

To: Bill Robinson <plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Canadian churches and abolition  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 12:43 PM 11/16/98 -0500, Bill Robinson wrote:

>Dear Howard -

>

>Project Ploughshares, which is a project of the Canadian Council of  
>Churches, is considering the feasibility of organizing some kind of  
>outreach project between Canadian church leaders and church leaders in  
>other countries on the subject of nuclear abolition....

December 1, 1998

Dear Bill,

I've been hanging onto your communication of November 16 about getting the Canadian Council of Churches to reach out to other countries on nuclear abolition. Since my response is somewhat complex, I'm just getting around to replying.

Basically it's a good idea. Because the Canadian government is questioning some of the cold war assumptions about nuclear deterrence and has led the way in land mines, it would be useful for Canadian religious bodies to provide similar world leadership within the religious community.

As you may recall, I initiated an effort related to the 1998 session of the NPT Preparatory Committee in Geneva that (1) produced a statement to delegates from Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, (2) sponsored a reception for delegates co-hosted by Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels, and (3) developed a presentation to delegates on spiritual and moral values. I'm sending separately the Raiser-Danneels statement with some endorsers. I can send you the presentation to delegates if you want it.

As follow up, I developed some ideas on "Mobilizing the Religious Community for Nuclear Abolition." (I'm sending you a copy separately by e-mail.) I suggested that the world religious community should demand that all possessors of nuclear weapons should unconditionally renounce their use and threatened use. I put this into a "Nuclear Abolition Covenant" for nuclear weapon states to sign. I circulated my "mobilizing" proposal to persons who I had been in touch with for the NPT PrepCom, including Dwain Epps at the World Council of Churches. At Doug Roche's suggestion I wrote to Msgr. Darmuid Martin, secretary of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace at the Vatican, and also to Archbishop Martino, Holy See delegate to the UN. Dwain Epps assured me that nuclear abolition is on the WCC's active agenda, and the two Catholic leaders sent polite acknowledgements of my ideas. I receive some other favorable replies, but nothing sufficient to make me think I could build lots of support for this particular approach. However, the covenant idea might prove useful for your initiative.

Short of such an absolute demand for nuclear abolition, you might consider a matter that is near at hand where you could be quite influential: the future of NATO's nuclear posture. This issue is coming into play because of NATO's nuclear policy review in anticipation of an upcoming 50th anniversary celebration.

Therefore, the Canadian Council of Churches might mobilize similar bodies in other NATO nations to demand that NATO cease its commitment to nuclear deterrence and nuclear war-fighting. This would be a no-use policy, going far beyond the call for no-first-use, which some are advocating. (I believe that no-first-use, while a slight improvement, is morally wrong because it retains the right to use nuclear weapons as second strike.)

The statement could state unequivocally that NATO as an alliance should henceforth cease from using nuclear weapons as a deterrent or in potential war situations. Although nuclear weapon states as individual entities -- the United States, the United Kingdom, and France -- would not be precluded from pursuing their separate policies on nuclear weapons, the statement could call upon them and other nuclear weapon states to de-alert their arsenals and separate warheads from delivery vehicles.

The statement could call for the immediate withdrawal of all nuclear weapons based outside the homeland of nuclear weapon states. That means U.S. nuclear bombs now based in Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, Greece, and Turkey. It could also call for a nuclear weapons free zone in all of Europe outside the boundaries of the nuclear weapon states.

Signers of this statement could include councils of churches and national denominations in all NATO countries. You might also bring in the Conference of European Churches, which included a call for "complete elimination of nuclear arms" in the Final Message of the Second European Ecumenical Assembly that met in Graz, Austria in June 1997. National conferences of Catholic bishops could also be invited to sign. It would be desirable to obtain parallel statements from the World Council of Churches and the Holy See, preferably by Pope John Paul II (for they are unlikely to sign on a group statement.)

I think many European church bodies are ready for something like this. Peace activists within religious denominations could be mobilized to bring their leaders into this effort.

A NATO-oriented statement would have to be carefully worded so that those who believe NATO should cease to exist would be willing to sign. Also, it might have to finesse (or ignore) the issue of NATO expansion.

You might also consider going beyond Europe and North America to gain endorsements from councils of churches in nations that are ordinarily allied with the United States, such as members of the British Commonwealth (especially Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa) and Japan.

We got a sprinkling of such signers in a couple of weeks for the Raiser-Danneels statement. Many more are possible, especially if the Canadian Council of Churches approaches its counterparts. A listing of councils of churches is found in World Council of Churches Yearbook. I can offer you some further contacts if you are interested. I can also help in getting support from the National Council of Churches in the U.S. and heads of U.S. denominations.

