 568-0466;
e-mail: a2000@silcom.com
web-site: <http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>

Sponsored by XMission <http://www.xmission.com>

Facilitated by the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

e-mail: wagingpeace@napf.org
web-site: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/>

-
To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com"

with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" 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>
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 14:23:38 -0700
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Here is my article on "The Legal Case for Nuclear Weapons Abolition."

Dave

THE LEGAL CASE FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS ABOLITION
by David Krieger*

The legal case for abolishing nuclear weapons is only one of many that can and should be made. Nuclear weapons place the future of humanity, indeed of all life, in jeopardy. They are not even weapons in any traditional sense. They kill indiscriminately. They cause unnecessary suffering that affects present and future generations. They have no legitimate use in warfare. They are instruments of genocide that no sane person or society would contemplate using.

The questions that I will address are these: Is the threat or use of nuclear weapons illegal under international law? Is the United States under a legal obligation to eliminate its nuclear arsenal? The answer to both questions is Yes, and it seems to me remarkable that the U.S. media has been nearly silent with regard to these issues.

A small breakthrough in this area occurred in June 1998 when Max Frankel, the distinguished columnist and former editor of the New York Times, wrote in the New York Times Magazine: "If I and other observers had resisted the nuclear club's double standard and exposed its hollow assumptions about human nature, the world might by now have devised more effective international controls over atomic weapons. The have-nots might have been appeased if they had been given a major voice in a strong international inspection agency and the right to pry even into the monopolists' stockpiles -- including ours. Instead we have wasted the half century since Hiroshima and provoked a chain reaction that is truly prolific."

Let me offer a syllogism, an expression of logic: All states are subject to international law. The United States is a state. Therefore, the United States is subject to international law.

Unfortunately, not everyone agrees with the logic that our country is subject to international law. Senator Alfonse D'Amato, for example, was recently quoted in the Los Angeles Times as stating, "To hell with international law.... You've got a choice to make. You're either with us or against us, and I only hope for your sake you make the right choice."

One choice is the rule of law. The other is the rule of force. I would argue that the right choice is international law. It is in the interests of our country and all countries to abide by the rule of law. Either way, we can be assured that other countries will follow our lead.

International law is made in two ways -- by treaties, which require the agreement of nations, and by such widespread agreement on issues of law that the law is accepted as customary international law. Both means carry the force of law in the international system.

7/16/98

The treaty which is most relevant to the abolition of nuclear weapons is the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which was opened for signatures in 1968 and entered into force in 1970. This treaty seeks to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to states which did not possess them prior to January 1, 1967. The five permanent members of the

United Nations Security Council (U.S., Russia, UK, France and China) are the states recognized in the NPT as possessing nuclear weapons prior to this date.

In return for the non-nuclear weapons states promising not to acquire nuclear weapons, the five nuclear weapons states promised in Article VI of the NPT to pursue good faith negotiations for a cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and for nuclear disarmament.

When the NPT was extended indefinitely in 1995, the nuclear weapons states promised the "determined pursuit...of systematic and progressive efforts" to achieve nuclear disarmament. For most states in the world, as reflected in their votes in the UN General Assembly, the efforts of the nuclear weapons states in this regard have been far from satisfactory.

The customary international law most relevant to the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons is international humanitarian law. This is part of the law of armed conflict, and was developed to set limits on the use of force in armed conflict for humanitarian purposes. The basic premise is that the means of injuring the enemy are not unlimited. Put another way, all is not fair (or legal) in warfare.

Under international law, a state cannot use weapons that fail to discriminate between civilians and combatants. Nor can a state use weapons that cause unnecessary suffering to combatants such as dum-dum bullets.

In December 1994 the United Nations General Assembly asked the International Court of Justice, the highest judicial body in the world on matters of international law, for an advisory opinion on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons. The exact question asked was: "Is the threat or use of nuclear weapons in any circumstance permitted under international law?"

The United States, joined by the UK, France, and Russia, argued to the Court that it should not hear the case because this was a political rather than legal issue. The Court, turning aside these arguments, issued its historic opinion on July 8, 1996. It was an opinion of great significance for humanity, but to date it has been largely ignored by the U.S. and its NATO allies. It has also been largely ignored by the U.S. media.

The Court began by unanimously finding that international law does not provide specific authorization of the threat or use of nuclear weapons. On the other hand, the Court found that international law did not contain "any comprehensive and universal prohibition of the threat or use of nuclear weapons as such." Three of the 14 judges -- Judge Koroma of Sierra Leone, Judge Shahabuddeen of Guyana, and Judge Weeramantry of Sri Lanka -- voted against this position, and issued powerful dissenting opinions.

The Court then went on to state unanimously that any threat or use of nuclear weapons for purposes other than self-defense, in accord with articles 2(4) and 51 of the United Nations Charter, was prohibited. It followed this statement with the unanimous conclusion that a threat or use of nuclear weapons must also meet the requirements of the principles and rules of international humanitarian law.

Earlier in its opinion, the Court had referred to "cardinal principles" of humanitarian law as follows: "The first is aimed at the protection of the civilian population and civilian objects and establishes the distinction between combatants and non-combatants; States must never make civilians the object of attack and must consequently never use weapons that are incapable of distinguishing between civilian and military targets. According to the second principle, it is prohibited to cause unnecessary suffering to combatants: it is accordingly prohibited to use weapons causing them such harm or uselessly aggravating their suffering. In application of that second principle, States do not have unlimited freedom of choice of means in the weapons they use." The Court also made clear that if a use would be unlawful, the threat of such use would also be unlawful.

Based upon its findings with regard to the application of international law to nuclear weapons, the Court reached an unusual two-paragraph conclusion that began, "the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of armed conflict."

The Court continued with a second paragraph stating that the current state of international law and the elements of fact at its disposal did not allow the Court to "conclude definitively whether the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be lawful or unlawful in an extreme circumstance of self-defence, in which the very survival of a state would be at stake." This indetermination by the Court when "the very survival of a state would be at stake," must be read in connection with the absolute prohibition of violating international humanitarian law. Thus, even in an extreme circumstance of self-defense, it would be necessary to avoid injuring a civilian population and causing unnecessary suffering to combatants. This would not be possible by means of using nuclear weapons for retaliation against a civilian population.

The vote on this two-paragraph conclusion was 7 to 7, with the President of the Court casting the deciding vote, according to the rules of the Court. However, when you analyze who voted against the conclusion you find that the three judges from Western nuclear weapons states were joined by the three judges who found an absolute prohibition on nuclear weapons. The Japanese judge also voted against this conclusion because he opposed the issue coming before the Court. Thus, a better reading of this vote would have ten supporting the conclusion or going further and arguing for an absolute prohibition, and only the judges from the U.S., UK and France opposing it because they found that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would not be "generally" illegal.

The Court went on to state unanimously: "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." In 1996 and 1997 the United Nations General Assembly passed resolutions urging the nuclear weapons states to fulfill this obligation.

In issuing the Court's opinion, Judge Bedjaoui, the then president of the Court, referred to nuclear weapons as "the ultimate evil" and declared, "Nuclear weapons can be expected -- in the present state of scientific development at least -- to cause indiscriminate victims among combatants and non-combatants alike, as well as unnecessary suffering among both categories. The very nature of this blind weapon therefore has a destabilizing effect on humanitarian law which regulates discernment in the type of weapon used."

Judge Bedjaoui also argued that it would be "quite foolhardy...to set the survival of a State above all other considerations, in particular above the survival of mankind itself."

I will conclude with a few observations.

First, the threat or use of nuclear weapons is illegal in any conceivable circumstance. Therefore, current U.S. and NATO policies relying upon nuclear weapons are illegal under international law.

Second, the U.S. has not been fulfilling its obligation under international law to negotiate the complete elimination of nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control.

Third, the likely outcome of this failure of leadership by the U.S. is the breakdown of the Non-Proliferation Treaty at its year 2000 Review Conference. The nuclear testing by India and Pakistan can be linked to India's strong opposition to what it has termed "nuclear apartheid," that is the continued reliance on nuclear weapons by a small group of states that have failed to fulfill their obligations under international law.

Fourth, the U.S. media has not played a constructive role in analyzing this situation, and reporting on it to the American people.

Fifth, current U.S. policies make the American people and the U.S. media unwitting accomplices in policies that threaten the mass murder of hundreds of millions of innocent people. If these weapons are used ever again, by accident or design, history -- if there is a history -- will judge the American people harshly for not demanding the abolition of these weapons when the opportunity to do so presented itself with the end of the Cold War.

At the outset, I said that the legal case for abolishing nuclear weapons is only one of many that can be made. The legal case is important, but the most important case that can be made is the moral case. To abolish nuclear weapons is to uphold the sanctity of life. I will conclude by quoting Lee Butler, a former commander of the U.S. Strategic Command and an eloquent spokesman for abolishing these weapons. General Butler stated: "We cannot at once keep sacred the miracle of existence and hold sacrosanct the capacity to destroy it. It is time to reassert the primacy of individual conscience, the voice of reason and the rightful interests of humanity." This cannot be done without the active participation of the media in analyzing and communicating the case for nuclear weapons abolition to the American people.

*David Krieger is the president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. He can be reached at 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108, (805)965-3443. Other articles by him are available at the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation web site: www.wagingpeace.org.

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/>

\$*\$*\$*\$*\$ 13 LINES REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT igc.apc.org \$*\$*\$*\$*\$

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 17:40:31 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: July 16, 1998
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

To: CTBT-Organizers
From: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Date: July 17, 1998
Subject: July 16, 1998

Dear CTBT Organizers:

Please let us know how your Call-In Day and other July 16 activities went.

We know that we generated hundreds of calls - educating Senate Offices on the need for a CTBT. Early reports, for example: In Washington State, over 1,000 Flyers were distributed and 5 state- wide phone trees activated to urge calls to Senator Gorton; In Rhode Island, Chaffee's staff asked why they were getting so many calls. . .

In eight states (Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Nebraska, Oregon, Tennessee, Washington, Wyoming) 20/20 Vision's Roots on the Radio activists took their message to the air waves - for example in Oregon, Michael Carrigan participated was a guest on a two-hour talk radio program.

Below is an example of a *letter to the editor,* published in the Nashville Tennessean. Nell Levin's (Nashville Peace Action) received a "three star" award,(which means Nell gets to attend a banquet honoring her thoughtful prose, but for you it means this is a great sample/ template letter.)

Don't Forget AUGUST 6/9.

If you are planning events in your community please be sure to contact Lisa Ledwidge with Physicians for Social Responsibility. Let her know when, where, who to contact etc. Tel: 202 898 0150 ext. 222
<ledwidge@psr.org>

Check the evolving list on PSR's web site at:

<http://www.psr.org/hirnag.htm>

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Tennessean
July 16,1998

Nuclear Testing Should Be Stopped

To the Editor:

On July 16, 1945 scientists lit up the pre-dawn New Mexico sky with the world's first nuclear weapons test explosion. Fifty- three years and over 2,000 tests later, it's time for a ban on nuclear testing.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is an international treaty that would ban nuclear testing worldwide. It is currently before the U.S. Senate for ratification and our senators, Bill Frist and Fred Thompson, have not yet endorsed it.

The CTBT is being held hostage by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Jesse Helms, R-N.C. Our Senators' support for the treaty would help pressure Sen. Helms to hold hearings and schedule a vote. Sen. Frist has an especially important role to play since he is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

India stunned the world by conducting nuclear weapons tests in May, and Pakistan followed with tests of its own. This raises the specter of a deadly nuclear arms race in South Asia.

Following the Indian tests, a nationwide poll found that 73% of Americans support Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. If America expects other nations to act responsibly, we must set the example by ratifying the CTBT now. Please contact Sen. Frist and Sen. Thompson and urge their immediate support of the test ban treaty.

Nell Levin
Nashville Peace Action
P.O. Box 121333 37212

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-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 14:24:56 -0700
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Humanities at a Crossroads
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Humanity at a Crossroads
by David Krieger

In response to the nuclear tests conducted by India and Pakistan, Henry Kissinger provided new insights into his "realist" view of rationality. Referring to Indian and Pakistani tests, he said: "They live in a rough neighborhood. They don't think the number of bombs makes war more likely. In a perfectly rational world, you'd think more nuclear weapons makes war less likely." Self-proclaimed "realists," including Henry Kissinger, have argued that nuclear weapons cannot be eliminated. But these same realists have been responsible for creating and maintaining some basic nuclear fictions that have been with us for decades. The first of these, a legal fiction, was written into the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1968. This fiction said that the only states to be considered nuclear weapons states were those that had detonated a nuclear device prior to January 1, 1967; in other words, the only nuclear weapons states were the US, USSR, UK, France, and China.

The fiction proclaimed by the "realists" was that only these five states were nuclear weapons states. Israel, India, and Pakistan, all widely understood to have nuclear weapons, were referred to as "threshold" states, meaning states with the capacity to develop nuclear weapons.

Another fiction of the "realists" was that it would be possible to simultaneously promote the peaceful atom and prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In fact, nuclear programs for supposedly peaceful purposes have served as the cover for efforts to develop nuclear weapons in Argentina, Brazil, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, North Korea, South Africa and elsewhere. These efforts succeeded in India, Israel, South Africa, and possibly North Korea.

With the nuclear tests carried out by India and Pakistan, it has become far more difficult to maintain these fictions. It cannot be denied that India and Pakistan are nuclear weapons states, regardless of the date set forth in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Conducting nuclear weapons tests is a solid indicator that a state has nuclear weapons. And Israel, as has been adequately revealed, is a nuclear weapons state with or without tests.

So where does this leave us? On one level, we are in an Alice in Wonderland world of "realists" who create fictions to serve their view of reality. On another level, most people in the world can now clearly see that the number of nuclear weapons states is growing.

We have reached a crossroads. The choice before us is to continue to live in the world of make believe, as the "realists" would encourage us to do, or to work for an unequivocal commitment from all nuclear weapons states to eliminate their nuclear arsenals under strict and effective international controls.

The unrealistic dream that the "realists" profess to believe in is that the nuclear weapons states can keep their arsenals forever without these weapons ever being used by accident or design. This view was implicitly criticized by the prestigious Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, which stated in its 1996 report, "The proposition that nuclear weapons can be retained in perpetuity and never used - accidentally or by decision - defies credibility. The only complete defence is the elimination of nuclear weapons and assurance that they will never be produced again."

The good news is that the Indians have made clear that they would prefer a world with no nuclear weapons states, and that they are willing to work for this. The Chinese have also made this commitment. Leadership is lacking primarily

from the three Western nuclear weapons states and Russia. It is in these countries that the so-called "realists" have maintained their grip on the national security apparatus.

What is real for the twenty-first century is what we will make real. If we choose to continue to maintain the fiction that nuclear weapons provide for our security, this will be our reality right up until the time a nuclear weapon explodes in one of our major cities or until a nuclear war breaks out.

On the other hand, if we choose to accept the reality that a nuclear-weapons-free world is possible, we will take the necessary steps to achieve such a world. We will begin the good faith negotiations for nuclear disarmament promised in the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We will negotiate a plan for the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons on Earth, and we will begin "systematic and progressive efforts" to implement this plan.

Moving ahead to achieve this new reality are eight nations, led by Ireland, calling themselves the New Agenda Coalition. They have urged us to enter the third millennium with an unequivocal commitment in place to achieve total nuclear disarmament. The call of the New Agenda Coalition is in line with the goal of the more than 1100 citizen organizations around the world supporting the Abolition 2000 Global Network's goal of a treaty banning nuclear weapons by the year 2000.

There is no doubt that this path is the one that humanity must choose to assure its future. The choice should be easier now that the fictions of so-called "realists" have been exploded along with the detonations by India and Pakistan.

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/>

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ 7 LINES REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT igc.apc.org \$\$\$\$\$\$\$

Return-Path: <rchablani@earthlink.net>
Date: Fri, 17 Jul 1998 23:07:33 +0000
From: RAJ CHABLANI <rchablani@earthlink.net>
Reply-To: rchablani@earthlink.net
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Abolition 2000 working group
X-URL: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition2000/working.html>

Dear Mr. Hallman,

What kind of commitment am I making if I ask to subscribe to the Religious Working Group e-mail list server? I would like to do what I can, but am also realizing that I need to keep an eye on how much further I spread out my time and energy (that is not to say that I don't have any left). Anyway, please let me know what is involved.

You have my e-mail address should you receive this and my snail-mail address is

47 E. Willis, Apt. 19

Detroit, MI 48209

313-833-8365

Thank you in advance.

Peace,

Raj Chablani

Return-Path: <acc@internetegypt.com>
From: acc@internetegypt.com
Date: Sat, 18 Jul 1998 17:30:14 +0300
Reply-To: acc@internetegypt.com
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: reply

Arab Coordination Center of NGOs
Address : 18 Darih Saad Zaghoul str., Cairo, Egypt.

Tel:3555502- Fax :5786298
or16 Mohamed Shafik Str. El-Mhanseen ,12411,Giza,Egypt.
Tel :3467892
E-mail :acc@internetegypt.com.

Dear Howard,

Your email of 9 June 1998 attract our attention and could be constructive start by NGOs for nuclear abolition . We shall forward it to a very prominent religious organization closely related to Al - Azhar (religious institution) . We shall try to follow up this contact to ensure future activities in this regard .

With best wishes

Coordinator

Bahig Nassar

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Sat, 18 Jul 1998 20:29:14 +0200
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: FW: Murray Thomson to Group of 78
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

Murray Thompson is a Canadian Quaker with a long time interest in the Indian subcontinent. The Group of 78 is a Canadian NGO.

Ross Wilcock
rwilcock@web.net

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

From: owner-pgs-priv-1@netserver.web.net
[mailto:owner-pgs-priv-1@netserver.web.net] On Behalf Of Alan F. Phillips
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 1998 12:43 AM
To: pgs-priv-1@netserver.web.net
Subject: Murray Thomson to Group of 78

Talk to The Group of 78: 16 June/98
Canada's Role in Promoting Peace between India and Pakistan:
by Murray Thomson.

Introduction

The paper today is about Canada, India, Pakistan, and about nuclear weapons and what to do about them. The first statement by the original members of the Group of 78, in 1981, called on the Canadian government to make the abolition of nuclear weapons a priority of foreign policy. And, seventeen years later, we are still at it!

The time I take to give this paper - about 15 minutes - is the time it takes, as most of you know, for a nuclear war to start between Russia and the US. The New England Journal of Medicine, one of the most prestigious medical journals in the world, has just completed a study on accidental nuclear war today. Its conclusion: "The risk of accidental war has increased in recent years, threatening a public health disaster of unprecedented scale...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".

The reasons cited for the increased danger include the fact that Russia's nuclear command system has steadily deteriorated. Computer networks malfunction more frequently, and deficient early-warning systems and ground radar are more prone to report false alarms. Budget cuts have reduced the training for nuclear commanders, who also suffer from pay cuts, housing & food shortages. Moreover the Russian government is considering distributing both the unlock codes and conditional launch authority down the chain of command.

The Journal's study also reported that in a 15 year period, 40,000 military personnel involved in the operational aspects of US nuclear forces were removed from their positions, either because of alcohol or other drug abuse

or because of psychiatric problems.

And remember that many of the US and Russian missiles are on high alert: the American launch-on-warning time is about 20 minutes, the Russians' closer to 15.

I start with these grim facts because many believe, as I do, that peace between India and Pakistan should be seen, first in the global context, rather than the regional one.

I don't want to minimize the danger on the subcontinent: the rising anger and hostility, the implacable logic to which both governments adhere today, the nuclear roulette on Kashmir, the flouting of efforts by the non-NWS to ensure we turn away from nuclear horror.

I believe that both the Indian and Pakistani governments should be censured for defying the spirit of the Treaty, whether or not they were signatories.

But the nuclear tests carried out by the two countries total just 12.

Compare this with the 44 by the UK, 47 by China, more than 200 by France, more than 700 by the former Soviet Union, and more than one thousand by the United States. Remember, too, that many of the earlier tests were in the atmosphere, and some were exploded in the backyard of the peoples of the Pacific. So if we are to bring sanctions against India and Pakistan because they have joined the nuclear club, then why not against all the other members, especially those who keep their weapons in a state of Launch-on-Warning?

It seems obvious that the foreign policies of the 185 governments in the world today should play by the same rules. We all know that the bargain struck by the nuclear NPT between the NWS and the non-NWS, defined in the often-quoted Article 6, has not been honoured by the NWS. Here is how the Indian Government viewed the Security Council resolution on the Indian tests:

>From a letter dated 4th June/98 from the Permanent Rep of India to the President of the UN's Security Council:

"Can the Security Council continue to ignore the overwhelming demand for elimination of nuclear weapons, which has been repeatedly endorsed by the General Assembly?... Why has (the S/C) not acted on the proliferation of tens of thousands of nuclear weapons since the UN was established? Is the Security Council's concern on matters of proliferation limited to horizontal proliferation alone? Is the continued retention of nuclear weapons by the NWS not considered a proliferation risk that threatens international peace and security?..."

Role of the Canadian government and people

Both the Canadian government and the Canadian people have important, and different roles to play today, whether or not they prove to be successful.

The government, I believe, should decide whether its first loyalty is to the International Court and the Non-NWS inside the UN, or to the US and NATO. And if it chooses to break with NATO, and I fervently hope it will, then the Canadian people should support that action and be prepared to take whatever economic or other consequences might ensue.

Canadian Government's position

So what is the Canadian government's position on nuclear weapons? In a statement, on 26 May/98, to the House Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs & Intl Trade, Minister Axworthy gave the key elements:

1. a forceful, responsible advocacy of nuclear disarmament and a nuclear non-proliferation regime based on the NPT and its associated instruments;
2. direct and clear opposition to any move by the NWS to validate their nuclear weapons in the new realpolitik, coupled with persistent pressure to

continue and expand the START process, while resisting destabilizing strategic developments, such as weapons in space;

3. vigorous opposition to any move to legitimize any new NWS, and

4. persistent advocacy of the non-proliferation regime backed by tangible measures such as those already taken.

* The Lysoen Declaration, signed by Axworthy and his Norwegian counterpart, also stressed the enhancement of human security as a cornerstone of the soft power approach.

All of these elements are important, as far as they go. But they don't go nearly far enough. And they leave out the fact:

* That Canada voted against a UN Resolution calling for multilateral negotiations "leading to the early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention [prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination]".

* That Canada still supports the NATO and US position against no-first-use, a position now taken, too, by the Russians.

* And Canada continues to host visits by nuclear-armed submarines.

The International Court has unanimously called for the conclusion of negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. But NATO, holding that nuclear weapons are essential, resists such negotiations.

Middle Power Initiatives

At least two initiatives by Middle Powers are underway. An Eight Nation Declaration on 9th June/98, initiated by Ireland and joined by Brazil, Egypt, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa and Sweden, supported the Canberra Commission's statement that "The proposition that nuclear weapons can be retained in perpetuity and never used, accidentally or by decision, defies credibility... We can no longer remain complacent at the reluctance of the NWS and the three nuclear-weapons-capable states to take the fundamental and requisite step, namely a clear commitment to the speedy, final and total elimination of their nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons capability, and we urge them to take that step, now."

A second Middle Powers Initiative was started by G78 member Doug Roche, in collaboration with the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons and the Physicians for Global Survival (led by the indomitable Debbie Gridale). It is likely that these two initiatives will merge at a meeting in Dublin on July 3rd.

Abolition 2000 Campaign

If the Canadian government has not done all it can to save us from nuclear war, the same can also be said for the Canadian churches, business, unions, professional communities and the NGOs. Yet at least they have found a common focus in the Abolition 2000 Campaign, both in Canada and the world.

Committed to achieving a convention within the next 18 months, Abolition 2000 has an increasingly impressive roster of support.

* Nineteen heads of Canada's major churches and religious communities, who have called on the Prime Minister to "urge all states to negotiate by the year 2000 an agreement for the elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework". And "all NWS to take all their nuclear forces off alert status and to commit themselves to no-first-use".

* The Canberra Commission and sixty-one senior Generals and Admirals, including General George Lee Butler, former Commander of the US Strategic Command from 1991 to 1994, and the only person who knew where 20,000 US

nuclear weapons were actually targeted;

* 117 former world leaders including Jimmy Carter, Gorbachev and Trudeau;

* 200,000 medical doctors, and more than one thousand citizens'

organizations in 75 countries;

* 13 million Japanese, who have signed a petition calling for a complete nuclear ban;

* many international NGOs including scientists, lawyers, and engineers.

The Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, for example, has drawn up a model Convention for such a purpose, to be used or modified if requested.

Support for nuclear opponents in India & Pakistan

Another important role for Canadians is to support and make common cause with the many individuals and organizations in India and Pakistan who oppose the nuclear option in their countries.

* Here is a message from Dr. S. Srivastwa, Intl Councillor of Indian Doctors for Peace & Development:

"Indian Doctors for Peace & Development expresses its deep sense of disappointment and profound regret that India and Pakistan have tested the nuclear devices and thereby launched themselves on a suicidal nuclear arms race. (It) will further squander the precious resources from the social sectors... The IDPD appeals to the Governments of India & Pakistan to take immediate steps to de-escalate the tension through immediate dialogue for an agreement not to make and deploy nuclear weapons, and to sign a treaty of no first use and non-aggression... IDPD urges the peace and disarmament movements all over the world to concentrate their energy with single minded devotion on the abolition of nuclear weapons within a fixed time frame...."

* The Pakistan-India Forum for Peace & Democracy, in West Bengal "deplores the war hysteria being whipped up by the ruling elite in India & Pakistan, condemned the series of nuclear explosions by the Indian government, the ongoing escalation of missile tests by both Pakistan and Indian military establishments, and the general militarisation of the subcontinent"

* A statement by a significant number of prominent Indian Scientists stated that "the Government of India has adopted the same cynical language as the nuclear weapons powers by claiming that these tests will contribute to disarmament... We stand firmly with the long tradition of eminent scientists who have consistently argued against the induction of nuclear weapons."

* The South Asia Partnership office in Pakistan also has "deplored the nuclear tests in India and Pakistan, strongly urged both countries to initiate a process of negotiations for peace & prosperity by signing the CTBT".

* A two day Seminar on The Importance of India & Pakistan in Promoting Regional Peace was held in the West Block three weekends ago, sponsored by the South Asia Partnership, Ceras of Montreal, Peacefund Canada and Human Concern International, in cooperation with the Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee. It seeks to establish a network of Canadians, many with origins in the subcontinent, to support the work of NGOs in both countries working for peace & reconciliation. (Two of the leaders of that seminar, Isabelle Valois and Jill Carr-Harris are with us today).

* Peacefund Canada has also sought a grant from CIDA to support the Indian and Pakistani doctors in their development of a peace education program in both countries.

Conclusion

I will give the last word to a colleague and friend from the subcontinent.

Lalita Ramdas, President of the International Council for Adult Education, lives with her husband, Ramu, a retired admiral and former Head of the Indian Navy, in a village near Bombay. Their daughter married a Pakistani so their lives are intimately involved in Indian-Pakistani relations. Recently she wrote:

"Ramu has decided, after an agonizing few weeks following the Indian blast, wrestling with a lifetime in uniform, that he cannot in all conscience support nuclearization. So he has decided to accept an invitation to speak at the National Convention against Nuclear Arms being organized in Delhi next week.

"This marks a kind of major step forward; it burns certain boats and bridges, as you can imagine, and we must see what the future holds. There is, predictably, a large body of vocal opinion that tends to categorize all 'anti-nuclear and anti-bomb' opinions as automatically 'anti-national' or western-inspired. The line we have to tread is therefore very fine, indeed". It is such courage, I believe, which will help stop the downward slide towards nuclear oblivion on which all of us now find ourselves. May we in Canada match their bravery with bold actions of our own.

Thank you.

-- Murray Thomson

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Mon, 20 Jul 1998 10:37:43 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Subject: pov-1: July Bulletin from Colombo, Sri Lanka
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
July 1998 Bulletin

Contents

1. NPC Offers Free Internet Service
2. Women in Peace Work
3. Material is Biased, Protest Participants
4. Disabled War Veterans Take Another Step Forward
5. Press Release: Attack on Douglas Devanandan

1. NPC OFFERS FREE INTERNET SERVICE

An alleged LTTE "strike" from cyberspace onto the computer networks of the Sri Lankan embassies abroad a few months ago created headlines in the country. The news was so exotic that it caught the attention of the international news agencies as well. But their assessment of the severity of the threat was insipid and technical. Quoting US intelligence sources, Reuters described the cyber attack as "little more than a bid by the LTTE to swamp Sri Lankan embassies with electronic mail."

To most computer illiterates, who make up the vast majority of the Sri Lankan population, the Internet and Cyberspace conjure up visions of mystery and power. The lack of knowledge about the Internet in Sri Lanka is coupled with a deep sense of insecurity in the Sinhalese psyche in relation to the LTTE. Therefore, even trivial incidents involving the LTTE can grab the headlines of the Sri Lankan media.

On June 24, the National Peace Council's web page designer Kisara Yatiyawela, together with the World Council of Churches Peace to the City Campaign Colombo coordinator Priyanka Mendis, invited organisations that have been in the forefront of peace work in the country to a session on the internet. The occasion was a "launch" of sorts of the NPC web page, made available to it courtesy of the World Council of Churches. Nearly thirty representatives of organisations crowded into a small room and viewed the NPC web page which was magnified on a screen.

Those present were also taken on a tour of the government and LTTE web sites. The two flickering flames on the LTTE "martyrs" page was

also a symbol of the sophisticated and dedicated manner in which the LTTE has sought to project its viewpoint through cyber space. By contrast the government web site was extremely matter of fact, and in fact quite dull.

Having shown what the internet was about, and how it could be used in promoting one's work by utilising the power and versatility of the internet, the NPC made an offer to the organisations present that they could send in any information on their organisations which they wished to be posted up on the internet. A format was provided, which would facilitate the posting up of information, including photographs and graphics, on the internet in double quick time.

2. WOMEN IN PEACE WORK

A conflict resolution workshop on June 26-28 for eighteen young women political activists in the southern Matara District brought forth some lively discussions on motivations, funding and needs. The workshop took place during a period when international NGOs working in the peace arena were being attacked in the media for being "anti-Sri Lanka" and "pro-LTTE." In particular, the London-based International Alert, which is an NGO with which the National Peace Council has held collaborative programmes in the past, had come in for scathing attack.

One of the first questions to be asked at the workshop was the NPC's relationship with International Alert. The Ven. Kalupahane Piyaratana said that the two organisations had engaged in joint programmes, but this did not mean that one was subordinate to the other or its agent. He explained the origins of the NPC as an inter-religious group which had its own identity before it entered into partnership with International Alert. The politicians' programmes done with International Alert two years ago, in which 22 MPs from all parties had visited several conflict-affected countries to widen their perspectives on peace making, had been extremely successful ones, he pointed out.

The Ven. Piyaratana, who is a member of the NPC's Governing Council, and the chief incumbent of a well known Buddhist temple in the district, elaborated on his own experience with foreign-funded NGOs. He reminded his audience that during the period of terror in 1988-89, during the period of the JVP insurrection and its bloody suppression in the south, that human rights NGOs had played a yeoman task in upholding the human rights of the people. These NGOs had joined hands with liberal political forces, and had contributed to the positive change in the political order. It was through his experience in working for human rights NGOs that he had been drawn into the work for peace.

Having satisfied themselves with regard to the bona fides of the National Peace Council, the participants were receptive to the message that women had an important role to play in the peace process. They should come out of their homes, and take up the challenging task of challenging the mindset that gave priority to imposition by force rather than to dialogue and compromise, said NPC programme officer Nirupa Kulasekera. While agreeing with the thrust of this argument, the participants pointed out the obstacles they had to overcome in the

reluctance of their parents and husbands to permit them to go out of their villages for longer durations.

The participants also identified the need for more knowledge about the principles and practice of conflict resolution and their inability to access it as another major obstacle in the path of their being able to serve the community as peace workers. They further pointed out that even the available material in the Sinhala language was quite restricted in content and perspective. The need for more material with a wider perspective and more intensive educational workshops was stressed.

3. MATERIAL IS BIASED, PROTEST PARTICIPANTS

A conflict resolution workshop held by the National Peace Council in the north-western Puttalam District on June 19-21 for about 20 community leaders consisting of school teachers, government servants, Buddhist monks and village notables aroused keen dissent on a number of points. The first was the "History of the conflict" presented by the NPC's programme officer, S.P. Nathan, which gave a breakdown of the various acts of the Sri Lankan government that had led to the progressive alienation of the Tamil community.

Some of the participants objected to this historical review as being "biased" as it did not contain the acts of the Tamil political parties and militant organisations that had also contributed to the breakdown of relations. The Ven. Buddiyagama Chandraratne, chief incumbent of a temple in the district, who was the organiser of the meeting, rebutted these allegations saying that the Sinhalese people should be prepared to admit the wrongs that their political leaders had committed in their name and which had led to the ethnic conflict.

However, some of the participants denied that there was an ethnic conflict in the country. They said that they, who were ordinary grassroots people, had no problems with their Tamil neighbours, who likewise had no problem with them. They added that the alleged "ethnic conflict" was really only an "elite conflict." They questioned why the NPC was coming to them in this rural setting to conduct this workshop, which should be conducted in Colombo with the elites. They also questioned the value of conducting workshops for powerless people like themselves, who could make no change in the macro-level politics, where the real decisions as to war and peace were being made. In the summing up, the need to carefully plan programmes of work such as this workshop, so that they would be relevant, and could be built upon, was emphasised.

4. DISABLED WAR VETERANS TAKE ANOTHER STEP FORWARD

The Association of Disabled Ex-Service Personnel (ADEP) took another step forward in firmly establishing themselves as a powerful organisation befitting their 4000 strong present membership, with another 8000 on the waiting list, when a group of over 20 district and divisional level organisers met to revise their constitution, establish their organisational goals and plan out their strategy to become a major

country-wide force for peace with justice. The meeting on July 3-5 was hosted by the National Peace Council.

The two-fold purpose of the organisation, to work towards ensuring the rights and privileges of all disabled soldiers and their families, and the families of dead and missing soldiers, while also working towards a peaceful settlement of the war was agreed on. The organisational structure, as one extending upwards, from the membership, to the divisional level, to the district level and to the national level was also agreed on.

A vigorous debate took place regarding the role of the district level organisers at the national level. As the armed forces are usually institutions based on a rigid and unquestioned hierarchy, with orders rather than dialogue and debate the norm, the democratic spirit within the organisation was encouraging. It was also encouraging that the issue of a peaceful and negotiated settlement as the national level option for which ADEP should strive for, was not a subject for acrimonious debate, but more for interested questioning in order to widen horizons and learn of new opportunities based on international experience.

5. Press Release: July 3, 1998 Attack on Douglas Devanandan

The National Peace Council is appalled at the grievous assault on Douglas Devanandan, MP, by detainees in the Kalutara prison. The inability of the prison authorities to provide adequate protection to the Hon. Devanandan was particularly tragic as he had undertaken a very difficult role to see for himself the condition of the prisoners and to find a satisfactory settlement to end their hunger strike.

The NPC calls on the government to review its prison system, which earned international notoriety with the massacre of Tamil prisoners within the high security Welikada jail in 1983. Last December three prisoners were killed by other prisoners within the high security Kalutara prison while a mob outside threw stones and demonstrated in favour of the killers. Despite numerous incidents since then, the state seems to have been unable to reform the legal and prison systems to deal with the issue of suspected LTTE members.

The prolonged incarceration without trial of large numbers of people is liable to lead to extreme frustration and imbalance leading to the type of cruel outrage that overtook the Hon. Devanandan. The fate of the Hon. Devanandan is an indictment of the present policies and practices of the political mainstream which have significantly failed to address the political demands that gave rise to the Tamil militancy.

The Hon. Devanandan was one of the all-party group of 22 MPs who went to Crete, Northern Ireland and the Philippines with us to find new ways to break the deadlock in the country. A former prisoner himself, and a militant who converted to mainstream politics, he epitomises the despair and frustration of those who are striving, yet unsuccessfully, to achieve their aspirations and redress their grievances through

democratic politics.

National Peace Council
291/50 Havelock Gardens
Colombo 6
Phone/Fax: +94-1-594378, 502522
Email: peace2@sri.lanka.net
<http://www.peace-srilanka.org/>

Colombo Peace to the City Campaign Local Coordinator:
Priyanka Mendis
Email: impress@slt.lk

----- End of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Mon, 20 Jul 1998 10:42:30 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: new CTBT poll results: KANSAS

July 20, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: new public opinion survey on KANSAS voter attitudes on the nuclear test ban

The following is the e-mail version of our press release on a new bipartisan poll on Kansas voter attitudes on the CTBT, South Asian testing, and related non-proliferation issues. This is the first of six state-specific polls that follow -up our national CTBT poll from May 1998.

For a full-color version of the release (with charts); the pollsters' detailed analysis of the survey responses; survey questions; and related national polling results, visit the Coalition's CTBT Site <<http://www.clw.org/org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Look for additional polling results from other states over the next few days.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: July 20, 1998

CONTACT: Adam Eiding, 202-547-3577; or Daryl Kimball, Director (202) 546-0795

"Eight Out of Ten Kansans Support Senate Approval of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty"

WASHINGTON, DC -- An overwhelming majority of Kansas voters want the Senate to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), according to a new bipartisan, statewide poll released today. When asked: "Do you think the U.S. Senate should approve a Treaty with 140 other countries that would prohibit underground nuclear weapons explosions worldwide," 79% of Kansas voters said the treaty should be "approved," while only 14% "disapprove." Support for the treaty is strong among Republicans (81% approve), Democrats (79% approve) and independents (79%), and in all regions of the state. Support for the CTBT in Kansas (79%) is even higher than it is nationwide (73%, according to a May 1998 survey).

The Kansas poll was commissioned by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control organizations. The survey results are based on the findings of an opinion survey of 501 registered Kansas voters conducted by Wirthlin

Worldwide, a Republican polling firm, and Democratic firm, The Mellman Group from June 20-24, 1998. The statistical margin for error for the sample as a whole is plus or minus 4.4 %.

The test ban treaty was submitted to the Senate last year, but the Senate has so far failed to even begin debate on the pact, which has gained new significance since India and Pakistan conducted nuclear blasts in May and June. Sixty-seven votes are needed for Senate ratification. The current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of staff and four previous chairmen, including Gen. Colin Powell, have endorsed the CTBT. President Clinton and other world leaders say that the CTBT is vital to curbing nuclear proliferation and encouraging India & Pakistan to sign the CTBT and end their arms race.

Kansans Consider the Test Ban "More Important" after the South Asian tests: Despite the repeated calls, Senate leaders Trent Lott (R-MS) and Jesse Helms (R-NC) have defied public opinion and labeled the treaty "irrelevant." However, Kansans disagree. Sixty-nine percent of Kansans said that they think the recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan "demonstrate how important it is for the U.S. to ratify and encourage global implementation of the CTBT."

Kansans have a high level of awareness of the nuclear testing by India and Pakistan. Eighty-two percent of Kansas voters say they have heard about the tests, with 86% saying the tests pose a "serious threat to international security." Knowledge of the recent India-Pakistan tests serves to increase support for the treaty. Among those who had heard a "great deal" or "some" about these tests, support of the treaty is overwhelming (82% approve, while only 12% disapprove).

Kansas voters were also asked whether they "favor" or "oppose" a variety of possible U.S. government responses to the tests by India and Pakistan. An overwhelming 84% favor urging India and Pakistan to approve the test ban and 70% favor U.S. ratification of the CTBT as the best responses. These proposals were far more popular than imposing sanctions (61% in favor, 28% opposed), or increasing military spending to develop and deploy a nuclear missile defense (31% in favor, 61% opposed).

"The Senate's do-nothing approach on the test ban treaty is irresponsible and dangerous. It hurts efforts to protect America and the world from the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the possibility of nuclear war. The overwhelming public support for the test ban is a wake-up call for the Senate to approve the treaty and stop nuclear blasts worldwide," says Daryl Kimball, Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

Another survey question reveals that when given the choice between two possible candidates for Senate: one who supports the CTBT and the other who opposes the CTBT, 70% of Kansans solidly prefer a candidate who supports the CTBT (while only 22% would support a candidate who opposes the treaty).

-- 30 --

For transcripts of survey questions, detailed analysis of the survey results, or inquires for the availability of spokespersons for interview,

please contact Adam Eiding at 202-547-3577.

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of the nation's 17 leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers and prevent new threats from emerging. The Coalition's CTBT web site is:
<<http://www.clw.org/org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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, 20 Jul 1998 14:01:26 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: <dkimball@clw.org>
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Draft sign-on ltr. to Clinton on n-weapons

July 17, 1998

TO: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers members groups and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: sign-on letter regarding steps toward nuclear weapons reduction and risk reduction

REPLY BY: Monday, July 20 by 5pm

[PLEASE NOTE: some of you may have received this draft letter via e-mail earlier today from John Isaacs or Jonathan Dean }

Attached is a draft letter to President Clinton containing suggestions for the Gore-Kiriyenko meeting starting July 23 that was originally discussed at our Deep Cuts Working Group meeting earlier this week. The text, prepared by Jonathan Dean of UCS (Chair of the Coalition's Deep Cuts Working Grp.), has been revised to reflect comments from a discussion held at the Stimson Center on the morning of July 17. BASIC, Council for a Livable World and UCS have already cleared the letter.

Please notify me by close of business Monday, July 20 of your willingness to endorse the letter so that it can be forwarded to administration officials before the Gore-Kiriyenko meeting begins. In replying, please give an organizational designation and indicate if you are responding for your organization or that the designation is for identification only.

DK

July 17, 1998

DRAFT LETTER

William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President,

Despite energetic action on the part of your administration, the administration - and the American public - may now be faced with the prospect of major failure in its efforts to control nuclear weapons and to prevent their spread.

Despite repeated commitments to you, President Yeltsin has been unable to bring the Duma to ratify the START II Treaty. Russian command and control over nuclear weapons is becoming more fragile. The May 1998 nuclear weapons tests by India and Pakistan have seriously undermined the authority [WC]of

the non-proliferation regime and increased the risk of nuclear war in South Asia. Time is short in your administration to act to prevent the structure of nuclear arms control and non-proliferation from crumbling.

Your September summit with President Yeltsin provides an opportunity to reverse this trend. We have two suggestions:

First, we suggest you seek agreement with President Yeltsin that the START II treaty be amplified by a protocol lowering the permitted level of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 for each country and committing both governments to immediately begin negotiation on exchange of data on nuclear forces, warhead dismantlement, and transfer of fissile material to monitored storage. The two governments would also invite Britain, France and China to join them in discussion of the possibility of five power nuclear arms control, to include transparency and prevention of accidental or unauthorized launch.

We believe this proposal on your part would be welcomed by the Yeltsin government and could induce the Duma to ratify the amended START II; Defense Minister Sergeyev and other Russian leaders have pointed out that, by 2012, Russia will be unable to pay for deploying more than 500 warheads, while President Yeltsin has repeatedly urged drawing the other weapon states into negotiation. At the same time, this action could move toward meeting the desires of India, Pakistan and of many non-weapon countries belonging to the Non-Proliferation Treaty for some significant action by all five declared weapon states with regard to their own nuclear forces and open the way for agreement on various forms of international controls over Indian and Pakistani nuclear materials.

We believe Britain, France and China would all cooperate in the face of this substantial U.S. Russian reduction. However, as an alternative, the U.S. could propose a staged global program for de-alerting to be applied to the nuclear capabilities of the five NPT nuclear weapon states. This would strengthen the case for a separate system of monitoring Indian and Pakistani aircraft and missiles to prevent weapon deployment and provide warning when these systems are being moved.

With significant action by the weapon states and with extension of international monitoring over Indian and Pakistani nuclear capabilities, the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests can be converted into a net gain for the NPT regime. Without these developments, the long-term effect of the tests will be dangerous weakening of the cohesion of the NPT regime.

Second, to control quickly the many thousands of tactical and reserve strategic nuclear weapons not yet limited by the START process --which likely pose the greatest risks of possible theft of a nuclear weapon, and whose existence has given rise to Russian START II fears that the United States could rapidly reload weapons on its missiles - we suggest that you immediately initiate with Russia a set of unilateral-reciprocal initiatives similar to those undertaken by President Bush and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in 1991.

Specifically, we suggest that you indicate your willingness to place most of the remaining U.S. tactical warheads and nearly all strategic reserve warheads in secure storage, open to monitoring by the Russians, with a commitment that they will eventually be dismantled, if the Russians are willing to do the same with comparable proportions of their weapons in these categories. Such an initiative could ensure that, within months, some 70% of the Russian nuclear

weapon stockpile not yet regulated by the START process was in secure, monitored storage, and committed to dismantlement; U.S. security would be significantly improved. Indeed, technology is now available that would make it possible to permanently and verifiably disable all of these weapons in a matter of weeks. While Congress has placed limits on the Administration's ability to propose such reciprocal measures with respect to active-duty strategic forces, there are no limits on your authority to pursue such a productive initiative with respect to tactical and strategic reserve weapons.

We urgently suggest that Vice President Gore be authorized to advance these suggestions in his meeting with Prime Minister Kiriyenko on July 23-24. The circumstances call for extraordinary action.

Sincerely,

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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, 20 Jul 1998 11:18:52 -0700 (PDT)
From: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: RE: NPT/Hague Appeal strategy ideas
To: hap99-list@igc.org,
"abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,
"abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de" <abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de>,
"abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca" <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>,
"Janet Bloomfield" <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
X-Sender: kwood@pop.igc.org

Dear Janet, Colin and All,

I propose that Abolition 2000 and the New Agenda coalition states taking part in HAP '99 hold a joint press conference during the Hague Appeal conference to critique the (guaranteed-to-be-disappointing) outcome of the 1999 NPT PrepCom (which will have just ended), attack the nuclear weapons states for their continued obstructionism, attack the illegal nuclear sharing practices of the NATO NPT states, and promote any good ideas of the PrepCom, and our agenda & strategy for a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

Credit for this good idea goes to Karel Koster of AMOK and PENN, The Netherlands.

What does the Ab 2000 conference organizing team think of this proposal?

--Karina.

At 07:05 PM 7/10/98 +-200, International Peace Bureau wrote:

>I strongly support this proposal. Is someone within the new structure
>working on a A2000 proposal for the Hague conference? I previously
>mentioned the idea of each A2000 working group doing a workshop - or of
>having 13 sessions based on the 13 presentations at the NPT. Feedback
>please!

>

>Colin Archer, IPB, Geneva.

>

>-----

>From: Janet Bloomfield[SMTP:jbloomfield@gn.apc.org]
>Sent: vendredi, 10. juillet 1998 14:00
>To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org; abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de;
>abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca
>Cc: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org
>Subject: NPT/Strategy ideas

>

>Dear Abolition Friends,

>It is a few weeks now since there were a number of contributions on the
>listserv about what we should we planning/thinking about in relation to
>the NPT Prep Comm in 1999 and the Review Conference in 2000.
>I've been thinking about all the contributions and I have come up with the
>following ideas. Bearing in mind that the Hague Appeal for Peace events

>will be taking place almost immediately after the 1999 NPT Prep Comm I
>think that a smaller more focussed effort in New York of the key
>people/groups who really want to be there with the grassroots gathering in
>the Hague may well be the most effective use of our collective resources.
>The lesson I draw from what we have done at the two Prep Comms so far is
>that intensive lobbying of the capitals in the two or three months prior
>to the meeting would be the most useful thing to do; backed up by well
>presented material and dialogue at the time of the meeting. You don't need
>hundreds of people to do that.
>The only problem there might be with that approach is that the delegations
>at the NPT might think that we were loosing some momentum and not keeping
>the pressure on...what do people think?
>For the 2000 Review Conference I think we really need to be developing a
>strategy now based on what we want to get out of it, which is a commitment
>to abolition is it not?
>The question is how. I would like to see a thorough discussion of Zia
>Mian's idea for an amendment conference. How would this fit in with the
>New Agenda Coalition and the Middle Power initiative? What are people
>planning to do next with the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention? From a
>number of recent discussions I have been involved in I sense that the
>India/Pakistan tests have woken up a number of arms controllers to the
>idea of the Convention...
>I really hope we can get a good discussion going on this.
>Yours in peace,
>Janet Bloomfield.
>p.s. ideas about mobilising the grassroots welcome to!

>
>*****
>Janet Bloomfield, 25, Farmadine, Saffron Walden, Essex, CB11 3HR. England.
>Phone/fax: +44 (0) 1799 516189.
>e-mail: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
Karina Wood
U.S. Outreach Coordinator,
Hague Appeal for Peace 1999
43 Nisbet St, 3rd Fl.
Providence, RI 02906
Tel: 401 751-8172
Fax: 401 751-1476
Email: kwood@igc.apc.org

Come to the global conference in The Hague, Netherlands May 11-16 1999!

To: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.apc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: RE: NPT/Hague Appeal strategy ideas
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 11:18 AM 7/20/98 -0700, Karina Wood wrote:

>Dear Janet, Colin and All,

>

>I propose that Abolition 2000 and the New Agenda coalition states taking
>part in HAP '99 hold a joint press conference during the Hague Appeal
>conference to critique the (guaranteed-to-be-disappointing) outcome of the
>1999 NPT PrepCom (which will have just ended), attack the nuclear weapons
>states for their continued obstructionism, attack the illegal nuclear
>sharing practices of the NATO NPT states, and promote any good ideas of the
>PrepCom, and our agenda & strategy for a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

>

>

Dear Karina:

You may be the realist among us, but I refuse to accept your guarantee that our work with the 1999 NPT PrepCom will be disappointing. Why bother at all if we think it is futile? Rather we should do a better job in our home countries (the US, UK, France, NATO allies, Japan) to influence our governments and with the Non-Aligned Movement to achieve a better outcome than we did in 1998. If somebody wants to prepare a contingency plan to respond to whatever outcome there is at the 1999 PrepCom, positive, negative, or in between, that's all right. But please don't write off what we are doing in the meantime.

That incidently is one of my concerns with the Hague Appeal conference. Many are abandoning their activism for a year to get ready for a talkfest and in the meantime are ceasing to put pressure on the nuclear weapon states, the surrogate nuclear weapon states (the six NATO nations basing nuclear weapons and with forces trained to use them), and others states under the nuclear umbrella to change their policies. While that may be an appropriate calling for some, many of us will still be engaged with political activism in the coming year.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 20 Jul 1998 11:19:26 -0700 (PDT)
From: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: correction to Annual Meeting report
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: kwood@pop.igc.org

Thanks so much to all of you who compiled these minutes!

A correction: the info for how to subscribe to the nato working group listserv is wrong. This is the correct info:

To subscribe to the NATO Working Group email listserver, send an email message to:

majordomo@igc.apc.org

leave subject line blank

write in body of message:

subscribe start3-europenfz@igc.apc.org <your email address>

Thanks,
Karina.
Karina Wood
U.S. Outreach Coordinator,
Hague Appeal for Peace 1999
43 Nisbet St, 3rd Fl.
Providence, RI 02906
Tel: 401 751-8172
Fax: 401 751-1476
Email: kwood@igc.apc.org

Come to the global conference in The Hague, Netherlands May 11-16 1999!

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Tue, 21 Jul 1998 13:04:15 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Subject: pov-1: July Bulletin from Kingston, Jamaica
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Kingston Peace to the City Campaign
July 1998 Bulletin

In this report we focus on:

1. No peace without Justice: an analysis of the ongoing efforts to realise the ideals of community development;
2. The video documentary: looking through the lenses of experience to chart the way forward;
3. Community Development Council: the constant factor;
4. Gateway to the future: Web Page Awaits Activation Appointment;
5. International Conference on the Sex Trade and the Tourist Industry.

1. No Peace without Justice

Reflecting on the period which has ensued since the writing of the last report, Coordinator of the S-Corner Clinic Angela Stultz-Crawlle noted that Bennetland and the areas surrounding the community are still maintaining the peace. She smiled wryly as she added, "saying peace does not mean absence of war though; it means truce or cease fire. As Board member Horace Levy commented," she added, "you can't have peace if there is no justice. And in this case, justice means putting in the infrastructure which will alleviate the poverty situation." Stultz-Crawlle went on to observe that until the powers-that-be address this urgent need, we as peace keepers can only offer patches and not full coverage to the wounds which the social situation visits on the inner city communities."

In spite of the mitigating factors, the S-Corner staff has been working assiduously with the youth to maintain the flow of positive energy and the spirit of motivation within the structure of the S-Corner project as well as in the wider community. However, this output is severely challenged by the Board recommendation of a severe rationalisation of the staff of the clinic, community college and outreach programmes, resulting in there being less people to do more work. Of course, this recourse results from the cash strapped conditions under which the project personnel have been operating for several months now. "We just could not continue like that," the community activist continued simply. "The Board decided to take drastic action to ensure our survival."

Looking towards the future and the possibilities which exist for the

project to continue to facilitate community change, Stultz-Crawle reasoned that "the challenges to overcome remain numerous but we have to make every effort to maintain our output. For example," she expanded, "we are constantly bombarded with applications for employment, especially from the young men, for whom we really have contacts for few openings. However, we were able to secure employment for three persons including the young man who we described in detail in the May report. He was so distressed by the war being waged among his friends, that he escaped to the sea for a whole day. He is currently employed by another Non-government organisation (NGO) as a watchman. The other two placements were women who got jobs as domestic workers based on our recommendation.

2. Video Documentary: looking through the lenses of experience to chart the way forward

Shooting for the video on the Peace to the city campaign has been completed, no pun intended! The community residents were very receptive to the local crew and co-operated with their efforts to gather the data. It was particularly encouraging to witness the committed participation of the youth who were initially hesitant to have their faces documented due to their previous involvement in activities which did not endear them to the law. However, on receiving assurances from the S-Corner staff that the final production would not highlight their identities, they acquiesced. Their involvement was demonstrative of the undoubted trust which they as well as the wider community have in the S-Corner organisation and its ability to represent their interests.

Bearing in mind that hindsight is reputed to produce a twenty-twenty vision on events which might have been experienced very differently, I decided to interview the project director on her impressions of the impact of the engagement in the project on the participants. She agreed that it is relevant to consider that the truism notwithstanding, reflection is always a worthwhile endeavour in order to distill lessons learnt.

Angela's trip down the memory lane commenced with the inception of the audio-visual engagement some months ago. She recounted that "it was difficult in the beginning to establish the trust that is necessary for a production like this. The youths who were directly involved not only in the video drama but who were also the centre stage actors in real life, were particularly worried," Angela further explained. "They were concerned about what would be done with the final product and how it would portray them. These fears were allayed somewhat during the footage collection period. However, concerns linger, given the explicit revelations which could implicate them with the law."

Angela also expressed reservations about the political implications of the production, given the climate of crime and violence which pervades life in the inner city communities of Kingston and St. Andrew. She said that "at this point, even at the end of the production, I feel as if I have been caught between a rock and a hard place, because you know the factors that has led to all of this injustice all of this fight that is seen on the surface.

"What the video does not show is how people are struggling on a day to day basis to survive. The violence is only a small part of their lives. The video focused on the efforts to maintain peace, so it spoke a lot about the violence and what was happening. It didn't bring out the positives, the things that these youths are also involved in, their efforts to change - which are tremendous, given that their situation has not changed. " She emphasised that the economy is still stagnant and indicators of poverty like the high unemployment rate remain constant. However, in spite of all the hardships, the creativity of community people has been undeniably demonstrated in efforts of self employment and even the maintenance of a joie-de-vie when there seems to be nothing in the environment to even smile about.

Drawing a conclusion on a work in progress was not the project director's choice; she saw more hope in appealing to editorial sensitivity when the final production is being worked on. Her last word was almost confessional in its bare sincerity. She acknowledged freely that she was disappointed that the video stops short of expressing the most important aspects of the protagonists' reality. "I do hope that when the final script is written it will speak to this gap and therefore avoid reinforcing the stereotyped perception of inner-city Kingston," she said, adding, "After all, the ghettos are inhabited by dynamic human beings."

Co-Producer of the video, Hilary Nicholson was also expansive on the complex issues raised by the video project, noting the underlying messages which this form of documentation of the Peace to the City Campaign is likely to convey. Her contribution was poetic in its poignancy as she said, "it's taken me a long time to struggle with the script, knowing as I have to know, that soon these will become bits of peoples' lives, flashing around the world. I thought it would take us much longer to get the trust of people in the community but there was very little hesitation for people to get involved in the project," Ms. Nicholson said. She is one of a three-women team which has done several similar audio-visual documentation projects on a wide variety of subjects in Jamaica. She went on to explain why the participants felt such a level of comfort in spite of the contradictory nature of the tasks to be accomplished.

"Long before we mentioned cameras, Gayatri and I were in the community talking to people about how they felt. Initially, Angela introduced us as the film crew but we were more concerned to say that we were representing the World Council of Churches which was trying to get an understanding around the world of the dynamics of their situation and that the objective was to share the information with communities which has not reached as far as S-Corner in the process of their development. We had to reassure the more suspicious that we were trying to encourage other people to try what they have tried. We cited the example of people in Africa who have some of the same problems, putting that experience in a wider context than the local tribalism which would be highlighted perhaps, on national television."

Hilary continued that it was also necessary to demonstrate that it was not the first time that she or the other members of the film crew were getting involved with development work in the community. She explained that some years ago, "Gayatri and Cynthia were involved in filming the latrine project which made such a difference in the lives of people who

before that did not have access to sanitary facilities."

The action researcher also recalled that they also were responsible for immortalising on film the role played by an individual, Bajie, who used to live at the foot of St. Joseph's Road. A virtual institution in himself, Bajie, now deceased, used to be a part of the Kumina band. Ms. Nicholson observed further that "because they never have the money to go outside their community, when somebody comes in to talk to them it makes a difference. We hung out on St. Joseph's Road, chatting to kids and youth. We went to the church service at the clap-hand church near the open land which adjoins the clinic at the bottom of Brotherton Road. We realised we had to get known, so after that initial visit we also went back another night. That's the kind of stuff we had to do."

Expanding on the results of the trust building process, Nicholson recalled with a note of awe in her voice that "For the past month and a half we were an intimate part of their lives. One of the dons even told us how long he spent in jail; another mentioned the kind of stuff he used to do and no longer did. What happened was that when it was time to come on camera, people were already feeling comfortable with us. The young don initially said "no" she said, "but after talking to him and another leader, they said yes."

Hilary emphasised that the crux of the communication problem was a tradition of low self-esteem; in spite of the apparent hesitation on the part of the main players in the documented drama, there was an underlying desire for recognition. "They want people to be interested in them," she explained. "The reason they are involved in the badness is because it gives them some status. When the idea of the video came along, they were enthusiastic but because they also know that people in the outside world see what they do as badness, they were uncertain. We could relate to this reticence because we understand what political violence is about; it's all about protecting yourself. However, the frankness with which they talked was heartening."

The result of the enthusiastic participation is that the video crew was able to gather much more footage than they had anticipated. According to the experienced activist, "this presents us with a dilemma because the question it raises is: when we edit and create a half-hour documentary which flies across the world to Geneva to the assembly, how in this process of investigative journalism and getting them to be part of the research, do they really benefit from this process? They got involved to the extent that they also made suggestions about who we should talk to and helped to determine who our main sources would be- a mature woman, a mature man and a staff member at S-Corner. But this was not a situation of equal power relations."

There was some discomfort on the part of the audio-visual production team Ms. Nicholson said candidly, owing to the fact that "when they have welcomed us this way, we recognise the inadequacy of the figure which we had included in the budget for contribution to community. "By the time that small amount is spread," she said sadly "it has to be spread so far, that its impact is really insignificant when the needs are so great. They do not want handouts," she said with emphasis. "What they need

is better houses and piped water. The latrines and pipe water put in by S-Corner a few years ago, transformed community but it is not enough since not everyone has access to these amenities. They need sports facilities. They now play on a barren piece of land earmarked for a housing project which has not yet started. They really need an opportunity to enjoy the basic necessities of life."

Having been so keenly stimulated by their engagement in the representation of the stories of their lives, it is to be hoped that the dreams of the community for improvement of self and the space they occupy will not be deferred but realised, before too long.

3. Community Development Council: the Constant Factor

We had the monthly Community Development Council meeting which aimed to strengthen the structure of the organisation by formalising an Executive body. This body which was appointed with immediate effect, will serve as the head of the community council; the President will sit on the S-Corner board and act as mediator between the community council and the S-corner Project. Mr. Irvin Munroe, long-time community activist, was elected as to the post of President.

4. Gateway to the Future: Web Page Awaits Activation Appointment

The web page has been completed; however, Cable and Wireless of Jamaica, the local telephone installation company, has assured us that they will not have any vacancies in their net system to host our web page until August. However we have an email address which is currently active. This address is jolee@cwjamaica.com.

5. International Conference on the Sex Trade, Tourism and Caribbean Development

For the past four months I extended my repertoire of activities to include coordination of a conference which was called to consider the contradictions inherent in the insidious collaboration which exists in the Caribbean between the sex trade, the world's oldest profession, and tourism, the region's largest foreign exchange earner. The event was a tremendous success with participation of over one hundred persons representing concerned local and overseas agencies as well as individuals.

The regional conference was entitled *The Working Sex: Caribbean Development, Tourism, Sex and Work*, and took place from July 16 through 17 at the Jamaica Conference Centre, Kingston. The conference was the culmination of a collaborative research project entitled *Tourism and the Sex Trade in the Caribbean*. The research was based on field interviews undertaken by researchers in the eight Caribbean countries of Barbados, Guyana, Suriname, Belize, Jamaica, The Dominican Republic, Curacao, and in Cartagena - the Caribbean coast of Colombia.

The Conference which was hosted by the Mona Unit of the Centre for

Gender and Development Studies, University of the West Indies. Their representatives, Shirley Campbell and Althea Perkins, along with the other researchers, from the region all presented preliminary findings on issues surrounding the life style, conditions of work, health concerns and the relationship between tourism and the sex trade.

The research project has been jointly co-ordinated and funded by the Caribbean Association for Feminist Research and Action (CAFRA), Women's Studies Program, University of Colorado-Boulder, and Instituto Latinoamericano de Services Legales Colorado-Boulder, and Instituto Latinoamericano de Services Legales Alternatives (ILSA).

Other financial sponsorship for the conference initiative was forthcoming from

- the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands
- Mama Cash Foundation
- The Tides Foundation
- Inter Pares/Consejeria
- The University of Colorado
- UNIFEM

Preliminary research findings for the Jamaican study were presented on the first day of the conference. Research in the Jamaican sex trade was conducted in three tourist resort locations on Jamaica's North Coast. A life history method was used to gather data among commercial sex workers. Key informants involved in the industry and related agencies such as health and security institutions were also interviewed. The research sites were Ocho Rios, in St. Ann; Montego Bay in St. James and Negril in Hanover/Westmoreland.

The study does not make final or definitive claims about this industry and its workers. It presents exploratory findings in an area of employment which is little understood and under researched. The researchers feel that inferences are indicated which at minimum provide grounds for further study by appropriate policy makers and related institutions.

Written by Imani Tafari-Ama who is a multi-media journalist and action researcher concerned with development issues affecting the poor. She is currently engaged in research on gender, power and sexuality in Paradise Gardens, one of Kingston's inner-city communities as part of the requirements for a Ph.D. degree in Development Studies at the Institute of Social Studies, the Hague, the Netherlands.

Local Coordinator for the Kingston Peace to the City Campaign:

Ms. Angela Stultz-Crawlle
S-Corner Clinic and Community Development
18 St. Joseph Road
Kingston 13
Jamaica
Tel./Fax: +1-876-923-0672
Email: jolee@cwjamaica.com

----- End of message from list: pov-l ---->

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 21 Jul 1998 08:10:08 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: more CTBT polling: NEBRASKA

July 21, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: new public opinion survey on NEBRASKA voter attitudes on the CTBT

These polling results are even more supportive of the CTBT than those from Kansas.

The following is the e-mail version of our press release on a new bipartisan poll on Nebraska voter attitudes on the CTBT, South Asian testing, and related non-proliferation issues. This is the second of six state-specific polls that follow -up our national CTBT poll from May 1998.

For a full-color version of the release (with charts); the pollsters' detailed analysis of the survey responses; survey questions; and related national polling results, visit the Coalition's CTBT Site <<http://www.clw.org/org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Look for additional polling results from other states over the next few days.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: July 21, 1998

CONTACT: Adam Eiding, 202-547-3577; or Daryl Kimball, Director (202) 546-0795

"Eight Out of Ten Nebraskans Support Senate Approval of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty"

WASHINGTON, DC -- An overwhelming majority of Nebraska voters want the Senate to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), according to a new bipartisan, statewide poll released today. When asked: "Do you think the U.S. Senate should approve a Treaty with 140 other countries that would prohibit underground nuclear weapons explosions worldwide," 83% of Nebraska voters say the treaty should be approved, while only 13% say it should not be approved. Support for the treaty is strong among Republicans (79% approve), Democrats (89% approve) and independents (81% approve), and among all demographic and geographics groups in the state. Support for the CTBT in Nebraska (83%) is even higher than it is nationwide (73%, according to a May 1998 survey).

The Nebraska poll was commissioned by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear

Dangers, a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control organizations. The survey results are based on the findings of an opinion survey of 400 registered Nebraska voters conducted by Wirthlin Worldwide, a Republican polling firm, and a Democratic firm, The Mellman Group from June 20-24, 1998. The statistical margin for error is plus or minus 4.9%.

The test ban treaty was submitted to the Senate last year, but the Senate has so far failed to act on the treaty, which has gained new significance since India and Pakistan conducted nuclear blasts in May and June. The current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of staff and four previous chairmen, including Gen. Colin Powell, have endorsed the CTBT.

"The test ban treaty is clearly in our security interests. The vast majority of Americans agree. But a very few Senate leaders are unwisely blocking a vote -- and even debate -- on the treaty. Now is the time for action, not delay," says retired Nebraska Senator J. James Exon, author of the 1992 law that led to the current U.S. nuclear test moratorium.

Exon, an early backer of the test ban, has encouraged Nebraska's current Senators, Robert Kerrey (D) and Chuck Hagel (R), to play a more active role in bringing the treaty to a vote. "I am confident that the treaty will win more than the sixty-seven votes needed for ratification, if Senate leaders allow a vote."

Nebraskans See Test Ban As "More Important" After South Asian Nuclear Tests:

Despite the repeated calls, Senate leaders Trent Lott (R-MS) and Jesse Helms (R-NC) have defied public opinion and labeled the treaty "irrelevant." However, Nebraskans disagree. Seventy percent of Nebraskans said that they think the recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan "demonstrate how important it is for the U.S. to ratify and encourage global implementation of the CTBT." Nebraskans have a high level of awareness of the nuclear testing by India and Pakistan. Eighty-one percent of Nebraska voters say they have heard about the tests, with 85% saying the tests pose a "serious threat to international security."

Nebraska voters were also asked whether they "favor" or "oppose" a variety of possible U.S. government responses to the tests by India and Pakistan. An overwhelming 87% favor urging India and Pakistan to approve the test ban and 75% favor U.S. ratification of the CTBT as the best responses. These proposals were far more popular than imposing sanctions (58% in favor, 31% opposed), or increasing military spending to develop and deploy a nuclear missile defense (32% in favor, 62% opposed).

"The Senate's do-nothing approach on the test ban treaty is irresponsible and dangerous. It hurts efforts to protect America and the world from the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the possibility of nuclear war. The overwhelming public support for the test ban is a wake-up call for the Senate to approve the treaty and stop nuclear blasts worldwide," says Daryl Kimball, Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

Another survey question reveals that when given the choice between two possible candidates for Senate: one who supports the CTBT and the other who opposes the CTBT, 69% of Nebraskans solidly prefer a candidate who supports

the CTBT (while only 23% would support a candidate who opposes the treaty).

-- 30 --

For survey questions, detailed analysis of the survey results, or inquires for the availability of spokespersons for interview, including Senator Exon, please contact Adam Eiding at 202-547-3577.

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of the nation's 17 leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers and prevent new threats from emerging. The Coalition's CTBT site is:
<<http://www.clw.org/org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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: Wed, 22 Jul 1998 08:03:18 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: ISSUE BRIEF #17: pro-CTBT editorials, pt. 2

July 22, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball
RE: pro-CTBT editorials keep pouring in

The following "Issue Brief" includes excerpts from 19 newspaper editorials calling for Senate action and approval of the CTBT since the Indian nuclear blasts of May 13.

Since the CTBT was transmitted to the Senate on Sept. 24, 1997, 68 newspaper editorials have expressed support for the CTBT and/or for prompt Senate action, while only 2 editorials have expressed opposition.

The editorials further amplify the fact -- so clearly demonstrated through the new state polls on the CTBT -- that Senator Helms' and Lott's are completely out of step with popular and elite opinion on the issue.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF

VOL. 2, NO. 17, July 22, 1998

"America's Editors Back Test Ban Treaty, Pt. 2:
Say Indian-Pakistani Nuke Blasts Underscore Need for Senate Approval"

LAST MONTH'S NUCLEAR weapons tests by India and Pakistan prompted condemnation and calls for implementation of the treaty that would ban such tests -- the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Those calls came from political leaders and from scores of editorials and op-eds in America's newspapers. The consistent message is that India and Pakistan must join the Test Ban Treaty regime and to help force them to do so, the U.S. Senate should debate and approve the CTBT without further delay.

Since the treaty was transmitted to the Senate nearly nine months ago, an overwhelming 68 newspaper editorials have expressed support for the CTBT and/or for prompt Senate action, while only 2 editorials have expressed opposition. The following are excerpts from editorials published by 19 of the nation's leading newspapers since India's May 13 test blasts:

The Dallas Morning News, "Sen. Helms should stop blocking ratification vote," July 12, 1998:

"Senator No is up to his old tricks. Jesse Helms, the North Carolina Republican who chairs the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, refuses to hold a public hearing on a treaty to ban all nuclear weapon tests. By doing so, he prevents the Senate from holding a ratification vote. The ultimate effect of his obstructionism could be to reverse the recent trend to nuclear nonproliferation.

Senator No's tactics are an affront to democracy. It is wrong for one politician to, in effect, tell the people's representatives that they may not conduct normal business. Sens. Phil Gramm and Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas should support a resolution by Sens. Joseph Biden, D-Del., and Arlen Specter, R-Pa., that calls for hearings and a ratification vote this year. Mr. Helms is plotting a risky course. He should relent before the seeds of nuclear proliferation sown by India and Pakistan take strong root and multiply."

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, "Timely Treaty," June 23, 1998:

"In response to recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan, the United States imposed congressionally mandated sanctions and urged the two nations to join the international nonproliferation regime -- as nonnuclear states. But that message is undermined when the United States itself is slow to give full support to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. President Clinton submitted the treaty to the Senate in 1996, but it has yet to be ratified. Sen. Jesse Helms, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has refused to hold hearings on the agreement. Republican Sen. Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania and Sen. Joseph Biden of Delaware ... on the Foreign Relations Committee, are circulating a Senate resolution that calls for hearings and expedited debate and vote on the CTBT. Sen. Helms should listen to his colleagues, the president and the American people."

Omaha World-Herald, "Nuclear Test Ban Pact Bad or Good? Helms Won't Even Allow a Look," June 11, 1998:

"Sen. Jesse Helms, R.-N.C., has planted himself in the way of another piece of business that deserves to be considered by the entire Senate: the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. As things stand, Helms has substituted his judgement for that of his 99 fellow senators, saying, in effect, that the discussion is over. That isn't the way such matters should be decided. The Constitution says that the Senate shall have the power to ratify treaties, not that one senator should be able to decide for all. It would be well if Biden and Specter succeed in getting the matter out for consideration."

The Winston-Salem Journal, "Strict Sanctions Don't Work," June 4, 1998:

"The other thing that Congress should do is ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty that the U.S. has already signed. Then the United States would be leading by example rather than trying to coerce through automatic sanctions laws that don't work."

The Akron Beacon Journal and Idaho Post-Register, "Strict Sanctions Don't

Work," June 1 and June 3, 1998:

"For its part, the United States could complement its more punitive measures by setting an example. It should finally ratify the test-ban accord."

The New York Times, "Keeping Nuclear Arms in Check," May 19, 1998:

"As difficult as it may be, India and Pakistan must be persuaded to sign and abide by the 1996 test ban treaty that has now been signed by 149 nations. By joining the treaty, India and Pakistan would bind themselves to refrain from any future testing. Enlisting India and Pakistan would be easier if the Senate ratified the test ban treaty, now irresponsibly held up by Senator Jesse Helms. Once again, the capricious chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is holding the nation's interest hostage to his ideological whims. Ratification would allow Washington to participate in a review conference next year that will develop diplomatic strategies for bringing holdout nations into the treaty."

The Birmingham Post-Herald, "The Test Ban Treaty," May 19, 1998 and The Rocky Mountain News, "Approve Test Ban Treaty," May 18, 1998:

"U.S. action on the [test ban] treaty could prompt action by other nations. Once it is in force, there would be enormous political pressure on all nations to live up to its terms. The best way for Helms to serve America's national security interests is not to keep thwarting a vote by the full Senate, but to allow one."

Newsday, "'We Welcome N-tests' ... But the Rest of Us Sure Don't," May 17, 1998:

"[India's testing] adds great urgency to the effort to will full adoption of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which has yet to be ratified by the U.S. Senate."

The Washington Post, "Test Time for Pakistan," May 15, 1998:

"The [test ban] treaty does not come into effect until India and at least 39 other nations with civilian nuclear power accept it. The U.S. Senate, which has been sitting on this treaty, should ratify it now."

Dayton Daily News, "U.S. Should Ratify Nuclear Test Ban Treaty," May 15, 1998:

"... the Senate ought to shove Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms out of the way and ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. What [the treaty] would do is give the signers more solidarity with which to pressure others not to test"

Palm Beach Post, "Nuking our security," May 14, 1998:

"Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R.-Miss., says India's nuclear tests mean the Senate won't ratify the United Nations-sponsored nuclear test ban treaty. Once again, Sen. Lott and other U.N.-bashers are attacking the institutions and methods that could improve American and world security."

Cincinnati Post, "India's Nuclear Genie," May 14, 1998:

"The United States might have a little better moral standing on this issue if the Senate would ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty."

The Oregonian, "Losing the Nuclear Demon," May 14, 1998:

"India's nuclear testing shows the urgency of obtaining a worldwide and binding treaty banning nuclear tests. Ironically, though, it actually jeopardizes U.S. ratification of the treaty already negotiated and signed by 149 nations. And if India can defy international opinion, other ambitious nations thinking of developing a nuclear arsenal are likely to wonder why they can't proceed also."

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, "Of Nukes and Nationalism," May 13, 1998:

"The three nuclear explosions that thundered beneath the desert in India's Rajasthan province did more than ignite fears of a regional nuclear arms race. They caught the United States in its own hypocrisy, unable to exert moral leadership in the world community. America's moral dilemma lies at the doorstep of our own homegrown nationalist, Sen. Jesse Helms, who has helped prevent ratification of the only international accord that provides leverage to deal with developing nuclear states. The United States would be in an excellent position to condemn India if we had ratified the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We have not, thanks to Senator Helms. Without ratifying the treaty, the United States can only talk out of both sides of its mouth."

The Denver Post, "Subcommittee gone MAD," May 13, 1998:

"Moreover, while the United States has pressured other countries to abide by nuclear non-proliferation pacts, its own Senate hasn't yet voted on the crucial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty -- indeed, U.S. Sen. Jesse Helms, who chairs the pivotal Foreign Relations committee, has refused to even schedule a hearing on the matter."

Syracuse Herald-Journal, "Nuclear Tests in India: Use Sanctions to Head Off Crisis," May 13, 1998:

"The U.S. foothold on the moral high ground is wobbly, however, as the Senate has not yet ratified the test ban treaty. In both India and the United States, the obstructionists are concerned more about domestic politics than foreign enemies."

Portland Press Herald, "India's reckless act restarts the arms race," May 13, 1998:

"The case for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and somehow forcing India (as well as Pakistan) to the table, grows stronger every day."

###

See the Coalition's CTBT Site

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

for the full text of these and other CTBT-related editorials and op-eds. The Coalition

is a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

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: Wed, 22 Jul 1998 08:11:53 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: even stronger CTBT poll results: OREGON

July 22, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: new public opinion survey on OREGON voter attitudes on the CTBT

The following is the e-mail version of our press release on a new bipartisan poll on Oregon voter attitudes on the CTBT, South Asian testing, and related non-proliferation issues. This is the third of six state-specific polls that follow -up our national CTBT poll from May 1998.

For a full-color version of the release (with charts); the pollsters' detailed analysis of the survey responses; survey questions; and related national polling results, visit the Coalition's CTBT Site
<<http://www.clw.org/org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Look for additional polling results from Ohio, Tennessee, and Utah over the next few days.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: July 22, 1998

CONTACT: Adam Eiding, 202-547-3577; or Daryl Kimball, Director (202) 546-0795

"86% of Oregon Voters Support Senate Approval of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty"

WASHINGTON, DC -- Oregonians are nearly unanimous in their support for Senate approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), according to a new bipartisan, statewide poll released today. When asked: "Do you think the U.S. Senate should approve a Treaty with 140 other countries that would prohibit underground nuclear weapons explosions worldwide," 86% of Oregon voters say the treaty should be approved and more than three-quarters (76%) of whom "strongly support" approval. Only 10% say it should not be approved. Support for the treaty is overwhelming among Republicans (84% approve), Democrats (87% approve) and independents (91% approve). Indeed, support cuts across every demographic and geographic group. Support for the CTBT in Oregon (86%) is even higher than it is nationwide (73%, according to a May 1998 survey).

The poll was commissioned by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a

non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control organizations. The survey results are based on the findings of an opinion survey of 400 registered Oregon voters conducted by Wirthlin Worldwide, a Republican polling firm, and a Democratic firm, The Mellman Group from June 20- 24, 1998. The statistical margin of error is plus or minus 4.9%.

The test ban treaty was submitted to the Senate last year, but the Senate has so far failed to act on the treaty, which has gained new significance since India and Pakistan conducted nuclear blasts in May and June. The current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of staff and four previous chairmen, including Gen. Colin Powell, have endorsed the CTBT.

"Now is the time for Congressional leaders to act, not to delay or stand idly by. The test ban treaty is clearly in our security interests and Oregonians and the vast majority of Americans wholeheartedly agree. Unfortunately, a very few Senate leaders are unwisely blocking a vote -- and even debate -- on the treaty," says former Oregon Congressman Michael J. Kopetski, author of the 1992 law that led to the current U.S. nuclear test moratorium.

"President Clinton and the Senate must work together to stop nuclear testing before the seeds of nuclear proliferation take stronger root in South Asia and elsewhere around the globe," he added.

Oregonians See Test Ban As "More Important" After South Asian Nuclear Tests:

Despite the repeated calls, Senate leaders Trent Lott (R-MS) and Jesse Helms (R-NC) have defied public opinion and labeled the treaty "irrelevant." Such thinking is out of step with the views of Oregonians. Eighty percent of Oregonians said that they think the recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan "demonstrate how important it is for the U.S. to ratify and encourage global implementation of the CTBT." Oregonians have a high level of awareness of the nuclear testing by India and Pakistan. Eighty-seven percent of Oregon voters say they have heard about the tests, with 86% saying the tests pose a "serious threat to international security."

Oregon voters were also asked whether they "favor" or "oppose" a variety of possible U.S. government responses to the tests by India and Pakistan. An overwhelming 90% favor urging India and Pakistan to approve the test ban and 79% favor U.S. ratification of the CTBT as the best responses. These proposals were far more popular than imposing strong economic and political sanctions (62% in favor, 27% opposed), or increasing military spending to develop and deploy a nuclear missile defense (23% in favor, 73% opposed).

"The Senate's do-nothing approach on the test ban treaty is irresponsible and dangerous. It hurts efforts to protect America and the world from the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the possibility of nuclear war. The overwhelming public support for the test ban is a wake-up call for the Senate to approve the treaty and stop nuclear blasts worldwide," says Daryl Kimball, Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

Another survey question reveals that when given the choice between two possible candidates for Senate -- one who supports the CTBT and the other who opposes the CTBT -- 73% of Oregonians solidly prefer a candidate who

supports the CTBT, while only 20% would support a candidate who opposes the treaty.

-- 30 --

For survey questions, detailed analysis of the survey results, or inquires for the availability of spokespersons for interview, including Congressman Kopetski, please contact Adam Eiding at 202-547-3577.

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of the nation's 17 leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers and prevent new threats from emerging. The Coalition's CTBT site is:

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

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

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: bmusil, btiller
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: A de-alerting campaign
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Bob and Bob:

Discussion at the CDI forum on Tuesday convinced me more than ever that we should mount an intense campaign on de-alerting during the remaining months of 1998. Here are a few, stream-of-consciousness ideas to start discussion.

A. Prior to Clinton-Yeltsin summit

1. Sign-on letter to Clinton and Yeltsin from peace activists (secular and religious) here and abroad. See previous draft.
2. Similar communications from "elite", such as Cranston's lists of military and civilian leaders; persons associated with UCS, Arms Control Association, etc.
3. Letters from members of Congress to Clinton (may be difficult during August recess).
4. Ask Bruce Blair to provide an illustrative, month-by-month schedule for de-alerting to zero within one year, applicable for all five, de jure nuclear weapon states.
5. News release of these letters and Blair's schedule (may be hard to get coverage).
6. Delegation calls on Clinton's national security staff prior to summit.

B. Develop and carry out a grassroots campaign, focused on influencing President Clinton

1. Enlist participating organizations, secular and religious
 - a. Offer a draft proposal for a campaign
 - b. Discuss with Nuclear Weapons Working Group and religious CTBT working group
2. Decide whether a special campaign committee is needed or to handle by existing working groups.
3. Assemble available educational material; prepare new material if necessary.
4. Prepare for outreach to grassroots activists.
5. Start grassroots campaign as Congress adjourns.
6. To be decided: whether to start public pressure on Clinton during the election season or wait until after the election and have five or six weeks of intensive pressure up to mid-December.
7. Use techniques of CTBT campaign, such as letter blitz, call-in day, editorials, letters to the editor, radio talk shows, shadow Clinton and other administration officials, etc.

C. Develop and carry out a parallel campaign by the "elite" to influence Clinton.

1. Details to be developed.

What do you think about this approach?

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>

Date: Wed, 22 Jul 1998 12:47:02 -0400

From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility

To: bmusil@psr.org, bharner@ix.netcom.com, panukes@igc.org, rac_uahc@csi.com, dkimball@clw.org, dculp@nrdc.org, paprog@igc.org, paexec@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, jsmith@clw.org, joe@fcnl.org, kyourish@hotmail.com, disarmament@igc.org, kathy@fcnl.org, wandwill@clark.net, ledwidge@psr.org, ctb@2020vision.org, meldredge@igc.org, armsintern@ucsusa.org, mfonte@clw.org, vision@2020vision.org, stevenraikin@delphi.com, tperry@ucsusa.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org

Subject: CTBT grassroots meeting

The next Grassroots CTBT meeting will be one week from tomorrow:

Date: Thursday, July 30th

Time: 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon

Place: FCNL, 245 2nd Street N.E.

Our last three meetings have been very productive, with good ideas and lots of energy. Please join us next week as we make decisions and commitments about our grassroots CTBT efforts.

If you took assignments at the last meeting, please work on them and bring a report!

* * * * *

Notes from the Grassroots CTBT meeting of 6-25-98:

1. Mailing to Mississippi activists --- Bruce Hall is still planning to send postcards, which would urge people to write to Lott on CTBT, but he has not received the money from Ploughshares yet. Send your Mississippi mailing labels to Bruce, or give him an order for cards that you will send out.

2. Mississippi conference call --- Marie Rietmann is coordinating a call for activists, to be held approximately July 30th. Contact her with names of potential participants, also with ideas for the call.

3. College Democrats conference July 8-9 --- Everything is set: program ad, table, videos. Thanks to the committee doing this.

4. July 16th events:

a. Peace Action flyers --- both generalized and state-specific, emphasizing the call-in day to Senators.

b. Roots on the Radio --- Marie Rietmann needs some local "experts" who will call-in to talk shows.

c. PSR, UCS, and WILPF are also doing mailings, emphasizing the July 16th call-in day to Senators.

d. We decided not to try for a "Day of Action" on July 16th (other than the Senate call-in and talk-show call-in), because it will be too soon after the May 28th actions.

e. Kathy Crandall has the call-in day logo available for downloading and printing.

5. Daryl Kimball has mailing labels for 217 groups that support CTBT ratification. Call him if you want labels for mailings.

6. Daryl reported on the CTBT polling in KS, TN, UT, NE, OR. Raw results in tomorrow. Release of the analyzed results in mid-July, using local and D.C. media. He is looking for some local "stars" to help with the publicity/media in those states.

7. State CTBT organizers --- Most of the states receiving special grants have hired their organizers. A conference call is scheduled for June 29th, to provide training, planning and coordination for their work. Kathy Crandall is the overall coordinator.

8. Religious leaders breakfast on CTBT --- FCNL and Howard Hallman are working on this, hoping to have it in July.

9. Action kit on CTBT --- FCNL is preparing an organizers kit, oriented around August 6-9 actions. Available around July 10th.

10. August 6-9 events:

a. Lisa Ledwidge is compiling a list of events around the country, so send information to her.

b. Bruce Hall and Kathy Crandall will pull packets together for organizers of August 6-9 events and send them out. Send items to them for inclusion in the packets.

11. Ratification message --- The Specter-Biden resolution is likely to be voted on with little advance warning. We will need to drop everything, get alerts out, make calls, etc. So draft your alerts in advance and have them ready. Tell your roots in advance, so that they will be ready when you send your messages out. Kathy Crandall will draft a faxable alert on Specter-Biden.

12. Fax blasts to activists --- Kathy Crandall is willing to do fax blasts to activists if we want her to. The aim is to reach the next tier out from the hard core CTBT followers. Also can be used for very urgent messages.