This is a lot of rambling, but I hope that some of my ideas are useful. If I can help further, please get in touch with me.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: Bill Robinson <plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Raiser-Danneels statement  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Bill,

Here is the Raiser-Danneels statement addressed to delegates of the 1998 session of the NPT Preparatory Committee.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

## ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st

century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed that "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

March 1998

Additional Signers of "ACT NOW FOR NUCLEAR ABOLITION"

Archbishop Michael, Metropolitan Bishop, Greek Orthodox Church in Austria; President, Ecumenical Council of Churches in Austria  
Superintendent Helmut Nausner, United Methodist Church in Austria; Secretary, Ecumenical Council of Churches  
Christine Gleixner, Mother Superior of the Order, Sisters of Bethany, and Vice Chair, Ecumenical Council of Churches in Austria  
Rev. Ivan Petkin, Bulgarian Orthodox Church in Austria  
Rev. Johannes El Baramousy, Koptic Orthodox Church in Austria  
Bishop Mag. Herwig Sturm. Lutheran Church in Austria

Bishop Bernhard Heitz, Old Catholic Church, Austria  
Bishop Dr. Heinrich Fasching, Roman Catholic Church. President, "Justitia et Pax" in Austria  
Metropolit Archbishop Ireneji, Russian Orthodox Church in Austria  
The Most Rev. J. Barry Curtis, President, Canadian Council of Churches  
Archbishop Michael G. Peers, Primate of the Anglican Church of Canada  
The Rev. Arie G. Van Eek, Council of Christian Reformed Churches in Canada  
The Rev. Telmor Sartison, Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada  
Marvin Frey, Executive Director, Mennonite Central Committee Canada  
The Rev. John D. Congram, Moderator, The Presbyterian Church in Canada  
Gale Wills, Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). in Canada  
Commissioner Donald V. Kerr. Territorial Commander, The Salvation Army, Canada  
The Very Rev. Bill Phipps, Moderator, United Church of Canada  
Rev. Dr. Lothar Engel, Deputy General, Association of Protestant Churches and Missions in Germany  
Bishop Dr. Walter F. Klaiber, United Methodist Church in Germany  
Rev. John Reardon, General Secretary, Council of Churches for Britain and Ireland  
D. Dr. Béla Harmati, Bishop of the Lutheran Church, President, Ecumenical Council of Churches in Hungary  
Dr. Zoltán Bóna, General Secretary, Ecumenical Council, of Churches in Hungary  
Rev. Domenico Tomasetto, President, Federation of Protestant, Churches in Italy  
Rev. Kenichi Otsu, General Secretary, National Christian Council in Japan  
Rev. Samuel I. Koshiishi, Acting General Secretary, Nippon Sei Ko Kai, (Anglican/ Episcopal Church)  
Rev. Junichiro Naito, Executive Secretary, Japan Baptist Convention  
Rev. Masakazu Asami, President, Japan Evangelical Lutheran Church  
Rev. Satoru Gohada, President, Japan Free Methodist Church  
Rev. Sadao Ozawa, General Secretary, United Church of Christ in Japan  
William V. Robinson, President, CCANZ (Conference of Churches in Aotearoa New Zealand)  
Rev. Jennifer Dawson, President, CCANZ  
Rev. Max Reid, President, CCANZ  
Mrs. Jan Cornack, General Secretary, CCANZ  
Rev. Billy Taranger, President, Christian Council of Norway  
Rev. Ingrid Vad Nilsen, General Secretary, Christian Council of Norway  
Bishop Nifon of Slobozia and Calarasi; President, Ecumenical Association of Churches in Romania  
Bishop Christoph Klein, Evangelical AC Church in Romania; Vice President, Ecumenical Association, of Churches in Romania  
Bishop Kalman Csiha, Reformed Church of Transsylvania; Member, Administrative Council Ecumenical Association of Churches in Romania  
Christian Teodoresu, General Secretary, Ecumenical Association of Churches in Romania  
Rev. Thord-Ove Thordson, General Secretary, Christian Council of Sweden  
Rev. Tord Ström, General Secretary, Free Church of Sweden  
Rev. Krister Andersson, President and General Secretary, Mission Covenant Church of Sweden

May 8, 1998

For further information, contact:

Howard W. Hallman, Co-Convener

Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition

1500 16th Street, NW. Washington, DC 20036, USA

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.org

To: Bill Robinson <plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: "Covenant" proposal  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Bill:

Here is my "covenant" proposal for your consideration.

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](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

May 29, 1998

Return-Path: <ccnd@gn.apc.org>  
From: ccnd <ccnd@gn.apc.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: RE: CCND and Abolition 2000  
Date: Mon, 16 Nov 1998 14:30:37 -0000

Dear Howard,

Thank you for your suggestions. We have the statement by Dr. Konrad Raiser but not the NGO presentation at the PrepCom session, so I would appreciate it if you emailed that one to me. Thanks again for your help!

In peace,  
Nancy

Dear Nancy,

I'm glad to hear that you will be represented at Harare. You might want to have available two documents from the 1998 NPT PrepCom meeting. One is the statement from Dr. Konrad Raiser and Cardinal Danneels to the delegates. The other is the presentation on a spiritual and moral perspective offered as one of 13 NGO presentations at a PrepCom session. Although these statements make specific reference to the PrepCom, they offer a broad religious perspective on nuclear abolition. If you don't have copies, I can e-mail you these two statements.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: ccnd <ccnd@gn.apc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: RE: CCND and Abolition 2000  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 02:30 PM 11/16/98 -0000, ccnd wrote:

>Dear Howard,

>

>Thank you for your suggestions. We have the statement by Dr. Konrad Raiser but not the NGO presentation at the PrepCom session, so I would appreciate it if you emailed that one to me. Thanks again for your help!

>

>In peace,

>Nancy

>

>

Nancy,

Here is the presentation you requested.

Howard

###

A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons  
A Presentation to the NPT Preparatory Committee  
Offered by Bishop Thomas Gumbleton  
Geneva, April 28, 1998

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the 1998 session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, we in the community of non-governmental organizations greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and provide information on vital issues that are on your agenda. My role is to offer some ideas developed by the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition.

You meet at a propitious time. With a new millennium rapidly approaching, the people of this planet would like to enter the new century free from the threat of nuclear holocaust. In the next two weeks you delegates here assembled have a great opportunity to take decisive action to set the course for the abolition of all nuclear weapons on Earth.

The moral grounds for nuclear abolition are expressed in a statement by Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, and Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Church, which you have received. They state

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. ...As an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt.

This view stems from a belief in the sanctity of life, a perspective shared by other world religions: Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism.

I believe that most of you today, who come from different faiths, in your heart of hearts, in the deep recesses of your mind, also understand the moral depravity of nuclear weapons. The challenge to you is to let your moral judgment guide your actions.

A statement developed for this meeting by the International Peace Conference, based in Prague, offers a pair of reasons for the total rejection of nuclear weapons: first, the threat to Creation and, second, the contribution to moral degradation.

"Nuclear weapons," says this statement, "fundamentally differ from all other weapons because of their potential to destroy all life on this planet. They are terminal in relation to Nature. They can destroy the divine Creation....They take from God the sole power to end the created order, and thus usurp the divine prerogative....Nuclear weapons stand condemned because they can destroy 'the sacred gift of life' and are thus innately demonic and blasphemous."

Secondly, the statement notes, "The terrible suffering caused by nuclear weapons, their potential for total destruction, and their perversion of the fundamental nature of matter have contributed immeasurably to the moral degradation of humanity in our time." This moral decline has escalated from the mass slaughter of World War I to the Nazi concentration camps to the mass bombing of cities in World War II to the development of nuclear weapons and their use on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the 1945. Since then "the East-West nuclear confrontation with the readiness of states to commit global genocide further hugely contributed to the moral de-sensitization of our age, now so evident in many aspects of contemporary life."

From an ethical perspective, Judge Mohammed Bedjaoui, when he was president of the International Court of Justice, stated: "The nuclear weapon, the ultimate evil, destabilizes humanitarian law which is the law of lesser evil. The existence of nuclear weapons is therefore a challenge to the very existence of humanitarian law, not to mention their long-term effects of damage to the human environment, in respect to which the right to life must be exercised."

Judge Bedjaoui spoke in connection with the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in which the Court decided unanimously that under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all aspects under strict and effective international control."

Notice the words "good faith", two terms with deep religious meaning. In this context they refer to basic honesty, to abiding by one's commitment. You delegates have it within your goodness to act decisively in behalf of all us: humans, animals, plants, the whole community of life. We have faith that you will show yourself worthy of this trust.

Even if no other nuclear bomb is exploded, the Earth will remain scarred by the nuclear weapons era. Earth and its people have suffered grave harm in the mining of fissionable material, by production of nuclear warheads with the byproduct of radioactive waste, and through nuclear testing in the atmosphere and below the ground.