Shalom,
Bob Tiller

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Wed, 22 Jul 1998 12:59:12 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Religious leaders statements

Howard,

At the CTBT grassroots meeting of 6-4-98, you reported that: you are working on an international religious leaders statement, that work is being done on state/local statements, and that Robert McNamara is working on something from religious leaders. Can you give a brief report on these activities at the next CTBT grassroots meeting?

Shalom,
Bob T.

To: dave
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: De-alerting campaign
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dave:

Here are two items I sent to Bob Musil and Bob Tiller regarding a possible de-alerting campaign. The first is a draft letter to Clinton and Yeltsin. The second is a rough outline of some campaign ideas.

I'd would like your reactions.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Draft letter on de-alerting, written by Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice; phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org. July 20, 1998

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear Mr. Presidents:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millenium with all nuclear weapons taken off alert through separation of warheads from their delivery vehicles and other means. We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning following misinterpretation of data from objects in space. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two agreed to stop aiming strategy missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to the next step of de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of study groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), the

National Academy of Science in the United States (1997), a panel of military leaders from around the globe (1996), and a panel of past and present heads of states and other civilian leaders from numerous countries (1998). It has the support of all the undersigned. Furthermore, de-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction.

Sincerely yours,

###

July 22, 1998

Dear Bob and Bob:

Discussion at the CDI forum on Tuesday convinced me more than ever that we should mount an intense campaign on de-alerting during the remaining months of 1998. Here are a few, stream-of-consciousness ideas to start discussion.

A. Prior to Clinton-Yeltsin summit

1. Sign-on letter to Clinton and Yeltsin from peace activists (secular and religious) here and abroad. See previous draft.
2. Similar communications from "elite", such as Cranston's lists of military and civilian leaders; persons associated with UCS, Arms Control Association, etc.
3. Letters from members of Congress to Clinton (may be difficult during August recess).
4. Ask Bruce Blair to provide an illustrative, month-by-month schedule for de-alerting to zero within one year, applicable for all five, de jure nuclear weapon states.
5. News release of these letters and Blair's schedule (may be hard to get coverage).
6. Delegation calls on Clinton's national security staff prior to summit.

B. Develop and carry out a grassroots campaign, focused on influencing President Clinton

1. Enlist participating organizations, secular and religious
 - a. Offer a draft proposal for a campaign
 - b. Discuss with Nuclear Weapons Working Group and religious CTBT working group
2. Decide whether a special campaign committee is needed or to handle by existing working groups.
3. Assemble available educational material; prepare new material if necessary.
4. Prepare for outreach to grassroots activists.
5. Start grassroots campaign as Congress adjourns.
6. To be decided: whether to start public pressure on Clinton during the election season or wait until after the election and have five or six weeks of intensive pressure up to mid-December.
7. Use techniques of CTBT campaign, such as letter blitz, call-in day, editorials, letters to the editor, radio talk shows, shadow Clinton and other administration officials, etc.

C. Develop and carry out a parallel campaign by the "elite" to influence Clinton.

1. Details to be developed.

What do you think about this approach?

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
CC: caucus Abolition <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Date: Wed, 22 Jul 1998 12:43:23 -0400
From: Stephen Young <syoun@basicint.org>
Organization: BASIC
References: <35B604A1.F0B3F555@peacenet.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Launch-on-warning alert status info please?
To: wsantelmann@peacenet.org

The best article of late appeared in Scientific American, by Bruce Blair and others.

If you have web access, it (along with some good links) is at:

<http://www.sciam.com/1197issue/1197vonhippel.html>

For those that don't, plus for quick reference, I paste the text below. (Sorry its a very long essay, but its very good.)

Stephen Young
BASIC

Taking Nuclear Weapons off Hair-Trigger Alert

It is time to end the practice of keeping nuclear missiles constantly ready to fire. This change would greatly reduce the possibility of a mistaken launch

by Bruce G. Blair, Harold A. Feiveson and Frank N. von Hippel

On January 25, 1995, military technicians at a handful of radar stations across northern Russia saw a troubling blip suddenly appear on their screens. A rocket, launched from somewhere off the coast of Norway, was rising rapidly through the night sky. Well aware that a single missile from a U.S. submarine plying those waters could scatter eight nuclear bombs over Moscow within 15 minutes, the radar operators immediately alerted their superiors. The message passed swiftly from Russian military authorities to President Boris Yeltsin, who, holding the electronic case that could order the firing of nuclear missiles in response, hurriedly conferred by telephone with his top advisers. For the first time ever, that "nuclear briefcase" was activated for emergency use.

For a few tense minutes, the trajectory of the mysterious rocket remained unknown to the worried Russian officials. Anxiety mounted when the separation of multiple rocket stages created an impression of a possible attack by several missiles. But the radar crews continued to track their targets, and after about eight minutes (just a few minutes short of the procedural deadline to respond to an impending nuclear attack), senior military officers determined that the rocket was headed far out to sea and posed no threat to Russia. The unidentified rocket in this case turned out to be a U.S. scientific probe, sent up to

investigate the northern lights. Weeks earlier the Norwegians had duly informed Russian authorities of the planned launch from the offshore island of Andoya, but somehow word of the high-altitude experiment had not reached the right ears.

That frightening incident (like some previous false alarms that activated U.S. strategic forces) aptly demonstrates the danger of maintaining nuclear arsenals in a state of hair-trigger alert. Doing so heightens the possibility that one day someone will mistakenly launch nuclear-tipped missiles, either because of a technical failure or a human error--a mistake made, perhaps, in the rush to respond to false indications of an attack.

Both the U.S. and Russian military have long instituted procedures to prevent such a calamity from happening. Designers of command systems in Russia have gone to extraordinary lengths to ensure strict central control over nuclear weapons. But their equipment is not foolproof, and Russia's early-warning and nuclear command systems are deteriorating. This past February the institute responsible for designing the sophisticated control systems for the Strategic Rocket Forces (the military unit that operates Russian intercontinental ballistic missiles) staged a one-day strike to protest pay arrears and the lack of resources to upgrade their equipment. Three days later Russia's defense minister, Igor Rodionov, asserted that "if the shortage of funds persists ... Russia may soon approach a threshold beyond which its missiles and nuclear systems become uncontrollable."

Rodionov's warning may have been, in part, a maneuver to muster political support for greater defense spending. But recent reports by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency confirm that Russia's Strategic Rocket Forces have indeed fallen on hard times. Local utility managers have repeatedly shut off the power to various nuclear weapons installations after the military authorities there failed to pay their electric bills. Worse yet, the equipment that controls nuclear weapons frequently malfunctions, and critical electronic devices and computers sometimes switch to a combat mode for no apparent reason. On seven occasions during the fall of 1996, operations at some nuclear weapons centers were severely disrupted when thieves tried to "mine" critical communications cables for their copper.

Many of the radars constructed by the former Soviet Union to detect a ballistic-missile attack no longer operate, so information provided by these installations is becoming increasingly unreliable. Even the nuclear suitcases that accompany the president, defense minister and chief of the General Staff are reportedly falling into disrepair. In short, the systems built to control Russian nuclear weapons are now crumbling.

In addition to these many technical difficulties, Russia's nuclear weapons establishment suffers from a host of human and organizational problems. Crews receive less training than they did formerly and are consequently less proficient in the safe handling of nuclear weapons. And despite President Yeltsin's promises to improve conditions, endemic housing and food shortages have led to demoralization and disaffection

within the elite Strategic Rocket Forces, the strategic submarine fleet and the custodians of Russia's stockpiles of nuclear warheads. As a result, the likelihood increases that desperate low-level commanders might disregard safety rules or, worse still, that they might take unauthorized control of nuclear weapons--something a deteriorating central command might be unable to prevent or counter. Although most Russian launch crews would need to receive special codes held by the General Staff before they could fire their missiles, one recent CIA report warned that some submarine crews may be able to launch the ballistic missiles on board their vessels without having to obtain such information

Even at the top, control over nuclear weapons could splinter along various political fault lines. Relations between politicians and military leaders in Russia are strained, and physical control of the launch codes remains in the hands of the military. Thus, the authority to fire ballistic missiles could be usurped by military commanders during an internal crisis. In fact, during the August 1991 coup against President Mikhail S. Gorbachev, top-level allegiances suddenly shifted, and the normal chain of command for Russia's nuclear weapons was broken. For three days, the power to launch nuclear weapons rested in the hands of Defense Minister Dmitri Yazov and the chief of the General Staff, Mikhail Moiseyev. Given the dire conditions in Russia, something similar could happen again.

The Nuclear Hair Trigger

Although international relations have changed drastically since the end of the cold war, both Russia and the U.S. continue to keep the bulk of their nuclear missiles on high-level alert. So within just a few minutes of receiving instructions to fire, a large fraction of the U.S. and Russian land-based rockets (which are armed with about 2,000 and 3,500 warheads, respectively) could begin their 25-minute flights over the North Pole to their wartime targets. Less than 15 minutes after receiving the order to attack, six U.S. Trident submarines at sea could loft roughly 1,000 warheads, and several Russian ballistic-missile submarines could dispatch between 300 and 400. In sum, the two nuclear superpowers remain ready to fire a total of more than 5,000 nuclear weapons at each other within half an hour.

Why do two countries at peace retain such aggressive postures, ones that perpetuate the danger of a mistaken or unauthorized launch? Because military planners on both sides remain fixated on the remote specter of a deliberate nuclear surprise attack from their former adversary. They assume that such a "first strike" would be aimed against their own strategic nuclear weapons and the command centers that direct them. To deter such an assault, each country strives to ensure that it could respond with a forceful counterattack against the full spectrum of military targets on its opponent's territory, including all nuclear weapons installations. This requirement saddles military planners with a task virtually identical in scope to mounting a first strike: they must be able to guarantee the rapid destruction of thousands of targets spread across a distant continent.

In order to meet this demand, both the U.S. and Russia rely on a launch-on-warning strategy--that is, each side is poised to release a massive retaliatory missile salvo after detecting an enemy missile attack but before the incoming warheads arrive (which might take just 15 minutes if they were fired from submarines nearby). Although it has thousands of warheads securely deployed at sea, the U.S. adheres to this quick-draw stance because of the vulnerability of its missile silos and command apparatus, including its political and military leadership in Washington, D.C.

Russian officials perceive an even greater need to launch their missiles on warning. The General Staff evidently fears that if its nuclear missiles are not launched immediately, then only tens of them would be able to respond after absorbing a systematic U.S. attack. Russian command posts and missile silos are as vulnerable as those of the U.S. to a massive assault.

Russia's current inability to deploy many of its most survivable forces--submarines at sea and mobile land-based rockets--amplifies this worry. A lack of resources and qualified personnel has forced the Russian navy to cut back operations considerably. At present, the Russian navy typically keeps only two of its 26 ballistic missile submarines at sea on combat patrol at any one time. Similar constraints prevent Russia from hiding more than one or two regiments of its truck-mounted mobile missiles by dispersing them in the field. The remaining 40 or so regiments, each controlling nine single-warhead missiles, keep their trucks parked in garages. These missiles are more exposed to attack than those housed in underground silos. Russia also has 36 10-warhead nuclear missiles carried on railway cars, which were designed to be hidden along Russia's vast rail network. But these railcars remain confined to fixed garrisons in keeping with a decision made by President Gorbachev in 1991.

These vulnerabilities have led Russia to ready some of its submarines in port and mobile missiles in garages to launch on warning, along with the missiles in silos. The time available for deciding to launch these weapons is shortened by the presence of American, British and French submarines cruising in the North Atlantic, only about 2,000 miles (3,200 kilometers) from Moscow. This proximity means that the nuclear-release procedures in Russia require a response time of less than 15 minutes: a few minutes for detecting an attack, another few minutes for top-level decision making and a few minutes for disseminating the launch order. Russian leaders and missile controllers are geared to work within this brief time frame and practice regularly with drills. U.S. nuclear forces operate with a similarly short fuse.

It is obvious that the rushed nature of this process, from warning to decision to action, risks causing a catastrophic mistake. The danger is compounded by the erosion of Russia's ability to distinguish reliably between natural phenomena or peaceful ventures into space and a true missile attack. Only one third of its modern early-warning radars are working at all, and at least two of the nine slots in its constellation of missile-warning satellites are empty.

The dangers stemming from this decline in Russia's technical capabilities are offset, to some extent, by the relaxation of tensions that has come with the end of the cold war. Given the milder political climate, decision makers on both sides should be more inclined to question the validity of any reports they receive of an impending missile attack. Nevertheless, the coupling of two arsenals geared for rapid response carries the inherent danger of producing a mistaken launch and an escalating volley of missiles in return. The possibility of such an apocalyptic accident cannot be ruled out even under normal conditions. And if the control of Russian nuclear weapons were to be stressed by an internal or international political crisis, the danger could suddenly become much more acute.

During the cold war, such risks were subordinated to the overriding requirement to deter an enemy believed to be willing to launch a nuclear attack. This rationalization is no longer defensible, if ever it was. Today, when both countries seek normal economic relations and cooperative security arrangements, perpetuating the readiness to launch nuclear weapons on the mere warning of an attack constitutes reckless behavior. Yet this thinking is so entrenched that it will yield only to steady pressure from the public on political leaders--especially presidents--to replace it with a safer policy.

"De-alerting" Missiles

The cuts in nuclear arms set by the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties (START) should lessen the threat of an accidental nuclear exchange, but those changes will come only gradually. Under the START III framework, endorsed in Helsinki this past spring by President Yeltsin and President Bill Clinton, the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals would shrink to about 2,000 warheads on each side by the year 2007. But if current practices are not revised, 10 years from now half of those nuclear weapons could still remain ready to launch on a few minutes' notice.

The chance of an accidental launch could be reduced much more rapidly by "de-alerting" the missiles--increasing the amount of time needed to prepare them for launch. The U.S. and Russia should move independently down this path to a safer world, preferably taking quick strides in parallel. Two prominent proponents of this approach are former senator Sam Nunn of Georgia and retired general George L. Butler, commander in chief of the U.S. Strategic Command from 1991 to 1994. This proposal is also gaining support in the community of nongovernmental organizations involved in nuclear security and from some members of the U.S. Congress. In Russia, the Ministry of Defense is seriously studying such an alteration.

President George Bush set a notable precedent for de-alerting nuclear weapons at the end of September 1991, when the Soviet Union began to split apart in the wake of the August coup attempt. On the advice of General Butler, President Bush ordered an immediate stand-down of the many U.S. strategic bombers that had remained ready for decades to take off with only a few minutes' warning. Soon afterward, air force personnel unloaded and stored the many nuclear weapons carried on these planes. In addition, President Bush ended the alert for the strategic

missiles destined to be eliminated under START I, a set composed of 450 silo-based Minuteman II rockets, along with the missiles on 10 Poseidon submarines. These important actions took only a few days.

President Gorbachev reciprocated a week later by ordering the deactivation of more than 500 land-based rockets and six strategic submarines, by promising to keep his strategic bombers at a low level of readiness and by putting the rail-based missiles in garrison. In the subsequent months, both countries also withdrew many thousands of shorter-range tactical nuclear warheads that had been deployed with their armies and navies and placed these weapons in central storage depots.

Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin took a further step together in 1994, when they agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. This change, though a welcome gesture, has little military significance. Missile commanders can reload target coordinates into guidance computers within seconds. In fact, the 1994 pact does not even alleviate the concern about an accidental Russian launch, because an unprogrammed missile would automatically switch back to its primary wartime target, which might be a Minuteman silo in Montana or a command center in Washington, London, Paris or Beijing. And Russian missiles, like their American counterparts, cannot be ordered to self-destruct once they are launched.

Possessing the most robust forces and cohesive command system, the U.S. government should take the lead in a new round of voluntary actions by announcing that it will withdraw the U.S. warheads that most threaten Russia's nuclear deterrent (particularly those capable of hitting Russia's missile silos and underground command posts). The most menacing warheads are those deployed on the 50 MX silo-based missiles, which are armed with 10 warheads each, and the 400 high-yield W88 warheads fitted atop some of the missiles on Trident submarines. We also recommend immobilizing all of the land-based Minuteman IIIs (about 500 missiles), which are armed with three warheads each, halving the number of submarines deployed in peacetime and cutting the number of warheads on each submarine-borne missile from eight to four. The operation of ballistic-missile submarines should also be altered so that crews would require approximately one day to ready missiles for launching.

These measures would leave almost 600 U.S. warheads remaining invulnerable at sea, each capable of destroying the heart of a great city. With such a force, the U.S. would preserve ample capacity to deter any nuclear aggressor. Such a dramatic shift by the U.S. would fully establish its intention not to pose a first-strike threat to Russia. We believe this change in policy would persuade Russia to follow suit and take most of its missiles off hair-trigger alert. These changes would also help accelerate the implementation of agreements for disarmament already negotiated under START II and START III. We estimate that most of the job could be completed within a year or two.

Capabilities already exist to confirm that nuclear weapons have been taken off alert. For instance, the number of ballistic-missile submarines in port can be monitored using satellites, and most other

measures could be checked during the random on-site inspections permitted by START I. Over the longer term, additional technical means could be engineered to provide more frequent checks that nuclear missiles posed no immediate threat. For example, electronic "seals" could be used to ensure that a component removed from a missile had not been replaced. The integrity of such seals could be verified remotely through satellite relay using encrypted communications.

Global Zero Alert

This blueprint for taking U.S. and Russian nuclear forces off alert would substantially diminish the ability of either country to mount a first strike. Thus, it would eliminate both the capacity and rationale for keeping missiles ready to fire on warning. Leaders would have to wait out any alarm of an attack before deciding how to respond, drastically reducing the risk of a mistaken or unauthorized launch.

We recognize that military leaders in the U.S. and Russia might insist on maintaining small portions of their current arsenals on high alert, perhaps hundreds of warheads each, until the other nuclear-weapon states--Britain, France and China--joined in adopting similar measures to reduce the readiness of their nuclear arsenals. But if the U.S. and Russia aspire to establish the highest possible standards of safety for their nuclear armaments, they should move as rapidly as possible to take all their missiles off alert and then follow with further steps to increase the time required to reactivate these weapons.

The ultimate goal would be to separate most, if not all, nuclear warheads from their missiles and then, eventually, to eliminate most of the stored warheads and missiles. To implement such an extensive program fully, the means for verification would have to be strengthened to ensure that every nuclear state would know whether another country was making nuclear missiles launch-ready.

Moving toward a global stand-down of nuclear arms will undoubtedly encounter strong resistance from those whose dominant fear remains a secretly prepared surprise attack. The design of procedures to take nuclear missiles off constant alert needs to take into account this already remote possibility. But these plans must urgently go forward to remove the much more immediate hazard--the mistaken or unauthorized launch of nuclear missiles.

Further Reading

THE LOGIC OF ACCIDENTAL NUCLEAR WAR. Bruce G. Blair. Brookings Institution, 1993.

GLOBAL ZERO ALERT FOR NUCLEAR FORCES. Bruce G. Blair. Brookings Institution, 1995.

CAGING THE NUCLEAR GENIE: AN AMERICAN CHALLENGE FOR GLOBAL SECURITY. Stansfield Turner. Westview Press, Boulder, Colo., 1997.

THE FUTURE OF U.S. NUCLEAR WEAPONS POLICY. National Academy of

Sciences. National Academy Press, 1997.

The Authors

BRUCE G. BLAIR, HAROLD A. FEIVESON and FRANK N. VON HIPPEL have studied nuclear arms policy intensively. Blair served for four years in the U.S. Air Force Strategic Air Command before earning a Ph.D. in operations research in 1984 from Yale University. He is currently a defense analyst at the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C. Feiveson received a master's degree in theoretical physics in 1959 from the University of California, Los Angeles. He worked in the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for four years before moving to Princeton University to study public and international affairs. Feiveson received his Ph.D. in 1972 and joined the Princeton faculty in 1974. Von Hippel, who received a doctorate in theoretical physics from the University of Oxford in 1962, served in the office of the president's science adviser in 1993 and 1994 as assistant director for national security. He is currently a professor of public and international affairs at Princeton.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
CC: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
Date: Wed, 22 Jul 1998 21:22:00 -0400
From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
References: <35B604A1.F0B3F555@peacenet.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Launch-on-warning alert status info please?
To: wsantelmann@peacenet.org

Here is a PSR piece on de-alerting nuclear weapons, May 1998. I hope it is useful.

.....
. Lisa Ledwidge .
. Physicians for Social Responsibility .
. 1101 14th Street NW, Suite 700 .
. Washington, DC 20005 USA .
. tel. 202-898-0150 ext. 222 .
. fax 202-898-0172 .
. http://www.psr.org .
.....

Nuclear Weapons De-Alerting

PSR Issue Brief on the Risks of Accidental Nuclear War

Physicians for Social Responsibility
1101 Fourteenth Street, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone (202) 898-0150 Fax (202) 898-0172
<http://www.psr.org> psrnatl@psr.org

After the end of the Cold War in 1989, many people expected that improved U.S.- Russian relations would bring an end to the nuclear standoff between the two countries. Presidents Bush and Gorbachev took steps towards a less threatening nuclear posture, and it seemed as if the threat of nuclear conflict might disappear. However, while much of the tension and rivalry of the Cold War is over, the nuclear danger has not passed. Tens of thousands of nuclear weapons remain, and both Russia and the U.S. keep hundreds of missiles on "hair- trigger" alert, ready to be launched at major cities within minutes. Command and control of Russia's nuclear weapons has become more and more tenuous, and the chances of accidental nuclear war have increased considerably. And the possibility remains that political change on either side could re-ignite Cold War hostilities.

Before it is too late, the U.S. and Russia must take steps to remove all existing nuclear warheads from their current alert status. Both countries must also pursue negotiations to reduce their arsenals to no more than 1000 warheads on each side, in accordance with the U.S.-Russian START III framework agreement. A serious risk of accidental nuclear war will remain until Russia and the U.S. abandon their current "launch on warning" nuclear posture and take their nuclear

weapons off alert.

The Danger of a Nuclear Accident

A dramatic demonstration of the risks of "hair-trigger" nuclear alert occurred in January 1995. Russia's nuclear command center detected an unidentified ballistic missile over the Norwegian Sea, and suspected a pre-emptive nuclear strike by the U.S. As Russia's Strategic Rocket Forces prepared to launch their missiles, President Yeltsin was notified and given his nuclear "briefcase." Because of Russia's "launch on warning" nuclear posture - requiring that missiles be fired before any incoming enemy missiles arrive - Yeltsin had about four minutes to decide whether to retaliate against the U.S. Fortunately, Yeltsin decided not to order a nuclear counterattack. The unidentified missile turned out to be a Norwegian weather rocket. The Russian embassy in Norway had been given notice of the rocket launch, but Russia's nuclear command had not been informed.

As this incident suggests, the nuclear standoff may be more dangerous now than at any time during the Cold War. The greatest danger lies in Russia's weakening command and control system, as well as in its rusty early-warning radar, which leads to false alarms and increased fears of a surprise attack. After the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Moscow lost authority over several major radar stations, as well as satellite-tracking systems, which were located in the newly independent states of Ukraine, Latvia, Georgia, and Kazakhstan. Thus, Russia's nuclear command center is now partially blind. Yet hundreds of nuclear weapons remain on hair-trigger alert, ready for launch within minutes if an attack is suspected.

Even without the false alarms, Moscow's deteriorating command and control of its weapons could lead to an accidental missile launch. According to a recent CIA report, Russia's ICBM's have spontaneously switched to "combat mode" on a number of occasions, increasing the risk of an unauthorized attack on the U.S. There is also the possibility that political events, such as the 1991 and 1993 coup attempts, could lead to a loss of control over Russia's nuclear weapons. The Russian general staff have access to the secret nuclear launch codes, and could order a nuclear attack without authorization from the political leadership.

The dangers posed by Russia's deteriorating nuclear forces are largely due to political and economic instability within the Russian Federation, and to problems which are afflicting the Russian military as a whole. However, U.S. nuclear policy is also partly to blame. Russia's military planners keep their nuclear forces on hair-trigger alert, and cling to the Cold War-era doctrine of launch on warning, because they see the U.S. nuclear posture as an increasingly serious threat. U.S. "counterforce" targeting aims to eliminate Russia's strategic forces in the event of a nuclear war, and Russian missile silos and command centers are still the primary targets in U.S. strategic planning. Russia's nuclear submarines and mobile land missiles - which are less vulnerable than its silo-based ICBMs - are becoming more and more unreliable. Moscow believes that it is now more vulnerable than ever to

a foreign missile attack, and the Russian military leadership believes that its missiles must be launched promptly on warning, since Russia's nuclear forces might not be able to survive a U.S. assault and retaliate afterwards. Launch-on-warning is seen as especially important when the U.S. continues to deploy weapons with greater accuracy and shorter flight times, such as the new D-5 missiles on U.S. Trident submarines.

Instead of continuing a qualitative arms race with new, more sophisticated missiles, Russia and the U.S. must end their Cold War-era nuclear standoff and take steps to reduce the risks of a nuclear accident. In 1993, Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin agreed to "de-target" their nuclear ICBMs, but this deal was largely symbolic since the original targets - major cities in Russia and the U.S. - can be restored within seconds. In fact, "de-targeting" would be meaningless if an accidental launch were to occur, since Russian missiles would automatically switch back to their primary wartime targets. "De-targeting" does not eliminate or even reduce the nuclear danger. Removing missiles from hair-trigger alert status does.

De-Alerting: Reducing the Nuclear Dangers

In the April 30, 1998 issue of the New England Journal of Medicine, several prominent nuclear weapons experts and members of PSR propose a strategy for reducing the risks of accidental nuclear conflict. Their approach focuses on "de-alerting" nuclear missiles - increasing the amount of time needed to prepare them for launch. De-alerting is also advocated by former senator Sam Nunn of Georgia and retired general George Lee Butler, commander in chief of the U.S. Strategic Command from 1991 to 1994.

Although nuclear de-alerting would be a reciprocal process, the U.S. should take the initiative in reducing the nuclear risks, since it has more robust forces and a stronger command and control system. As a first step, the U.S. could adopt a nuclear posture which seems less threatening to Russia. This would encourage Russian military planners to alter their doctrine of launch on warning, and begin taking missiles off hair-trigger alert. The U.S. could begin by removing the warheads of MX II missiles (which are already scheduled to be retired under the START II agreement). Minuteman III missiles could also be temporarily disabled by having their safety switches pinned open - this has already been done for Minuteman IIs, as part of a 1991 initiative by President Bush. Finally, the U.S. could remove to storage the warheads on 8 Trident submarines (set to be retired under START III) and reduce the number of warheads on each remaining missile from eight to four. Even after these steps are taken, six U.S. submarines carrying up to 576 warheads would remain virtually invulnerable at sea, and the disabled Minuteman IIIs could only be destroyed by a successful attack on about 500 silos.

In response to these measures by the U.S., Russia could reciprocate by removing the warheads from all SS-24 rail- and silo-based missiles, which are slated to be retired under START II. Russia could also immobilize all silo- and submarine-based missiles scheduled for retirement under the START agreements, and take steps to disable

truck-mobile ballistic missiles, so that they cannot be activated for at least several hours. This kind of reciprocal de-alerting would be similar to the steps taken in 1991, when President Bush ended the alert for missiles set to be eliminated under START I, and President Gorbachev responded by deactivating more than 500 land-based rockets and six strategic submarines. Once reciprocal measures like these are taken, both sides can easily verify that weapons have been taken off alert, using satellite monitoring and the on-site inspections permitted by START I.

Ending the Nuclear Standoff

Medical organizations have identified the prevention of nuclear war as one of the medical profession's most important goals. De-alerting weapons would be an essential step in preventing nuclear war, and avoiding the accidents which could lead to a nuclear conflict. Opponents of de-alerting have argued that if the U.S. took its weapons off hair-trigger alert, Russia might not reciprocate, and the policy of nuclear "deterrence" might be undermined. However, even if the U.S. de-alerted its missiles unilaterally, it would still have an invulnerable nuclear force, powerful enough to deter any potential enemy. By taking the initiative in de-alerting, the U.S. would not jeopardize its national security; if Russia fails to reciprocate, U.S. weapons can simply be returned to their former alert status. Not all U.S. weapons would need to be de-alerted at once; the U.S. could begin by taking 500 missiles off alert, and inviting Russia both to inspect those warheads and to reciprocate within 30 days. Once each side has de-alerted 500, they could continue by de-alerting 500 more. No nuclear weapons would need to be retired or permanently disarmed; they would just be removed from hair-trigger alert.

The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff are currently considering options for de-alerting, although no action has been taken thus far. Because of the increasing danger of accidental nuclear conflict, it is essential for President Clinton and the U.S. Congress to move forward with the de-alerting process, and take steps towards a more secure and peaceful era, free of the dangers of nuclear war.

Written by Eric Bunselmeyer, with assistance from Miriam Novik and Robert W. Tiller. May 1998.

For more information, contact Robert Tiller at PSR. Phone: (202) 898-0150 x 220. E-mail: btiller@psr.org

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Queries
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

Did we ever receive the \$500 from the Christian Council of Japan? What is the balance in the Ploughshare account? I've got some expenses to submit for reimbursement, so I need a better picture of our balance.

Thanks,
Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Thu, 23 Jul 1998 08:40:02 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: more CTBT poll results: OHIO

July 23, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: new public opinion survey on OHIO voter attitudes on the CTBT

The following is the e-mail version of our press release on a new poll on Ohio voter attitudes on the CTBT. This is the fourth of six state-specific polls that follow -up our national CTBT poll from May 1998.

For a full-color version of the release (with charts); the pollsters' detailed analysis of the survey responses; and related national polling results, visit the Coalition's CTBT Site <<http://www.clw.org/org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Look for additional polling results from Tennessee, and Utah over the next few days.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: July 23, 1998

CONTACT: Adam Eiding, 202-547-3577; or Daryl Kimball, Director (202) 546-0795

"Eight Out of Ten Ohioans Support Senate Approval of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty"

WASHINGTON, DC -- A new state-wide poll shows that an overwhelming majority of Ohio voters support Senate approval of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), one of the major national security matters to be addressed by the Congress in 1998. When asked if the United States Senate should approve or disapprove of a treaty signed by the United States and 140 other countries "which would prohibit nuclear weapons test explosions worldwide," 79% of Ohio voters say the treaty should be approved, while only 14% do not feel such a treaty should be approved, while 9% said they "don't know." Support for the CTBT in Ohio (79%) is even higher than it is nationwide (73%, according to a May 1998 survey).

The Ohio poll results are based on a survey of 800 registered voters in Ohio. Telephone interviewing was conducted June 8-13, 1998 by The Mellman Group, a respected national polling firm based in Washington, DC, for the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. The statistical margin of error for the sample as a whole is plus or minus 3.5 percentage points at the 95%

confidence level.

The test ban treaty was submitted to the Senate last year, but the Senate has so far failed to even begin debate on the pact, which has gained new significance since India and Pakistan conducted nuclear blasts in May and June. Sixty-seven votes are needed for Senate ratification.

The current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of staff and four previous chairmen, including Gen. Colin Powell, have endorsed the CTBT. President Clinton and other world leaders say that the CTBT is vital to curb nuclear proliferation and encourage India & Pakistan to sign the CTBT and end their arms race.

Support for the Test Ban Treaty in Ohio Runs Strong and Deep --

The new Ohio poll shows that the CTBT enjoys overwhelming bipartisan support. The treaty is strongly favored by independent voters (81% approve, 12% disapprove), Democratic voters (80% approve, 14% disapprove), and Republican voters (76% approve, 15% disapprove) alike. Even self-identified "conservatives" support Senate approval of the CTBT by a 61 point margin (76% approve, 15% disapprove.)

Support also cuts across all regions of the state. Those in the Dayton area support the CTBT the most (89% approve, 7% disapprove), while support in other areas of the state is still overwhelmingly deep (Columbus: 83% approve, 13% disapprove; Cincinnati: 75% approve, 9% disapprove; Cleveland: 76% approve, 15% disapprove; Toledo: 73% approve, 17% disapprove).

Ohioans and Other Americans Want the Test Ban Treaty -- Will the Senate Listen? Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS) and Foreign Relations Committee Chair Jesse Helms (R-NC) have defied public opinion and blocked Senate consideration of the pact. Other Senators including John Glenn (D-OH) and Arlen Specter (R-PA) have called for Senate action on the CTBT "as expeditiously as possible."

"The Senate's do-nothing approach on the test ban treaty is irresponsible and dangerous. It hurts efforts to protect America and the world from the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the possibility of nuclear war. The overwhelming public support for the test ban is a wake-up call for the Senate to approve the treaty and stop nuclear blasts worldwide," says Daryl Kimball, Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

Beginning with President Dwight D. Eisenhower, U.S. presidents have sought to help prevent the development of new and more deadly nuclear bomb through a ban on nuclear testing. After 40 years of effort, the CTBT was finally negotiated in 1996 and has been signed by the U.S., Russia, China, France and the United Kingdom. Now it must be ratified by the U.S. and 43 other nuclear-capable states to enter into force.

After over 1,030 U.S. nuclear explosions, weapons scientists have determined that nuclear testing is not necessary to maintain the nation's arsenal. Also, the CTBT would provide valuable new intelligence tools to detect and deter secret nuclear weapons test explosions by other nations.

"What is striking about the results in Ohio, as in the nation as a whole, is the overwhelming nature of support for this Treaty. Indeed, far from being a partisan issue, support for a nuclear test ban treaty comes from all sides of the political spectrum," commented pollster Mark Mellman.

-- 30 --

For a detailed analysis of the survey results or inquires for the availability of spokespersons for interview, please contact Adam Eiding at 202-547-3577.

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers and prevent new threats from emerging. The Coalition's CTBT site is:

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

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

110 Maryland Ave. NE #201

Washington DC 20002

p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142

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

>From meldredge Thu Jul 23 09:46:31 1998

Return-Path: <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Date: Thu, 23 Jul 1998 09:46:08 -0700 (PDT)

X-Sender: meldredge@pop.igc.org

To: bananas-ana@igc.org, healls@aol.com, healtm@aol.com,
bcostner@emeraldnet.net, allister@snakeriveralliance.org,
mstewart@snakeriveralliance.org, kathy@fcnl.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@fcnl.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,
syoung@basicint.org, billeisen@rocketmail.com, armsintern@ucsusa.org,
ctbt@2020vision.org, panukes@igc.org

From: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Subject: Markey introductory statement

Enclosed is the introductory statement made by Rep. Markey on the SSM resolution. Bill number and dear colleague letter will be available tomorrow. It's time to start getting co-sponsors!

-M

**INTRODUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS
CUSTODIANSHIP RESOLUTION
STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD J. MARKEY (D-MA)
JULY 23, 1998**

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to express the Sense of Congress regarding the proper direction of U.S. efforts to maintain the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile in the post-Cold War era.

Currently, the Department of Energy's Stockpile Stewardship squanders billions of dollars on facilities to research and design new warheads, and continue nuclear weapons development as if the Cold War had never ended. In doing so, it bolsters nuclear weapons aspirations of other nations who follow our lead, and puts our real security at risk. It is time to stop this wasteful approach and develop a custodianship program more adequately suited to modern needs. The resolution I am introducing today urges DOE to cease its ill-advised stockpile stewardship program and develop a program that is less costly, less provocative, and less likely to spend billions on facilities with little relevance to the safety of the arsenal.

Many experts have suggested that there are alternatives to the Department of Energy's current stockpile stewardship program that can maintain the U.S. nuclear arsenal at a significantly lower cost. None of these alternatives have been seriously considered by DOE. In reality, many of the projects funded under this program are nothing more than a jobs program for nuclear scientists, but a jobs program with serious non-proliferation consequences. Other nations already look to our massive investment into nuclear weapons research and use it to justify their expanding nuclear programs.

To promote the kind of curatorship of the arsenal that is really needed with

the end

of the Cold War, I am today introducing a resolution which expresses support for a program that protects our national security without being a guise for new weapons programs that will further undermine the already unsteady international nuclear non-proliferation regime. This resolution expresses the Sense of Congress that the nuclear weapons stockpile can be maintained with a program that is far smaller, less expensive, and which does not require the facilities or experiments that are likely to be used for warhead design or development. In addition, the resolution urges the Secretary of Energy to direct the Department of Energy program for custodianship of the nuclear weapons arsenal towards less costly and less provocative methods and to cease the current stockpile stewardship plans of the Departments.

It is my hope that this resolution will serve as a useful vehicle for educating the Congress and the public about the nature of the current stockpile stewardship program and promoting a more informed debate and consideration of less destabilizing and costly alternatives. I urge my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this important resolution.

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.

>From meldredge Thu Jul 23 10:25:10 1998

Return-Path: <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Date: Thu, 23 Jul 1998 10:24:43 -0700 (PDT)

X-Sender: meldredge@pop.igc.org

To: kathy@fcnl.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@fcnl.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, syoung@basicint.org, billeisen@rocketmail.com, armsintern@ucsusa.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, panukes@igc.org

From: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Subject: Markey Resolution Letter

I would like to drop the enclosed letter, with national group sign-ons, by Monday, July 27. Please let me know if your group can sign on. Sorry for the short notice, but Markey has just introduced the resolution today and we need to get out there with our support as soon as possible.

-M

Please let me know if you can sign on by 10:00AM Monday morning.

-M

July 27, 1998

U.S. House of Representatives

Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Representative:

As peace, disarmament, religious, and environmental groups with hundreds of thousands of members across the country, we write to you to urge your support of House Concurrent Resolution #---, sponsored by Representative Edward Markey. This resolution expresses a sense of Congress that the current plans for maintaining the US nuclear weapons arsenal, known as the Stockpile Stewardship Program (SSP), are in fact excessive and dangerous. The resolution urges the Department of Energy (DOE) to take a custodial approach that saves money and is more suited to protecting the fragile non-proliferation regime.

Rather than maintaining the safety of the nuclear arsenal, the stockpile stewardship program perpetuates the research and development of nuclear weapons, at even greater levels of funding that during the Cold War. The new facilities planned or under construction as part of the SSP are primarily for nuclear weapons research and design, not for maintaining a safe arsenal. By investing in new nuclear weapons research, the US fuels the nuclear aspirations of nations that follow our lead, putting our true security at risk.

In addition to our non-proliferation concerns, the SSP is using valuable taxpayer money, which is needed to meet viable human and environmental programs, on unnecessary weapons research. The program is expected to cost at least \$60 billion over 13 years. Due to the inevitable construction cost

increases, magnified by the dozens of new construction projects planned for this program, we expect this total to rise.

As one of our nation's leaders, you are in an optimal post to help position the U.S. as leaders in the international community. The Stockpile Stewardship Program is only continuing a dangerous, obsolete arms race. The US nuclear weapons stockpile can be maintained without this excessive program, yet DOE is unwilling to explore other options. H. Con Res. # _____ directs DOE to develop alternative approaches that provide for real national security and true curatorship of the arsenal more in keeping with today's needs. Please join this fight and co-sponsor H. Con Res. # _____.

Sincerely,

Maureen Eldredge
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Kimberly Robson
Women's Action for New Directions

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.

To: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Markey Resolution Letter
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 10:24 AM 7/23/98 -0700, you wrote:

>I would like to drop the enclosed letter, with national group sign-ons, by
>Monday, July 27. Please let me know if your group can sign on. Sorry for
>the short notice, but Markey has just introduced the resolution today and we
>need to get out there with our support as soon as possible.

>-M

>

Dear Maureen:

I'll sign. Thanks for doing this.

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

Return-Path: <glodem@wizvax.net>
X-Sender: glodem@mail1.wizvax.net
Date: Thu, 23 Jul 1998 16:52:41 -0500
To: (Recipient list suppressed)
From: glodem@wizvax.net (Marvin Clark)
Subject: NFWF by 2000: Polls in four countries favor nuclear weapons abolition

GLOBAL DEMILITARIZATION July 23, 1998

For those favoring Nuclear Weapons Abolition,

If you are interested in spending a few minutes to urge political leaders of the nuclear weapons nations, by Email, to disable all the nuclear weapons in the world by the year 2000, please continue below the *****'s.

If you want to DELETE your address from this mailing list, please send the following Email:

To: glodem@wizvax.net [Please execute your "REPLY" command so we will get your exact address which is on our mailing list].

Subject: delete

Message: [Please list all your other Email addresses and we will put them on our "permanent delete list" also].

To change your address: Send message to 'delete' old address and 'add' new one.

Monthly reminder: please copy, paste and mail the following or similar Email, post or FAX messages to the President of the USA each month. Also please send copies to the Heads of State of the other nuclear weapons nations as shown below. Some Email addresses are via the countries' Permanent Missions to the United Nations. China is the only country without an Email address. Please advise us if you have one for China.

If you want a list of the mail addresses of the other nuclear Heads of State, please request them from us.

If you are an officer of a peace, environmental or religious organization: In your next correspondence with your members, please urge them to also send these messages each month by Email, post card, letter, Fax or phone.

=====

To: president@whitehouse.gov
Subject: Polls in four countries favor nuclear weapons abolition
Cc: President Russia <webmaster@gov.ru>, Prime Minister Britain <gbrun@undp.org>, President France <fraun@undp.org>, Prime Minister Israel <pm@pmo.gov.il>, Prime Minister India <indun@undp.org>, Prime Minister Pakistan <pakistan@undp.org>

Dear Mr. President,

A recent public opinion poll in Germany, commissioned by the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, showed that 93% thought that:

"Nuclear weapons are basically contrary to international law and should neither be produced nor stockpiled".

And 87% thought that:

"The nuclear weapon states, in order to create a nuclear weapon free world, should start getting rid of their own nuclear weapons as quickly as possible".

USA, British, and Canadian polls show similar results: The public favors abolition of nuclear weapons.

I urge you to call for a meeting soon of the nuclear weapons Heads of State and take a strong leadership role to disable all the nuclear weapons in the world during your term of office.

Sincerely yours,

[Your name, post address & country]

Best wishes,

Sue & Marvin Clark
Co-directors
Global Demilitarization
42 Maple Ave.
Troy, NY, 12180 USA
phone: +1-518-274-0784
Email: glodem@wizvax.net

Administrative Board Members

Oscar Arias, Nobel Peace Laureate, honorary member
Mary Evelyn Jegen, SND, Pax Christi International
Dietrich Fischer, Author, Professor, Pace University
Bill Price, Director, World Peacemakers
Bill Hartung, Author
Organizations are for identification only

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 24 Jul 1998 00:13:11 +0200 (CEST)
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, fme@motherearth.org, a-days@motherearth.org,
induran@motherearth.org, abolition-2000@agoranet.be,
tp2000.lst.grp@gn.apc.org
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

-> RETURN FORM ATTACHED !!

Dear Abolitionists,

Following several encouraging mails, especially from Janet Bloomfield and Colin Archer, I wish to propose For Mother Earth to convene an 'Abolition 2000 Peace Walk' from the Hague Appeal for Peace in La Hague (Netherlands) to NATO HQ in Brussels (Belgium).

This peace walk would be a closing event for the May 10-15 1999 'Hague Appeal for Peace' (HAP) in La Hague. HAP is scheduled to become the major end-of-the-century international NGO conference with several thousands of participants calling for 'the abolition of war'!