Beyond harm to people and environmental damage, nuclear weapons have taken an enormous economic toll. Since the 1940s the nuclear weapon states have spent more than \$8 trillion to develop, test, produce, transport, deploy, and safeguard their nuclear arsenal. This vast waste of resources brings to mind the words of U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, himself a former general, words deemed so important that they are engraved beside his tomb in Abilene, Kansas. " Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed....This is not a way of life at all....Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

The great irony is that the nuclear weapon states through these vast expenditures have failed to produce the security they seek. Indeed, it is their own people who are at greatest risk due to their doctrine of mutually assured destruction. Citizens of the allies of nuclear weapon states are

themselves vulnerable to nuclear attack because of the military doctrine of the nuclear powers. Any other nation gaining nuclear weapons would join the ranks of the insecure.

Tragically the nuclear weapon states and their allies are victims of a self-imposed and self-destructive addiction to nuclear weapons. Yes, an addiction. Like many other addictions cure can come in two ways.

First, the addicted can exercise self-will, can renounce the addictive substance or orientation, and can through great determination and inner strength free itself from the addiction that is sapping its vitality. In this case, the nuclear weapon states can say individually or join together in a covenant that says, "We renounce the use of nuclear weapons for war-fighting purposes. We renounce nuclear deterrence as an instrument of foreign and military policy." Renunciation would remove the fundamental blockage to carrying out a series of actions that lead to nuclear abolition. Other speakers on this program will describe the steps that can be taken along this road.

Second, friends of the addicted can apply "tough love". They can talk firmly and insist that the addicted take the necessary steps leading out of addiction. In the matter at hand, you delegates from non-nuclear weapon states can exercise tough love by insisting that the nuclear powers embark upon a course of action that moves toward nuclear abolition. You can even develop a plan in the form of a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish nuclear weapons. Even if you are part of a political bloc with one or more nuclear weapon states, true friendship requires you to apply tough love by acting independently and supporting measures leading to nuclear abolition. Beyond that, each and every one of you has a higher loyalty to all of humankind, to the well-being of all peoples on Earth.

As you prepare to meet the challenges before you during this session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, I invite you to pause and observe one minute of silence. Draw upon the perspective of your personal faith and use this minute to reflect upon the human suffering caused by nuclear weapons in their more than fifty years of existence: the victims at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the indigenous people and other inhabitants living in the vicinity of test sites in the western United States, Algeria, Russia, Kazakhstan, China, the South Pacific, and Australia; persons far away from test sites but harmed by drifting radioactive fallout; the people who have suffered by the side effects of mining operations and weapon production facilities.

In silence we can remember all who have suffered.. We can share together feelings of regret and contrition. You who are delegates can also use this moment to reflect on what you can accomplish in the next two weeks. You can re-dedicate yourself to working courageously and with imagination to find ways to end the nuclear arms race and rid Earth of this horrible plague on human existence.

May we pause now in silence.

[After one minute.]

In the spirit of renewal and re-dedication, the NGO community this afternoon would like to offer you ideas on steps that can be undertaken to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons, an achievable goal that humankind longs to accomplish. Although NGOs have various perspectives on the issues presented, we have collaborated in preparing these statements. We hope that our ideas will be useful to you in your deliberations. Throughout your session we will be available to you to elaborate on what we have presented today. We look forward to further exchange of ideas in the period leading up to the year 2000 NPT review conference.

Lastly I want to thank you personally for the privilege of speaking to you.

Note: This statement was developed by Howard W. Hallman, a co-convenor of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, with input from several advisers. For information, contact him at Methodists United for Peace with

Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036, USA. tel/'fax +1 301 896-0013; e-mail mupj@igc.org

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Tue, 17 Nov 1998 08:30:52 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Transactions  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

Typically I had just made deposits and written checks when the mailman brought your envelope with Bruce's check.

FYI, in those instances where someone (like Bruce) has written a single check for a contribution to both accounts I deposit the whole amount in the Education Fund to assure the propriety of their tax deduction.

Best,

Phil

To: relctbt

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

Subject: November 24 meeting

Cc: disarmament@igc.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, laura@2020vision.org, btiller@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org, paprog@igc.org, wand@wand.org, dculp@igc.org, dkimball@clw.org, jsmith@clw.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org

Bcc: mupj@igc.org

X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

There will be a meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT on Tuesday, November 24, 1998 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the conference room of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, D.C. The agenda will include the following items:

1. Final review of the petition for the CTBT and accompanying documents. The petition is intended to be circulated in churches, synagogues, mosques, meetings, and other religious gatherings during the first three months of 1999 and to be presented directly to home-state offices of U.S. senators. You will receive a draft prior to the meeting.
2. The possibility of sending delegations of religious leaders to members of President Clinton's cabinet to press for strong leadership for CTBT ratification.
3. Feedback from the November 3 meeting on evaluation of experience with the CTBT campaign and consideration of priorities for 1999.
4. Setting a regular time for monthly meetings of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT in 1999. If you cannot come on the 24th and have a preference for a meeting time or have particular times when you cannot attend, please let me know.