Our dream is for the peace walk to count thousands of participants walking for the conclusion of a Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons by the year 2000. The walk could be a major public event which would finally put the Abolition 2000 movement on the agenda of the media, the public ... and the politicians!! And let's be honest: this is what we all badly need if we want to meet the challenge we set ourselves by the year 2000!

We might start the Peace Walk in La Hague with a rally on Sunday May 16th at the footsteps of the International Court of Justice. A public meeting with testimonies of Hibakusha from Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Indigenous People who suffered from uranium mining and atomic testing, international jurists, etc ...

The start of an aprox. ten days walk to Brussels (25km/day - 17 miles/day - including restday). Arriving at NATO we might rally, vigil, inspect, ... and/or peacefully block the gates of the place where State Officials continue to plan nuclear warfare, and this contrary to international law.

It is important for us to hear if more people of the Abolition 2000 network would walk along. Would you take ten days vacation from 'normal' work to join such an event? Because, let's face it, if you won't do it, who is gonna do it?? It would also be good to hear if you would mobilise your members to join such an event, or network with other NGO's. This would make a big difference.

I will share your reactions at our next For Mother Earth meeting and we might start contacting people to provide you with organic foods, camp-sites, support vehicles, press, ... and nice walking roads.

We are looking forward to your input.
Love & Peace,

Love and peace,
Janet

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Fri, 24 Jul 1998 12:12:36 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Subject: pov-1: Announcements for Two Conferences
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Conference: "Burying the Past: Justice, Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Politics of South Africa, Guatemala, East Germany and Northern Ireland, 14-16 September, 1998, St. Antony's College Oxford, U.K.

- How can the injuries of the past be put to rest without reviving civil conflict? Is forgiveness really a political possibility, and would it suspend justice or fulfil it? What institutional and practical forms might political repentance and forgiveness take? Should politics aspire to the peace of reconciliation, or must it make do with the peace of accommodation?

These and many other questions will be addressed by this international and interdisciplinary conference. Conference language: English.

For more information, contact Dr Nigel Biggar, Oriel College, Oxford OX1 4EW, U.K. Telephone: +44 (0)1865 276555 or FAX: +44 (0)1865 791823

Agenda for Peace: Reconciliation, October 2-4, 1998, Loccum,

- What is the function and the priority attached to a reconciliation between the antagonists in building sustainable structures for a future life together after long and bitter fighting? What definition and concepts of reconciliation should dominate for a healing force to emerge which can overcome enmity and enhance the prospects of peace? How can the task of reconciliation be translated into concrete political action and projects and be implemented in practice so that the initial impetus is not lost in mere rhetoric, but will bring about a constructive transformation of the conflict?

- This international conference is held in cooperation with "Gernika Gogoratuz", Peace Research Center in Gernika (Basque region/Spain).

Conference Languages: German and English.

- For more information contact one of the following individuals: Dr. Jorg CallieB, Director of Studies (Loccum), Tel. +49-5766-81-109, E-Mail: Joerg.Calliess@evlka.de; Karin Hahn, Secretary, Tel. +49-5766-81-113, Fax.+49-5766-81-128; Dr. Juan Gutierrez, Director, Gernika Gogoratuz Tel/Fax. +34-34 27 93 95.

- More information is on the Evangelische Akademie Loccum's web page at <http://www.evlka.de/estern/loccum>. (See link to Programm II/98.)

----- End of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Return-Path: <owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Fri, 24 Jul 1998 15:23:50 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Subject: pov-l: Conference Correction
Sender: owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org

----- Start of message from list: pov-l ---->

(Web page address corrected , and list of speakers included. Sorry for the inconvenience!)

Agenda for Peace: Reconciliation, October 2-4, 1998, Loccum,
- What is the function and the priority attached to a reconciliation between the antagonists in building sustainable structures for a future life together after long and bitter fighting? What definition and concepts of reconciliation should dominate for a healing force to emerge which can overcome enmity and enhance the prospects of peace? How can the task of reconciliation be translated into concrete political action and projects and be implemented in practice so that the initial impetus is not lost in mere rhetoric, but will bring about a constructive transformation of the conflict?
- This international conference is held in cooperation with "Gernika Gogoratuz", Peace Research Center in Gernika (Basque region/Spain).
Conference Languages: German and English.

Among the Speakers of the Conference are:
Norbert Ropers (Berlin), Geiko Mueller-Fahrenheit (Bremen), Dieter Senghaas (Bremen), Viola Raheb (Bethlehem), Katarina Kruhonja (Ossijek), William Everett (Newton/Mass.), Gary Thompson (Johannesburg), Gisela Perren-Klinger (Switzerland), Gema Varona (San Sebastian), Charles Reed (London), David Grant (Alkmaar), Robin Wilson (Belfast) and Mari Fitzduff (Derry).

- For more information contact one of the following individuals: Dr. Joerg Calliess, Director of Studies (Loccum), Tel. +49-5766-81-109, E-Mail: Joerg.Calliess@evlka.de; Karin Hahn, Secretary, Tel. +49-5766-81-113, Fax.+49-5766-81-128; Dr. Juan Gutierrez, Director, Gernika Gogoratuz Tel/Fax. +34-34 27 93 95.

- More information is on the Evangelische Akademie Loccum's web page at <http://www.evlka.de/extern/loccum>. (See link to Programm II/98.)

----- End of message from list: pov-l ---->

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Fri, 24 Jul 1998 10:19:25 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Russia to conduct "subcritical" experiment

July 24, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: Russia announces that it will conduct subcritical experiment this year

The United States and Russia have failed to curtail their subcritical nuclear "experiments" programs since the signing of the CTBT, and they have failed to agree on effective "transparency" measures that would provide independent confirmation that such experiments do not go produce a "nuclear explosion" (which is a proposal advanced last year by the Coalition.)

For more details on subcritical experiments see
<<http://www.psr.org/subcrits.htm>>

The following report quotes a senior Minatom official who confirmed that Russia is planning another subcritical experiment.

DK

Thursday July 23, 1:34 PM

Russia plans "subcritical" nuclear test this year

By Adam Tanner

MOSCOW, July 23 (Reuters) - Russia plans to carry out a "subcritical" nuclear test in the next few months, a top atomic official said on Thursday.

During a subcritical nuclear test, which is allowed under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, scientists stop short of triggering a nuclear reaction and so there is no radioactive yield from an explosion.

"This is ordinary work that we carry out periodically and we will continue to do so this year as well," First Deputy Atomic Energy Minister Lev Ryabev told Reuters. "It is needed to maintain our military stockpiles in an appropriate condition."

Ryabev said the the Atomic Energy Ministry would carry out the test underground on the Russian Arctic island of Novaya Zemlya, 1,800 km (1,100 miles) northeast of Moscow, before the onset of winter.

The United States has carried out three underground subcritical tests since last year, prompting criticism that such efforts offered Russia and China cover to continue underground nuclear testing.

"If the United States and Russia, two world leaders, continue with these tests, it could invite similar tests by other nuclear states and thereby stir up a new nuclear arms race," the mayor of Nagasaki, Japan, wrote to U.S. President Bill Clinton in March.

Soon after his letter, both India and Pakistan carried out full underground tests with nuclear explosions that released radioactivity.

"They can criticise, but there are specialists responsible for overseeing the readiness of military stockpiles here and in the United States, so we must have faith in these specialists," Ryabev said in an interview. "These tests are conducted with strict adherence to international agreements barring nuclear tests which we have signed but not ratified.

"As regards the environment, all necessary measures are taken, so there is no danger. There is no spread of radiation," he said. "Of course, as with any explosion it needs to be carried out in a distant place rather than a central square of Moscow or somewhere in a city."

Experts say such experiments allow scientists to test plutonium and develop new nuclear bombs without a full-scale nuclear blast.

"The U.S. conducted two such tests last year and Russia is working on doing the same things," said Igor Kudrik, a researcher at the environmental Bellona Foundation in Oslo. "It would allow the development of nuclear bombs without violating the Comprehensive Test Ban.

"That means that countries such as Russia and the U.S. can continue to develop nuclear devices."

The test ban has barred all nuclear explosions since 1995, although both India and Pakistan have refused to sign the agreement.

On Thursday, thousands of Russian workers at the Institute of Experimental Physics in the closed nuclear city of Sarov, which is helping to prepare the next subcritical test, went on strike for three hours to protest against unpaid wages.

Some experts say protests like the one in Sarov, until recently called Arzamas-16, could undermine safety standards as workers focus on economic demands rather than scientific work.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

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, 24 Jul 1998 10:34:38 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: more CTBT poll results: TENNESSEE

July 24, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: new public opinion survey on TENNESSEE voter attitudes on the CTBT

The following is the e-mail version of our press release on a new bipartisan poll on Tennessee voter attitudes on the CTBT, South Asian testing, and related non-proliferation issues. This is the fifth of six state-specific polls that follow -up our national CTBT poll from May 1998.

For a full-color version of the release (with charts); the pollsters' detailed analysis of the survey responses; and survey questions, and related national polling results, see

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

Look for additional polling results from Utah, as well as additional, overall analysis of all of our recent state and national polls Monday.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: July 24, 1998

CONTACT: Adam Eiding, 202-547-3577; or Daryl Kimball, Director (202) 546-0795

"Tennessee Voters Strongly Support Senate Approval of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty"

WASHINGTON, DC -- An overwhelming majority of Tennessee voters want the Senate to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), according to a new bipartisan, statewide poll released today. When asked: "Do you think the U.S. Senate should approve a Treaty with 140 other countries that would prohibit underground nuclear weapons explosions worldwide," 78% of Tennesseans say the treaty should be approved, while only 19% say it should not be approved. Support for the treaty is strong among Republicans (73% approve), Democrats (80% approve) and independents (83% approve), and among all demographic and geographic groups in the state. Support for the CTBT in Tennessee (78%) is similar to the level of support nationwide (73%, according to a May 1998 survey).

The Tennessee poll was commissioned by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms

control organizations. The survey results are based on the findings of an opinion survey of 503 registered Tennessee voters conducted by Wirthlin Worldwide, a Republican polling firm, and a Democratic firm, The Mellman Group from June 20-24, 1998. The statistical margin for error is plus or minus 4.4%.

The test ban treaty was submitted to the Senate last September, but the Senate has so far failed to act on the treaty, which has gained new significance since India and Pakistan conducted nuclear blasts in May of this year. The current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of staff and four previous chairmen, including Gen. Colin Powell, have endorsed the CTBT. President Clinton and other world leaders say that the CTBT is vital to America's effort to stop the spread of nuclear weapons worldwide. The CTBT is also key to encouraging India and Pakistan to sign the CTBT and end their arms race, which are considered necessary steps before U.S. economic sanctions on these nations can be lifted.

Tennesseans See Test Ban As "More Important" After South Asian Nuclear Tests:

Despite calls for action on the test ban, Senate leaders Trent Lott (R-MS) and Jesse Helms (R-NC) have defied public opinion and labeled the treaty "irrelevant." However, Tennessee voters disagree. Sixty-seven percent of Tennesseans said that they think the recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan "demonstrate how important it is for the U.S. to ratify and encourage global implementation of the CTBT." Tennessee voters have a high level of awareness of the nuclear testing by India and Pakistan. Seventy-nine percent of Tennessee voters say they have heard about the tests, with 86% saying the tests pose a "serious threat to international security."

Tennessee voters were also asked whether they "favor" or "oppose" a variety of possible U.S. government responses to the tests by India and Pakistan. An overwhelming 86% favor urging India and Pakistan to approve the test ban and 71% favor U.S. ratification of the CTBT as the best responses. These proposals were more popular than imposing sanctions (67% in favor, 22% opposed), or increasing military spending to develop and deploy a nuclear missile defense (38% in favor, 56% opposed).

"The Senate's do-nothing approach on the test ban treaty is irresponsible and dangerous. It hurts efforts to protect America and the world from the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the possibility of nuclear war. The overwhelming public support for the test ban is a wake-up call for the Senate to approve the treaty and stop nuclear blasts worldwide," says Daryl Kimball, Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

Another survey question reveals that when given the choice between two possible candidates for Senate -- one who supports the CTBT and the other who opposes the CTBT -- 70% of Tennesseans solidly prefer a candidate who supports the CTBT, while only 24% would support a candidate who opposes the treaty.

-- 30 --

For survey questions, detailed analysis of the survey results, or inquires

for the availability of spokespersons for interview, please contact Adam Eiding at 202-547-3577.

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of the nation's 17 leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers and prevent new threats from emerging. The Coalition's CTBT site is:

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

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

110 Maryland Ave. NE #201

Washington DC 20002

p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142

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

>From meldredge Fri Jul 24 08:43:20 1998

Return-Path: <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Date: Fri, 24 Jul 1998 08:42:52 -0700 (PDT)

X-Sender: meldredge@pop.igc.org

To: bananas-ana@igc.org, healls@aol.com, healtm@aol.com,
bcostner@emeraldnet.net, allister@snakeriveralliance.org,
mstewart@snakeriveralliance.org, kathy@fcnl.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@fcnl.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,
syoung@basicint.org, billeisen@rocketmail.com, armsintern@ucsusa.org,
ctbt@2020vision.org, panukes@igc.org, abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

From: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Subject: H. Con. Res. 307

Dear friends and allies:

At long last, we have a resolution on stockpile stewardship introduced into the House of Reps. It is H. Con. Res. 307, I have posted the text below. I urge everyone to contact their Representative in Washington (Capital switchboard, 202-224-3121) and urge him or her to co-sponsor the Markey Resolution, H. Con. Res. 307. You should also consider making an appointment to meet with your Rep. over the recess in August when they will be home campaigning in your State, and ask them to co-sponsor the Resolution. If you do any election work, I also recommend that you raise this as a question to incumbents and candidates - as in "will you co-sponsor the Markey Resolution against our overblown, dangerous nuclear weapons program and support an alternative program that is cheaper and does not develop new nuclear weapons?", or "If elected, will you....."

We have lots of fact sheets and information if you need talking points. Thanks,
M

Resolution:

H.L.C.

105TH CONGRESS

2D SESSION

H. CON. RES. 307

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MARKEY submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on _____

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the nuclear weapons stockpile.

Whereas it is in the best interests of the Nation and the world to ban nuclear tests forever;

Whereas the nuclear weapons arsenal of the United States has been extensively tested in the past, and the President again certified its safety and reliability on February 11, 1998;

Whereas the nuclear weapons stockpile can be maintained without nuclear explosive testing;

Whereas there exists an ongoing stockpile evaluation and maintenance program that has ensured the safety and re-liability of the arsenal for decades;

Whereas the priority of the stewardship program should be the safety of the arsenal, and the United States should not design or develop nuclear weapons with new military capabilities or modify the nuclear explosive package in existing weapons;

Whereas the proposed stockpile stewardship program, funded at \$4,500,000,000 annually over ten years, is not needed to maintain the arsenal and many of its programs and facilities are unnecessary and hence a waste of taxpayer dollars;

Whereas the proposed stockpile stewardship program is provocative to both nuclear weapon states and non-nuclear weapon states, and it runs counter to the obligations of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to pursue negotiations in good faith on cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament;

Whereas nuclear weapons laboratories intend to use the current stockpile stewardship program to maintain and significantly enhance scientific and technical capabilities for undertaking "development of advanced new types of nuclear weapons" (as stated in the United States Department of Energy Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan, 1996); and

Whereas a number of less costly and more appropriate alter-natives exist that can fulfill the stockpile maintenance re-quirements of the United States while complying with the obligations of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nu-clear Weapons:

Now, therefore be it Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that-

3

H.L.C.

1 (1)the nuclear weapons stockpile can be main-
2 tained with a program that is far smaller, is less ex-
3 pensive, and does not require facilities or experi-
4 ments that are likely to be used for warhead design
5 or development; and

6 (2) the Secretary of Energy should direct the
7 Department of Energy program for custodianship of
8 the nuclear weapons arsenal toward less costly, less
9 provocative methods and cease the current stockpile
10 stewardship plans of the Department.

F:\M5\MARKEY\MARKEY.048

July 22, 1998 (5:08 p.m.)

Markey's Introductory Statement:
INTRODUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS
CUSTODIANSHIP RESOLUTION
STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE EDWARD J. MARKEY (D-MA)
JULY 23, 1998

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution to express the Sense of Congress regarding the proper direction of U.S. efforts to maintain the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile in the post-Cold War

era.

Currently, the Department of Energy's Stockpile Stewardship squanders billions of dollars on facilities to research and design new warheads, and continue nuclear weapons development as if the Cold War had never ended. In doing so, it bolsters nuclear weapons aspirations of other nations who follow our lead, and puts our real security at risk. It is time to stop this wasteful approach and develop a custodianship program more adequately suited to modern needs. The resolution I am introducing today urges DOE to cease its ill-advised stockpile stewardship program and develop a program that is less costly, less provocative, and less likely to spend billions on facilities with little relevance to the safety of the arsenal.

Many experts have suggested that there are alternatives to the Department of Energy's current stockpile stewardship program that can maintain the U.S. nuclear arsenal at a significantly lower cost. None of these alternatives have been seriously considered by DOE. In reality, many of the projects funded under this program are nothing more than a jobs program for nuclear scientists, but a jobs program with serious non-proliferation consequences. Other nations already look to our massive investment into nuclear weapons research and use it to justify their expanding nuclear programs.

To promote the kind of curatorship of the arsenal that is really needed with the end of the Cold War, I am today introducing a resolution which expresses support for a program that protects our national security without being a guise for new weapons programs that will further undermine the already unsteady international nuclear non-proliferation regime. This resolution expresses the Sense of Congress that the nuclear weapons stockpile can be maintained with a program that is far smaller, less expensive, and which does not require the facilities or experiments that are likely to be used for warhead design or development. In addition, the resolution urges the Secretary of Energy to direct the Department of Energy program for custodianship of the nuclear weapons arsenal towards less costly and less provocative methods and to cease the current stockpile stewardship plans of the Departments.

It is my hope that this resolution will serve as a useful vehicle for educating the Congress and the public about the nature of the current stockpile stewardship program and promoting a more informed debate and consideration of less destabilizing and costly alternatives. I urge my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this important resolution.

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.

>From meldredge Fri Jul 24 08:43:29 1998

Return-Path: <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Date: Fri, 24 Jul 1998 08:43:07 -0700 (PDT)

X-Sender: meldredge@pop.igc.org

To: bananas-ana@igc.org, healls@aol.com, healtm@aol.com,
bcostner@emeraldnet.net, allister@snakeriveralliance.org,
mstewart@snakeriveralliance.org, kathy@fcnl.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@fcnl.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,
syoung@basicint.org, billeisen@rocketmail.com, armsintern@ucsusa.org,
ctbt@2020vision.org, panukes@igc.org, abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

From: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Subject: Markey Resolution, Dear Colleague

Enclosed is the dear colleague that Rep. Markey sent out today.

-M

July 24, 1998

DON'T LET STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP
UNDERMINE U.S. NUCLEAR
NON-PROLIFERATION GOALS
COSPONSOR H. CON. RES. 307

Dear Colleague:

Currently, the Department of Energy's Stockpile Stewardship Program squanders billions of dollars on facilities to research and design new warheads, and continue nuclear weapons development as if the Cold War had never ended. In doing so, this program bolsters the nuclear weapons aspirations of other nations who follow our lead, and puts our real security at risk. It is time to stop this wasteful approach and develop a custodianship program more adequately suited to modern needs. In order to advance this objective I have introduced H. Con. Res. 307, which urges DOE to cease its ill-advised stockpile stewardship program and develop a program that is less costly, less provocative, and less likely to spend billions on facilities with little relevance to the safety of the arsenal.

Many experts have suggested that there are alternatives to the Department of Energy's current stockpile stewardship program that can maintain the U.S. nuclear arsenal at a significantly lower cost. None of these alternatives are currently being seriously considered by DOE. In reality, many of the projects presently funded under this program are nothing more than a jobs program for nuclear scientists, but a jobs program with serious non-proliferation consequences. Other nations already look to our massive investment into nuclear weapons research and use it to justify their

expanding nuclear programs.

To promote the kind of curatorship of the arsenal that is really needed with the end of the Cold War, H. Con. Res. 307 expresses support for a stockpile stewardship program that protects our national security without being a guise for new weapons programs that will further undermine the already unsteady international nuclear non-proliferation regime. I urge you to join in cosponsoring this resolution. Please call Mr. Jeff Duncan or Ms. Joleen Connolly at x52836 of my staff if your would like to cosponsor this resolution and help move towards a more sound nuclear policy.

Sincerely,

Ed Markey

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.

its own. The United States joined most countries of the world including Ukraine -- in condemning the tests. The Indian and Pakistani tests jeopardize international efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. And the back-to-back tests might well provoke another round of military competition between India and Pakistan perhaps eventually triggering another war, this one with nuclear weapons.

One family woven into a single garment of destiny. If the nuclear tests conducted by Pakistan on May 28 had not been a test underground, but an attack overhead on India, every country in the region would have come within the circle of the suffering. We are all connected.

If the nuclear test conducted by India on May 11, had not been a test underground, but an attack overhead on Pakistan the prevailing winds that sweep over the subcontinent would have pulled that radioactive plume back into India. The forces of nature prove what our wisest teachers have long known about the force of spirit: we reap what we sow.

One family Pakistani and Indian children playing, eating, and laughing in those two countries while the adults threaten one another with the possibility of nuclear war. Shall we betray those children, or choose instead to safeguard their future? We appeal to the wisdom of the Indian and Pakistani peoples and their leaders to do what they rightly urged us to do during our dangerous, nuclear arms race with the Soviet Union: come to the table. Sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Accept meaningful constraints on the deployment of ballistic missiles. Help work toward a treaty to cut off production of fissile material, and adopt guidelines to limit exports of dangerous technology. Sit down together; negotiate; make peace. In the name of your children.

Join the peacemakers. The ranks are growing every day. There are fewer nuclear weapons deployed in the world today than there were ten years ago. The United States has reduced its own nuclear arsenal. We have done that under SALT and START II. And we will reduce further under START III once the Russian Duma ratifies START II. I am going to Moscow tonight, in part to urge them to do so. At the same time, the United States Congress should act now to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Ukraine has been a peacemaker. It has earned the thanks of a grateful world for renouncing and dismantling its nuclear weapons. "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks," says the Bible, and by shipping nuclear warheads to the Russian Federation and receiving reactor fuel back in exchange, Ukraine has shown us all how.

South Africa is a peacemaker. They had a nuclear weapons program and, as they made the move to democracy, chose to end it. Argentina and Brazil are peacemakers now. As their countries moved from military rule to civilian rule, from dictatorships to democracies, they agreed as neighbors to renounce the development and deployment of nuclear weapons. India and Pakistan can do the same.

Over sixty years ago, Mahatma Gandhi said: "I have the unquenchable faith that, of all the countries in the world, India is the one country which can learn the art of non-violence." Gandhi was speaking of both India and

Pakistan, both Hindus and Muslims.

In India and Pakistan, one finds some of the most ancient and deepest spiritual traditions on the planet. One finds hundreds and hundreds of millions of people who lead their entire lives in the bosom of their religious beliefs. They know in the depth of their souls that if we dedicate the human mind to overcome hatred, we can curb the evil impulse to use the new capacity of human technology to destroy. They know how to use the wisdom of Islam and Hinduism to illuminate our brotherhood and sisterhood. All the great religions teach that we must act as though we are parents of one another's children, with responsibility for their well being.

That truth will save us.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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, 27 Jul 1998 08:25:16 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: more CTBT poll results: UTAH

July 27, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: new public opinion survey on UTAH voter attitudes on the CTBT

The following is the e-mail version of our press release on a new bipartisan poll on Tennessee voter attitudes on the CTBT, South Asian testing, and related non-proliferation issues. This is the last of six state-specific polls that follow -up our national CTBT poll from May 1998.

For a full-color version of the release (with charts); the pollsters' detailed analysis of the survey responses; and survey questions, and related national polling results, see

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

Look for additional, overall analysis of all of our recent state and national polls later this week.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: July 27, 1998

CONTACT: Adam Eiding, 202-547-3577; or Daryl Kimball, Director (202) 546-0795

"Eight In Ten Utah Voters Support Senate Approval of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty"

WASHINGTON, DC -- An overwhelming majority of Utah voters want the Senate to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), according to a new bipartisan, statewide poll released today. When asked, "Do you think the U.S. Senate should approve a Treaty with 140 other countries that would prohibit underground nuclear weapons explosions worldwide," 83% of Utah voters say the treaty should be approved, while only 14% say it should not be approved, and 4% were undecided. Support for the treaty is strong among Republicans (81% approve), Democrats (90% approve) and independents (80% approve), and among all demographic and geographic groups in the state. Support for the CTBT in Utah (83%) is higher than it is nationwide (73%).

The Utah poll was commissioned by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control groups.

The results are based on the findings of an opinion survey of 400 registered Utah voters conducted by Wirthlin Worldwide, a Republican polling firm, and a Democratic firm, The Mellman Group, from June 20-23. The statistical margin for error is plus or minus 4.9%.

The test ban treaty was sent to the Senate last year, but so far it has so far failed to act on the treaty, which has gained new significance since India and Pakistan's nuclear blasts of May 1998. Sixty-seven votes are needed for ratification. President Clinton and other world leaders say the CTBT is vital to efforts to encourage India and Pakistan to stop nuclear testing and their arms race. The current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and four previous chairmen, including Gen. Colin Powell, all support the CTBT. Weapons scientists have determined that our arsenal can be maintained without nuclear test explosions.

Utah Voters See Test Ban As "More Important" After South Asian Nuclear Tests
Despite repeated calls for action on the test ban, Senate leaders Trent Lott (R-MS) and Jesse Helms (R-NC) have defied public opinion and labeled the treaty "irrelevant." But Utah voters strongly disagree. Seventy-five percent of Utah voters said that they think the recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan "demonstrate how important it is for the U.S. to ratify and encourage global implementation of the CTBT." Eighty-five percent of Utah voters say they have heard about the tests, with 87% saying the tests pose a "serious threat to international security."

Utah voters' staunch support for the CTBT may be attributed to their view that the test ban can help stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries like Iran, which recently tested a new ballistic missile. Fully 82% of voters in the state believe that having an international treaty that prohibits all nuclear weapons explosions is a better way to protect the U.S. from nuclear proliferation than resuming U.S. testing.

Utah voters were asked whether they "favor" or "oppose" a variety of possible U.S. government responses to the tests by India and Pakistan. An overwhelming 91% favor urging India and Pakistan to approve the test ban and 76% favor U.S. ratification of the CTBT as the best responses. These proposals were more popular than imposing sanctions (70% in favor, 22% opposed), or the proposal of Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS) -- increasing military spending to develop and deploy a nuclear missile defense (30% in favor, 64% opposed).

"The Senate's do-nothing approach on the test ban treaty is irresponsible and dangerous. It hurts efforts to protect America and the world from the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the possibility of nuclear war. The overwhelming public support for the test ban is a wake-up call for the Senate to approve the treaty and stop nuclear blasts worldwide," says Daryl Kimball, Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

Another survey question reveals that when given the choice between two possible candidates for Senate -- one who supports the CTBT and the other who opposes the CTBT -- 73% of Utah voters solidly prefer a candidate who supports the CTBT, while only 22% would support a candidate who opposes the treaty.

For survey questions, detailed analysis of the survey results, or inquires for the availability of spokespersons for interview, including Senator Exon, please contact Adam Eiding at 202-547-3577.

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of the nation's 17 leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers and prevent new threats from emerging. The Coalition's CTBT site is:
<<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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: Wed, 29 Jul 1998 09:21:19 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: final CTBT poll results: state/natl.

July 29, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: combined state and national poll results news release

The following is the e-mail version of our "combination" press release on the new bipartisan poll on the CTBT, South Asian testing, and related non-proliferation issues.

This information will be released to the DC press today at a noon press briefing in Room S-116, featuring speakers Senator Joseph Biden and Arlen Specter.

For a full-color version of the release (with charts); the pollsters' detailed analysis of the survey responses; and survey questions, and related national polling results, see

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

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: July 29, 1998

CONTACT: Adam Eiding, 202-547-3577; or Daryl Kimball, Director (202) 546-0795

"Eight In Ten Voters Support Senate Approval of Nuclear Test Ban Treaty -- Voters in Key States Say Ban Is 'More Important' After South Asian Nuke Tests"

WASHINGTON, DC -- An overwhelming majority of American voters want the Senate to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), according to new public opinion surveys conducted in six states by a bipartisan polling team in June. When asked -- "Do you think the U.S. Senate should approve a Treaty with 140 other countries that would prohibit underground nuclear weapons explosions worldwide?" -- approximately 8 out of every 10 voters say the treaty should be approved. Support for the treaty is strong among Republicans, Democrats, and independents, and among all demographic and geographic groups in states represented by Senators considered pivotal to the outcome of the ratification debate. The polls also indicate that voters strongly disagree with the arguments used by the few Senators who are delaying Senate action on the test ban treaty.

The polls were commissioned by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control groups. The results are based on the findings of opinion surveys of registered voters in six states conducted by Wirthlin Worldwide, a Republican polling firm, and a Democratic firm, The Mellman Group, from June 20-24. The statistical margin of error is plus or minus 4.4 to 4.9 percentage points.

The test ban treaty was sent to the Senate for its advice and consent for ratification in September 1997, but so far it has failed to act on the treaty, which has gained new significance since India and Pakistan's nuclear blasts of May 1998. Sixty-seven votes are needed for ratification. Senators Arlen Specter (R-PA), Joseph Biden (D-DE), and others are circulating a resolution calling for prompt hearings and a vote on the treaty.

President Clinton and other world leaders say the CTBT is vital to ongoing efforts by State Department envoy Strobe Talbot and others to encourage India and Pakistan to stop nuclear testing and end their arms race. Clinton has called upon the Senate to approve the CTBT this year, before his possible visit to New Delhi and Islamabad this fall. The current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and four previous chairmen, including Gen. Colin Powell, have all endorsed the test ban treaty.

Since India and Pakistan's nuclear tests in May, public support for a nuclear test ban treaty appears to be growing. Support for Senate approval of the CTBT is higher in each of the six states (Kansas: 79% approve, 14% disapprove; Nebraska: 83% approve, 13% disapprove; Oregon: 86% approve, 10% disapprove; Tennessee: 78% approve, 19% disapprove; and Utah: 83% approve; 14% disapprove) than it is nationwide (73% approve, 16% disapprove, according to a May 1998 poll conducted days after India's tests, but before Pakistan's).

Support Cuts Across All Demographic and Partisan Lines:

In all states and in the national survey, Republican, Democratic, and independent voters overwhelmingly support Senate approval of the CTBT. In no state does support for the test ban from Republican, Democratic, or independent voters drop below 70%. Support for the test ban treaty is also strong among all demographic groups, including veterans and voters with family members who have served in the military. The results of the new surveys are consistent with those from 11 nationwide polls on the test ban conducted since 1957, when President Eisenhower first sought a nuclear test ban. While poll questions have varied somewhat over the years, support has ranged only from 61%-85%.

Americans See Test Ban As "More Important" After South Asian Nuclear Tests:

Despite repeated calls for action on the test ban, Senate leaders Trent Lott (R-MS) and Jesse Helms (R-NC) have defied public opinion and labeled the treaty "irrelevant." However, the state polls indicate that voters strongly disagree. According to the new opinion surveys, a strong majority of voters think the recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan "demonstrate how important it is for the U.S. to ratify and encourage global implementation of the CTBT." In several states, the more voters have heard about the tests, the greater their support for the CTBT.

The Indian and Pakistani tests have penetrated the public's consciousness: at least 8 out of every 10 voters in each state surveyed say they have heard about the tests and equal numbers say the tests pose a "serious threat to international security."

Voters in five of the states were asked whether they "favor" or "oppose" a variety of possible U.S. government responses to the tests by India and Pakistan. An overwhelming number support urging India and Pakistan to approve the test ban (state results range from 84%-91% favor) and U.S. Senate ratification of the CTBT (70% to 79% favor) as the best responses to the South Asian crisis. These proposals were more popular than imposing "strong economic and political sanctions" (58% to 70% favor, 22% to 31% oppose), and far more popular than the proposal of Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS) -- increasing military spending to develop and deploy a nuclear missile defense (55% to 73% oppose, 23% to 39% favor).

"The Senate's do-nothing approach on the test ban treaty is irresponsible and dangerous. It hurts efforts to protect America and the world from the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the possibility of nuclear war. The overwhelming public support for the test ban is a wake-up call for the Senate to approve the treaty and stop nuclear blasts worldwide," says Daryl Kimball, Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

The voters' staunch support for the CTBT may be attributed to their view that the test ban can help stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries like Iran, which recently tested a new ballistic missile. Most voters believe that having an international treaty that prohibits all nuclear weapons explosions is a better way to protect the U.S. from nuclear proliferation than resuming U.S. testing.

Another survey question reveals that when given the choice between two possible candidates for Senate -- one who supports the CTBT and the other who opposes the CTBT -- most voters solidly prefer a candidate who supports the CTBT over one who opposes the treaty. In this question, respondents heard descriptions of two hypothetical candidates for Senate:

Candidate A (Supports CTBT) says that the U.S. Senate should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, because the treaty is an important step in stopping the spread of nuclear weapons worldwide. Candidate A says the treaty would outlaw nuclear testing, improve our ability to detect nuclear tests and would prevent other countries from developing reliable nuclear weapons. Candidate A says the U.S. has conducted over 1000 nuclear test and does not need further nuclear tests to maintain our nuclear arsenal.

Candidate A says the U.S. should be a leader and ratify the Treaty if we expect other nations to stop their nuclear weapons testing.

Candidate B (Opposes CTBT) says that he U.S. Senate should not ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty because the treaty does not stop other countries from acquiring nuclear weapons. Candidate B says that because compliance with the treaty cannot be verified, ratifying the treaty would prevent the U.S. from conducting tests to maintain and improve our nuclear arsenal while other countries seeking nuclear arms could continue to conduct secret tests.

"What is striking about the results in each of these states, as in the nation as a whole, is the overwhelming nature of support for this Treaty. Indeed, far from being a partisan issue, support for a nuclear test ban treaty comes from all sides of the political and ideological spectrum," commented pollster Michael Dabadie of Wirthlin Worldwide.

-- 30 --

For survey questions, detailed analysis of the survey results, or inquires for the availability of spokespersons for interview, please contact Adam Eidinger at 202-547-3577 or see the Coalition web site section on polling at <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/polling.htm>>

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers and prevent new threats from emerging. The Coalition's CTBT site is: <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

>From meldredge Wed Jul 29 06:51:30 1998

Return-Path: <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Date: Wed, 29 Jul 1998 06:51:13 -0700 (PDT)

X-Sender: meldredge@pop.igc.org

To: bananas-ana@igc.org, healls@aol.com, healtm@aol.com,
bcostner@emeraldnet.net, allister@snakeriveralliance.org,
mstewart@snakeriveralliance.org, 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, 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,
syoung@basicint.org, billeisen@rocketmail.com, armsintern@ucsusa.org,
ctbt@2020vision.org, panukes@igc.org

From: maureen eldredge <meldredge@igc.apc.org>

Subject: Stockpile Stewardship Letter

Enclosed is the letter sent to the House this morning about the SSM resolution.

-M
PROVIDE FOR REAL NATIONAL SECURITY; SAVE MONEY-
CO-SPONSOR H. CON. RES. 307

July 29, 1998

U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Representative:

As peace, disarmament, religious, and environmental groups with hundreds of thousands of members across the country, we write to you to urge your support of House Concurrent Resolution 307, sponsored by Representative Edward Markey. This resolution expresses a sense of Congress that the current plans for maintaining the US nuclear weapons arsenal, known as the Stockpile Stewardship Program (SSP), are in fact excessive and dangerous. The resolution urges the Department of Energy (DOE) to take a custodial approach that saves money and is more suited to protecting the fragile non-proliferation regime.

Rather than maintaining the safety of the nuclear arsenal, the Stockpile Stewardship Program perpetuates the research and development of nuclear weapons, at even greater levels of funding than during the Cold War. The new facilities planned or under construction as part of the SSP are useful primarily for nuclear weapons research and design, not for maintaining a safe arsenal. Investing in new nuclear weapons research facilities runs counter to US obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) to pursue negotiations in good faith on cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, and fuels the nuclear aspirations of nations that follow our lead, putting our true security at risk. Further, by making possible the continued research and development of nuclear weapons without

underground tests, the SSP flies in the face of the historical purpose of and global expectations for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), and undermines prospects for its long-term viability.

In addition to our non-proliferation concerns, the SSP is wasting valuable taxpayer money, which is needed to meet viable human and environmental programs, on unnecessary weapons research. The program is expected to cost at least \$60 billion over 13 years. Due to the inevitable construction cost overruns, magnified by the dozens of new construction projects planned for this program, we expect this total to rise.

As one of our nation's elected representatives, you have the ability to help position the U.S. as leaders in the international community. The Stockpile Stewardship Program is only continuing a dangerous, obsolete nuclear arms race. The US nuclear weapons stockpile can be safely maintained, in conformity with our treaty obligations, without this excessive program, yet DOE is unwilling to explore other options. H. Con Res. 307 directs DOE to develop alternative approaches that provide for real national security and true curatorship of the arsenal more in keeping with today's needs. Please join this fight and co-sponsor H. Con Res. 307.

Sincerely,

Maureen Eldredge
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Joe Volk
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Maurice Paprin
Fund for New Priorities in America

Tom Clements
Greenpeace USA

Howard W. Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Gordon Clark
Peace Action

Robert Tiller
Physicians for Social Responsibility

Paul Walker
Veterans for Peace

Kimberly Robson
Women's Action for New Directions

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.

Return-Path: <ledwidge@psr.org>
Date: Wed, 29 Jul 1998 10:31:54 -0400
From: Lisa Ledwidge <ledwidge@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
To: armsintern@ucsusa.org, paprog@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, ctbt@2020vision.org,
disarmament@igc.org, dkimball@clw.org, meldredge@igc.org
CC: panukes@igc.org, wandwill@clark.net, kathy@fcn.org, bridget@fcn.org,
btiller@psr.org
Subject: REMINDER [Fwd: Non-traditional allies outreach on CTBT]
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id HAA02500

NWWG friends, I am re-sending the message I sent last week as a reminder to make your call(s) so we can have a productive reporting session at tomorrow's NWWG mtg. See you then! thanks, LIsa

Forwarded message:

July 17 1998

To: Select members of NWWG
Fr: Lisa

Thank you for agreeing to do outreach to non-traditional allies re: CTBT. This is an update and a reminder.

Below I've attached :

- some talking points
- list of allies, those who volunteered to contact them, progress made thus far
- list of state organizers and DC contacts

Let's plan to report our progress at the next NWWG meeting (July *30*). (This means reporting names and contact info of local folks to the DC organizers so they can in turn forward it to the state organizers.)

Thank you very much for your help on this potentially extremely valuable outreach effort!

--
Lisa Ledwidge
Physicians for Social Responsibility
1101 14th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005 USA
tel. 202-898-0150 ext. 222
fax 202-898-0172
<http://www.psr.org>

Non-Traditional Allies Outreach
(*endorsers of CTBT)
PLEASE DO NOT DISTRIBUTE

*Business Executives for National Security - Daryl

*Lawyers Alliance for World Security- Daryl

*Federation of American Scientists - Michael

*Sierra Club & Audubon Society- Lisa (will ask Bob Musil to contact)

*LWV - Daryl

*Greenpeace - Fran (is making progress)

*Friends of the Earth - Maureen

USPIRG - Maureen

*Vets for Peace - Daniel

UNA - Michael

Native American groups - open

National Farmers Organization - Marie

South Asian groups - Indira

WFA - Daryl

Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities - Marie

Civil Rights Groups - Lisa (will contact Darryl Fagin, ADA)

African American Churches - Howard

College Dems - Michael

Green Group coalition - Michael (decided not to take up CTBT as an issue; Michael and Lisa/PSR still working on it with individual members)

Non-traditional allies outreach - some talking points
(PLEASE DO NOT DISTRIBUTE)

* Trying to enlist the support of non traditional allies at local level for CTBT

* Status of treaty: stuck in Senate (Helms); need Repubs.; India, Pakistan, now more than ever; want vote -- at least debate -- this year; etc.

* Broad base of support was crucial to success in April 1997 CWC ratification, will be crucial for CTB

* Summer field organizers in Colorado, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Nebraska, Oregon, Tennessee, Washington, & Wyoming. Alaska & Utah have already-existing networks of volunteers. Trying to expand visible CTBT support in these 11 states in order to have more effective and broad-based:

- meetings with Senators or staff
- sign-on letters to Senators
- events and media campaigns

*** Do you know anyone in these states who may be willing or interested in attending a meeting with the Senator/Senate staffers; signing on to a letter; attending an event; or otherwise, to a lesser or greater extent, engaged in a local campaign for a nuclear test ban?

Alaska
Colorado
Indiana
Kansas
Maine
Nebraska
Oregon
Tennessee
Utah
Washington
Wyoming

Give CTBT state contact person's info for them to pass along to local contact(s). Or, better yet, get their organization's chapter contact or potentially interested member info — be sure to relay this to CTBT state contact person.

Thank you for your help!

State Contacts in Key CTBT States for DC Organizers (updated 7-17-98)

STATE
DC Contact(s)
State Contact(s) (* indicates hired organizers working through July and August)

AK

Lisa Ledwidge, PSR
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 898-0150 ext. 222
Fax: 898-0172
ledwidge@psr.org

Cathy Schumaker, M.D.
3601 C Street, Suite 540

Anchorage, AK 99502-5932
Tel: 907-269-8036
Fax: 907-561-1896
schukalt@alaska.net

CO

Bruce Hall, Peace Action
1819 H Street, Suite 425
Washington DC 20006
Tel: 862-9740 ext. 3038
Fax: 862-9762
E-mail: panukes@igc.org
&
Lisa Ledwidge, PSR

*Dallas Gudgell
& Beryl Schwartz
Peace Action Colorado
PO Box 48058
Denver, CO 80204
Tel: 303-832-4789
Fax:
berylls@earthlink.net

IN

Lisa Ledwidge PSR

Mark Mebane (hired by Indiana Network)
Indiana Test Ban Network/ Hoosiers for
National Security
311 South Fifth Street
Goshen IN 46528
Tel: 219-534-3402
Fax: 219-534-4937
E-mail: dbc@TLN.NET
(Working Through Fourth Freedom Forum &
with Karen Jacob)

KS

Kathy Guthrie
FCNL
245 2nd Street NE
Washington DC 20002
Tel: 547-600 ext. 112
Fax: 547-6019
kathy@fcnl.org

*Wendy Pearlman
Bill Beachy
1248 SW Buchanan
Topeka, KS 66604

Tel: 785-232-4388
Fax: (same as phone - no need to call first)
topekacpj@aol.com

ME

Lisa Ledwidge, PSR
1101 14th Street NW #700
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 898-0150 ext. 222
Fax: 898-0172
E-mail: ledwidge@psr.org
&
Michael Pancook, UCS
1616 P Street NW, #310
Washington, DC 20026
Tel: 332-0900
Fax: 332-0905
armsintern@ucsusa.org

Audrey Stewart
Peace Action/ PSR
PO Box 3842
Portland, ME 04104
Tel: (207) 772-0680
Fax: (207) 828-8620
pam@nlis.net

NE

Marie Rietman, 20/20 Vision
1828 Jefferson Place NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 833-2020
Fax: 833-5307
E-mail: ctbt@2020vision.org

Jo Peterson
(402) 596-7158
Nebraskans for Peace
4924 Chicago Street
Omaha, NE 68132-2903
Tel: 402-453-0776
Fax: Same as tel.
geln38a@prodigy.igc.org

Gregory Nipper (hired by Nebraskans for
Peace)
Tel: 402-551-5148
gnipper@creighton.edu

OH

Sheila Dormody, Peace Action

1819 H Street, Suite 425
Washington DC 20006
Tel: 862-9740 ext. 3006
Fax: 862-9762
E-mail: pafield@igc.org

Linda Kimball
Oxford Citizens for Peace and Justice
724 Melinda Drive
Oxford, OH 45056
Tel: 513-523-3640
Fax:
kimbaljp@muohio.edu

Francis Chiappa
Cleveland Peace Action
2997 Hampshire Rd.
Cleveland Heights, OH 44118
Tel: 216-321-1670
Fax: 216-845-9013
chiapski@aol.com

Ellen Robinson
Peace Council of Youngstown
204 Broadway
Youngstown, OH 44504
Tel: 216-742-6648
Fax:
djrobins@cc.ysu.edu

OR

Bruce Hall, Peace Action
1819 H Street, Suite 425
Washington DC 20006
Tel: 862-9740 ext. 3038
Fax: 862-9762
E-mail: panukes@igc.org
&
Marie Rietman, 20/20 Vision

Michael Carrigan, Oregon Peace Works
333 State Street
Salem OR 97301
Tel: 503-585-2767
Fax: 503-588-0088
opw@teleport.com
Ken Ferguson *

TN

Bruce Hall, Peace Action
1819 H Street, Suite 425
Washington DC 20006

Tel: 862-9740 ext. 3038
Fax: 862-9762
E-mail: panukes@igc.org
&
Michael Pancook, UCS

Bill Akin
Mid-South Peace & Justice Center
PO Box 11428
Memphis, TN 38111-0428
Tel: 901-452-6997
&
*Nell Levin
1611 Forrest Avenue
Nashville, TN 37206
Tel: 615 226 8070
Fa: 615.226.7202
nellrose@earthlink.net

UT

Kimberly Robson, WAND
110 Maryland Avenue, NE, Suite 205
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 543-8505
Fax: 675-6469
wandwill@clark.net

Deb Sawyer
Writing To Reduce Nuclear Dangers
549 Cortez Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84103
Tel: 801-364-2971
Fax: 801-595-0469
dsawyer@aros.net

WA

Marie Rietman, 20/20 Vision
1828 Jefferson Place NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 833-2020
Fax: 833-5307
E-mail: ctbt@2020vision.org
&
Kathy Crandall,
Disarmament Clearinghouse

Mary Hanson 20/20 Vision
4701 38th Ave. NE
Seattle, WA 98105
Tel: 206-528-0289
Fax: Same as Tel (Call First)
hansonmary@hotmail.com

&
Peace Action of Washington
5828 Roosevelt Way NE
Seattle, WA 98105
Tel: 206-527-8050
Fax: 206-527-9985
peaceact@scn.org
WY

Bruce Hall, Peace Action
&
Kathy Crandall,
Disarmament Clearinghouse

Dallas Gudgell in CO &
Don Stoen, Wyoming Peace Initiative
2740 Kelly Drive
Cheyenne, WY 82001
Tel: 307-634-3066

end

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Wed, 29 Jul 1998 18:29:26 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: news: Biden-Specter on the CTBT

July 29, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Biden-Specter renew call for hearings and vote on CTBT

At today's Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers press briefing at the Capitol Building on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and our new public opinion polling data on the subject, Sens. Biden and Specter renewed their call for prompt action on the CTBT.

The text of Senator Biden's press release is attached below.

DK

Joseph R. Biden, Jr.

UNITED STATES SENATOR - DELAWARE
<http://www.senate.gov/--biden>

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
JULY 29, 1998

CONTACTS: CHRIS MADISON 202-224-0133
REBEKKA BONNER 202-224-0086

Biden, Specter Urge Foreign Relations Committee
to Schedule CTBT Hearing

WASHINGTON, D.C. -- Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr., ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today joined Sen. Arlen Specter (R-PA) in urging the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to schedule a hearing on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

"Ten months ago, the President submitted the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty to the Senate for its advice and consent," Biden said. "Since then, I regret there has not been a single hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this Treaty, although the Committee has had time to hold a hearing on the Treaty on the International Criminal Court, which will not be submitted to the Senate for many years."

The CTBT is an international treaty that obligates its signatories not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion. It reinforces the world non-proliferation regime by ensuring that non-nuclear states will not develop sophisticated nuclear weapons and that nuclear states will cease developing ever more sophisticated nuclear devices. It will also significantly improve world capabilities to detect and monitor nuclear tests worldwide.

"Failure by the United States Senate to ratify the Treaty may give rise to an inference that the United States government is not serious about banning nuclear testing and may, in effect, encourage or at least not discourage such testing," Biden and Specter said in a letter to their Senate colleagues.

Biden and Specter also released the results of a nationwide poll indicating widespread support for the Treaty. Biden noted, "The vast majority of Americans support U.S. ratification of the Treaty. In 5 states -- with 7 Republican senators -- the percentage of treaty supporters ranges from 77 to 86 percent of those polled. Less than one in four Americans want us to resume nuclear testing in the wake of the India and Pakistan tests. It's very hard to argue with numbers like that. Americans know that the best response to the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests is to rope those two countries into signing the test ban."

Biden and Specter are cosponsors of a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Foreign Relations Committee should hold hearings on the CTBT and that the full Senate should take up the Treaty for debate and a vote on ratification as soon as possible.

###

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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: Thu, 30 Jul 1998 11:39:08 +0100 (BST)
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Pakistan Contact
To: Abolition-Caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: geowcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org

GF/9308

Dear Abolitionists

I have just received, by letter, news of an interesting contact in Pakistan.

They are the Presbyterian Church of Pakistan. They believe in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and have "as a governing principle ... always to do good heal: never to hurt or destroy". They want to stay in touch and work together with us. I have sent them information about World Court project. If anybody else in A2000 hasn't come across them, and wants to get in touch, they are on riapre@hotmail.com. The main contact is Rev. Youhana Bhatti, Kasur Presbytery, 154-M, Gulberg III, Lahore, Pakistan, Ph 0092-42-8544612.

Best Wishes

George Farebrother

UK Secretary George Farebrother (geowcpuk@gn.apc.org)

67 Summerheath Rd, Hailsham, Sussex, BN27 3DR, England
Phone & Fax 01323 844 269

Web Site: <http://www.gn.apc.org/wcp>

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

Date: Thu, 30 Jul 1998 14:46:38 +0100 (BST)

From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: CD update: Pakistan

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host ae247.du.pipex.com [193.130.244.247] claimed to be Acronym

X-Sender: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org

For ACRO receivers: CD Update, 30 July 1998

CD may start FMCT negotiations next week.

Today, when the CD resumed after a month's break, Pakistan withdrew its objections to starting negotiations on a fissile materials 'cut-off' treaty (FMCT). After conducting its nuclear tests, India had earlier indicated that it was dropping its linkage between FMCT negotiations and time-bound nuclear disarmament. There will now be consultations in the CD to see if there is consensus on establishing an ad hoc committee, and if so, on who should chair it. The CD will hold a special informal plenary next on Tuesday, in the hope that agreements can be reached and FMCT negotiations put underway. This is the nearest the CD has got since March 1995, but there are still some hurdles to be surmounted.

It was clear from the statement by Pakistan's Ambassador, Mounir Akram, that its softened position was a direct consequence of its discussions with the US (headed by Strobe Talbott) in Islamabad last week.

He said that Pakistan would join the US in promoting a decision for establishing the ad hoc committee, in accordance with the March 1995 Shannon report (CD/1299). Regarding Pakistan's long standing position with regard to stocks, Akram said: "In the course of the negotiations in the Ad Hoc Committee, Pakistan will, as envisaged in the Shannon Report, raise its concerns about and seek a solution to the problem of unequal stockpiles."

He also added: "We believe that a wide disparity in fissile material stockpiles of India and Pakistan could erode the stability of nuclear deterrence. The impact of such asymmetry could be further exacerbated once India acquires the S-300 ABM Systems and additional anti-aircraft systems from the Russian Federation."

Many Ambassadors took the floor to welcome Pakistan's expressed flexibility re FMCT and to hope that the committee will be convened next week and negotiations able to be started shortly thereafter.

Other business: UK Ambassador introduced the main points of the Strategic Defence Review.

The statement from Pakistan will be put up on the Acronym Institute website as soon as possible (hopefully by the end of today).

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>

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Meeting on Tuesday, August 4
Cc: dkimball@clw.org, disarmament@igc.org, btiller@psr.org, dculp@igc.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, panukes@igc.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

There will be a meeting of the interfaith CTBT working group at 1:00 p.m., Tuesday, August 4, 1998 at the Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 2nd Street, NE to discuss an Interfaith Breakfast on the CTBT on September 16. We will also take up a couple other matters. I hope that you can attend.

It seems almost certain that the Senate will not take up the CTBT before this session adjourns. However, efforts are underway to achieve agreement on a date-certain for a vote, say, in March 1999. Our challenge between now and adjournment is to push hard for such an agreement.

The Interfaith Breakfast in September can help us draw in a wider group from the religious community to support this final push for this session and to become involved in a renewed ratification campaign in 1999. David Culp has a tentative acceptance from Senator Jeffords to speak on Wednesday morning, September 16 at the Mott House. When we meet on August 4, we want to discuss who to invite beyond the staff now working on the CTBT and how to follow through with invitations. We are thinking of heads of denominational offices in Washington, representatives of denominations whose heads signed the religious leaders statement on the CTBT but which haven't been involved in campaign activities, and other potential supporters within the religious community. Please come with your suggestions of who to invite. If you cannot be there on August 4, please call me or send your ideas to me in advance. We will also discuss Walter Owensby's suggestion for an audio linkage with CTBT supporters around the country.

At a CTBT Grassroots meeting today, we discuss plans for the September push to get the Senate to schedule a vote on the CTBT next year before they adjourn this session. Among the proposals, though not yet adopted, was to have a call-in day on September 24, the second anniversary of the CTBT signing. Daryl Kimball is pulling together other ideas for consideration, and we can review them on August 4.

In a separate memo I'm sending you information about recently completed polls regarding support for the CTBT in six states. This is information you can get out to your contacts in those states.

The CTBT Grassroots group will meet next on September 3 at 10:30 at FCNL to set in motion our efforts in the final month of the congressional session; you're invited to participate. Our interfaith CTBT working group will meet again on Wednesday, September 9 at 1:00 at FCNL.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <bridget@fcnl.org>

X-Sender: bridget@local.fcnl.org

Date: Thu, 30 Jul 1998 18:01:14 -0400

To: ograbc@aol.com, fagin@ix.netcom.com, AIMbasic@aol.com, ejl@armscontrol.org, wade@armscontrol.org, cunr@aol.com, chellman@cdi.org, towles@csbahome.com, heeter@csbahome.com, Bazie@center.cbtp.org, washofc@aol.com, cwu_washington.parti@ecunet.org, dkimball@clw.org, jdi@clw.org, skerr@clw.org, cdavis@clw.org, cardamone@clw.org, pdd@clark.net, disarmament@igc.org, etandc@igc.org, lllumpe@fas.org, bobvan@erols.com, wdc.greenpeace.org@clark.net, ipsps@igc.apc.org, 73744.3675@compuserve.com, britishr@aol.com, obryonJRS@aol.com, tgraham@lawscns.org, mccwash@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, meldredge@igc.org, stevenraikin@delphi.com, billeisen@rocketmail.com, cpain@nrdc.org, network@igc.apc.org, hamilton@rtk.net, paexec@igc.org, paprog@igc.apc.org, bmusil@psr.org, dculp@nrdc.org, defense@pogo.org, sionno@pusa.org, cena@taxpayer.net, laura@2020vision.org, rac@uahc.org, tperry@ucsusa.org, tcollina@ucsusa, uuawo@aol.com, mccolloc@ucc.org, lintnerj@ucc.org, info@paxworld.org, vfp@ipc.org, wandwill@clark.net, tbarner@wfa.org (Tim Barner), denhartz@erols.com, ggilhool@ix.netcom.com

From: Bridget Moix <bridget@fcnl.org>

Subject: this time I'm really leaving

Dear Friends,

After numerous final meetings and countless goodbye parties, I'm finally leaving for real. (I begin work on a Masters in International Security/Conflict Resolution at Columbia in a few weeks.) Working with you all has been a wonderful experience that I will miss dearly. You have taught me more in two years than I ever imagined, and become good friends along the way. I look forward to staying in touch and continuing to work on arms control issues from my new home in New York.

My new contact information is:

Bridget Moix
25-90 35th St., Apt. 6C
Astoria, NY 11103
email: bridgetmoix@hotmail.com

(I can also be reached beginning in September through the World Policy Institute, where I'll be working part time with Bill Hartung and Jennifer Washburn on their arms trade project.)

Feel free to add me to your mailing lists, and make sure you look me up whenever you're in New York!

in peace,
Bridget

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Thu, 30 Jul 1998 18:39:52 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Helms' staff goes "ballistic" on CTBT briefing

July 29

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: the story inside the story

No vote. No hearings. Not even a meeting room?

I thought you might be amused by the following piece from today's LA Times.

DK

Los Angeles Times
July 30, 1998
By Tyler Marshall

WASHINGTON - STILL KICKING: Those who last year saw Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms' (R-N.C.) political flirtation with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright as a sign that the crusty lawmaker might be mellowing in his advanced years seem to have gotten it wrong. Helms, a longtime critic of international arms control treaties, and his staff are giving no quarter in the preliminary skirmishes for the debate to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Helms' spokesman Marc Thiessen reportedly fired off a bitter complaint after discovering that the committee's ranking Democrat, Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr. of Delaware, and Specter planned to use the committee's meeting room Wednesday for a press event promoting the treaty. Thiessen was said to be especially upset because it would happen as Helms was "flat on his back" recovering from double knee replacement surgery. "You might say he [Thiessen] went ballistic," said Adam Eidinger, who helped put together the event on behalf of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. Biden, apparently eager to avoid a confrontation, quickly agreed to shift rooms. Thiessen declined comment.

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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: Thu, 30 Jul 1998 18:29:18 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: news: Biden/Specter urge CTBT action, pt. 2

July 29, 1998

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

Below are three of the news stories on yesterday's Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers press briefing with Senators Arlen Specter and Joseph Biden on the merits of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT):

- * one from USIA (with the best direct quotes);
- * another from Congressional Quarterly's "Daily Monitor;" and
- * the third from Bloomberg newswire.

A full transcript of the July 29 briefing will be available on the Coalition web site in about a week.

DK

29 July 1998

BIDEN, SPECTER URGE QUICK APPROVAL OF CTBT; CITE WIDE SUPPORT

(But Senate leader says he sees no action this year) (790)

By Ralph Dannheisser
USIA Congressional Correspondent

Washington -- Citing new opinion polls that show overwhelming public support for U.S. approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), two senior senators have called for quick Senate consideration of treaty ratification.

Republican Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania and Democrat Joseph Biden of Delaware made their renewed plea for swift action at a press briefing at the U.S. Capitol July 29.

Representatives of two polling firms present at the same briefing released data showing that about three-fourths of the public supports approval of the treaty, with support strong in all regions of the country and among members of both parties.

Shortly after the briefing, however, Senate Majority (Republican) Leader Trent Lott -- who sets the Senate schedule -- told reporters there is no chance that the body will consider the CTBT this year.

President Clinton submitted the treaty to the Senate for its consideration on September 22, 1997 -- more than 10 months ago. But Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms, a North Carolina Republican, has blocked review by his committee, which has initial jurisdiction.

Biden said his view, buttressed by the new public opinion polling, is that "if we had a hearing and had a vote, we would win overwhelmingly." Accordingly, he said, it is "not at all surprising" that treaty opponents are blocking consideration.

He termed the effort "a stealth campaign to kill this treaty by not allowing it to come up." The United States signed the treaty September 24, 1996, but final approval of a treaty requires ratification by a two-thirds majority of the Senate -- 67 votes in the 100-member body.

The CTBT would prohibit underground nuclear weapons test explosions by all participating nations. The Treaty has been signed by 150 countries -- including the five nuclear weapons states: Britain, France, Russia, China, and the United States -- and ratified by 15, including Britain and France.

Biden argued that the United States, given its technological edge, is in the best position of any country in the world to do without further testing.

If this nation does not ratify the treaty, he predicted, countries like Japan, South Korea, and Brazil will undertake serious reviews of their own non-nuclear status within the next few years. He called U.S. approval of a ban before this is allowed to happen "absolutely vital to our naked self-interest."

Specter and Biden have sponsored a nonbinding "Sense of the Senate" resolution that would call on Helms and his committee to hold hearings -- and on the Senate to debate and vote on the issue -- "as expeditiously as possible."

In a letter seeking co-sponsors, Specter warned that "failure by the United States Senate to ratify the treaty may give rise to an inference that the United States government is not serious about banning nuclear testing and may, in effect, encourage or at least not discourage such testing."

The polls Biden and Specter cited were commissioned by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control groups, and conducted by Wirthlin Worldwide, a Republican polling firm, and The Mellman Group, a Democratic firm.

Results showed that large majorities of voters polled in six states across the nation favor Senate ratification. The percentage of supporters ranges from a low of 78 percent in Tennessee to a high of 86 percent in Oregon. And in none of the six states surveyed does support drop below 70 percent among Republican, Democratic, or

independent voters.

The pollsters noted that public support for a test ban appears to have grown since India and Pakistan conducted competing nuclear tests in May. Thus all the state polls, conducted in June, showed higher levels of support than the national figure of 73 percent that emerged from polling conducted in May.

Mark Mellman, one of the pollsters, called the results "very clear, very consistent, very overwhelming." It is "very rare that you see this level of consensus on any issue," particularly in the field of foreign policy, he added.

Pollster Michael Dabadie of Wirthlin Worldwide similarly commented, "What is striking about the results...is the overwhelming nature of support for this treaty.

"Indeed, far from being a partisan issue, support for a nuclear test ban treaty comes from all sides of the political and ideological spectrum," Dabadie said."

FOREIGN AFFAIRS:

SEN. SPECTER PLANS TO SEEK TEST VOTE ON THE TEST BAN TREATY

By Miles A. Pomper, CQ Staff Writer

Jul. 30, 1998 - Sen. Arlen Specter, R-Pa, wants a test vote -- in more ways than one.

Specter told reporters yesterday he will offer an amendment to the foreign operations spending bill (S2334) to measure Senate sentiment on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. "Let's find out exactly where we stand," he said.

The treaty has been bottled up in the Senate by Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., and Foreign Relations Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C. Helms has yet to hold a hearing on the treaty, despite administration requests, claiming the accord is unverifiable and unenforceable.

But Specter and another treaty supporter, Joseph R. Biden, Jr., D-Del., ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, released a Wirthlin Worldwide poll yesterday claiming overwhelming public support for the treaty.

Specter's proposed amendment would reinstate \$29 million that the Appropriations Committee cut from the spending bill. The money would be used to fund a preparatory committee that would install seismic devices and other measures laying the groundwork for implementation of the treaty.

Biden and Specter said they thought the amendment was more likely to win Senate support than their earlier proposal for a sense-of-the-Senate resolution calling for consideration of the treaty, since it would not

impinge on Helms's prerogatives as a chairman.

U.S. Senators See Test Ban Treaty Approval Next Year

Washington, July 29 (Bloomberg) -- The U.S. Senate will ratify the Clinton administration-supported Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty within the next 12 months, two Senate proponents predicted.

Senators Joseph Biden, a Delaware Democrat, and Arlen Specter, a Pennsylvania Republican, said the nuclear tests India and Pakistan conducted in May helped rally public support for their chamber to finally approve the treaty, which has languished in the Senate for a year, because of opposition from conservatives.

"The American people overwhelmingly support this treaty," said Biden, ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at a news conference. Senate ratification, however, is "not likely," before Congress adjourns in October, he said.

The U.S. and 157 other nations endorsed the worldwide nuclear test ban treaty at the United Nations on Sept. 10, 1996. The pact aims to end proliferation of nuclear weapons and their underground testing throughout the world.

A poll released yesterday by the non-governmental Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers at the conference said that 73 percent of Americans nationwide support ratification of the CTBT against 16 percent who oppose it. The survey polled 1,000 registered voters in May and has a margin of error of plus or minus 3.1 percentage points.

The Clinton administration is "very encouraged by the polling data that they highlighted today," said P.J. Crowley, a White House spokesman. "The swift ratification of the CTBT is clearly in the national interest," Crowley said. "We have called upon the Senate and are renewing our call on the Senate to ratify the treaty, which has already been signed by 149 nations."

Helms' Objection

The CTBT is "absolutely vital to our naked self-interest," said Biden, while allowing the U.S. to "maintain its leadership in non-proliferation in the wake of the Pakistan and India tests."

The Senate Republican leadership "cannot hide for ever," he said. Senator Jesse Helms, the conservative North Carolina Republican who chairs the Foreign Relations Committee, has said the Senate won't consider the CTBT until the administration first sends Congress an amended version of the 26-year-old Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty.

That treaty prohibits the U.S. and the former Soviet Union from deploying a massive continental defense system against ballistic missiles. Helms opposes the ABM treaty because "of the danger posed by

rogue states possessing weapons of mass destruction," like Iraq.

``The only stumbling block to the CTBT's ratification by the Senate is President Clinton's refusal to submit the ABM treaty and the Kyoto Protocol" on global warming, said Marc Thiessen, a Helms spokesman. The Kyoto Protocol calls for countries to cut their overall emissions of greenhouse gases by at least 5 percent below 1990 levels between 2008 and 2010.

Last March, the Senate passed legally binding language, ``which the administration agreed to," that requires the president to submit the ABM treaty for ratification, Thiessen said. ``Chairman Helms hasn't said he was opposed under all circumstances" to the CTBT, he said.

``This is all about a defense missile system policy versus a continuation of a non-proliferation policy," Biden said.

If U.S. lawmakers fail to pass the CTBT, that could prompt other ``very responsible nations, such as Japan, South Korea and Brazil" to rethink their position on non-proliferation should testing resume around the world, he said.

``India and Pakistan have reminded us how important it is to have a worldwide test ban treaty," Biden said.

In May, India and archival and neighbor Pakistan defied the international community by testing nuclear devices. Both nations, which haven't signed the CTBT, have said the tests were prompted by their respective security interests.

16:37:32 07/30/1998

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
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: Fri, 31 Jul 1998 04:12:11 +0200 (CEST)
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Will 2000 Walk from The Hague to NATO in Brussels??
To: fme@motherearth.org, a-days@motherearth.org, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org,
abolition-2000@agoranet.be, induran@motherearth.org,
tp2000.lst.grp@gn.apc.org, network@oneworld.org
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

-> REGISTER NOW <<http://www.motherearth.org/walk99.htm>>

PLEASE REGISTER YOUR INTEREST TODAY. THIS WILL HELP US MAKE A DECISION !!
AND FORWARD THIS CALL FOR ACTION TO AS MANY PEOPLE AND NETWORKS AS POSSIBLE
AND MAKE AN ANNOUNCEMENT ON YOUR WWW & LINK TO OUR WWW

News release #1 - 1999 PEACE WALK

Will 2,000 march from the ICJ in The Hague to NATO headquarters in Brussels
For a Treaty to Abolish Nuclear Weapons by the year 2000

Gent, July 31 1998 - Activists at For Mother Earth are considering organising a 2,000 people 'Abolition 2000' peace walk from the footsteps of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in The Hague (Netherlands) to NATO in Brussels (Belgium). The walk would start on May 16th and May 26 1999 at the headquarters of NATO.

The walk is designed to press NATO member states and other nuclear weapon states to eliminate their nuclear arsenals by signing a treaty banning nuclear weapons by the year 2000. Especially NATO member states have blocked for many years all international efforts in the United Nations to negotiate a treaty banning nuclear weapons. NATO member states simply refuse to start negotiations, as the alliance continues to rely on its nuclear deterrent as first strike weapons. This although the threat or use of nuclear weapons are contrary to the rules of international law, as confirmed by the ICJ in a historic ruling on July 8th 1996.

This end of the millennium peace march would be a closing event for 'The Hague Appeal for Peace' (HAP), a large international conference calling for the abolition of war. HAP is scheduled to become the major end-of-the-century international NGO conference with several thousands of participants meeting in The Hague from May 11-16.

"Our dream is for the peace walk to count at least 2,000 participants walking for the conclusion of a Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons by the year 2000. The walk should be a major public event which would finally put the growing Abolition 2000 movement and its aims on the agenda of the politicians!! NATO member states will be embarrassed for thousands of people highlighting NATO's illegal, costly and unnecessary nuclear policy." declares Pol D'Huyvetter, a campaigner at For Mother Earth.

The walk would start in The Hague with a rally on Sunday May 16th at the footsteps of the International Court of Justice. A public meeting with testimonies of Hibakusha (survivors from Hiroshima and Nagasaki), Indigenous People who suffered from uranium mining and atomic testing, international jurists, etc.
...

The walkers would cover approx. 25km/day (17 miles/day). Arriving at NATO there could be a rally, a vigil, an 'inspection on preparation of war crimes', ... and/or a peaceful blockade of the main-gates of the place where State Officials continue to meet in the Nuclear Planning Group preparing nuclear warfare with what are clearly weapons of mass-destruction.

Interested walkers are asked to register their interest 'today' through internet <<http://www.motherearth.org/walk99.htm>> or by sending a letter to For Mother Earth [Lange Steenstraat 16/d, 9000 Gent, Belgium]. Also NGO's interested to join this public event are invited to contact For Mother Earth. A final decision about this walk will be taken depending on the registered interest from NGO's and participants. We will assess the respons by the end of august.

The previous days we were happy to register NGO interest from EYFA Amsterdam (European Youth for Action) FoE International Amsterdam (Friends of the Earth), HAP USA (Hague Appeal for Peace USA), IPB Geneva (International Peace Bureau), the International Free Vanunu Committee - Oslo, the Norwegian Peace Alliance and Nichigu Asangha, a survivor from Hiroshima. We hope many more people and NGO's will react the upcoming month.

For Mother Earth has already organised two major anti-nuclear peace walks; a Walk across America in 1992, and a Walk across Europe in 1995.

end

PS: and check out the updates on our 'new' website with photographs of our latest 'War Crimes Inspection' at NATO hq on July 8th 1998!!!

<<http://www.motherearth.org/photos/1998/adphoto.htm>>

July 12 1998 -> Walk for Nuclear Disarmament from NATO HQ to
August 9 1998 Trident nuclear submarine base in Scotland

August 11 - 25 Trident Ploughshares 2000 Peace Camp

October 1 1998 International Day of Non-Violent Action
Citizens Inspect nuclear 'sites of crime'

* For Mother Earth International office *

* Lange Steenstraat 16/D, 9000 Gent, Belgium *
* Phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39 *
* Mobile +32-95-28 02 59 *
* Fax +32-9-233 73 02 *

* E-mail: international@motherearth.org *

* WWW:http://www.motherearth.org *

* Postal account : 000-1618561-19 *

* For Mother Earth is member of Abolition 2000 - the global *

network to eliminate nuclear weapons, the International Peace

* Bureau (IPB), World Information Service on Energy (WISE), *

* International Network on Sustainable Energy and Eurosolar *

* For Mother Earth has offices in Belgium, Bulgaria, *

* Romania, Slovakia, Sri Lanka and USA, aswell as *

* contacts/groups in Belarus, Czech Republic, France, *

* Finland, Germany, Netherlands and United Kingdom *

WHEN SPIDERS UNITE, THEY CAN TIE DOWN A LION -Ethiopian Proverb

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org
Date: Fri, 31 Jul 1998 08:41:10 -0400
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: Peace through Reason <prop1@prop1.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Political Websites
Cc: fnb-1@tao.ca
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

This may be of interest. Washington Times is a conservative newspaper.
Do you know of any other political websites to add to this list?

et in dc <prop1@prop1.org>

Links to Political Web Sites | Political Parties
July 31, 1998, Washington Times

Democratic National Committee (<http://www.democrats.org>)
Republican National Committee (<http://www.rnc.org>)
Reform Party News (<http://www.reformparty.org>)
Libertarian Party (<http://www.lp.org>)
U.S. Taxpayers Party (<http://www.ustaxpayers.org>)

Political Resources: FEC Records (<http://www.tray.com/fecinfo/>)
TechnoPolitics (<http://www.technopolitics.com>)
Conservative Caucus (<http://www.conservativeusa.org>)

* Peace Through Reason - <http://prop1.org> - Convert the War Machines! *

- To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com" with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" 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: "CNANW-L" <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>
Date: Fri, 31 Jul 1998 08:50:37 -0400
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Doukhobor Letter supports the Trans Eurasia Pilgrimage for Peace
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

[As sent by fax to Chris Hunter, Centre for Peacemaking and Community
Development, Grozny, peacecentre@glasnet.ru]

THE UNION OF SPIRITUAL COMMUNITIES OF CHRIST, CANADA

Box 700,
Grand Forks, B.C.
VON IHO
Telephone: +1 (604)442-8252
Fax: +1 (604)442-3433

July 29, 1998

Dear Chris:

Members of the Union of Spiritual Communities of Christ more commonly known as Doukhobors. would like to congratulate you and your colleagues on your Eurasian wide Pilgrimage "for a War-free, Non-violent New Millennium".

We wish you safety and success in completing your challenging itinerary and ambitious goal, and you can be assured our prayers are with you and your friends. The USCC and the wider Doukhobor community in Canada and around the world support your appeal to representatives of the world's governments, religious figures, non-governmental organizations and the media to end the nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan, for the nuclear powers to begin total global nuclear disarmament, and to endorse the Hague Appeal for Peace 99.

The Hague Appeal to de-legitimize and abolish war in the 21 century and to actively seek and implement non-violent alternative mechanisms to avert armed conflict resonate in the heart, mind and soul of every Doukhobor.

To emphatically demonstrate their renunciation of militarism and violence several thousand Doukhobors destroyed all their weapons in Transcaucasia in 1895, and endured the severe persecution which followed. In 1899 with the help of Leo Tolstoy and his colleagues, English and American Quakers, and other people of good will, almost 8000 Doukhobors from whom we are descended were allowed by Tsarist authorities to emigrate to Canada.

The fact that your itinerary will take you to or near places of historical

significance to Doukhobors, and that your aspirations mirror ours, ensure that we are with you in spirit, even if we cannot be with you physically as you make your pilgrimage. Perhaps you may even meet Russian Doukhobors en route as they are currently trying to re-establish themselves in various parts of the former Soviet Union, through which you intend to pass. If this happens we hope they will extend their hospitality and good will to you and your friends and we would appreciate you passing on our greetings to them.

In conclusion Chris, may Cod bless all of you and give you strength to complete your task. It is through these kinds of initiatives and the combined efforts of people around the world that the vision of peace, justice and freedom for all may be realized in the new millennium.

Sincerely

signed

John S. Verigin Jr.
Executive Assistant, USCC

JIVJR/mk

P.S. Members of the Kootenay Boundary Branch of the United Nations Association of Canada share the sentiments expressed above and send their greetings and best wishes.

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 31 Jul 1998 14:15:26 -0600
From: "BobKinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: Re: CTBT letter campaign
To: <unitedchurch@unidial.com>, <Sable@Sable-Boulder.com>,
"Ron Forthofer" <rforthofer@aol.com>, <rhund@aol.com>,
<rebecca@minister.com>, <ginnym@sprynet.com>,
"Ed Hawley" <SBDarling@aol.com>, <ctbt-organize@igc.org>,
<broyster@info2000.net>, <berkucc2@aol.com>,
"Beryl Schwartz" <berylls@earthlink.net>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

Please do all you can to get people to send similar letters to the Denver Post and Rocky Mountain News

> From: BobKinsey <bkinsey@peacemission.org>
>
> SAMPLE LETTER:
> To the Editor:
>
> Colorado voters want to know whether candidates for the Office of U.S.
> Senator favor or oppose ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
> on nuclear weapons. A recent poll by the independent Mellman group
> shows
> that over 75% would vote for the candidate who supports the treaty.
>
> This treaty would protect the environment from further nuclear pollution
> caused by testing. It would discourage the further proliferation of
> nuclear weapons and put in place monitoring systems to insure that
> countries keep to the treaty. With international cooperation on the
> elimination of nuclear weapons we would be safer. Our children would
> grow
> up with a deeper sense of hope in the future. We would free up the
> massive dollars we spend maintaining our nuclear arsenals for more
> constructive measures or to cut back on government spending. The
> Brookings institute has informed us we have spent \$5.8 Trillion dollars
> on
> these weapons. Enough is Enough! General Lee
> Butler, past Strategic Air Commander in Chief who was responsible for
> targeting and delivering them, has called for measures that will
> eliminate nuclear weapons. He and sixty other senior officers say that
> now
> is the time.
>
> There is overwhelming public support for the CTBT. But how can we vote
> for
> it if the candidates for Senate equivocate. Let them take a stand. Are
> they for it or against it. Being for non-proliferation
> measures "in general" is not enough. Let's put the pressure on the
> candidates to say, " CTBT-Yes. I will work for its ratification from the
> moment I hit the ground in Washington!"
>

> Sincerely,

>

>

>

> OR OR OR AND? AND? AND?

>

>

>

> To the Editor:

>

> As a citizen of the State of Colorado I want to know whether candidates
> for

> the Office of U.S. Senator favor or oppose ratification of the

> Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

>

> Ten months ago, the President submitted the Treaty to the Senate for its

> advice and consent. Since then there has not been a single hearing in

> the

> Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this Treaty, although the Committee

> has had time to hold a hearing on the Treaty on the International

> Criminal

> Court, which will not be submitted to the Senate for many years.

>

> The CTBT is an international treaty that obligates its signatories not to

> carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear

> explosion.

> It reinforces the world non-proliferation regime by ensuring that

> non-nuclear states will not develop sophisticated nuclear weapons and

> that

> nuclear states will cease developing ever more sophisticated nuclear

> devices. It will also significantly improve world capabilities to detect

> and monitor nuclear tests worldwide.

>

> Failure by the United States Senate to ratify the Treaty may give rise to

> an inference that the United States government is not serious about

> banning

> nuclear testing and may, in effect, encourage such testing.

>

> This treaty sets a major foreign and military policy for the United

> States.

> It is about our safety and the safety of all the world for generations

> to

> come. It will set priorities for government spending. This election

> should provide voters with an opportunity to support or not support it

> according to their convictions. Colorado News media should make sure

> all

> candidates for the United States Senate declare their position on this

> treaty prior to the election.

>

> Sincerely,

>

Return-Path: <lmehall@ibm.net>
Reply-To: <lmehall@ibm.net>
From: "LYNETTE MEHALL" <lmehall@ibm.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Great trip!
Date: Sat, 1 Aug 1998 09:27:46 -0000
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

Dear Howard and Carlee,

We just got back on Monday from a great trip to Jamaica! I attended a World Congress of Reading there in Ochos Rios. We stayed at the Renaissance Jamaica Grande Hotel - a beautiful 735 room all-inclusive resort! Clint and a friend went with us. Luke stayed here because he needed to work. He had been on a trip around the Midwest the week before following a Grateful Dead Revival. We were relieved that he managed fine here, and both houses were in excellent shape (you never know with teens!).

Jamaica definitely has a great deal of poverty. The bus ride to Montego Bay (where we flew in and out of) real was an eye-opener! I had heard this already from others who had visited Jamaica. Goats and cows are just tied up by a piece of rope to graze anywhere along the countryside! The shacks some people live in are quite pathetic! I think it was good for Clint to see. It reminds us how fortunate we are and that there are others out there who need our help!

We visited the Dunn River Falls - a huge waterfall of large rocks that you can climb up, went snorkeling, swam in the Caribbean (9sp?) and relaxed!! It was the first long vacation we had taken since we went to family camp in Minnesota! It was especially great for Rick who had lots of time to read and let go of the office challenges!

I start my new job on Monday! It is scary! I was in there four days this past week to work awhile. I am grappling with the student schedules now and trying to work out the glitches!

Hope you are enjoying the cool weather we are! Take Care! Love,
Lynette

P.S. My rule of E-mail is that I don't check spelling or grammar!!

To: btiller@psr.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: De-alerting campaign: phase I
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Bob:

Here are some notes on possibilities for Phase I of a De-alerting Campaign, focusing on the Clinton-Yeltsin Summit. (Phase II would focus on Clinton in September to December.)

Sign-on Letter to Clinton and Yeltsin

Initial signers: PSR, Methodists United for Peace with Justice (MUPJ) at minimum; possibly add Peace Action, WAND, FCNL, Pax Christi USA. Get in circulation by August 7 with a two-week deadline for signatures.

Circulate through various networks: Monday Lobby, Abolition 2000 (worldwide), Pax Christi International, International FOR, other religious networks (U.S. and international), IPPNW, international groups of lawyers, engineers; in US, mayors, city council members, state legislators. Try for Russian signers; also, British, French. Anyone in China? If we developed information that ground zero for a Russian attack in all U.S. cities over, say, 200,000 in which there are heavy concentrations of African-Americans and Hispanics, we might be able to get signers from this segment (though this might need to wait Phase II when we have more time).

Solicit separate letters to Clinton and Yeltsin (notables, persons and organizations who don't ordinarily sign-on to our letters): World Council of Churches, Holy See, U.S. Catholic Conference; Senator Nunn (could he get other present and former senators to sign? also present and former members of the House?); or Senator Daschle as lead for a letter from senators; Senator Cranston (enclosing the statements of generals and admirals, civilian leaders); maybe a fresh sign-on letter from these folks (though probably too difficult at this time to get many). Would it be possible to get a letter from Duma members? From citizen groups in Russia who wouldn't sign an international sign-on letter?

Ask Bruce Blair to write a 12 month schedule for achieving zero alert and have him send it to Clinton and Yeltsin. Maybe Senator Nunn could be a co-author.

We might prepare and submit separately a short compendium of various commissions and group statements advocating de-alerting (Canberra Commission, etc.)

A few days before the summit, release all these letters and information to the press. Or, at least get a friendly reporter or two to write a feature story. We probably could send a separate release on religious signers to Religious News Service, and also to Catholic News Service if we get some leading Catholics. Try to get TV interviews of notables advocating de-alerting.

Contact the foreign ministers of the Eight Nation Initiative and ask them to offer to provide verification teams for mutual, reciprocal de-alerting in U.S and Russia and later in UK, France, and China as they join process. Include their offer in the news package.

We would be trying to create the idea that de-alerting makes a lot of sense, that lots of people support it.

In a separate communication to Clinton's staff, we might offer assurance that we are willing to counter public criticism of de-alerting. For instance, if a member of Congress attacks de-alerting, we could get constituents (bishops, physicians, others) to contact him/her and ask why he/she opposes making Americans more secure from nuclear attack?

No doubt you will have some other ideas.

Shalom,
Howard

To: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: MUPWJ Bd Minutes 2/27/98
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 07:26 PM 8/2/98 -0400, you wrote:
>Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\MINMU.DOC
>

Dear Jim and Char:

For some reason or other, I'm not able to download the attachment, even though my directory shows it in Word ".doc". Your second message didn't include the minutes. Please send them as part of an e-mail message, not an attachment.

I started writing a Peace Leaf article about concrete steps for nuclear abolition for the next 18 months, but I haven't gotten very far. I will complete it along with some related sidebars. I may even rough out a layout so that I will have an idea about length. I'll have something before the end of August.

Jim, I hope your operation goes well and that you have a speedy recovery.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
Date: Mon, 3 Aug 1998 10:40:24 -0400
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
Subject: Ploughshares Check
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

I picked up the Ploughshares check for \$1000 and will deposit it later today.

I also received, as I'm sure you did, minutes from Jim.

Phil

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
Date: Mon, 03 Aug 1998 22:34:08 -0400
From: Peter Weiss <petweiss@igc.org>
To: abolish <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>,
katie dewes <katie@chch.planet.org.nz>,
Doug Roche <djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca>, mpi <mpi@igc.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) [Fwd: A wonderful, moving essay by Arundhati Roy]
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Definitely worth reading.

PeterReturn-Path: <fdove@worldcom.nl>

Received: from worldcom.nl (worldcom.nl [194.109.12.147])
by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id AAA12775;
Mon, 3 Aug 1998 00:43:06 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from director (Director [172.16.1.16])
by worldcom.nl (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id JAA18536;
Mon, 3 Aug 1998 09:47:41 +0200

Resent-Message-Id: <199808030747.JAA18536@worldcom.nl>

Comments: Authenticated sender is <fdove@worldcom.nl>

Resent-from: "Fiona Dove" <fdove@worldcom.nl>

Resent-to: achin@unv.ernet.in, pbidwai@unv.ernet.in, petweiss@igc.apc.org,
srfnyusa@igc.apc.org, ialana@antenna.nl

Resent-date: Mon, 3 Aug 1998 09:46:39 +0000

Received: from igcb.igc.org (igcb.igc.apc.org [192.82.108.46])
by worldcom.nl (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id XAA07618
for <fdove@worldcom.nl>; Sat, 1 Aug 1998 23:58:11 +0200

Received: from igce.igc.org (igce.igc.org [192.82.108.49])
by igcb.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id OAA19141;
Sat, 1 Aug 1998 14:09:20 -0700 (PDT)

Received: from pppe-37.igc.org (stree@pppe-37.igc.org)
by igce.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id OAA28347;
Sat, 1 Aug 1998 14:02:49 -0700 (PDT)

Date: Sat, 1 Aug 1998 14:02:49 -0700 (PDT)

Message-Id: <2.2.16.19980801170337.58e75faa@pop.igc.org>

X-Sender: stree@pop.igc.org

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)

Mime-Version: 1.0

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

To: fdove@worldcom.nl, ipsps@igc.org, PBENNIS@compuserve.com, tallen@igc.org

From: Sanho Tree <stree@igc.apc.org>

Subject: A wonderful, moving essay by Arundhati Roy

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by worldcom.nl id XAA07618

Old-Status:

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id AAA12775

Saturday August 1, 1998 The Guardian (UK)

The end of imagination

Arundhati Roy took the literary world by storm last year with her first
novel, *The God of Small Things*, which won the Booker prize. In her first

piece of writing since then, she expresses her horror at the nuclear arms race in her native India

"The desert shook," the Government of India informed us (its people).

"The whole mountain turned white," the Government of Pakistan replied.