Earlier I had indicated that there would be a meeting on December 2 for a further round of discussion on CTBT strategy for 1999. The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers has taken charge of this meeting and has decided to limit attendance to members of the Coalition plus chosen guests. This will not include most faith-based organizations working for CTBT ratification. Sorry about that. I've been invited but will decline the invitation to this closed meeting.

I assume that the Coalition will publish and circulate its 1999 CTBT strategy. When this information is available, we will want to relate efforts of the faith-based community to what others will be doing.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Fri, 13 Nov 1998 16:41:32 -0500  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: More on Y2K  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

The CNN report below provides more information on Y2K. The BASIC (British American Security Information Council) Report referred to can be found at: <http://www.basicint.org>

For more on WHAT YOU CAN DO to encourage De-alerting as one step away from nuclear disaster, and one step toward a nuclear weapons-free world,

please order a De-alerting Resources and Action Kit from the Disarmament

Clearinghouse:

**DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE**

Kathy Crandall, Coordinator  
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

\*\*\*\*\*

>From CNN Interactive:

Nuclear arsenals at risk for Year 2000 computer bug

November 12, 1998  
Web posted at: 11:31 p.m. EDT (2331 GMT)

From Correspondent Rick Lockridge

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- For nuclear weapons to work as designed, a lot of things have to go right -- targeting, launching, delivery. All of those steps are controlled by computer chips, and all of those chips need to work together harmoniously.

Reliance on thousands of chips and millions of lines of computer code could make nuclear weapons especially vulnerable to the Year 2000 computer bug.

A new report by a group opposing nuclear weapons, the British American Security Information Center, claims the Defense Department will be unable to stop the Y2K bug from infesting thousands of nuclear weapons all over the world.

The report singles out American submarine-based missiles and intercontinental ballistic missiles, as well as Russian land-based nuclear weapons. But the center claims that China and all other nuclear powers will also have problems with the bug.

The group recommends deactivating all nuclear weapons before January 1, 2000, so there is no chance of an unanticipated nuclear disaster.

This would get rid of, completely, the fear of surprise attack," said Michael Kraig, the report's author.

Pentagon officials responsible for dealing with the Y2K bug declined to comment directly on the report. But a Pentagon spokeswoman told CNN that

"nuclear command and control centers have been given the highest priority, and we feel that we are in pretty good shape there."

No one knows for sure whether or how the Y2K bug might affect nuclear weapons -- and no one will know until the calendar turns.

--

**DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE**

Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools

Kathy Crandall, Coordinator

1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)

<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

--

**DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE**

Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools

Kathy Crandall, Coordinator

1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)

<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sun, 15 Nov 1998 08:34:20 GMT  
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Citizens' Forums  
To: Abolition-Caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: geowcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org (Unverified)

GF/9770

World Court Project, working with Abolition 2000 UK, has been organising Citizens' Forums on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons in various parts of the UK. They were originally inspired by the "Roundtables" carried out in Canada, but they are aimed at ordinary citizens rather than local community leaders.

The Forums have been designed as an educational project. The aim is to encourage members of the public to think about the issue, and come to their own conclusions. They are based on the assumption that the global elimination of nuclear weapons is a desirable objective supported by both the government and the general public. However, people outside the anti-nuclear movement are not very aware of the issues. There is also considerable need for discussion on ways and means of achieving the goal.

Forum members take part in a one-off discussion. Because they have studied a fairly comprehensive Information Booklet (constantly updated) beforehand they are well-informed. At the end of the session they produce a short agreed report on the best way forward. This should include their anxieties as well as their hopes. The results of the forums are fed back to the Foreign Office.

The results have been encouraging. After some trepidation the members enjoy and respect the process, and come to conclusions which are authentically their own. They also value the opportunity to come to grips with an important issue which has received little serious media exposure.

Following is a report on the results of the first year of Citizens' Forums. Although the project has some reference to the UK, it would be easy to adjust it to the needs of other countries. Please let me know if you would like me to post you an information booklet and material for organisers.

George Farebrother

.....

## REPORT ON CITIZENS' FORUMS

George Farebrother, October 1998

Twelve Citizens' Forums have now taken place and several more are in the planning stage. There has been enough experience to come to some general conclusions about the views of the members.