By afternoon the wind had fallen silent over Pokhran. At 3.45pm, the timer detonated the three devices. Around 200 to 300m deep in the earth, the heat generated was equivalent to a million degrees centigrade - as hot as temperatures on the sun. Instantly, rocks weighing around a thousand tons, a mini mountain underground, vapourised... shockwaves from the blast began to lift a mound of earth the size of a football field by several metres. One scientist on seeing it said, "I can now believe stories of Lord Krishna lifting a hill."

India Today

May 1998. It'll go down in history books, provided of course we have history books to go down in. Provided, of course, we have a future.

There's nothing new or original left to be said about nuclear weapons. There can be nothing more humiliating for a writer of fiction to have to do than restate a case that has, over the years, already been made by other people in other parts of the world, and made passionately, eloquently and knowledgeably.

I am prepared to grovel. To humiliate myself abjectly, because, in the circumstances, silence would be indefensible. So those of you who are willing: let's pick our parts, put on these discarded costumes and speak our second-hand lines in this sad second-hand play. But let's not forget that the stakes we're playing for are huge. Our fatigue and our shame could mean the end of us. The end of our children and our children's children. Of everything we love. We have to reach within ourselves and find the strength to think. To fight.

Once again we are pitifully behind the times - not just scientifically and technologically (ignore the hollow claims) but more pertinently in our ability to grasp the true nature of nuclear weapons. Our Comprehension of the Horror Department is hopelessly obsolete. Here we are, all of us in India and in Pakistan, discussing the finer points of politics and foreign policy, behaving for all the world as though our governments have just devised a newer, bigger bomb, a sort of immense hand grenade with which they will annihilate the enemy (each other) and protect us from all harm.

How desperately we want to believe that. What wonderful, willing, well-behaved, gullible subjects we have turned out to be. The rest of humanity may not forgive us, but then the rest of the rest of humanity, depending on who fashions its views, may not know what a tired, dejected, heart-broken people we are. Perhaps it doesn't realise how urgently we need a miracle. How deeply we yearn for magic.

If only, if only nuclear war was just another kind of war. If only it was about the usual things - nations and territories, gods and histories. If

only those of us who dread it are worthless moral cowards who are not prepared to die in defence of our beliefs. If only nuclear war was the kind of war in which countries battle countries, and men battle men. But it isn't. If there is a nuclear war, our foes will not be China or America or even each other. Our foe will be the earth herself.

Our cities and forests, our fields and villages will burn for days. Rivers will turn to poison. The air will become fire. The wind will spread the flames. When everything there is to burn has burned and the fires die, smoke will rise and shut out the sun. The earth will be enveloped in darkness. There will be no day - only interminable night.

What shall we do then, those of us who are still alive? Burned and blind and bald and ill, carrying the cancerous carcasses of our children in our arms, where shall we go? What shall we eat? What shall we drink? What shall we breathe?

The Head of the Health, Environment and Safety Group of the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre in Bombay has a plan. He declared that India could survive nuclear war. His advice is that in the event of nuclear war we take the same safety measures as the ones that scientists have recommended in the event of accidents at nuclear plants.

Take iodine pills, he suggests. And other steps such as remaining indoors, consuming only stored water and food and avoiding milk. Infants should be given powdered milk. "People in the danger zone should immediately go to the ground floor and if possible to the basement."

What do you do with these levels of lunacy? What do you do if you're trapped in an asylum and the doctors are all dangerously deranged?

Ignore it, it's just a novelist's naiveté, they'll tell you, Doomsday Prophet hyperbole. It'll never come to that. There will be no war. Nuclear weapons are about peace, not war. "Deterrence" is the buzz word of the people who like to think of themselves as hawks. (Nice birds, those. Cool. Stylish. Predatory. Pity there won't be many of them around after the war. Extinction is a word we must try to get used to.) Deterrence is an old thesis that has been resurrected and is being recycled with added local flavour. The Theory of Deterrence cornered the credit for having prevented the cold war from turning into a third world war. The only immutable fact about the third world war is that, if there's going to be one, it will be fought after the second world war. In other words, there's no fixed schedule.

The Theory of Deterrence has some fundamental flaws. Flaw Number One is that it presumes a complete, sophisticated understanding of the psychology of your enemy. It assumes that what deters you (the fear of annihilation) will deter them. What about those who are not deterred by that? The suicide bomber psyche - the "We'll take you with us" school - is that an outlandish thought? How did Rajiv Gandhi die?

In any case who's the "you" and who's the "enemy"? Both are only governments. Governments change. They wear masks within masks. They moult and re-invent themselves all the time. The one we have at the moment, for instance, does not even have enough seats to last a full term in office, but

demands that we trust it to do pirouettes and party tricks with nuclear bombs even as it scrabbles around for a foothold to maintain a simple majority in Parliament.

Flaw Number Two is that deterrence is premised on fear. But fear is premised on knowledge. On an understanding of the true extent and scale of the devastation that nuclear war will wreak. It is not some inherent, mystical attribute of nuclear bombs that they automatically inspire thoughts of peace. On the contrary, it is the endless, tireless, confrontational work of people who have had the courage to openly denounce them, the marches, the demonstrations, the films, the outrage - that is what has averted, or perhaps only postponed, nuclear war. Deterrence will not and cannot work given the levels of ignorance and illiteracy that hang over our two countries like dense, impenetrable veils.

India and Pakistan have nuclear bombs now and feel entirely justified in having them. Soon others will too. Israel, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Norway, Nepal (I'm trying to be eclectic here), Denmark, Germany, Bhutan, Mexico, Lebanon, Sri Lanka, Burma, Bosnia, Singapore, North Korea, Sweden, South Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, Afghanistan, Uzbekistan... and why not? Every country in the world has a special case to make. Everybody has borders and beliefs.

And when all our larders are bursting with shiny bombs and our bellies are empty (deterrence is an exorbitant beast), we can trade bombs for food. And when nuclear technology goes on the market, when it gets truly competitive and prices fall, not just governments but anybody who can afford it can have their own private arsenal - businessmen, terrorists, perhaps even the occasional rich writer (like me). Our planet will bristle with beautiful missiles. There will be a new world order. The dictatorship of the pro-nuke elite.

But let us pause to give credit where it's due. Who must we thank for all this? The men who made it happen. The Masters of the Universe. Ladies and gentlemen, the United States of America! Come on up here folks, stand up and take a bow. Thank you for doing this to the world. Thank you for making a difference. Thank you for showing us the way. Thank you for altering the very meaning of life.

>From now on it is not dying we must fear, but living.

All I can say to every man, woman and sentient child in India, and over there, just a little way away in Pakistan, is: take it personally. Whoever you are - Hindu, Muslim, urban, agrarian - it doesn't matter. The only good thing about nuclear war is that it is the single most egalitarian idea that man has ever had. On the day of reckoning, you will not be asked to present your credentials. The devastation will be indiscriminate. The bomb isn't in your backyard. It's in your body. And mine. Nobody, no nation, no government, no man, no god has the right to put it there. We're radioactive already, and the war hasn't even begun. So stand up and say something. Never mind if it's been said before. Speak up on your own behalf. Take it very personally.

In early May (before the bomb), I left home for three weeks. I thought I would return. I had every intention of returning. Of course things haven't

worked out quite the way I had planned.

While I was away, I met a friend whom I have always loved for, among other things, her ability to combine deep affection with a frankness that borders on savagery. "I've been thinking about you," she said, "about The God of Small Things - what's in it, what's over it, under it, around it, above it..."

She fell silent for a while. I was uneasy and not at all sure that I wanted to hear the rest of what she had to say. She, however, was sure that she was going to say it. "In this last year - less than a year actually - you've had too much of everything - fame, money, prizes, adulation, criticism, condemnation, ridicule, love, hate, anger, envy, generosity - everything. In some ways it's a perfect story. Perfectly baroque in its excess. The trouble is that it has, or can have, only one perfect ending."

Her eyes were on me, bright with a slanting, probing brilliance. She knew that I knew what she was going to say. She was insane. She was going to say that nothing that happened to me in the future could ever match the buzz of this. That the whole of the rest of my life was going to be vaguely unsatisfying. And, therefore, the only perfect ending to the story would be death. My death.

The thought had occurred to me too. Of course it had. The fact that all this, this global dazzle - these lights in my eyes, the applause, the flowers, the photographers, the journalists feigning a deep interest in my life (yet struggling to get a single fact straight), the men in suits fawning over me, the shiny hotel bathrooms with endless towels - none of it was likely to happen again. Would I miss it? Had I grown to need it? Was I a fame-junkie? Would I have withdrawal symptoms?

The more I thought about it, the clearer it became to me that if fame was going to be my permanent condition it would kill me. Club me to death with its good manners and hygiene. I'll admit that I've enjoyed my own five minutes of it immensely, but primarily because it was just five minutes. Because I knew (or thought I knew) that I could go home when I was bored and giggle about it. Grow old and irresponsible. Eat mangoes in the moonlight. Maybe write a couple of failed books - worstsellers - to see what it felt like. For a whole year I've cartwheeled across the world, anchored always to thoughts of home and the life I would go back to.

Contrary to all the enquiries and predictions about my impending emigration, that was the well I dipped into. That was my sustenance. My strength. I told my friend there was no such thing as a perfect story. I said that in any case hers was an external view of things, this assumption that the trajectory of a person's happiness, or let's say fulfilment, had peaked (and now must trough) because she had accidentally stumbled upon "success". It was premised on the unimaginative belief that wealth and fame were the mandatory stuff of everybody's dreams.

You've lived too long in New York, I told her. There are other worlds. Other kinds of dreams. Dreams in which failure is feasible, honourable, sometimes even worth striving for. Worlds in which recognition is not the only barometer of brilliance or human worth. There are plenty of warriors I know and love, people far more valuable than myself, who go to war each day,

knowing in advance that they will fail. True, they are less "successful" in the most vulgar sense of the word, but by no means less fulfilled.

The only dream worth having, I told her, is to dream that you will live while you're alive and die only when you're dead. (Prescience? Perhaps.)

"Which means exactly what?" (Arched eyebrows, a little annoyed.)

I tried to explain, but didn't do a very good job of it. Sometimes I need to write to think. So I wrote it down for her on a paper napkin. This is what I wrote: To love. To be loved. To never forget your own insignificance. To never get used to the unspeakable violence and the vulgar disparity of life around you. To seek joy in the saddest places. To pursue beauty to its lair. To never simplify what is complicated or complicate what is simple. To respect strength, never power. Above all, to watch. To try and understand. To never look away. And never, never to forget.

I've known her for many years, this friend of mine. She's an architect too. She looked dubious, somewhat unconvinced by my paper napkin speech. I could tell that structurally, just in terms of the sleek, narrative symmetry of things, and because she loves me, her thrill at my "success" was so keen, so generous, that it weighed in evenly with her (anticipated) horror at the idea of my death. I understood that it was nothing personal... Just a design thing.

Anyhow, two weeks after that conversation, I returned to India. To what I think/thought of as home. Something had died but it wasn't me. It was infinitely more precious. It was a world that has been ailing for a while, and has finally breathed its last. It's been cremated now. The air is thick with ugliness and there's the unmistakable stench of fascism on the breeze.

Day after day, in newspaper editorials, on the radio, on TV chat shows, on MTV for heaven's sake, people whose instincts one thought one could trust - writers, painters, journalists - make the crossing. The chill seeps into my bones as it becomes painfully apparent from the lessons of everyday life that what you read in history books is true. That fascism is indeed as much about people as about governments. That it begins at home. In drawing rooms. In bedrooms. In beds.

"Explosion of self-esteem", "Road to Resurgence", "A Moment of Pride", these were headlines in the papers in the days following the nuclear tests. "We have proved that we are not eunuchs any more," said Mr Thackeray of the Shiv Sena (Whoever said we were? True, a good number of us are women, but that, as far as I know, isn't the same thing.) Reading the papers, it was often hard to tell when people were referring to Viagra (which was competing for second place on the front pages) and when they were talking about the bomb - "We have superior strength and potency." (This was our Minister for Defence after Pakistan completed its tests.)

"These are not just nuclear tests, they are nationalism tests," we were repeatedly told.

This has been hammered home, over and over again. The bomb is India. India is the bomb. Not just India, Hindu India. Therefore, be warned, any

criticism of it is not just ant-national but anti-Hindu. (Of course in Pakistan the bomb is Islamic. Other than that, politically, the same physics applies.) This is one of the unexpected perks of having a nuclear bomb. Not only can the government use it to threaten the Enemy, they can use it to declare war on their own people. Us.

When I told my friends that I was writing this piece, they cautioned me. "Go ahead," they said, "but first make sure you're not vulnerable. Make sure your papers are in order. Make sure your taxes are paid."

My papers are in order. My taxes are paid. But how can one not be vulnerable in a climate like this? Everyone is vulnerable. Accidents happen. There's safety only in acquiescence. As I write, I am filled with foreboding. In this country, I have truly known what it means for a writer to feel loved (and, to some degree, hated too). Last year I was one of the items being paraded in the media's end-of-the-year National Pride Parade. Among the others, much to my mortification, were a bomb-maker and an international beauty queen. Each time a beaming person stopped me on the street and said "You have made India proud" (referring to the prize I won, not the book I wrote), I felt a little uneasy. It frightened me then and it terrifies me now, because I know how easily that swell, that tide of emotion, can turn against me. Perhaps the time for that has come. I'm going to step out from under the fairy lights and say what's on my mind.

It's this:

If protesting against having a nuclear bomb implanted in my brain is anti-Hindu and anti-national, then I secede. I hereby declare myself an independent, mobile republic. I am a citizen of the earth. I own no territory. I have no flag. I'm female, but have nothing against eunuchs. My policies are simple. I'm willing to sign any nuclear non-proliferation treaty or nuclear test ban treaty that's going. Immigrants are welcome. You can help me design our flag.

My world has died. And I write to mourn its passing.

India's nuclear tests, the manner in which they were conducted, the euphoria with which they have been greeted (by us) is indefensible. To me, it signifies dreadful things. The end of imagination.

On the 15th of August last year we celebrated the 50th anniversary of India's independence. Next May we can mark our first anniversary in nuclear bondage.

Why did they do it? Political expediency is the obvious, cynical answer, except that it only raises another, more basic question: Why should it have been politically expedient? The three Official Reasons given are: China, Pakistan and Exposing Western Hypocrisy.

Taken at face value, and examined individually, they're somewhat baffling. I'm not for a moment suggesting that these are not real issues. Merely that they aren't new. The only new thing on the old horizon is the Indian government. In his appallingly cavalier letter to the US president our prime minister says India's decision to go ahead with the nuclear tests was due to

a "deteriorating security environment". He goes on to mention the war with China in 1962 and the "three aggressions we have suffered in the last 50 years [from Pakistan]. And for the last 10 years we have been the victim of unremitting terrorism and militancy sponsored by it . . . especially in Jammu and Kashmir."

The war with China is 35 years old. Unless there's some vital state secret that we don't know about, it certainly seemed as though matters had improved slightly between us. The most recent war with Pakistan was fought 27 years ago. Admittedly Kashmir continues to be a deeply troubled region and no doubt Pakistan is gleefully fanning the flames. But surely there must be flames to fan in the first place?

As for the third Official Reason: Exposing Western Hypocrisy - how much more exposed can they be? Which decent human being on earth harbours any illusions about it? These are people whose histories are spongy with the blood of others. Colonialism, apartheid, slavery, ethnic cleansing, germ warfare, chemical weapons, they virtually invented it all. They have plundered nations, snuffed out civilisations, exterminated entire populations. They stand on the world's stage stark naked but entirely unembarrassed, because they know that they have more money, more food and bigger bombs than anybody else. They know they can wipe us out in the course of an ordinary working day. Personally, I'd say it is arrogance more than hypocrisy.

We have less money, less food and smaller bombs. However, we have, or had, all kinds of other wealth. Delightful, unquantifiable. What we've done with it is the opposite of what we think we've done. We've pawned it all. We've traded it in. For what? In order to enter into a contract with the very people we claim to despise.

All in all, I think it is fair to say that we're the hypocrites. We're the ones who've abandoned what was arguably a moral position - ie. We have the technology, we can make bombs if we want to, but we won't. We don't believe in them.

We're the ones who have now set up this craven clamouring to be admitted into the club of superpowers. For India to demand the status of a superpower is as ridiculous as demanding to play in the World Cup finals simply because we have a ball. Never mind that we haven't qualified, or that we don't play much soccer and haven't got a team.

We are a nation of nearly a billion people. In development terms we rank No 138 out of the 175 countries listed in the UNDP's Human Development Index (even Ghana and Sri Lanka rank above us). More than 400 million of our people are illiterate and live in absolute poverty, more than 600 million lack even basic sanitation and more than 200 million have no safe drinking water.

The nuclear bomb and the demolition of the Barbi Masjid in Ayodhya are both part of the same political process. They are hideous byproducts for a nation's search for herself. Of India's efforts to forge a national identity. The poorer the nation, the larger the numbers of illiterate people and the more morally bankrupt her leaders, the cruder and more dangerous the

notion of what that identity is or should be.

The jeering, hooting young men who battered down the Babri Masjid are the same ones whose pictures appeared in the papers in the days that followed the nuclear tests. They were on the streets, celebrating India's nuclear bomb and simultaneously "condemning Western Culture" by emptying crates of Coke and Pepsi into public drains. I'm a little baffled by their logic: Coke is Western Culture, but the nuclear bomb is an old Indian tradition?

Yes, I've heard - the bomb is in the Vedas [ancient Hindu scriptures]. It might be, but if you look hard enough you'll find Coke in the Vedas too. That's the great thing about all religious texts. You can find anything you want in them - as long as you know what you're looking for.

But returning to the subject of the non-vedic 1990s: we storm the heart of whiteness, we embrace the most diabolical creation of western science and call it our own. But we protest against their music, their food, their clothes, their cinema and their literature. That's not hypocrisy. That's humour.

It's funny enough to make a skull smile.

We're back on the old ship. The SS Authenticity & Indianness.

If there is going to be a pro-authenticity/anti-national drive, perhaps the government ought to get its history straight and its facts right. If they're going to do it, they may as well do it properly.

First of all, the original inhabitants of this land were not Hindu. Ancient though it is, there were human beings on earth before there was Hinduism. India's tribal people have a greater claim to being indigenous to this land than anybody else, and how are they treated by the state and its minions? Oppressed, cheated, robbed of their lands, shunted around like surplus goods. Perhaps a good place to start would be to restore to them the dignity that was once theirs. Perhaps the government could make a public undertaking that more dams of this kind will not be built, that more people will not be displaced.

But of course that would be inconceivable, wouldn't it? Why? Because it's impractical. Because tribal people don't really matter. Their histories, their customs, their deities are dispensable. They must learn to sacrifice these things for the greater good of the Nation (that has snatched from them everything they ever had).

Okay, so that's out.

For the rest, I could compile a practical list of things to ban and buildings to break. It'll need some research, but off the top of my head here are a few suggestions.

They could begin by banning a number of ingredients from our cuisine: chillies (Mexico), tomatoes (Peru), potatoes (Bolivia), coffee (Morocco), tea, white sugar, cinnamon (China) . . . they could then move into recipes. Tea with milk and sugar, for instance (Britain).

Smoking will be out of the question. Tobacco came from North America. Cricket, English and Democracy should be forbidden. Either kabaddi or kho-kho could replace cricket. I don't want to start a riot, so I hesitate to suggest a replacement for English. (Italian? It has found its way to us via a kinder route: marriage, not imperialism.)

All hospitals in which western medicine is practised or prescribed should be shut down. All national newspapers discontinued. The railways dismantled. Airports closed. And what about our newest toy - the mobile phone? Can we live without it, or shall I suggest that they make an exception there? They could put it down in the column marked "Universal"? (Only essential commodities will be included here. No music, art or literature.)

Needless to say, sending your children to university in the US, and rushing there yourself to have your prostate operated upon will be a cognisable offence.

It will be a long, long list. It would take years of work. I could not use a computer because that wouldn't be very authentic of me, would it?

I don't mean to be facetious, merely to point out that this is surely the short cut to hell. There's no such thing as an Authentic India or a Real Indian. There is no Divine Committee that has the right to sanction one single, authorised version of what India is or should be.

Railing against the past will not heal us. History has happened. It's over and done with. All we can do is to change its course by encouraging what we love instead of destroying what we don't. There is beauty yet in this brutal, damaged world of ours. Hidden, fierce, immense. Beauty that is uniquely ours and beauty that we have received with grace from others, enhanced, re-invented and made our own. We have to seek it out, nurture it, love it. Making bombs will only destroy us. It doesn't matter whether we use them or not. They will destroy us either way.

India's nuclear bomb is the final act of betrayal by a ruling class that has failed its people.

However many garlands we heap on our scientists, however many medals we pin to their chests, the truth is that it's far easier to make a bomb than to educate four hundred million people.

According to opinion polls, we're expected to believe that there's a national consensus on the issue. It's official now. Everybody loves the bomb. (Therefore the bomb is good.)

Is it possible for a man who cannot write his own name to understand even the basic, elementary facts about the nature of nuclear weapons? Has anybody told him that nuclear war has nothing at all to do with his received notions of war? Nothing to do with honour, nothing to do with pride. Has anybody bothered to explain to him about thermal blasts, radioactive fallout and the nuclear winter? Are there even words in his language to describe the concepts of enriched uranium, fissile material and critical mass? Or has his language itself become obsolete? Is he trapped in a time capsule, watching the world pass him by, unable to understand or communicate with it because his language never took into account the horrors that the human race would

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 5 Aug 1998 09:16:09 -0400
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@execulink.com>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: FW: FMCT News From Geneva
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Non-member submission from ["Sean Howard" <sean@gn.apc.org>]
From: "Sean Howard" <sean@gn.apc.org>
To: <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Cc: <s.pullinger@isisuk.demon.co.uk>, <takubo@alles.or.jp>, <svm@vertic.org>, <73744.3675@compuserve.com>, <jaquith@mindspring.com>, <CXJ15621@niftyserve.or.jp>, <achin@unv.ernet.in>, <isis-europe@tornado.be>, <robwcpuk@gn.apc.org>, <acr@tiac.net>, <ACA@armscontrol.org>, <plewis@unog.ch>, <pfrogers@bradford.ac.uk>, <cesd@agoranet.be>, <d.atwood@mbox.unicc.org>, <qpsirs@quaker.org.uk>, <mccoy@pc.jaring.my>, <flick@igc.apc.org>, <acridds@aol.com>, <krause@hei.unige.ch>, <ngallagher@mail.wesleyan.edu>, <arnett@sipri.se>, <dkimball@clw.org>, <ftrjs@fy.chalmers.se>, <cns@miis.edu>, <cpaine@nrdc.org>, <jmike@interaccess.com>, <disarmament@igc.apc.org>, <kurosawa@law.osaka-u.ac.jp>, <mhibb@mh.com>, <tcochran@nrdc.org>, <pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in>, <katie@chch.planet.co.nz>, <ploughshares@igc.apc.org>, <iakim@glas.apc.org>, <epp92@antenna.nl>, <ddur@dialup.FranceNet.fr>, <pgs@web.net>, <JGG786@aol.com>, <dlshen@fudan.ac.cn>, <nei.til.atomvapen@online.no>, <cmj_msp6@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu>, <mapw@ozemail.com.au>
Subject:
Date: Wed, 5 Aug 1998 11:06:52 +0100

Dear Friends,
Because of severe e-mail difficulties in Geneva, Rebecca has asked me to send the following update to you.
Peace and best wishes,
Sean Howard,
Editor,
Disarmament Diplomacy.

**FMCT UPDATE FROM REBECCA JOHNSON:
THURSDAY TARGET DAY FOR DECISION ON FMCT NEGOTIATIONS IN THE CD**
Subject to agreement from capitals, the delegations at the Conference on Disarmament have provisionally agreed the wording for a draft decision on establishing a committee to negotiate a ban on the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons purposes (fissban or FMCT). The breakthrough came during a long, closed meeting of the CD on Tuesday August 4, following Pakistan's dramatic announcement at the CD plenary of July 30 that Islamabad would agree to negotiations going ahead on the basis of the March 1995 'Shannon report'. After conducting nuclear tests in May, India had also withdrawn its main obstacle, signalling that it would no longer insist on

simultaneous negotiations on a timetable for nuclear disarmament.

If the capitals agree to the wording in the draft decision, and the three CD 'groupings' confirm this in meetings on Wednesday, the CD could take the decision to establish the committee at the plenary scheduled for Thursday. Some think it might take longer and that a special plenary will have to be convened.

At this stage the draft decision is based on a proposal by Austria dated 3 February 1998, which called for an ad hoc committee under agenda item 1, entitled 'Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament', to negotiate, on the basis of the 1995 Shannon report (referred to by its CD number CD/1299), a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosives.

There was considerable discussion about the title of the draft decision and about a Presidential statement which would accompany it, which would probably contain reaffirmations that the decision does not prejudice the presidential consultations on nuclear disarmament (agreed to in March) or the possibility of working on other nuclear disarmament issues under agenda item 1, if consensus on anything else is reached.

The major difficulties were reportedly over language raised by Egypt, and then Canada. There were some localised wasp stings from Syria and a couple of others, which were not taken very seriously. India remained relatively quiet, Pakistan and Morocco were constructive; the NWS early on accepted the formulation of establishing the committee under agenda item 1, despite the fact that it contained the words 'nuclear disarmament' but wanted to limit any further 'concessions'; the cross-reference to the Shannon report appeared to meet concerns (at least at this stage) about being able to raise the questions of stocks. There was some talk that China and Russia did not have instructions, but the Chinese and Russian delegates I spoke to at the end did not seem to think there was anything they couldn't agree to in the main draft agreement.

It is not clear at this point how many States would back a Canadian proposal for the President also to state that the purpose of the negotiations is both non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. Indeed, a number seemed confused about the proposal and worried that it might delay and 'complicate matters'.

This is the closest the CD has ever got to starting work on the fissban.

While the odds shifted from 'fifty-fifty' at the beginning of the meeting to 'eighty-twenty' by 8.15, there remains some nervousness that certain capitals or delegations might still have some delaying tactics up their sleeves, and that if the opportunity is not seized quickly it could be lost.

Despite all the limitations, I prefer to be an optimist.

Rebecca Johnson

To: btiller@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Clinton-Yeltsin letter
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Bob:

Here is the re-draft of the sign-on letter to President Clinton and President Yeltsin. I verified that all those study groups support de-alerting in some form. In the civilian leaders statement I came across the phrase about placing separated warheads in "secure national storage" and added it to the letter.

The White House Public Affairs Office says that the summit will take place in early September before Labor Day, though precise dates haven't been announced. Therefore, I set the deadline for sign-on as Friday, August 21. That will give us a week to get the letter to presidential staff (though we could offer a version with the initial signature to U.S. staff before that).

Please let me now if you approve these drafts or want changes. Then I'll post it to abolition-caucus and to other potential signers. Do you have the Monday Lobby list on e-mail? I don't, so I would appreciate your handling that aspect.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Revised draft, August 5, 1998

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millenium with all nuclear weapons taken off high alert status. One of the most straightforward method would be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of study groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders from 46 nations, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New Agenda statement by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

###

Transmittal of Clinton-Yeltsin sign-on letter
Draft, August 5, 1998

Dear Colleagues:

The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma.

Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, asking President Clinton and President Yeltsin to embarked upon a de-alerting initiative and to complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you to be a co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us your name, title, organization, and country. You may reply to btiller@igc.org. Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.

If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.

Shalom,

Robert Tiller, [title]
Physicians for Social Responsibility
Phone: 202 898-0150
Fax: 202 898-0172
E-mail: btiller@psr.org

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Wed, 05 Aug 1998 15:55:16 +0200
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Subject: pov-1: July Bulletin from Durban, South Africa
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>

----- Start of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Durban Peace to the City Campaign
July 1998 Bulletin

1. Working for Solutions in Community Policing Forums
2. Fellowship on the Dividing Line (learning from Belfast)

Working for Solutions in Community Policing Forums

The Diakonia Council of Churches is encouraging partnership in faith and action with churches in the Durban metropolitan region to promote justice and peace. In order to achieve this goal, the organisation has divided the staff into different teams, each with a different focus. One of those teams is the Peace Team. As part of this team, Rev. Mbonambi Khuzwayo, the Peace Process Organiser, has worked extensively with Community Policing Forums (CPFs) in his work dealing with criminal violence in the region.

Community Policing Forums (CPFs) were established as part of the S.A. Police Service Act of 1995. The multiple aims of CPFs include establishing and maintaining a partnership between the community and the police, and promoting communication and cooperation to improve police services and promote the transparency and accountability of the police. CPFs should also serve to promote joint problem identification and solving by the police and community.

CPFs have been successful in some places and unsuccessful in others. At a workshop in July 1997 hosted by the Diakonia Council of Churches, obstacles hampering effective community policing were raised. These included lack of knowledge and training about CPFs in the community, poor representation by civil society, police involvement in crime, the involvement of known criminals on some forums, a lack of transparency, and a lack of resources to carry out CPF-sponsored projects. In addition, members of CPFs from the community were often labelled as "spies" for the police. A deep mistrust between communities and police was fostered under apartheid. Church involvement in local dispute resolution committees has been very successful in a number of communities in KwaZulu-Natal since often the church represents the involvement of an impartial and trustworthy participant which legitimizes the process.

Two communities in the Durban metropolitan and surrounding area provide an interesting model for future CPFs. In both cases, the

involvement of church leaders has played a critical role in shaping a successful CPF.

KwaMakhuta

Last year the KwaMakhuta CPF won a competition for the community most effective in dealing with crime. KwaMakhuta is a peri-urban area about 35 minutes outside of the Durban city centre. When the CPF was first started in 1995, the police were only able to investigate about 13% of crimes in the area effectively. Now police are able to investigate about 60% effectively. This is largely due to a relationship of trust that has been built between the community and police. The chair of the KwaMakhuta CPF is a representative of the church who has been able to shape the CPF's proceedings to include an opening and closing prayer. The chair has also been able to involve other clergy in the community to take part in the CPF. This in turn has helped to strengthen community trust in the entire process. One limitation, however, of the church involvement in the KwaMakhuta CPF is limited accountability with the upper echelons of church structures. There is no permanent structure that church representatives report back to and by which projects could be supported.

Umbilo

Church involvement in the Umbilo CPF, serving an inner city suburb of Durban, is a different example of how projects can be supported with the assistance of an permanent church structure. The chair of the CPF in Umbilo approached the local Ministers' Fellowship (similar to a Ministers' Fraternal) to participate in the CPF. A representative was appointed which reported back to the Ministers' Fellowship as an organised church structure. Through the CPF, the community then asked the Ministers' Fellowship to organise counselling for victims of violence. The project has been underway since February of this year. The plan calls for engaging professional therapists to do an initial consultation with the victim. Thereafter a minister from the victim's denomination begins a longer counselling process. The group is still seeking funding from a provincial funding agency called Community Care Centres and from a separate government fund. To date support has been enlisted from the local churches in the form of donated time, a local school has donated R 200, and the Spar grocery store in the area has donated gifts in kind.

These two models are important because they show what kinds of different and successful intervention are possible with church involvement. The Diakonia Council of Churches' Peace Team has held a number of workshops to encourage church involvement in CPFs, either through direct involvement or through specific projects like the one in Umbilo. Many CPFs have not been successful partly because they focus on problems and not solutions. The Peace Team is encouraging churches to see themselves as part of a solution.

Fellowship on the Dividing Line

The following is an excerpt from a talk given by the Reverend David Kerr, President of the Methodist Church in Ireland and Superintendent of

Belfast Central City Mission, at a Peace to the City - Durban Supper Briefing on 22 July 1998.

There is one particular Methodist Church that sits right on one of those peace lines dividing Catholic and Protestant residents of Belfast. You wouldn't think it's a peace line. You would see a beautiful brick wall with a nice fencing at the top of it and some nice shrubbery growing up in front of it. It would look quite attractive. But I would have to point out to you that the function of that wall, and you would notice it was very high, is to keep the two communities apart.

When we would come to an opening where there was a roadway you would become more aware of it. Because there are heavy metal gates firmly closed with a little side gate open to allow pedestrian access. That is how you would encounter the peace line in that particular part of the city. And our church sat facing the road which was now almost exclusively Catholic. The Protestant Community were intimidated back behind the other side of the wall and the Roman Catholics who had lived on the other side were intimidated back to theirs. Those who are interested in perpetuating the violence do everything they can to keep the divisions sharp. So this church, it seemed to me, was God given in its placement that it was there, right on the peace line.

The congregation had once numbered 400. It was down to about 40. They were waiting to close. A young colleague joined me on the staff and I shared my dream and vision with him. And he immediately caught the vision and took the responsibility to run with this church to create it into a symbol and a sign of peace and reconciliation. The first thing we did was to buy the first two houses in the street beside it that were vandalised. The first thing that did for us was to ensure that if the gate were permanently closed, we would still have access to the church grounds via the gardens. But having bought two derelict houses, what do you do with them? My committee, made up of hard-headed businessmen, were not terribly pleased that I had gone out and done this. They were wanting to know what was going to be done. And I didn't quite know what was going to be done.

Until I met a Roman Catholic Sister, Sister Noreen, and I said "Noreen I haven't seen you for quite some time, what are you doing?" She said, "David there's a group of us who have been praying together for a year and we feel led to form an ecumenical community on the Protestant side of the peace line. And as a matter of fact, I'm now looking for property." I said to Noreen, "Come with me." I took her around to these two houses, and I said, "If those houses were fixed up, could you actually use them?" And she said, "I think we could." So I said, "Right, when you're free, I'll bring our mission architect up and we'll see what we can do with these two houses." So Noreen came along with our architect and we drew up plans for turning them into a community house for six people. The mission committee, my executive, were persuaded by foul means as well as fair, to come up with the necessary money for their total refurbishment. Part of the Mission's contribution is that the community has the houses at a low rental for as long as they want to use them.

So those were in place and next door to them was the church,

frequently subject to vandalism, struggling to keep its worship going, struggling to work with a group of young people, many of whom represented both traditions. When tension heightened they would disappear or they would come and start fighting on the church grounds. The church folk did not really have the resources to deal with this. But about 250 yards further up the road, there was another ecumenical community, Cornerstone. That community were resourced to be able to fund a youth worker. So we talked with them and their youth worker came to work with our young people. We had the church and two ecumenical communities working together and making use of the church buildings.

Sister Noreen decided that it would be a good thing to start a Mothers and Toddlers Group and we all thought that this would be a good thing to do, and we got it started. Then we started looking into the nitty gritty of it, who will open up, etc. Noreen said, "no problem I'm round the corner, I'll open up." Then the Methodist Society Steward said to me later (and I can still see her saying this), "How could you give the keys to the Methodist Church to a Roman Catholic Sister?" And there was a struggle going on but the Grace of God was in the struggle and the keys were handed over, a tremendous symbolism. We sometimes lose the significance of the small things that can ease the tension of a situation. And they came in and began to run the Mothers and Toddlers Group and some ladies in the church started a Luncheon Club and older Catholics and Protestants came together. One of the ladies started reminiscing with them and before long they had formed a Reminiscence Group, when they came together to talk about What is Used to be Like on Springfield Road. As they revived their memories the longing came to have a brighter future and a brighter vision than the one that they could see.

And as my colleague worked with these groups, he came to me and he said, "I think we can get government funding to build this thing up, but we can't do it in the name of the church, they won't give the government funding in the name of the church." So we had a bit of a think about it and I came up with the idea of setting up a limited company made up of the ecumenical community groups and the church. The church would lease the property to the limited company and thereby be able to receive government money. That has now taken place. Government has funded to the tune of 500,000 pounds the complete refurbishment of that church. We have taken up the responsibility for refurbishing a smaller sanctuary. The first half of the church is now a set of community rooms with a little restaurant, a proper nursery and a meeting place for all sorts of groups. A large hall at the back has been hardened up and has been made into a gym and sports hall for the young people where they can vent off all their aggression. That is now a reality.

Four years ago that was a dream, an impossible dream. Today it is actually working and Catholic and Protestants come together, meet together, use the sanctuary for services of worship, use all the facilities for the community. And little by little heart is coming back into it. The sharpness of the division of the peace wall is being blurred and we believe that this is one of the signs and one of the steps that takes us forward.

Peace to the City! - Durban
Coordinator: Mike Vorster, Diakonia Council of Churches
coord@durbanpeace.org.za
Tel: +27-31-305-6001
Fax: +27-31-306-2486
<http://www.durbanpeace.org.za>

----- End of message from list: pov-1 ---->

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 05 Aug 1998 15:34:27 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: Biden on CTBT
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org

Dear CTBT-Organizers,

Many of you have probably seen this already (Sen. Biden (D-DE and Ranking Senator of on the Foreign Relations Committee) on the importance of the CTBT), but I wanted to make sure that it made to the whole list.

I know its August - but let's keep up the good work on CTBT!
Kathy

NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION AND SENATE RATIFICATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE
NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY (Senate - July 30, 1998)

[Page: S9421]

Mr. BIDEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

It is a truism that despite the end of the Cold War, we live in a dangerous world. The ultimate danger we face, perhaps, is that nuclear weapons will be obtained--or even used--by unstable countries or terrorist groups.

We must undertake a range of activities to reduce that danger. There is no magic bullet. No single program or initiative will rid the world of the threat of nuclear cataclysm at the hands of a new or unstable nuclear power.

Rather, we need a coherent strategy with many elements--a strategy designed to reduce both the supply of nuclear weapons technology to would-be nuclear powers and the regional tensions that fuel their demand for those weapons.

I would like to spend a few minutes today talking about one piece of that strategy that this body can implement: We can and should give our advice

and consent to ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.
And we should do that promptly.

In her speech on the 35th anniversary of John F. Kennedy's American

University speech, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright called for U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty. Noting the recent Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests, she said that ratification was needed 'now, more than ever.'

Senator Specter and I have also called for ratification now, both in floor statements and by drafting a resolution calling for expeditious Senate consideration of the Test-Ban Treaty.

Why is the Test-Ban so crucial? Because it is directly related to the global bargain that is the heart of the global nonproliferation regime. Other countries will give up their ambition to acquire nuclear weapons, but only if the declared nuclear powers honestly seek to end their nuclear advantage. We have to keep up our side of the bargain--and that means ratifying and adhering to the comprehensive test ban--or the non-nuclear weapons states will not feel bound to theirs.

One lesson of this decade's nuclear developments in India, Pakistan, Iraq and North Korea is that very basic nuclear weapon design information is no longer a tightly held secret. The technology required to produce nuclear weapons remains expensive and complex, but it is well within the reach of literally scores of countries.

To keep countries from producing what scores of them could produce, you need more than pressure or sanctions. You must constantly maintain their consent to remain non-nuclear weapons states.

Ideally, we would maintain that consent by removing the security concerns that propel countries to seek nuclear weapons. But that is terribly difficult, be it in Kashmir or the Middle East, in the Balkans or the Korean Peninsula or the Taiwan Straits.

In the world of today and of the foreseeable future, peace does not reign. Nuclear non-proliferation will not prevail in this world either, unless we convince states that nuclear weapons are not the key to survival, to status or to power.

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is not merely emblematic of the nuclear powers' commitment to the non-nuclear weapons states. It also

will
put a cap on the development of new classes of nuclear weapons by the nuclear powers.

The test-ban treaty will also limit the ability of any non-nuclear weapons state to develop sophisticated nuclear weapons or to gain confidence in more primitive nuclear weapons if it were to illegally acquire or produce them. If you can't test your weapon, you are very unlikely to rely upon it as an instrument of war.

These are important reassurances to the non-nuclear nations of the world. They are why those countries agreed to foreswear all nuclear tests and to accept intrusive on-site inspection if a suspicion arose that they might have tested a nuclear device.

Will the Test-Ban Treaty also gradually reduce a country's confidence in

the reliability of its nuclear weapons over the next 30 or 50 years, as some of its opponents assert? If so, that is actually reassuring to the non-nuclear weapons states, for it gives them hope of the eventual realization of that 'cessation of the nuclear arms race' encouraged by Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. So even the cloud that most frightens test-ban opponents has a silver lining: it helps keep the rest of

the world on board the non-proliferation bandwagon. Now it is true, Mr. President, that some countries have never accepted the world non-proliferation bargain. The so-called 'threshold states' of India, Pakistan and Israel all viewed nuclear weapons as essential to their national security, and India denounced the Non-Proliferation Treaty because it did not require immediate nuclear disarmament.

Still other countries, like Iran, Iraq and North Korea, signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty but maintained covert nuclear weapons programs.

But the vast majority of the world's states, including many prospective nuclear powers, have gone along with this bargain. And it is vital to our national security that we maintain their adherence to the world non-proliferation regime. They must not become 'threshold states,' let alone actually test nuclear weapons.

So, how will we maintain the adherence of the world's non-nuclear weapons

states to the nuclear proliferation regime? The Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests are a direct challenge to that regime. The regime--and the

countries who support it--can only meet that challenge if the United States leads the way.

On one level, we are already doing that. We have imposed severe sanctions on both India and Pakistan, and both of their economies are at risk. We have adjusted our sanctions to limit their effect upon innocent populations, and we are working to give the President the flexibility to lift them in return for serious steps by India and Pakistan toward capping their arms race and addressing their differences.

On the world-wide level, however, our record is mixed. Some countries have joined us in imposing sanctions on India and Pakistan. We have also been joined in strong statements by countries ranging from Japan to Russia and China.

Statements and resolutions by the G-8, the Organization of American States, the Conference on Disarmament, and the United Nations Security Council have rightly condemned India and Pakistan's nuclear tests and called upon them to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, to refrain from actual deployment of their weapons, to ratify

the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty and to move toward a peaceful settlement of the Kashmir dispute.

But the world is acutely aware of our failure to persuade more countries to impose sanctions, and also of our own failure, so far, to ratify the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty. Until we ratify this Treaty, the nuclear hard-liners in India and Pakistan will be able to cite U.S. hypocrisy as

one more reason to reject the nuclear non-proliferation regime. And until we ratify the Treaty, the rest of the world will find it easier to reject U.S. calls for diplomatic and economic measures to pressure India and Pakistan.

We must keep our part of that non-proliferation bargain, if we are to maintain U.S. leadership on non-proliferation, keep the rest of the world on board, and influence India and Pakistan. The truth is that we have little choice.

If we fail to keep faith with the non-nuclear states because we cannot even ratify the Test-Ban Treaty, then we will also fail to keep them from developing nuclear weapons of their own. And in that case, Mr. President, we might as well prepare for a world of at least 15 or 20 nuclear weapon states, rather than the 5 or 7 or 8 we have today. That is the stark reality we face.

[Page: S9422]

THE FATE OF THE TEST-BAN TREATY

But we need not fail, Mr. President. The Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is a very sensible treaty that is clearly in our national interest. It binds the rest of the world to refrain from nuclear testing, just as we have bound our own government for the last 6 years.

The Test-Ban Treaty forces us to rely upon so-called 'stockpile stewardship' to maintain the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons, but we are in a better position economically and scientifically to do that than is any other country in the world.

Treaty verification will require our attention and our resources, but those are resources that we would have to spend anyway in order to monitor world-wide nuclear weapons programs. Indeed, the International Monitoring System under the Treaty may save us money, as we will pay only a quarter of those costs for monitoring resources that otherwise we might well have to finance in full.

But we do have a problem. We have been unable to hold hearings on this treaty in the Foreign Relations Committee, even though committees with lesser roles have held them. And the Majority Leader has said that he will not bring this treaty to the floor.

Why is that, Mr. President? I know that my good friends the chairman and the majority leader have raised arguments against the Treaty, but they seem curiously unwilling to make those arguments in the context of a proper committee or floor debate on a resolution of ratification.

Could they be afraid of losing? Could they be afraid that, once the pros and cons are laid out with a resolution of ratification before us, two thirds of this body will support ratification? Perhaps; I know that I

think
the Treaty can readily get that support.

For the arguments in favor of ratification look pretty strong. The conditions that the President has asked us to attach to a resolution of ratification will assure that we maintain our weapons and the ability to test them, and that he will consider every year whether we must withdraw from the Treaty and resume testing to maintain nuclear deterrence.

I also know, Mr. President, that the American people overwhelmingly support ratification of the Test-Ban Treaty. A nation-wide poll in mid-May, after the Indian tests, found 73 percent in favor of ratification and only 16 percent against it. Later polls in 5 states--with 7 Republican senators--found support for the Treaty ranging from 79 percent to 86 percent.

The May poll also found that the American people knew there was a risk that other countries would try to cheat, so the public is not supporting ratification because they wear rose-colored glasses. The people are pretty level-headed on this issue, as on so many others. They know that no treaty is perfect. They also know that this Treaty, on balance, is good for America.

So perhaps those who block the Senate from fulfilling its Constitutional duty regarding this Treaty are doing that because they know the people overwhelmingly support this Treaty, and they know that ratification would pass.

Perhaps they just don't like arms control treaties. Perhaps they would rather rely only upon American military might, including nuclear weapons tests. Perhaps they want a nation-wide ballistic missile defense and figure that then it won't matter how many countries have nuclear weapons. Perhaps they figure our weapons will keep us safe, even if we let the rest of the world fall into the abyss of nuclear war.

I don't share that view, Mr. President. I believe we can keep non-proliferation on track. I believe that we can maintain nuclear deterrence without engaging in nuclear testing, and that the Comprehensive

Test-Ban Treaty is a small price for keeping the non-nuclear states with us on an issue where the fate of the world is truly at stake.

I cannot force a resolution of ratification on this Treaty through the Foreign Relations Committee and onto the floor of this body.

But the American people want us to ratify this Treaty. They are absolutely right to want that. I will remind my colleagues--however often I must--of their duty under the U.S. Constitution and to our national security. I will make sure that the American people know who stands with them in that vital quest.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, and I have drafted a resolution calling for expeditious consideration of this Treaty. So far, we have been joined by 34 of our colleagues as co-sponsors of that resolution.

We know that many others support us quietly, Mr. President, but hesitate to part company with their leaders. We are confident, however, that as more of them reflect on what is at stake, and on the need for continued U.S. leadership in nuclear non-proliferation, they will realize that they will do their leaders a favor by helping the Senate to do what is so clearly in the national interest.

The Senate will give its advice and consent to ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty. The only question is when.

The world is a dangerous place, Mr. President, and we must not underestimate the challenges our country faces. But the spirit of America lies in our ability to rise to those challenges and overcome them. The immediate challenge of non-proliferation is to bring forth a resolution of ratification on a useful treaty, Mr. President. We should show more of that American spirit in our approach to that task.

(Thanks to Jenny Smith at the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers for posting this.)

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20008
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0172
<disarmament@igc.org>
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 06 Aug 1998 16:14:44 +0200
From: "T.Damjanov" <damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: New INES email address!
To: INESnet@fy.chalmers.se, inesap@fy.chalmers.se, abolition-caucus@igc.org,
ABOLITION-EUROPE@vlberlin.comlink.de
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id HAB08915

This is to inform you that the International Office of the
INTERNATIONAL NETWORK OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS
FOR GLOBAL RESPONSIBILITY (INES)
has the following new email address:

< INES_nat@t-online.de >

Please change your address lists accordingly!

In addition, PLEASE NOTE:

This email address is also valid for the office of the German
"Scientists Initiative Responsibility for Peace and Sustainability"
(NaturwissenschaftlerInnen-Initiative
Verantwortung für Friedens- und Zukunftsfähigkeit)
which is an INES member organisation

Best regards,
Tobias Damjanov
Project Staff
INTERNATIONAL NETWORK OF ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS
FOR GLOBAL RESPONSIBILITY (INES)
Am Beckerkamp 12/app. 26
D-21031 Hamburg, Germany
phone: (49-40) 7269 2394
(for fax messages, call me before)
e-mail: <damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de>

INES is a member of Abolition 2000
- a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons -

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Thu, 06 Aug 1998 10:02:24 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Clinton-Yeltsin letter
References: <2.2.16.19980805100257.367f5b3c@pop.igc.org>

Howard,

Here is the text as we agreed on it by phone. You may want to look over the three changes -- one in the first paragraph and two in the fifth paragraph -- to make sure that we have the same text before we send it out.

Thanks for your initiative.

Shalom,
Bob

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>
> Dear Bob:
>
> Here is the re-draft of the sign-on letter to President Clinton and
> President Yeltsin. I verified that all those study groups support
> de-alerting in some form. In the civilian leaders statement I came across
> the phrase about placing separated warheads in "secure national storage" and
> added it to the letter.
>
> The White House Public Affairs Office says that the summit will take place
> in early September before Labor Day, though precise dates haven't been
> announced. Therefore, I set the deadline for sign-on as Friday, August 21.
> That will give us a week to get the letter to presidential staff (though we
> could offer a version with the initial signature to U.S. staff before that).
>
> Please let me now if you approve these drafts or want changes. Then I'll
> post it to abolition-caucus and to other potential signers. Do you have the
> Monday Lobby list on e-mail? I don't, so I would appreciate your handling
> that aspect.
>
> Shalom,
> Howard
>
> ###
>
> Revised draft, August 5, 1998
>
> The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
> The White House
> Washington, DC 20500
>
> The Honorable Boris Yeltsin

> The Kremlin
> Moscow, Russia
>
> Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:
>
> When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a
> course so that Earth may enter the new millenium with all nuclear weapons
> taken off high alert status. One straightforward method to accomplish this would
> be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in
> secure national storage.
>
> We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting
> process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than
> December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and
> China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert
> within that time frame.
>
> With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the
> United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully
> avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of
> nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized
> launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack
> by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation
> of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially
> enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.
>
> Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through
> executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and
> President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the
> alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental
> ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to
> stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within
> the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your
> respective nuclear arsenals.
>
> De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including
> the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals
> leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in
> the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime
ministers
> (1998), and the recent New Agenda statement by the foreign ministers of
> Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and
> Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious
> bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.
>
> De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like
> to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We
> hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in
> this direction.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ###
>

> Transmittal of Clinton-Yeltsin sign-on letter
> Draft, August 5, 1998
>
> Dear Colleagues:
>
> The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September
> offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear
> disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to
> de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from
> delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive
> action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the
> Russian Duma.
>
> Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, asking President Clinton
> and President Yeltsin to embarked upon a de-alerting initiative and to
> complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you to be a
> co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us your name,
> title, organization, and country. You may reply to btiller@igc.org.
> Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.
>
> If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.
>
> Shalom,
>
> Robert Tiller, [title]
> Physicians for Social Responsibility
> Phone: 202 898-0150
> Fax: 202 898-0172
> E-mail: btiller@psr.org
>
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
> E-mail: mupj@igc.org
>
> 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
>
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Clinton-Yeltsin letter
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 10:02 AM 8/6/98 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard,
>
>Here is the text as we agreed on it by phone. You may want to look over
>the three changes -- one in the first paragraph and two in the fifth
>paragraph -- to make sure that we have the same text before we send it
>out.
>
>Thanks for your initiative.
>
>Shalom,
>Bob
>

Yes, Bob, those are the changes we agreed to.

Howard

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Thu, 06 Aug 1998 10:06:52 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Re: Clinton-Yeltsin letter
References: <2.2.16.19980805100257.367f5b3c@pop.igc.org> <35C9B770.6759@psr.org>

Oooops, we spelled millennium wrong. It has two n's in the middle.

Shalom,
BT

Bob Tiller wrote:

>
> Howard,
>
> Here is the text as we agreed on it by phone. You may want to look over
> the three changes -- one in the first paragraph and two in the fifth
> paragraph -- to make sure that we have the same text before we send it
> out.
>
> Thanks for your initiative.
>
> Shalom,
> Bob
>
> Howard W. Hallman wrote:
>>
>> Dear Bob:
>>
>> Here is the re-draft of the sign-on letter to President Clinton and
>> President Yeltsin. I verified that all those study groups support
>> de-alerting in some form. In the civilian leaders statement I came across
>> the phrase about placing separated warheads in "secure national storage" and
>> added it to the letter.
>>
>> The White House Public Affairs Office says that the summit will take place
>> in early September before Labor Day, though precise dates haven't been
>> announced. Therefore, I set the deadline for sign-on as Friday, August 21.
>> That will give us a week to get the letter to presidential staff (though we
>> could offer a version with the initial signature to U.S. staff before that).
>>
>> Please let me now if you approve these drafts or want changes. Then I'll
>> post it to abolition-caucus and to other potential signers. Do you have the
>> Monday Lobby list on e-mail? I don't, so I would appreciate your handling
>> that aspect.
>>
>> Shalom,
>> Howard

>>
>> ###
>>
>> Revised draft, August 5, 1998
>>
>> The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
>> The White House
>> Washington, DC 20500
>>
>> The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
>> The Kremlin
>> Moscow, Russia
>>
>> Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:
>>
>> When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a
>> course so that Earth may enter the new millenium with all nuclear weapons
>> taken off high alert status. One straightforward method to accomplish this would
>> be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in
>> secure national storage.
>>
>> We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting
>> process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than
>> December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and
>> China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert
>> within that time frame.
>>
>> With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the
>> United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully
>> avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of
>> nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized
>> launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack
>> by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation
>> of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially
>> enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.
>>
>> Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through
>> executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and
>> President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the
>> alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental
>> ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to
>> stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within
>> the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your
>> respective nuclear arsenals.
>>
>> De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including
>> the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals
>> leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in
>> the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime
ministers
>> (1998), and the recent New Agenda statement by the foreign ministers of
>> Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and
>> Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious
>> bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

>>
>> De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like
>> to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We
>> hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in
>> this direction.

>>
>> Sincerely yours,

>>
>> ###

>>
>> Transmittal of Clinton-Yeltsin sign-on letter
>> Draft, August 5, 1998

>>
>> Dear Colleagues:

>>
>> The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September
>> offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear
>> disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to
>> de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from
>> delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive
>> action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the
>> Russian Duma.

>>
>> Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, asking President Clinton
>> and President Yeltsin to embarked upon a de-alerting initiative and to
>> complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you to be a
>> co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us your name,
>> title, organization, and country. You may reply to btiller@igc.org.
>> Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.

>>
>> If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.

>>
>> Shalom,

>>
>> Robert Tiller, [title]
>> Physicians for Social Responsibility
>> Phone: 202 898-0150
>> Fax: 202 898-0172
>> E-mail: btiller@psr.org

>>
>> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
>> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
>> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
>> E-mail: mupj@igc.org

>>
>> 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

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

To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Clinton-Yeltsin letter
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 10:06 AM 8/6/98 -0400, you wrote:
>Oooops, we spelled millennium wrong. It has two n's in the middle.
>
>Shalom,
>BT
>
>
>Good eye, Bob.

Howard

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 06 Aug 1998 11:44:55 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter
References: <35C9BD79.25A7@psr.org>

Bob & Howard:

I like this letter and will circulate it to my e-mail list if you would like me to.

I respectfully suggest that you make a minor change in the next to the last paragraph referring to the New Agenda statement - I believe it should be the New Agenda Coalition Declaration of the countries of

The way that it is currently stated looks like an informal gathering of foreign ministers made a statement, and I did call it a "statement" in my sign-on letter and received 2 reply's correcting that it is a "declaration" - and an official U.N. document

I'm sorry to be so petty - I assume that this is going to the abolition-caucus?

I'm not sure how you wanted to work the Russian angle on this. Here are some contacts - but clearly you'll have to explain a bit more what you want them to do.

In Russia, you could send this to:

<yaro@glas.apc.org > Alla Yaroshinskaya

(include explanation of the letter -Alla is a government official - advisor to Yeltsin, so she won't be able to sign-on as an NGO)

<sprapic@glas.apc.org> Russian American Press & Informatio Center in St Petersburg

(the Rabinowitz of Russia - sort of - ask for additional groups that might want to sign on.)

<civicpeace@glasnet.ru> Civic Peace was the organizing partner with IPB of the Moscow Conference last fall - They don't put a huge focus on nuclear issues, but are the closest equivalent of a Peace Action/ PSR group in Russia. Tair Tairov helped to organize the conference and speaks English, but I don't know if he is regularly in the office.

Anita Seth at IEER has developed contacts throughout Russia - and speaks Russian, so I would call her and ask for help in formulating a Russian angle on this. <anitas@ieer.org>

Bob Tiller wrote:

> Dear Colleagues:

>

> The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early

> September offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading

> to nuclear disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to

> request them to de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating
> warheads from delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective
> through executive action without a treaty requiring ratification by the
> U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma.
>
> Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, asking President
> Clinton and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative
> and to complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you
> to be a co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us
> your name, title, organization, and country. You may reply to
> <btiller@psr.org> Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.
>
> If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.
>
> Shalom,
>
> Robert W. Tiller, Director of Security Programs
> Physicians for Social Responsibility
> Phone: 202 898-0150, ext. 220
> Fax: 202 898-0172
> E-mail: btiller@psr.org
>
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
> E-mail: mupj@igc.org
>
> -----
>
> August --, 1998
>
> The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
> The White House
> Washington, DC 20500
>
> The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
> The Kremlin
> Moscow, Russia
>
> Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin:
>
> When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a
> course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear
> weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method to
> accomplish this would be to separate warheads from their delivery
> vehicles and place them in secure national storage.
>
> We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the
> de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no
> later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United
> Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear
> arsenals off alert within that time frame.
>
> With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia,

> the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and
> carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a
> condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or
> unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face
> the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to
> miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these
> dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national
> security of all the nuclear weapon states.

>
> Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out
> through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President
> George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991
> when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable
> number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a
> positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each
> other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority
> to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

>
> De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including
> the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals
> leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences
> in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders,
> including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers
> (1998), and the recent New Agenda statement by the foreign ministers of
> Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and
> Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of
> religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

>
> De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would
> like to enter the new millennium free from the fear of nuclear
> destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity
> to lead the world in this direction.

>
> Sincerely yours,

>
> Name
> Title
> Organization
> Country

To: btiller@psr.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re New Agenda Declaration
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Bob:

Picking up Kathy Crandall's suggestion, I think we can change it to read "New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of..." The UN document says "...Declaration adopted by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs", which we could follow, but I think "foreign ministers" says the same thing less awkwardly.

If it's all right with you, I'll make this change in Clinton-Yeltsin letter before I send it to abolition-caucus and other potential signers.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 06 Aug 1998 12:23:26 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: (no subject)

Bob, Howard

Here is an interesting thought - post your letter to the Russia Today
Chat Line on nuclear weapons - inviting sign-ons . . .

<http://www.russiatoday.com/.chat/rooms/nucboard.html>

Kathy

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 06 Aug 1998 15:35:18 -0400
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: USA/URGENT ACTION ALERT
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: aslater@pop2.igc.org

Dear Friends,

Congressman Ed Markey is urgently seeking co-sponsors for H.Con.Res.307 to cut off all funding for stockpile stewardship **BEFORE THE AUGUST RECESS IN TWO DAYS!!** We need to call our Congresspeople and ask them to cosponsor, today and tomorrow!! So far, only Congresspeople Woolsey, Lee and Tierny have signed on as co-sponsors. They want ten co-sponsors before the recess.

Please make your calls **TODAY** and ask your representative to contact Jeff Duncan in Congressman Markey's office at 202-225-2836. **HOW BETTER TO MEMORIALIZE AUGUST 6TH THAN TO JOIN THIS EFFORT TO STOP THE NEW SPIRALING NUCLEAR ARMS RACE.** Many thanks. Peace

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Thu, 06 Aug 1998 10:28:09 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
To: btiller@psr.org
Subject: Sign-on letter

Dear Colleagues:

The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma.

Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, asking President Clinton and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative and to complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you to be a co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us your name, title, organization, and country. You may reply to <btiller@psr.org> Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.

If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.

Shalom,

Robert W. Tiller, Director of Security Programs
Physicians for Social Responsibility
Phone: 202 898-0150, ext. 220
Fax: 202 898-0172
E-mail: btiller@psr.org

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

August --, 1998

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method to accomplish this would be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New Agenda statement by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millennium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

Name
Title
Organization
Country

Return-Path: <owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com
Date: Thu, 06 Aug 1998 16:10:32 -0700
To: sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Subject: (sunflower-napf) The Sunflower, No. 15, August 1998
Sender: owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com

=====
THE SUNFLOWER
=====

ISSUE NO. 15, August 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

- * INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT
- * PROLIFERATION
 - China Stocks Up -- With U.S. Help
 - India Plans Nuclear Submarine
 - Iran Test-Fires Missile
 - Israel Buys Three German Submarines
 - U.S. Aided Indian and Pakistani Nuclear Programs
 - U.S. Kills Anti-Proliferation Panel
 - Verification of CTBT Improved
- * SUPERPOWER ARMS RACE
 - Russia and U.S. Plan to Conduct Subcritical Nuclear Tests
 - Pure Fusion Nuclear Weapons
- * ABOLITION 2000 NEWS
 - Protest at NATO Headquarters
 - Petition Signatories
 - Resolutions and Municipalities
 - New Network Members
 - Abolition 2000 - USA
 - Abolition 2000 - France
- * NUCLEAR WASTE
 - Asian Nuclear Waste Reaches Storage Site in Idaho
 - Hanford Cleanup Starts at \$6.9 billion
 - Increase in Radioactive Pollution Found in Scotland
- * OTHER NEWS
 - Nuclear Submarine Accident
 - Britain Reveals Plutonium Stockpile

ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE

DATES TO REMEMBER

EVENTS

RESOURCES

=====

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

=====

Following nearly five weeks of negotiations in Rome, a treaty to establish a permanent International Criminal Court was accepted by 120 votes to 7, with 21 abstentions. The treaty, when ratified by 60 countries, will allow the Court to hold individuals accountable for crimes of genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and aggression. UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan hailed the proposed Court as "a gift of hope to future generations and a giant step forward in the march toward universal human rights and the rule of law." Only seven countries voted against establishing the Court. These include Iraq, Libya, Sudan and the United States. (LAT 980719)
For more information, see: http://www.wagingpeace.org/icc_home.html

=====

PROLIFERATION

=====

China Stocks Up -- With U.S. Help

China produced six new intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) in the first four months of the year, increasing its arsenal by a third. A CIA report earlier this year disclosed that China had 18 long-range nuclear missiles capable of hitting the U.S. and that 13 of them were targeted at U.S. cities. As reported earlier (Sunflower, May 1998). Air Force Gen. Eugene Habiger, commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, stated that China is also "looking at putting in a new system with Multiple Independently-targetable Re-entry Vehicles" or MIRVs. MIRVing ICBMs would certainly step-up the nuclear arms race and destabilize arms control and disarmament efforts. Furthermore, the U.S. Congress was told that China has obtained weapons-capable technology from the U.S. that goes far beyond that of satellite exports. Stephen Bryen, director of the Defense Technology Security Administration during the Reagan administration, told a hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, that "China has been able to get technology that was forbidden to the Soviet Union," such as supercomputers, machine tools, and jet engines. (AP 980709/25)

India Plans Nuclear Submarine

In response to "the emerging strategic challenge from China in the Indian Ocean," India plans to begin building its first nuclear-powered submarine by 2001/2. The so-called "Advanced Technology Vessel" (ATV) is likely to serve as an effective platform for nuclear-armed missiles such as the Sagarika, a cruise missile which is now at an advanced stage of development. The reactor for the new submarine will begin tests at the Kalapakkam atomic research centre near Madras within the next 12 months. (Reuters 980723)

Iran Test-Fires Missile

On July 22, Iran test-fired a medium range missile. The missile exploded or was detonated about 100 seconds into the flight. The weapon, with a range of about 800 miles, is capable of hitting Israel and Saudi Arabia, and of altering the political and military balance of power in the Middle East. It is believed that the so-called Shahab-3 was based on a North Korean Rodong missile. The chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Sen. Richard Shelby (R-AI), commented that the time had come for the United States to develop and deploy a national missile defense system. (NYT/FAS 980723)

Israel Buys Three German Submarines

Israel is buying three Dolphin-class submarines from Germany which are capable of carrying nuclear-armed cruise missiles. Israel is seeking to deter a preemptive strike by Iran or any other Middle East nation that may acquire nuclear weapons. Following a disclosure that German companies supplied materials for Iraq's weapons programs, Germany announced it would pay for two of the three Israeli submarines. The U.S. expects all three submarines to be delivered before the end of this year. The new submarines may be equipped with a new air-launched cruise missile: Popeye Turbo. Popeye has a range of 200 miles, can be equipped with a nuclear warhead, and should be operational by 2002 (Pentagon, CSIS). Israel may have as many as 400 nuclear weapons, some 150 of which are stored in limestone bunkers southeast of Tel Aviv (JIR). (WT 980701)

U.S. Aided Indian and Pakistani Nuclear Programs

The Atoms For Peace Program, implemented in early 1953 shortly after the U.S. had conducted the first full scale test of a hydrogen bomb, defused both domestic and international critics. The program promised to provide energy that was clean and too cheap to meter. Poor countries were supplied with research reactors and their foreign scientists were trained in the secrets of nuclear fission in exchange for guarantees not to develop nuclear weapons programs. Today, nuclear war looms over South Asia as a result of the Atoms For Peace Program. (WP 980615)

U.S. Kills Anti-Proliferation Panel

Proliferation is the number one subject in world affairs right now. Nevertheless, House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-GA), who has criticized President Clinton for not curbing the spread of missiles and nuclear arms, helped kill a special commission last month that had been created to address that very problem. Headed by former CIA Director John M. Deutch, the eight member panel had just begun to streamline government efforts to combat the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and the means to deliver them. Aides to Mr. Gingrich and Rep. Benjamin Gilman (R-NY), who heads the House International Relations Committee, said the panel got a late start, was ineffective and was dominated by experts picked by Democrats, 6 to 2. While the Senate (in March) easily approved an extension of the panel to July 29, 1999, Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Gilman delayed a House vote for 13 weeks, forcing the panel to fold. (NYT 980713)

Verification of CTBT Improved

According to the Department of Energy, U.S. government scientists have developed two highly sensitive devices that better detect nuclear bomb blasts in other countries by detecting traces of radioactive material. One device analyzes air samples for radioactive particles that seep from underground nuclear explosions, while the other device detects above-ground nuclear explosions. The devices will be placed around the globe and can be used to monitor adherence to the CTBT. (Reuters 980828)

SUPERPOWER ARMS RACE

Russia and U.S. Plan to Conduct Subcritical Nuclear Tests

Russia plans to carry out a "subcritical" nuclear test before the onset of winter. First Deputy Atomic Energy Minister Lev Ryabev said the Atomic Energy Ministry would carry out the test underground on the Russian Arctic island of Novaya Zemlya, 1,800 km (1,100 miles) northeast of Moscow. The United States has carried out three underground subcritical tests since last year, and plans to detonate a fourth, named 'Bagpipe,' before October 1, when the new fiscal year begins. Subcritical nuclear tests allow scientists to improve nuclear weapons without a full-scale nuclear blast. This violates the spirit if not the letter of the CTBT that President Clinton signed in 1996. The European Parliament demanded the U.S. stop the testing in a resolution it passed on February 19, 1998. The mayor of Nagasaki, Japan wrote to U.S. President Bill Clinton in March: "If the United States and Russia, two world leaders, continue with these tests, it could invite similar tests by other nuclear states and thereby stir up a new nuclear arms race." Soon after his letter, both India and Pakistan carried out full underground tests with nuclear explosions that released radioactivity. (Reuters 980724)

For the EP-resolution, see: http://www.wagingpeace.org/res_EP_subcritical.html

Pure Fusion Nuclear Weapons

Both the National Ignition Facility (NIF), under construction at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, and the Laser Megajoule project planned near Bordeaux, France, will violate the CTBT and could open the way for the development of new, 'pure fusion' nuclear weapons. This is the conclusion of a new study by the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER). The NIF, a \$2.2 billion complex, will be the world's first machine to generate tiny thermonuclear explosions, igniting hydrogen with a super laser gun instead of a nuclear chain reaction.

Arms control advocates worry about the development of small pure-fusion bombs which could be made with easily obtainable elements, hydrogen isotopes, that would dangerously blur the distinction between nuclear and non-nuclear explosives. The IEER study is the first to make such a specific accusation but it echoes growing criticism that the U.S. is heading down a dangerous nuclear road. Dr. Ray E. Kidder, a former nuclear bomb designer at Livermore, praised the group's work as rigorous and thorough, and said the issue of a possible treaty violation was important. Kidder and two colleagues have prepared a proposal for limiting pure-fusion research. The proposal will appear in a coming issue of Physics Today, a professional journal. Earlier, Dr. Frank von Hippel, a former Clinton adviser who teaches at Princeton University, as well as Dr. Hans A. Bethe, a Nobel laureate who was a main architect of the first atomic bomb, warned of the dangers of "pure-fusion weapons." (NYT 980715, Nature Magazine 980716)

For Bethe's letter to President Clinton, see: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/betheletter.html>

For the IEER study, see: <http://www.ieer.org>

ABOLITION 2000 - GOOD NEWS FROM THE GRASSROOTS

Protest at NATO Headquarters

On July 10, demonstrators belonging to the "Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days Network" blocked the main entrance to NATO headquarters in Brussels. About ten anti-nuclear demonstrators penetrated the compound and were subsequently arrested. Delegates of the "Network" presented documents to a NATO official recalling the July 1996 Opinion from the International Court of Justice in The Hague declaring the threat or use of nuclear weapons to be illegal. (AN 980712)

Petition Signatures

M. Jean DuFour, Conseil General - St. Just, Marseille signed the Abolition 2000 International Petition this week. 80 signatures recently arrived from Cheng Joon Hor of Malaysia. 104 signatures were received from Neuman Hall, the Holy Spirit RC Church in Berkeley CA. 15 signatures were received from the Wilshire United Methodist Church. New Zealand reports a growing total of signatures - 1307 as of July 13. Another 1048 signatures have recently arrived from Japan.

Resolutions and Municipalities

On July 12th at their Annual General Meeting, the British Medical Association passed a resolution in favor of nuclear abolition. -- Darmstadt became the first Germany city to adopt the Abolition 2000 Municipality Declaration.

--> For municipalities, see: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/municlist.html>

Organizations Signing On

The following Indian organizations have joined Abolition 2000: World Peace and Friendship Society, the Indian Board of Alternative Medicine, the Tamil Nadu United Nations Association and the Pakistan-India People's Forum for Peace and Democracy.

http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/organizs_index.html

Abolition 2000 - USA

The Nuclear Information and Resource Service (NIRS) has launched the Nuclear Free New England campaign. They are joining with hundreds of activists to close down every nuclear reactor in New England by 2000. Potentially the largest anti-nuclear rally in the U.S. over the last decade will be held in Battleboro, Vermont on August 22. To register, <mailto:can@shaysnet.com>.

Abolition 2000 - France

Mouvement de la Paix recently created a big attraction in one of the most crowded squares of Paris. With a 3 meter high petition painted on a wood panel, a big inflatable balloon and a huge banner with the three demands on it, they

urged Parisians and tourists on the Opera Square to sign the Abolition 2000 International Petition. Hundreds signed up, including people from all five continents, and many soccer fans!

=====

NUCLEAR WASTE

=====

Asian Nuclear Waste Reaches Storage Site in Idaho

The first of five trainloads of nuclear waste from Asia reached a temporary storage site at the Idaho National Environmental and Engineering Laboratory, a site operated by Lockheed Martin for the U.S. Government. The dates of the remaining four shipments are unknown. The shipment, which arrived in the San Francisco Bay on July 22, was escorted by peace activists in small boats calling themselves a "Peace Navy." The spent fuel rods were then transferred to trains to begin the 1,000 mile journey to Idaho. Along the journey the train passed through the Feather River Canyon, an area with an extremely high incidence of train derailment. The cost of transporting the spent fuel rods from California to Idaho was estimated at \$4 million, not including costs of training more than 2,000 law enforcement officers and others to safeguard the shipment. The waste will be stored in concrete and lead vaults at the site until federal authorities approve a permanent storage site for high-level nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, or elsewhere. -- The shipment is part of the 1953 Atoms For Peace Program, in which the United States promised to supply foreign countries with nuclear research reactors and fuel in exchange for a promise to refrain from developing nuclear weapons. Part of the program, according to federal officials, was that the United States would take back spent fuel. (UPI 980723)

Hanford Cleanup Starts at \$6.9 billion

On July 21, the U.S. Department of Energy (D.O.E.) agreed to a \$6.9 billion deal with a British company to begin converting the equivalent of 2,800 railroad cars of radioactive waste into glass at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington. The contract to start converting the radioactive waste into glass for storage, a process called vitrification, now goes to Congress for approval. Congress now has 30 days to accept or reject the agreement. The contract would signify one of the biggest public works projects in history. Hanford intends to convert 54 million gallons of waste, now buried in 177 underground tanks, into glass for storage, a process that could take 30 years and cost \$40 to \$50 billion. The D.O.E. maintains that this process will put the waste in a form which will provide long-lasting protection of the Columbia River. This project will only treat 10 percent of Hanford's waste in the next 20 years. This will leave 10 years to vitrify the remaining (90 percent) of the waste by the 2028 deadline reached under a tri-party agreement between the D.O.E., Washington State, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The state of Washington threatened recently to sue the D.O.E. for failing to meet tri-party milestones. At least 67 of Hanford's tanks are known or suspected to be leaking, and Washington officials have become impatient with clean-up delays. The tri-party agreement, a court-sanctioned 1989 pact for cleanup, requires Hanford to begin processing low-level tank waste by December, 2003. (Oregonian 980722)

Increase in Radioactive Pollution Found in Scotland

Greenpeace found a dramatic increase in radioactive contamination off of Scotland's west coast, from the Sellafield reprocessing plant. Samples of seaweed taken in May 1998 show that levels of technicium-99 (TC-99) are continuing to increase and spread along the Scottish coast. In one location, contamination levels have tripled in a year. "Such massive increases in radioactive contamination fly in the face of public opinion both internationally and within Scotland," said Mike Townsley of Greenpeace. On July 16th, Norwegian Prime Minister Kjell Bondevik met with British Prime Minister Tony Blair to demand the closure of Sellafield and Dounreay in an effort to reduce such radioactive discharge. (Greenpeace 980708)

=====

OTHER NEWS

=====

Nuclear Submarine Accident

A British Trident submarine, the HMS Vanguard, carrying a crew of 135 and up to 96 nuclear warheads, went into an uncontrolled dive during a training exercise on July 16th in the Celtic Deep, between the South coast of Ireland and Lands End. The emergency began after the nuclear reactor was shut down and the crew tried to switch to back up electrical power. If it had not pulled out of its dive, it would have headed down and probably imploded, killing the crew and spreading radioactivity over a massive area. The Vanguard's near disaster echoes the fate of an American nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. Thresher, which sank off the New England coast in 1963. There was a garbled message to a surface ship and, after two weeks, the 129-crew vessel was found crushed at a depth of 8,500 feet. An inquiry blamed a broken sea-water pipe for smashing power circuits, but it was later claimed there was an explosion in the nuclear reactor. (Sunday Mail 980716)

Britain Reveals Plutonium Stockpile

Britain decided to trim its nuclear arsenal and reveal the size of its plutonium stockpile. Defence Secretary George Robertson announced that Britain would keep one of its Trident submarines on patrol all year round, but cut the number of warheads on board from a maximum of 96 to 48. The stockpile of operationally available warheads for the Trident submarines would be cut to 200 from a maximum of 300. Robertson also revealed that Britain held 7.6 tons of plutonium, 21.9 tons of highly enriched uranium and 15,000 tons of other forms of uranium in its defense stocks. (Reuters 980709)

=====

ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE

=====

1) ==> URGENT: GET ON THE PHONE TODAY!!

Congressman Ed Markey (D-MA) is urgently seeking co-sponsors for House Resolution 307 to cut off all funding for stockpile stewardship BEFORE THE AUGUST RECESS IN TWO DAYS!! We need to call our Congresspeople and ask them to cosponsor, today and tomorrow!! So far, only Congresspeople Woolsey, Lee and Tierny have signed on as co-sponsors. They want ten co-sponsors before the recess. Please make your calls TODAY and ask your representative to contact Jeff Duncan in Congressman Markey's office at 202-225-2836. HOW BETTER TO MEMORIALIZE AUGUST 6TH THAN TO JOIN THIS EFFORT TO STOP THE NEW SPIRALING NUCLEAR ARMS RACE. Many thanks. YOUR REPRESENTATIVES TO SUPPORT THE STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP RESOLUTION
You can find the Resolution text on our web-site at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/res_ssmp_woolsey.html

2) ==> BOYCOTT NESTLE FOR THEIR NEW NUCLEAR CHOCOLATE CANDY BAR, complete with a "chocolate chain reaction" logo. In a statement Nestle said "The word 'nuclear' was used in a fun, cool manner to communicate the product's energy." Tell Nestle there is nothing fun or cool about nuclear weapons, nuclear fallout or nuclear waste. Join Grandmothers for Peace in this boycott.
For more information, contact Grandmothers for Peace at <mailto:wiednerb@aol.com>.

3) ==> URGE YOUR REPRESENTATIVE TO SUPPORT NEGOTIATIONS FOR A NUCLEAR WEAPONS CONVENTION. Ask your representative to support Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey's resolution, HR 479, calling for a Nuclear Weapons Convention. Also, ask them to co-sponsor Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton's bill, HR-827, the "Nuclear Disarmament and Economic Conversion Act."

** The Woolsey Resolution can be found at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/res_a2000_woolsey.html

** For more on HR-827, please go to <http://www.prop1.org/anukelst.htm#827>

A complete list of all Congressional phone and fax numbers and e-mail addresses can be found at: <http://www.vote-smart.org>

4) ==> WRITE A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF YOUR LOCAL NEWSPAPER

Express the urgency of nuclear weapons abolition now that the recent tests in South Asia have brought this issue back to the forefront of people's attention.

5) ==> 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
Body: subscribe act-now-napf

6) ==> SIGN THE ABOLITION 2000 INTERNATIONAL PETITION
<http://www.wagingpeace.org/intlpetition.html>

7) ==> FORWARD THIS NEWSLETTER TO A FRIEND

=====
D A T E S T O R E M E M B E R
=====

August 3, 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty enters into force.

August 5, 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty banning nuclear weapons testing in the atmosphere, in outer space and underground is signed.

August 6, 1945 Hiroshima Day--the world's second atomic bomb, "Little Boy," is dropped on Hiroshima, Japan. Some 70,000-90,000 people were immediately killed, and a total of 145,000 people are thought to have died from the bombing by the end of 1945.

August 6, 1985 South Pacific Nuclear Weapons Free Zone is signed at Rarotonga.

August 9, 1945 Nagasaki Day--the world's third atomic bomb, "Fat Man," is dropped on Nagasaki, Japan. Some 35,000-40,000 people were killed immediately, and a total of 75,000-90,000 people are thought to have died from the bombing by the end of 1945.

August 13, 1961 East Germans begin to build the Berlin Wall.

August 24, 1968 France tests its first hydrogen bomb.

August 29, 1949 The Soviet Union detonates its first atomic bomb.

August 31, 1990 East and West Germany sign Treaty of Unification.

=====
E V E N T S
=====

August 6

** Hiroshima Day will be commemorated this month all over the world with rallies, vigils, prayers and meetings on or around August 6th.

** The Foundation will sponsor the Sadako Peace Day ceremony commemorating the 53rd anniversary of the first use of nuclear weapons at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The program includes music, poetry and reflection at Sadako Peace Garden at La Casa de Maria Retreat Center in Montecito, California from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. For further information, contact the Foundation at <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>

August 8

** Trident to Life Campaign is hosting a vigil at the Kings Bay Trident Submarine Base at St Mary's GA 2-5pm on Spur 40 at Kings Bay Road.

August 9

** Dr Helen Caldicott will speak and many groups will participate, including - Peace Action, New Mexico, Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety, Los Alamos Study Group and Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping. From noon till dusk at Ashley Pond in Los Alamos.

** The Walk for Nuclear Disarmament ends at Faslane Trident Nuclear Submarine Base in Scotland. Starting in Belgium, there will be actions at Trident related sites on the way to Scotland.

August 9-25

** Trident Ploughshares 2000 Disarmament Camp, Falsane, Scotland

For information, contact: Mother Earth International office (Belgium), phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39;
<mailto:international@motherearth.org>

August 15 to 21

** Vermont Walk for Nuclear Abolition. From Montpelier, VT to Springfield, VT

For further information contact: <mailto:afscvt@together.net> or <mailto:efarns@together.net>

August 22

** Anti-nuclear rally in Battleboro, Vermont.

Part of the Nuclear Free New England campaign organized by the Nuclear Information and Resource Service (NIRS).

<http://www.nirs.org>

To register, <mailto:can@shaysnet.com>

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
=====

All issues of The Sunflower are on the web at: http://www.wagingpeace.org/the_sunflower.html

BOOKS, REPORTS, STUDIES

*** "Dangerous Thermonuclear Quest: The Potential of Explosive Fusion Research for the Development of Pure Fusion Weapons," by Arjun Makhijani and Hisham Zerriffi, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER) in Takoma Park, Md., July 1998; web-site: <http://www.ieer.org>

FREE OF CHARGE

*** Find out about books offered for free at <http://www.ratical.com/radiation/>

*** The Legal Case for Nuclear Weapons Abolition by David Krieger
<http://www.napf.org/articles/legalcase.html>

*** Live interview with David Krieger on: "U.S. Trying to De-Escalate Nuclear Tensions." Don Rush investigates the options for U.S. policy in Asia: is there anything the US should - or can do - to de-escalate nuclear tensions between India and Pakistan.

RealAudio file at: <http://www.webactive.com/webactive/audio/pacifica/pac980603d.ram>

=====
F E E D B A C K
=====

-->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.
Lori Beckwith, Susan Broidy

=====
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>

To subscribe, please send an e-mail, leaving the Subject line empty,

To: Majordomo@lists.xmission.com
Body: subscribe sunflower-napf

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.

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: September 16 breakfast on CTBT
Cc: ctbt
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

The interfaith working group on the CTBT met on August 4 to consider plans for a breakfast meeting on September 16 to rally support for a final push for this session of Congress. I am here reporting what we discussed, and I want to ask you to make some concrete commitments (so read on, please).

It is now clear that hearings and floor action on the CTBT won't occur this year. However, we want to press for a binding commitment that the Senate will take up the CTBT in 1999. This means that we need to work with Democrats and supportive Republicans to obtain an agreement for a vote-certain date in 1999. The leverage is the ability of senators supportive of the CTBT to tie up the Senate on crucial legislation until this commitment is made. Senators most likely to lead this effort come from states other than the ones we've been concentrating on. This means a shift for us, including some grassroots alerts before and after the breakfast and direct contacts with a number of senators. The breakfast will be a rallying point midway through September for this effort.

The breakfast will be take place on Wednesday, September 16 at the Mott House. The schedule will be as follows: 8:30 a.m., continental breakfast; 9:00, Senator Jeffords; 9:30, strategy discussion. We want to draw 30 to 40 people. This will include active participants in our interfaith CTBT group, heads of Washington offices, and representatives of other religious denominations and associations who haven't been involved but which likely would favor the CTBT.

In addition, we want to offer activists in key locations around the country an opportunity to listen in on Senator Jeffords' presentation and our discussion, and possibly to feed in questions. This can include individuals and also small groups coming together to listen and then to plot their follow-up strategy. Given the time of the event, we would be mostly likely to reach people in the Eastern and Central time zones but might also draw in some early risers in the Mountain and Pacific zones. Walter Owensby and Marie Rietmann are developing a detailed plan for this phase, which you will receive by the end of August. In the meantime, please develop lists of persons you will want to notify of this opportunity.

Letters of invitation will go out under a letterhead with names of sponsoring organizations. We will also develop a flyer that list names of sponsors. We would like to get the invitation letter out by August 14. Therefore, would you please let me know in the next few days your reply to the following questions:

- (1) Will your organization be a co-sponsor of this interfaith breakfast on the CTBT?
- (2) May we include your organization's name on the letter of invitation?
- (3) May we include your organization's name on the flyer?

We will provide further information on the breakfast as it develops, especially on the listen-in segment. Meanwhile, please put this date on your calendar.

Other dates to mark include (i) a meeting of the interfaith working group on the CTBT on Wednesday, September 9 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at FCNL and (ii) for those who want more in-depth involvement, a meeting of the broader grassroots working group on the CTBT on Thursday, September 3 from 10:30 a.m. to 12 noon at FCNL.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 07 Aug 1998 13:44:34 +0200
From: "T.Damjanov" <damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Declaration by the German Abolition Coalition
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, ABOLITION-EUROPE@vlberlin.comlink.de,
inesap@fy.chalmers.se
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id EAB11292

Dear friends,

On 5-6 June, the German Campaign "Abolish Nukes - Start with Ourselves" (a coalition of 42 German organisations) held its Annual Meeting at Dresden. During this conference, the Trustees' Committee of the Campaign (Trägerkreis) adopted a DECLARATION called "WHAT IS NEXT AFTER THE LATEST NUCLEAR TESTS? A REVIEW OF NUCLEAR ARMAMENT".

This document is now available in an English translation. Since it is quite lengthy (30 kB), I do not want to disseminate it automatically through the listservers to which this mail is sent. So, if you wish to receive it, please contact me directly at:

damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de

Peacefully yours,
Tobias Damjanov
Member of the Trustees' Committee of the Campaign

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Fri, 07 Aug 1998 08:59:15 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Re New Agenda Declaration
References: <2.2.16.19980806170247.325773f4@pop.igc.org>

No problem. I posted it to a large list of folks already --- but I think they won't mind if we make that change in the final version.

Shalom,
BT

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>
> Dear Bob:
>
> Picking up Kathy Crandall's suggestion, I think we can change it to read
> "New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of...." The UN
> document says "...Declaration adopted by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs",
> which we could follow, but I think "foreign ministers" says the same thing
> less awkwardly.
>
> If it's all right with you, I'll make this change in Clinton-Yeltsin letter
> before I send it to abolition-caucus and other potential signers.
>
> Shalom,
> Howard
>
> 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
>
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

To: abolition-caucus
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma.

Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, urging President Clinton and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative and to complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you to be a co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us your name, title, organization, and country. You may reply to btiller@igc.org. Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.