There has been overwhelming agreement that the subject of nuclear weapons elimination is something of a closed book even to intelligent and enquiring people. There was little awareness of the World Court Advisory Opinion, the Canberra Commission, General Lee Butler's remarkable turnabout, or the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. More esoteric areas such as the UN Committee on Disarmament or the New Agenda Coalition were even more remote. Many of them were not really aware of the number of nuclear weapons still in existence, their awesome power, and which countries deployed them. Some believed that, with the end of the Cold War, the problem had gone away. Most members found their knowledge of these areas, and therefore of the hopes and fears surrounding the nuclear disarmament process, considerably enhanced by taking part in a citizens' Forum - a process which demands active engagement rather than passive exposure. However, they did feel that both media and government had failed to keep them adequately informed and believed that they should be more fully consulted on this vital issue.

Forum members are not the sort of people to despair at the state of the world. Otherwise they wouldn't have taken part. They welcomed the cautious approach of the booklet and of the presentations. Almost all members ended up by endorsing the need for a nuclear weapons-free world. In some cases they found my own attitude rather too "conservative" and demanded faster progress. Most of them, however, were able to see that the process was full of pitfalls and some danger; and that it would require very hard practical work. Although there was some call for immediate reductions in nuclear weapon numbers, many forums appreciated the distinction between numerical and qualitative disarmament, and the apparent friction between the "step by step" approach favoured by the UK Government and the faster move towards an international treaty demanded by many members of the Non-Aligned Movement. Many of forum members came to the conclusion that such distinctions are more apparent than real.

It was important, as far as possible, to allow forum members to thrash out these problems for themselves, without too much outside interference. It has been one of the most rewarding aspects of the process to see how people can stimulate each other to revise their views and to reach a common conclusion. One is reminded of the way a jury operates. The Forums can quite quickly develop their own identity and feel a collective pride in their shared achievement.

Although the Booklet does not presuppose too much prior knowledge, it is still quite challenging for newcomers to the issue. Most Forum members were happy with it and were willing to follow up some of the suggestions at the end. They were interested in the international law aspects and some enjoyed the exercise relating the ICJ Opinion to Trident. However, a sizeable minority remains to be persuaded that international law, which is not yet fully enforceable, can really make much difference, although most accepted that the Court's confirmation of the legal obligation of progress towards disarmament could have a real effect. They were especially anxious that the UK should accept, and act on, this obligation. In spite of some doubts about the efficacy of the law, per se, to force change, they strongly wanted our country to be seen as law-abiding, especially as regards Trident for which they

could see no lawful use. There were calls for a regular assessment of our nuclear weapons policy and its progress towards legal respectability, either by the Attorney General, or by a Royal Commission.

Any attempt to develop new nuclear weapons, or to upgrade existing ones, was condemned. There was considerable distrust of sub-critical or computer testing; Britain should play no part in these.

The legal anxiety was closely related to doubts about the moral viability of nuclear deterrence. This is strongly felt and deeply troubling to some people. Sometimes this is allied to worries about the costs of nuclear weapons and a feeling that the money would be better spent on domestic social needs or relieving the causes of tension such as world debt or poverty; and by providing resources to assist Russian de-nuclearisation and economic recovery. Some of these comments came spontaneously and were not based on the materials members had studied. This suggests that, on this sort of issue, the Government should be responding to the general public as well as to anti-nuclear activists. The existence, let alone the role, of the World Court, was quite new to many people. However, several Forum members were aware of recent progress in containing anti-personnel mines, in working toward an International Criminal Court, and in operating ad-hoc tribunals such that for former Yugoslavia.

Some reservations about the wisdom of complete nuclear disarmament were expressed. These included the dangers from terrorism and "rogue" states. There was considerable anxiety about the emergence of India and Pakistan as nuclear-capable states. As this issue is of concern to the Nuclear Weapon states, it is important that HMG explains to the electorate in some detail how this can be accommodated in its plans for a nuclear-free world. There was also some residual belief in the efficacy of nuclear weapons in preventing war between the major powers.

Some Forum members were intrigued by the booklet article on how a decline in "tacit knowledge" can help to prevent a fast reversal of nuclear disarmament. However, they were not always convinced by the theory. Nearly all were alarmed by the section on near-accidents and this probably explains their near-unanimous demand for further de-alerting and even de-coupling, of nuclear weapons and the adoption of a No First Use policy. Some of the members also appreciated that such steps were an essential component of the elimination process.

There was an marked enthusiasm for the UK taking a lead in the disarmament process both by setting an example in the marginalisation of its own nuclear deterrent and by taking strong initiatives in international fora. This arises from an appreciation of our present Government's strong position and its international links, as well as from a very natural desire to see our country do well. In this respect it is interesting to note that there was quite widespread knowledge and appreciation of the UK's positive role in recent negotiations regarding anti-personnel mines and the International Criminal Court.

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-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Sun, 15 Nov 1998 13:18:33 +0100  
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-1: November bulletin from Belfast  
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Reply-To: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id EAA11329

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

Belfast Peace to the City Campaign  
November 1998 Bulletin

### Contents

1. An Update on the Northern Ireland Political Situation
2. An Article on Peace Building in Northern Ireland
3. A Story from Northern Ireland Interpreting Peacemaking
4. News on Conferences and Publications
5. Suggestions from our Readers

### 1. An Update on the Northern Ireland Political Situation - November 1998.

1. So near and yet so far. The peace process in Northern Ireland is mired in its most difficult phase yet. While there does not seem to be any mandate for a return to shooting or bombing, a serious impasse has developed over the issue of the decommissioning of paramilitary weapons. The Ulster Unionist Party, the pivotal protestant party to the Agreement, commands the support of only a narrow majority of Unionist members of the Assembly. It would in all probability lose that majority, and with a crucial part of the structure of the Agreement, if it agrees to Sinn Fein entering government without at least some IRA decommissioning. Sinn Fein, another crucial party to the Agreement, insists that this linkage is not part of the Agreement an interpretation supported by other (loyalist) paramilitaries and by the letter of the Agreement. The Faustian bargain of the referendum, whereby a narrow Unionist majority voted in favour of the Agreement on the implied basis of a series of assurances, one of which was an assumption that decommissioning would begin before the Executive was established may be about to be cashed in. All in all, a new zero-sum game.

Win-lose scenarios are both the stuff of all habitual politics in Northern Ireland and an anathema to the Agreement. The remaining win-lose issues - decommissioning, policing and parades - are still the greatest obstacles to a common future. Problematically, there is suspicion that some Unionists and Republicans would welcome a situation in which the other party left the negotiating table. Interestingly, both groups appear to believe that there are serious costs in being the first to give up on this \*best ever chance for peace\*. The result is a curious stalemate, in which there is no forward movement on decommissioning but no actual retreat

from matters now behind us. There has been remarkably little controversy over the early release of paramilitary prisoners. The emotion around this issue seems to have been spent during the referendum campaign.

The deadline for establishing a 'shadow-executive' has been missed. As a result, there is considerable suspicion in nationalist circles that the Unionists have no intention of ever allowing republicans in to government. The next official deadline is February, when powers should begin to be transferred from Westminster. There is currently no reason to believe that the issue will be resolved in spite of newspaper rumours of an emergency meeting of the IRA military council before Christmas.

A lot rides on the successful resolution of this matter. The failure to resolve it by February would mean the end of the timetable established in April and a real crisis about the actual practical effect of the Agreement. On the other hand, following prisoner release, the ending of the Unionist policy of having no contact with Sinn Fein, Clinton's visit and the successful survival through the crises of Drumcree and Omagh and all the other events, there is a lot at stake. If things don't improve, I would not rule out a special summit on the issue of arms decommissioning involving the world's media and political leaders once more. Learning to find win-win on this issue is of critical importance to a co-operative future.

2. The policing commission met an overwhelmingly republican crowd in West Belfast last week and were left in no doubt about the depth and emotion of anti-RUC sentiment. It is hard to see how demands for simple abolition can be practically realised, yet having set it as an unnegotiable barrier, we have a potential win/lose situation. Nevertheless, the very fact that a powerful commission went to West Belfast and really felt and saw the depth of alienation from British institutions among republicans is progress indeed. There is still a lot of wishful-thinking among Unionists about nationalist attitudes to the RUC. It is unimaginable that a Unionist government would have bothered to undertake such a step. Progress must be measured in small steps.

3. Sinn Fein are often accused of being a fascist party. Usually, this is based on flimsy evidence but the intimidation from republicans, finally successful, to prevent a soccer match between a West Belfast team, Donegall Celtic, and the RUC was extremely overt. At the third time of asking the club capitulated, having earlier voted to play the match. The overtness of Sinn Fein pressure, in spite of opposition from the Irish news and other leading nationalist institutions does indeed pose serious questions about Sinn Fein's capacity to accept decisions which go against them. Touch the RUC and you're dead appears to be the motif. Hatred is deeply ingrained and it will take more than a paper Agreement to leave it behind.

## 2. An Article on Peace-Building in Northern Ireland

The Community Bridge Building Program of Down and Dromore Diocese,  
Church of Ireland

Reconciliation - or Community Bridge Building - was a top priority area identified by the clergy of Down and Dromore Diocese In the Church of Ireland (Anglican) when Bishop Harold Miller arrived in 1997. A Building Bridges Working Group was set up to develop this emphasis in the life and mission of the diocese. Their desire was to bring the whole Diocese with them on a journey in peacemaking. For some individuals and parishes they recognised that this would mean taking first steps in establishing contacts with others whose cultural identity and religious affiliations are different to their own and with whose political viewpoints they may have strong disagreements. For others, the challenge they realised would be to move such already existing relationships to deeper levels of dialogue and co-operative action.