If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.

Shalom,

Robert Tiller, Director of Security Programs
Physicians for Social Responsibility
1101 14th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005 U.S.A.
Phone: 202 898-0150
Fax: 202 898-0172
E-mail: btiller@psr.org

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

###

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

Name, Title
Organization
Country

To: usa
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

Bob Tiller of Physicians for Social Responsibility and I have developed a sign-on letter to President Clinton and President Yeltsin, urging them to take decisive action on de-alerting when they meet together in early September. We have posted this letter on abolition-caucus with the belief that this list includes everyone on the abolition-usa list. However, if you have not received it there and want to review and sign the letter, please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

To: "Alla Yaroshinskaya" <yaro@glas.apc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Ms. Yaroshinskaya:

Advocates of nuclear disarmament in the United States note that President Bill Clinton and President Boris Yeltsin will be meeting in early September. We see this as an opportunity to urge them to take decisive action to de-alert their respective nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma.

Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, urging President Clinton and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative and to complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We are circulating this letter to obtain signers in the United States and around the globe. We would particularly like to obtain signers in Russia. Would you be able to offer us suggestions on how to make contacts? Would you be willing to circulate this letter to citizen organizations? Or can you supply us with names and addresses so that we can circulate it? For the signers we would like to have name, title, organization, and country. Reply can come to me at mupj@igc.org. Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.

If you have any questions, please get in touch with me. Thank you for your assistance.

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

###

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

Name, Title
Organization
Country

To: sprapic@glas.apc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to Presidents Yeltsin and Clinton on de-alerting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Friends:

Advocates of nuclear disarmament in the United States note that President Bill Clinton and President Boris Yeltsin will be meeting in early September. We see this as an opportunity to urge them to take decisive action to de-alert their respective nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma.

Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, urging President Clinton and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative and to complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We are circulating this letter to obtain signers in the United States and around the globe. We would particularly like to obtain signers in Russia. Would you be able to offer us suggestions on how to make contacts? Would you be willing to circulate this letter to citizen organizations? Or can you supply us with names and addresses so that we can circulate it? For the signers we would like to have name, title, organization, and country. Reply can come to me at mupj@igc.org. Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.

If you have any questions, please get in touch with me. Thank you for your assistance.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

###

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

Name, Title
Organization
Country

To: civicpeace@glasnet.ru
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to Presidents Yeltsin and Clinton on de-alerting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Friends:

Advocates of nuclear disarmament in the United States note that President Bill Clinton and President Boris Yeltsin will be meeting in early September. We see this as an opportunity to urge them to take decisive action to de-alert their respective nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma.

Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, urging President Clinton and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative and to complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We are circulating this letter to obtain signers in the United States and around the globe. We would particularly like to obtain signers in Russia. Would you be willing to sign? Can you offer us suggestions on how to make contacts? Would you be willing to circulate this letter to citizen organizations? Or can you supply us with names and addresses so that we can circulate it? For the signers we would like to have name, title, organization, and country. Reply can come to me at mupj@igc.org. Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.

If you have any questions, please get in touch with me. Thank you for your assistance.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

###

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

Name, Title
Organization
Country

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 7 Aug 1998 07:25:32 -0700 (PDT)
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Sign-on letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: mupj@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Dear Colleagues:

The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma.

Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, urging President Clinton and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative and to complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you to be a co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us your name, title, organization, and country. You may reply to btiller@igc.org. Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.

If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.

Shalom,

Robert Tiller, Director of Security Programs
Physicians for Social Responsibility
1101 14th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005 U.S.A.
Phone: 202 898-0150
Fax: 202 898-0172
E-mail: btiller@psr.org

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

###

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

Name, Title
Organization
Country

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

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

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 07 Aug 1998 10:32:26 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: September 16 breakfast on CTBT
References: <2.2.16.19980807095548.31772f56@pop.igc.org>

Howard:

Replying to your inquiries:

1) The Disarmament Clearinghouse will be happy to co-sponsor the event, unless (which would make sense) you want only faith-based groups to sponsor
2&3) Assuming you want the Clearinghouse sponsorship, you could also include us on the invitation & flyer - also assuming that I get to see them first, and hoping that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now logo can be used somewhere on materials

I would also be happy to help pull together information packets of materials for people to have available on the day that would suggest follow-on activities.

-Sorry I missed the last meeting. I intended to be there but had minor home repair crisis. Call me if there is something specific I can do. - Kathy

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

> Dear Colleagues:

>

> The interfaith working group on the CTBT met on August 4 to consider plans
> for a breakfast meeting on September 16 to rally support for a final push
> for this session of Congress. I am here reporting what we discussed, and I
> want to ask you to make some concrete commitments (so read on, please).

>

> It is now clear that hearings and floor action on the CTBT won't occur this
> year. However, we want to press for a binding commitment that the Senate
> will take up the CTBT in 1999. This means that we need to work with
> Democrats and supportive Republicans to obtain an agreement for a
> vote-certain date in 1999. The leverage is the ability of senators
> supportive of the CTBT to tie up the Senate on crucial legislation until
> this commitment is made. Senators most likely to lead this effort come from
> states other than the ones we've been concentrating on. This means a shift
> for us, including some grassroots alerts before and after the breakfast and
> direct contacts with a number of senators. The breakfast will be a rallying
> point midway through September for this effort.

>

> The breakfast will be take place on Wednesday, September 16 at the Mott
> House. The schedule will be as follows: 8:30 a.m., continental breakfast;
> 9:00, Senator Jeffords; 9:30, strategy discussion. We want to draw 30 to 40
> people. This will include active participants in our interfaith CTBT group,
> heads of Washington offices, and representatives of other religious
> denominations and associations who haven't been involved but which likely
> would favor the CTBT.

>
> In addition, we want to offer activists in key locations around the country
> an opportunity to listen in on Senator Jeffords' presentation and our
> discussion, and possibly to feed in questions. This can include individuals
> and also small groups coming together to listen and then to plot their
> follow-up strategy. Given the time of the event, we would be mostly likely
> to reach people in the Eastern and Central time zones but might also draw in
> some early risers in the Mountain and Pacific zones. Walter Owensby and
> Marie Rietmann are developing a detailed plan for this phase, which you will
> receive by the end of August. In the meantime, please develop lists of
> persons you will want to notify of this opportunity.
>
> Letters of invitation will go out under a letterhead with names of
> sponsoring organizations. We will also develop a flyer that list names of
> sponsors. We would like to get the invitation letter out by August 14.
> Therefore, would you please let me know in the next few days your reply to
> the following questions:
> (1) Will your organization be a co-sponsor of this interfaith breakfast on
> the CTBT?
> (2) May we include your organization's name on the letter of invitation?
> (3) May we include your organization's name on the flyer?
>
> We will provide further information on the breakfast as it develops,
> especially on the listen-in segment. Meanwhile, please put this date on
> your calendar.
>
> Other dates to mark include (i) a meeting of the interfaith working group on
> the CTBT on Wednesday, September 9 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at FCNL and (ii)
> for those who want more in-depth involvement, a meeting of the broader
> grassroots working group on the CTBT on Thursday, September 3 from 10:30
> a.m. to 12 noon at FCNL.
>
> Shalom,
> Howard
>
> 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
>
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Fri, 07 Aug 1998 11:06:02 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: September 16 breakfast on CTBT
References: <2.2.16.19980807095548.31772f56@pop.igc.org>

Howard,

You can list PSR as a co-sponsor if you wish, but maybe you aren't looking for "secular" groups.

Unfortunately, neither Lisa nor I can attend on the 16th -- we will be in Kentucky.

Shalom,
BT

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>
> Dear Colleagues:
>
> The interfaith working group on the CTBT met on August 4 to consider plans
> for a breakfast meeting on September 16 to rally support for a final push
> for this session of Congress. I am here reporting what we discussed, and I
> want to ask you to make some concrete commitments (so read on, please).
>
> It is now clear that hearings and floor action on the CTBT won't occur this
> year. However, we want to press for a binding commitment that the Senate
> will take up the CTBT in 1999. This means that we need to work with
> Democrats and supportive Republicans to obtain an agreement for a
> vote-certain date in 1999. The leverage is the ability of senators
> supportive of the CTBT to tie up the Senate on crucial legislation until
> this commitment is made. Senators most likely to lead this effort come from
> states other than the ones we've been concentrating on. This means a shift
> for us, including some grassroots alerts before and after the breakfast and
> direct contacts with a number of senators. The breakfast will be a rallying
> point midway through September for this effort.
>
> The breakfast will be take place on Wednesday, September 16 at the Mott
> House. The schedule will be as follows: 8:30 a.m., continental breakfast;
> 9:00, Senator Jeffords; 9:30, strategy discussion. We want to draw 30 to 40
> people. This will include active participants in our interfaith CTBT group,
> heads of Washington offices, and representatives of other religious
> denominations and associations who haven't been involved but which likely
> would favor the CTBT.
>
> In addition, we want to offer activists in key locations around the country
> an opportunity to listen in on Senator Jeffords' presentation and our
> discussion, and possibly to feed in questions. This can include individuals

> and also small groups coming together to listen and then to plot their
> follow-up strategy. Given the time of the event, we would be mostly likely
> to reach people in the Eastern and Central time zones but might also draw in
> some early risers in the Mountain and Pacific zones. Walter Owensby and
> Marie Rietmann are developing a detailed plan for this phase, which you will
> receive by the end of August. In the meantime, please develop lists of
> persons you will want to notify of this opportunity.

>

> Letters of invitation will go out under a letterhead with names of
> sponsoring organizations. We will also develop a flyer that list names of
> sponsors. We would like to get the invitation letter out by August 14.
> Therefore, would you please let me know in the next few days your reply to
> the following questions:

> (1) Will your organization be a co-sponsor of this interfaith breakfast on
> the CTBT?

> (2) May we include your organization's name on the letter of invitation?

> (3) May we include your organization's name on the flyer?

>

> We will provide further information on the breakfast as it develops,
> especially on the listen-in segment. Meanwhile, please put this date on
> your calendar.

>

> Other dates to mark include (i) a meeting of the interfaith working group on
> the CTBT on Wednesday, September 9 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at FCNL and (ii)
> for those who want more in-depth involvement, a meeting of the broader
> grassroots working group on the CTBT on Thursday, September 3 from 10:30
> a.m. to 12 noon at FCNL.

>

> Shalom,
> Howard

>

> 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

>

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

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma.

Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, urging President Clinton and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative and to complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you to be a co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us your name, title, organization, and country. You may reply to btiller@igc.org. Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.

If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.

Shalom,

Robert Tiller, Director of Security Programs
Physicians for Social Responsibility
1101 14th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005 U.S.A.
Phone: 202 898-0150
Fax: 202 898-0172
E-mail: btiller@psr.org

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

###

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

Name, Title
Organization
Country

To: clayton
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to Clinton on de-alerting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Clayton:

By now you have probably received the attached sign-on letter to Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting, which Bob Tiller and I developed. In addition to FOR in the United States signing the letter, would you be able to put it circulation to the International FOR network so that we can get signers in from around the world. If you don't have time, I'm willing to do so if you'll tell me who to send it to.

Our deadline for sign-ons is Friday, August 21, 1998. Names can go to btiller@psr.org. Thanks for your help.

Shalom,
Howard

###

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States

(1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

Name, Title
Organization
Country

To: dave
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dave:

By now you have probably received the attached sign-on letter to Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting, which Bob Tiller and I developed. In addition to Pax Christi USA signing the letter, would you be able to put it circulation to the Pax Christi International network so that we can get signers in from around the world. If you don't have time, I'm willing to do so if you'll tell me who to send it to.

Our deadline for sign-ons is Friday, August 21, 1998. Names can go to btiller@psr.org. Thanks for your help.

Shalom,
Howard

###

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States

(1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

Name, Title
Organization
Country

To: gpowers@nccbuscc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Gerry:

Earlier as part of a group mailing, I sent you a sign-on letter to President Clinton and President Yeltsin on de-alerting. I realize that it's not always easy for you to get clearance for such letters (but maybe less so now that you've been promoted). If you cannot sign on but agree with the idea, I urge you to send your own letter to the two presidents from the U.S. Catholic Conference. If you do, please send me a copy. We want to make the sign-on letter and parallel letters available to the press prior to the Clinton-Yeltsin summit.

Thanks for your cooperation.

Shalom,
Howard

To: "Dwain Epps" <dce@wcc-coe.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting
Cc: sal@wcc-coe.org, ses@wcc-coe.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dwain:

Bob Tiller of Physicians for Social Responsibility and I have developed the attached sign-on letter to President Clinton and President Yeltsin, urging them to take decisive action to de-alert their respective nuclear arsenals. We are seeking sign-ons with a deadline of Friday, August 21, prior to their summit that begins around September 1. We invite the World Council of Churches to sign. If you don't want to sign this group statement, perhaps you or Dr. Raiser could write to the two presidents, adding your endorsement to taking all nuclear weapons off-alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles. If you do, please share a copy with me.

As the letter to Clinton and Yeltsin indicates, de-alerting has wide endorsement by expert bodies. If you or one of your staff wants to read more about de-alerting, there is an excellent article in Scientific American, November 1997 by Bruce Blair of Brookings Institution and others. It is available at <http://www.sciam.com/1197issue/1197vonhippel.html>.

Thanks for your cooperation.

Shalom,
Howard

###

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
The Kremlin
Moscow, Russia

Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert within that time frame.

With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the

alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

Name, Title
Organization
Country

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 7 Aug 1998 13:58:10 -0400
From: fellowship@igc.apc.org (Fellowship Editor)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: *Press Report* 8/6 Citizens Inspection Team
To: (Recipient list suppressed)
X-Sender: fellowship@pop.igc.apc.org

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
August 7, 1998

Contact: Clayton Ramey or Vincent Romano
(914) 358-4601

US Navy Base Refuses Citizens' Inspection Team

Groton, Connecticut--Ten people were arrested yesterday while attempting to conduct a nonviolent citizens' weapons inspection at the US Navy Sub Base here, issuing a call for nuclear disarmament and an end to economic sanctions on Iraq, on Hiroshima Day, the eighth anniversary of sanctions. They were charged with criminal trespass and ordered to appear before a federal magistrate at a later date.

The Citizens Weapons Inspection Team, organized by the Fellowship of Reconciliation, contacted Base Commander Robert Nestleroad in advance and informed him of their intentions to investigate if there were weapons of mass destruction present on the base. On August 3rd, they surveyed the base from an aerial overview and confirmed the location of three rows of seven bunkers suspected of containing nuclear weapons. The US Navy Sub Base in Groton homeports Seawolf and other attack submarines that are capable of firing nuclear-armed cruise missiles and deployed ships to the Persian Gulf during the last crisis over inspection teams in Iraq.

Seventy-five people from New York and New England gathered at the base entrance to pray, sing, and hear speeches calling for disarmament and de-linking the economic sanctions on Iraq from its weapons inspections. Then, the inspection team approached the guard booth, and were met by a base representative who deferred them to the Public Affairs office. The inspection team informed the base that citizens have a right and a duty under the Nuremberg Principles to oppose war crimes that may be carried out in their name. They warned that the base was out of compliance with international law, particularly the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in July 1996, which ruled that the threat or use of nuclear weapons was generally illegal, and affirmed the obligation of the nuclear states under the Nonproliferation Treaty to conclude negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament.

When the conversation with base officials stalled, the team attempted to carry out their inspection without the Navy's assistance. The inspectors slowly walked with linked hands toward the line of soldiers blocking their way, who gracefully backpedaled several hundred feet, before stopping and pulling the inspectors off the road to arrest them.

The members of the citizens' inspection team were: Richard Deats, Clayton Ramey, and Vincent Romano of the Fellowship of Reconciliation in Nyack, New York; Sam Hine and Peter Weeks of the Woodcrest Bruderhof in Rifton, New

York; Bruce Martin, director of the American Friends Service Committee in Hartford, Connecticut; Frances Crowe of Northampton, Massachusetts; Ginny Schneider of Florence, Massachusetts; Hattie Nestel of Athol, Massachusetts; and Cal Robertson of Groton Long Point, Connecticut.

-30-

Return-Path: <cprcrogers@mindspring.com>
X-Sender: cprcrogers@pop.mindspring.com
Date: Fri, 07 Aug 1998 03:06:28 -0700
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: Harry Rogers <cprcrogers@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting

Howard Please sign me on to the letter to President Clinton. I agree that it is timely

Peace

Harry Rogers

Nuclear Issues Coordinator

Carolina Peace Resource Center

Columbia SC

tel8032522221

fax8032523832

email hrogers@mindspring.com

>From wrl Fri Aug 7 13:58:32 1998
>Return-Path: <wrl@igc.apc.org>
>X-Sender: wrl@pop.igc.apc.org (Unverified)
>Date: Fri, 07 Aug 1998 16:50:38 -0400
>To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>, abolition-caucus@igc.org
>From: War Resisters League <wrl@igc.apc.org>
>Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting

Dear Howard,

Please add my name to the letter:

Christopher Ney, Disarmament Coordinator
War Resisters Leagu
USA

At 07:25 AM 8/7/1998 -0700, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September
>offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear
>disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to
>de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from
>delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive
>action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the
>Russian Duma.

>

>Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, urging President Clinton
>and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative and to
>complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you to be a
>co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us your name,
>title, organization, and country. You may reply to btiller@igc.org.
>Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.

>

>If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.

>

>Shalom,

>

>Robert Tiller, Director of Security Programs
>Physicians for Social Responsibility
>1101 14th Street, NW
>Washington, DC 20005 U.S.A.
>Phone: 202 898-0150
>Fax: 202 898-0172
>E-mail: btiller@psr.org

>

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

>
>###
>
>The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
>The White House
>Washington, DC 20500
>
>The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
>The Kremlin
>Moscow, Russia
>
>Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:
>
>When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a
>course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons
>taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate
>warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national
>storage.
>
>We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting
>process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than
>December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and
>China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert
>within that time frame.
>
>With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the
>United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully
>avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of
>nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized
>launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack
>by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation
>of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially
>enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.
>
>Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through
>executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and
>President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the
>alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental
>ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to
>stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within
>the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your
>respective nuclear arsenals.
>
>De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the
>Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders
>from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United
>States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and
>present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New
>Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt,
>Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998).
>This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and
>numerous non-governmental organizations.
>
>De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like

>to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We
>hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in
>this direction.

>
>Sincerely yours,

>
>Name, Title
>Organization
>Country

>
>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

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

>
>

War Resisters League
339 Lafayette St.
New York, NY 10012
212-228-0450
212-228-6193 (fax)
1-800-975-9688 (YouthPeace and A Day Without the Pentagon)
wrl@igc.apc.org
web address: <http://www.nonviolence.org/wrl>

Return-Path: <caab.lindis_anni@virgin.net>
Date: Fri, 07 Aug 1998 21:01:57 +0100
From: Lindis Percy & Anni Rainbow <caab.lindis_anni@virgin.net>
Reply-To: caab.lindis_anni@virgin.net
Organization: CAAB
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting
References: <2.2.16.19980807102444.23bf6478@pop.igc.org>

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>
> Dear Colleagues:
>
> The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September
> offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear
> disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to
> de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from
> delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive
> action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the
> Russian Duma.
>
> Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, urging President Clinton
> and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative and to
> complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you to be a
> co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us your name,
> title, organization, and country. You may reply to btiller@igc.org.
> Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.
>
> If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.
>
> Shalom,
>
> Robert Tiller, Director of Security Programs
> Physicians for Social Responsibility
> 1101 14th Street, NW
> Washington, DC 20005 U.S.A.
> Phone: 202 898-0150
> Fax: 202 898-0172
> E-mail: btiller@psr.org
>
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> 1500 16th Street, NW
> Washington, DC 20036 U.S.A.
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
> E-mail: mupj@igc.org
>
> ###
>
> The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
> The White House
> Washington, DC 20500
>

> The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
> The Kremlin
> Moscow, Russia

>
> Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

>
> When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a
> course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons
> taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate
> warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

>
> We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting
> process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than
> December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and
> China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert
> within that time frame.

>
> With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the
> United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully
> avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of
> nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized
> launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack
> by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation
> of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially
> enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

>
> Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through
> executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and
> President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the
> alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental
> ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to
> stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within
> the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your
> respective nuclear arsenals.

>
> De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the
> Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders
> from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United
> States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and
> present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New
> Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt,
> Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998).
> This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and
> numerous non-governmental organizations.

>
> De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like
> to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We
> hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in
> this direction.

>
> Sincerely yours,

>
> Name, Title: Anni Rainbow and Lindis Percy
> Organization: Campaign for the Accountability of American Bases(CAAB)

> Country: England, U.K.
>
> 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
>
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

Dear friends,

Please sign us up to your sane and sensible letter...and thank you so much for writing it.

In Peace,
Anni Rainbow and Lindis Percy
CAMPAIGN for the ACCOUNTABILITY of AMERICAN BASES(CAAB)
8 Park Row, Otley, West Yorkshire, LS21 1HQ, England, U.K.
Tel/Fax Nos: +44-(0)1943-466405 or +44-(0)1482-702033

Return-Path: <MARK_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org>
Sender: MARK_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org
Date: Fri, 7 Aug 1998 17:08:35 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: CTBT DATE CONFLICTS
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: MARK_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org (MARK BROWN)

To: mupj@igc.apc.org

Ballerup/Denmark
August 7, 1998

Dear Howard,

Thank you for the message concerning the September 16 Breakfast on the CTBT. I will be returning from my sabbatical leave to the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs on August 27th. I can be reached then, or in the days following, concerning matters related to the CTBT. If you need a response from LOGA prior to August 27th concerning our "sponsorship" of the Sept. 16 breakfast or regarding the invitations and flyer, please contact the LOGA director, The Rev. Russell Siler, at 783-7507.

Unfortunately, Rev. Siler and I will be in Chicago on Sept. 16 and will be unable to attend the breakfast.

Also, it is unfortunate that the next CTBT meeting (Sept. 9) falls right at the time of a major planning meeting for Churches for Middle East Peace. I'm sure this will be a conflict for a number of people. It would be very difficult for CMEP to change the date/time (Sept. 9, 1-4 pm) of its meeting at this point because a number of people are coming from out of town and the meeting has been on the schedule for quite some time.

Thank you for your continuing coordinating work around the CTBT.

Mark

Mark B. Brown
Assistant Director (International Affairs and Human Rights)
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs
Fri, Aug 7, 1998

cc: Russell Siler, LOGA
Corinne Whitlatch, CMEP

> [FROM: "HOWARD W. HALLMAN" <MUPJ@IGC.APC.ORG>]! SUBJECT: SEPTEMBER 16
> BREAKFAST ON CTBT
>
> Dear Colleagues:
>
> The interfaith working group on the CTBT met on August 4 to consider

> plans for a breakfast meeting on September 16 to rally support for a
> final push for this session of Congress. I am here reporting what we
> discussed, and I want to ask you to make some concrete commitments (so
> read on, please).

>
> It is now clear that hearings and floor action on the CTBT won't occur
> this year. However, we want to press for a binding commitment that the
> Senate will take up the CTBT in 1999. This means that we need to work
> with Democrats and supportive Republicans to obtain an agreement for a
> vote-certain date in 1999. The leverage is the ability of senators
> supportive of the CTBT to tie up the Senate on crucial legislation until
> this commitment is made. Senators most likely to lead this effort come
> from states other than the ones we've been concentrating on. This means
> a shift for us, including some grassroots alerts before and after the
> breakfast and direct contacts with a number of senators. The breakfast
> will be a rallying point midway through September for this effort.

>
> The breakfast will be take place on Wednesday, September 16 at the Mott
> House. The schedule will be as follows: 8:30 a.m., continental
> breakfast; 9:00, Senator Jeffords; 9:30, strategy discussion. We want
> to draw 30 to 40 people. This will include active participants in our
> interfaith CTBT group, heads of Washington offices, and representatives
> of other religious denominations and associations who haven't been
> involved but which likely would favor the CTBT.

>
> In addition, we want to offer activists in key locations around the
> country an opportunity to listen in on Senator Jeffords' presentation
> and our discussion, and possibly to feed in questions. This can include
> individuals and also small groups coming together to listen and then to
> plot their follow-up strategy. Given the time of the event, we would be
> mostly likely to reach people in the Eastern and Central time zones but
> might also draw in some early risers in the Mountain and Pacific zones.
> Walter Owensby and Marie Rietmann are developing a detailed plan for
> this phase, which you will receive by the end of August. In the
> meantime, please develop lists of persons you will want to notify of
> this opportunity.

>
> Letters of invitation will go out under a letterhead with names of
> sponsoring organizations. We will also develop a flyer that list names
> of sponsors. We would like to get the invitation letter out by August
> 14. Therefore, would you please let me know in the next few days your
> reply to the following questions:

- > (1) Will your organization be a co-sponsor of this interfaith breakfast
> on the CTBT?
- > (2) May we include your organization's name on the letter of invitation?
- > (3) May we include your organization's name on the flyer?

>
> We will provide further information on the breakfast as it develops,
> especially on the listen-in segment. Meanwhile, please put this date on
> your calendar.

>
> Other dates to mark include (i) a meeting of the interfaith working
> group on the CTBT on Wednesday, September 9 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at

- > FCNL and (ii) for those who want more in-depth involvement, a meeting of
- > the broader grassroots working group on the CTBT on Thursday, September
- > 3 from 10:30 a.m. to 12 noon at FCNL.
- >
- > 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

Return-Path: <geowcpuk@gn.apc.org>
Date: Sat, 8 Aug 1998 00:07:58 +0100 (BST)
X-Sender: geowcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting

At 07:25 07/08/98 -0700, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September
>offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear
>disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to
>de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from
>delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive
>action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the
>Russian Duma.

.....

Howard

Please sign World Court Project UK on to this

George

>

UK Secretary George Farebrother (geowcpuk@gn.apc.org)

67 Summerheath Rd, Hailsham, Sussex, BN27 3DR, England
Phone & Fax 01323 844 269

Web Site: <http://www.gn.apc.org/wcp>

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: <prop1@prop1.org>
X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org
Date: Fri, 07 Aug 1998 22:59:50 -0400
To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, mupj@igc.apc.org
From: Peace through Reason <prop1@prop1.org>
Subject: Re: De-alerting sign-on
Cc: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>

Hi, we'd like to sign on to the letter with the language Jackie Cabasso added. Very timely and important.

Ellen Thomas
Proposition One Committee
PO Box 27217, Washington DC 20038
202-462-0757 - prop1@prop1.org - <http://prop1.org>

>>-----

>>

>>August --, 1998

>>

>>The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton

>>The White House

>>Washington, DC 20500

>>

>>The Honorable Boris Yeltsin

>>The Kremlin

>>Moscow, Russia

>>

>>Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin:

>>

>>When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a
>>course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear
>>weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method to
>>accomplish this would be to separate warheads from their delivery
>>vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

>>

>>We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the
>>de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no
>>later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United
>>Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear
>>arsenals off alert within that time frame.

>

>>With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia,
>>the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and
>>carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a
>>condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or
>>unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face
>>the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to
>>miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these
>>dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national
>>security of all the nuclear weapon states.

>

>*Further, by undertaking a process of mutual de-alerting, the United States

>and Russia will be in a much stronger position to dissuade India and Pakistan
>from alerting and deploying their own nuclear forces.*

>>
>>Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out
>>through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President
>>George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991
>>when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable
>>number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a
>>positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each
>>other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority
>>to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.

>>
>>De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including
>>the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals
>>leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences
>>in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders,
>>including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers
>>(1998), and the recent New Agenda statement by the foreign ministers of
>>Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and
>>Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of
>>religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

>>
>>De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would
>>like to enter the new millennium free from the fear of nuclear
>>destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity
>>to lead the world in this direction.

>>
>>Sincerely yours,

>>
>>Name
>>Title
>>Organization
>>Country

>>
>>
> *****

> WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION
> 1440 Broadway, Suite 500
> Oakland, CA USA 94612
> Tel: (510)839-5877
> Fax: (510)839-5397
> wslf@igc.apc.org

> ***** Part of ABOLITION 2000 *****
> Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

>
>

* Peace Through Reason - <http://prop1.org> - Convert the War Machines! *

Return-Path: <nonukes@foesyd.org.au>
X-Sender: foesyd4@tig.com.au
Date: Sat, 8 Aug 1998 16:13:16 +1000
To: btiller@psr.org, btiller@igc.org, mupj@igc.org
From: FoE Sydney - Nuclear Campaign <nonukes@foesyd.org.au>
Subject: SIGN-ON TO YELTSIN/CLINTON LETTER

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.

nonukes@foesyd.org.au <http://www.peg.apc.org/~foesydney/>

The Traditional Owners of the Jabiluka site, the Mirrar Gundjehmi people,
now have a web- site whose address is <http://www.green.net.au/gundjehmi>

NOTE E-MAIL ADDRESS, nonukes@foesyd.org.au

DEAR PSR and MUPJ,
FOE Sydney has great pleasure in signing on to your letter asking
presidents Clinton and Yeltsin to mutually commence the de-alerting process
on their nuclear weapons systems, and to complete it by January 1999, as
reccommended by the Canberra commission the NAS in the US, and various
statelments by retired generals and the new Aganda declaration.

FOE Sydney is also considering sending a letter to Yeltsin and Clinton, re
plans to do subcritical testing.

If you have preliminary thoughts about that, maybe you could let us have them.

Do you have a fax number for Presidents Yeltsin and Clinton, and for
Yeltsin's Minister for defence?

I had one last year, but it has disappeared in my mass of papers, and
obviously, i will need it.

John hallam,
Nuclear campaigner,
FOE Sydney.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Sat, 8 Aug 1998 16:44:58 +1000
From: FoE Sydney - Nuclear Campaign <nonukes@foesydney.org.au>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: YELTSIN/CLINTON SUBCRIT.TESTS LETTER IN PREPARATION FROM FOESYDNEY
To: ABOLITION-EUROPE@vlberlin.comlink.de, abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: foesydney4@tig.com.au

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.

nonukes@foesydney.org.au <http://www.peg.apc.org/~foesydney/>

The Traditional Owners of the Jabiluka site, the Mirrar Gundjehmi people,
now have a web- site whose address is <http://www.green.net.au/gundjehmi>

NOTE E-MAIL ADDRESS, nonukes@foesydney.org.au

Dear People,

FOE Sydney was the author of a monster sign - on letter when India and
Pakistan tested, to the prime ministers of India and Pakistan. 97 NGOs
signed it. On and off, we have been campaigning on weapons for years. When
the French tested at Mururoa, we were key organisers of the 30,000 strong
demonstration that was held in front of the French consulate in Sydney.

I understand from your postings (Shundahai and prop-1) that the US and
Russia are due to perform subcritical tests sometime soon.

FOE Sydney has already signed on to a letter to Clinton about subcritical
testing.

However, we are thinking of doing our own in the next week or so, primarily
to Yeltsin rather than Clinton, but formally addressed to both, asking them
not to proceed with these subcritical tests.

In order to do so, I need Yeltsin's and Clinton's fax numbers. Even more, I
need the fax number of Yeltsin's Minister for defence.

CAN ANYONE HELP WITH THESE?

I'd also be interested in your thoughts BEFORE I start writing, which I
should do over the next 2-3 days.

Can you help with the fax no and any random thoughts you might have?

Thanks,
John Hallam

FOE Sydney.

Return-Path: <psysrusa@interserv.com>
From: psysrusa@interserv.com
Date: Sat, 8 Aug 1998 05:42:26 -0700 (PDT)
Subject: Re: De-alerting sign-on
To: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>, Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, bananas-ana@igc.org
Cc: mupj@igc.apc.org, abolition-caucus@igc.org

I have sent in my signature to this letter and would support this amendment.

Anne Anderson
Psychologists for Social Responsibility

On Fri, 7 Aug 1998, Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org> wrote:
>Dear Bob and Howard, Would you consider a friendly amendment to the
>de-alerting letter? I would propose adding a referense to India and
>Pakistan. Suggested lanuage is indicated with *asterisks* (between the third
>and fourth paragraphs). Thanks for your consideration. -- Jackie

>
>At 09:14 AM 8/7/98 -0400, Bob Tiller wrote:

>>Dear Colleagues:

>>
>>The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early
>>September offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading
>>to nuclear disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to
>>request them to de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating
>>warheads from delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective
>>through executive action without a treaty requiring ratification by the
>>U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma.

>>
>>Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, asking President
>>Clinton and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative
>>and to complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you
>>to be a co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us
>>your name, title, organization, and country. You may reply to
>><btiller@psr.org> Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.

>>
>>If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.

>>
>>Shalom,

>>
>>Robert W. Tiller, Director of Security Programs
>>Physicians for Social Responsibility
>>Phone: 202 898-0150, ext. 220
>>Fax: 202 898-0172
>>E-mail: btiller@psr.org

>>
>>Howard W. Hallman, Chair
>>Methodists United for Peace with Justice
>>Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
>>E-mail: mupj@igc.org

>>
>>-----

>>
>>August --, 1998
>>
>>The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
>>The White House
>>Washington, DC 20500
>>
>>The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
>>The Kremlin
>>Moscow, Russia
>>
>>Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin:
>>
>>When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a
>>course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear
>>weapons taken off high alert status. One straightforward method to
>>accomplish this would be to separate warheads from their delivery
>>vehicles and place them in secure national storage.
>>
>>We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the
>>de-alerting process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no
>>later than December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United
>>Kingdom, France, and China so that they will likewise take their nuclear
>>arsenals off alert within that time frame.
>
>>With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia,
>>the United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and
>>carefully avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a
>>condition of nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or
>>unauthorized launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face
>>the risk of attack by missiles launched on warning due to
>>miscommunication or misinterpretation of data. By removing these
>>dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially enhance the national
>>security of all the nuclear weapon states.
>
>*Further, by undertaking a process of mutual de-alerting, the United States
>and Russia will be in a much stronger position to dissuade India and Pakistan
>from alerting and deploying their own nuclear forces.*
>>
>>Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out
>>through executive action. This is what your predecessors, President
>>George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991
>>when they reduced the alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable
>>number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a
>>positive step when you agreed to stop aiming strategic missiles at each
>>other's country. It is well within the purview of executive authority
>>to move now to de-alerting your respective nuclear arsenals.
>>
>>De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including
>>the Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals
>>leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences
>>in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders,
>>including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers
>>(1998), and the recent New Agenda statement by the foreign ministers of

>>Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and
>>Sweden (1998). This approach also has the support of a variety of
>>religious bodies and numerous non-governmental organizations.

>>
>>De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would
>>like to enter the new millennium free from the fear of nuclear
>>destruction. We hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity
>>to lead the world in this direction.

>>
>>Sincerely yours,

>>
>>Name
>>Title
>>Organization
>>Country

>>
>>
> *****
> WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION
> 1440 Broadway, Suite 500
> Oakland, CA USA 94612
> Tel: (510)839-5877
> Fax: (510)839-5397
> wslf@igc.apc.org
> ***** Part of ABOLITION 2000 *****
> Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons
>
>

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>

Received: from arl-img-7.compuserve.com (arl-img-7.compuserve.com [149.174.217.137])

by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id NAA23896

for <mupj@igc.apc.org>; Sat, 8 Aug 1998 13:48:31 -0700 (PDT)

Received: (from root@localhost)

by arl-img-7.compuserve.com (8.8.6/8.8.6/2.12) id QAA22645

for mupj@igc.apc.org; Sat, 8 Aug 1998 16:48:04 -0400 (EDT)

Date: Sat, 8 Aug 1998 16:47:26 -0400

From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>

Subject: Japanese Contribution

Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>

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

Message-ID: <199808081647_MC2-5584-5D9A@compuserve.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

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

Content-Disposition: inline

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Howard, I've deposited the Holston Conference's contribution of \$140 in
our General Fund. The bank has given me no indication that a contributio=

n

has been received from Japan.

Phil

Return-Path: <hcaldic@ibm.net>
Date: Sat, 08 Aug 1998 04:37:03 +1000
From: hcaldic <hcaldic@ibm.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting
References: <2.2.16.19980807102444.23bf6478@pop.igc.org>

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>
> Dear Colleagues:
>
> The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September
> offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear
> disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to
> de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from
> delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive
> action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the
> Russian Duma.
>
> Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, urging President Clinton
> and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative and to
> complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you to be a
> co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us your name,
> title, organization, and country. You may reply to btiller@igc.org.
> Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.
>
> If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.
>
> Shalom,
>
> Robert Tiller, Director of Security Programs
> Physicians for Social Responsibility
> 1101 14th Street, NW
> Washington, DC 20005 U.S.A.
> Phone: 202 898-0150
> Fax: 202 898-0172
> E-mail: btiller@psr.org
>
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> 1500 16th Street, NW
> Washington, DC 20036 U.S.A.
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
> E-mail: mupj@igc.org
>
> ###
>
> The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
> The White House
> Washington, DC 20500
>
> The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
> The Kremlin

> Moscow, Russia

>

> Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

>

> When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a
> course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons
> taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate
> warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

>

> We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting
> process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than
> December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and
> China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert
> within that time frame.

>

> With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the
> United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully
> avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of
> nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized
> launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack
> by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation
> of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially
> enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

>

> Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through
> executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and
> President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the
> alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental
> ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to
> stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within
> the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your
> respective nuclear arsenals.

>

> De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the
> Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders
> from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United
> States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and
> present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New
> Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt,
> Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998).
> This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and
> numerous non-governmental organizations.

>

> De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like
> to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We
> hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in
> this direction.

>

> Sincerely yours,

>

> Name, Title

> Organization

> Country

>

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

Dear Howard, I have another idea. In order for Clinton to move to the moral high ground and to remove himself from his sexual dilemmas, he and Yeltsin could reasonably agree to sign a treaty to abolish nuclear weapons bilaterally within the next five years - a sort of Rechevich - can't spell it. He would then go down in history as the greatest president and millions throughout the world would be grateful, and he could then rise above the rubbish which now engulfs him. Yetsin I'm sure would agree. Let's go for something big because the "stockpile stewardship - new Manhattan project will soon preempt any arms control deals currently under contemplation, Sincerely, Helen Caldicott

Return-Path: <hcaldic@ibm.net>
Date: Sat, 08 Aug 1998 04:37:03 +1000
From: hcaldic <hcaldic@ibm.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter to Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting
References: <2.2.16.19980807102444.23bf6478@pop.igc.org>

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>
> Dear Colleagues:
>
> The meeting of President Clinton and President Yeltsin in early September
> offers us an opportunity to press our case for steps leading to nuclear
> disarmament. We believe that it is particularly timely to request them to
> de-alert their nuclear arsenals, such as by separating warheads from
> delivery vehicles. They can accomplish this objective through executive
> action without a treaty requiring ratification by the U.S. Senate and the
> Russian Duma.
>
> Therefore, we have developed the attached letter, urging President Clinton
> and President Yeltsin to embark upon a de-alerting initiative and to
> complete the task no later than December 31, 1999. We invite you to be a
> co-signer of this letter. If you are willing, please provide us your name,
> title, organization, and country. You may reply to btiller@igc.org.
> Deadline for signing is Friday, August 21, 1998.
>
> If you have any questions, please get in touch with one of us.
>
> Shalom,
>
> Robert Tiller, Director of Security Programs
> Physicians for Social Responsibility
> 1101 14th Street, NW
> Washington, DC 20005 U.S.A.
> Phone: 202 898-0150
> Fax: 202 898-0172
> E-mail: btiller@psr.org
>
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice
> 1500 16th Street, NW
> Washington, DC 20036 U.S.A.
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
> E-mail: mupj@igc.org
>
> ###
>
> The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
> The White House
> Washington, DC 20500
>
> The Honorable Boris Yeltsin
> The Kremlin

> Moscow, Russia

>

> Dear President Clinton and President Yeltsin.:

>

> When you come together in your forthcoming meeting, we urge you to set a
> course so that Earth may enter the new millennium with all nuclear weapons
> taken off high alert status. One straightforward method would be to separate
> warheads from their delivery vehicles and place them in secure national storage.

>

> We ask that the United States and Russia mutually commence the de-alerting
> process no later than January 1999 and complete the task no later than
> December 31, 1999. We ask you to work with the United Kingdom, France, and
> China so that they will likewise take their nuclear arsenals off alert
> within that time frame.

>

> With the Cold War over for nearly ten years, the United States, Russia, the
> United Kingdom, France, and China maintain peaceful relations and carefully
> avoid military confrontation. Yet all five nations live in a condition of
> nuclear insecurity because of the danger of accidental or unauthorized
> launch of missiles kept on hair-trigger alert. They face the risk of attack
> by missiles launched on warning due to miscommunication or misinterpretation
> of data. By removing these dangers, mutual de-alerting will substantially
> enhance the national security of all the nuclear weapon states.

>

> Mutual de-alerting is an action which the two of you can carry out through
> executive action. This is what your predecessors, President George Bush and
> President Mikhail Gorbachev, did in the fall of 1991 when they reduced the
> alert status of strategic bombers and a sizable number of intercontinental
> ballistic missiles. In 1994 you two took a positive step when you agreed to
> stop aiming strategic missiles at each other's country. It is well within
> the purview of executive authority to move now to de-alerting your
> respective nuclear arsenals.

>

> De-alerting carries the endorsement of a variety of groups, including the
> Canberra Commission (1996), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders
> from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United
> States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and
> present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the recent New
> Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt,
> Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998).
> This approach also has the support of a variety of religious bodies and
> numerous non-governmental organizations.

>

> De-alerting would be very welcome by all the people of Earth who would like
> to enter the new millenium free from the fear of nuclear destruction. We
> hope that you will take advantage of the opportunity to lead the world in
> this direction.

>

> Sincerely yours,

>

> Name, Title

> Organization

> Country

>

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

Dear Howard, I have another idea. In order for Clinton to move to the moral high ground and to remove himself from his sexual dilemmas, he and Yeltsin could reasonably agree to sign a treaty to abolish nuclear weapons bilaterally within the next five years - a sort of Rechevich - can't spell it. He would then go down in history as the greatest president and millions throughout the world would be grateful, and he could then rise above the rubbish which now engulfs him. Yetsin I'm sure would agree. Let's go for something big because the "stockpile stewardship - new Manhattan project will soon preempt any arms control deals currently under contemplation, Sincerely, Helen Caldicott

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Sun, 09 Aug 1998 16:16:40 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Sign-on letter

Howard,

Have you been seeing all the e-mails about our sign-on letter? We have to make some decisions soon:

1. What to do about individuals who want to sign on? I am sort of inclined to omit them, but I don't feel strongly about it. What do you think?

2. What to do about the amendment that Jackie Cabasso proposed and posted to the abolition caucus? I am sort of inclined to refuse it.

What do you think?

Shalom,
Bob T.

Return-Path: <bkinsey@peacemission.org>
From: "BobKinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: sign on letter
Date: Fri, 7 Aug 1998 23:59:15 -0600
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

Please add Rocky Mountain United Church of Christ
Peace and Justice Task Force
Bob Kinsey Chairperson