In the past year this Working Group has taken a number of steps to move the process on. In November of 1997 a Diocesan Action Evening was held at Down Cathedral with over 400 people, representing all but a few of the parishes in the diocese, listening to challenging presentations about this aspect of Christian discipleship and then discussing with each other their response to them. Among the comments made by parish representatives were: "Although I was tired and felt rushed to get there I came away challenged by the fact that each of us can do our bit to promote a lasting peace in our province by reaching out where we are to those we come into contact with daily." "The amount we can do seems such a small step, but every journey begins with the first step." "It will mean work for all Christians if we are to have a lasting peace - but that's what we want, isn't it?" Early in 1998 every parish Rector and Select Vestry was asked to consider a draft commitment statement on Community Bridge Building. Once all of the parish responses had been analysed and considered in detail there were a series of Clergy Cluster Group meetings held in May for further input and discussion.

On the eve of Pentecost a Diocesan Service, "The Next Step," was held in St Anne's Cathedral, with over eight hundred clergy and parishioners from all parts of the diocese gathered, along with friends from other churches. The biblical themes of reconciliation as outlined in the Commitment statement provided the focus for the sermon, prayers and liturgy. The service included interviews with two people who had family members killed as the result of violence during Northern Ireland's "Troubles." Both spoke of the struggle to overcome not only the pain of bereavement, but also the temptation to bitterness and hatred that followed it. In his sermon Bishop Harold addressed the challenge of repentance, taking as his text the Genesis account of the Tower of Babel. Applying the message to the situation in Northern Ireland he stated: "we have a choice to make in this land. We can either go on in our different communities, building our towers, establishing our voice, our power-base, our future and in the end destroy ourselves\*or we can repent, turn to God together.. and ask God to do that Pentecostal work of reversing the results of Babel."

The year's work culminated in a motion put to the Diocesan Synod in June where it was unanimously agreed to adopt the Diocesan Commitment to bridge building and peacemaking. (See text below.) An unusually large number of speakers added their personal endorsement and support to the motion, and the Bishop commented "it was wonderful

to see the unanimity and determination to implement this (Commitment.)"

The Building Bridges initiative is set to take another step forward on Sunday 22nd November. All Rectors have been asked to use this opportunity to encourage members to take a step forward in their thinking, their praying, their attitudes and actions in showing the love of Christ to members of all other religious, social and political communities sharing this island.

November 22nd, as the Sunday before Advent, is known in the Anglican tradition as Stir-up Sunday due to the words of the collect, "Stir up, we beseech thee, O Lord, the wills of thy faithful people" The prayer of the Building Bridges Working Group is that God will stir up within the members of Down and Dromore Diocese the willingness and desire to take another step forward in developing positive relationships with those who in various ways may be different to themselves.

Writing recently to the clergy of the diocese Bishop Harold said, "I believe that we are being called to the kind of imaginative and visionary leadership in our generation that will enable our Church to be cleared of sectarianism and bitterness and to speak with freedom the Gospel of love, peace and renewal to this generation. Without that, we will surely die."

Within the diocese the work of Community Bridge Building continues, on a diocesan level, through local parish initiatives, and at a personal level in the day to day life of ordinary people whose commitment to peacemaking extends well beyond the pew.

#### Diocesan Commitment to Community Bridge Building

As members of the Church of Ireland in the Diocese of Down and Dromore -

seeking to respond to the call of Jesus Christ to follow him, we recommit ourselves to the work of reconciliation, peacemaking and community bridge building.

We affirm our belief in the reconciling power of God in Jesus Christ

We affirm our belief

in God's love for all people

that Christ calls us to love our enemies

that it is God's will that all people should be reconciled to himself and to one another and that God has entrusted to us the ministry of reconciliation.

We confess our need to follow more closely in the footsteps of Jesus the Peacemaker

We confess that, at times,

our attitude and actions towards those of other communities and religious traditions have caused offence, deep hurt and division

we have been self righteous and refused to recognise our need to change

we have been content to condemn the violence of others, but have been unwilling to undertake the costly work of building peace

We commit ourselves to pray and work for peace

We commit ourselves

- to make the ministry of Reconciliation a priority in our prayers
- to meet with those from who we differ, within our own Church, and across religious and political divides seeking to build relationships of trust and mutual respect

- to work for justice for all, not just those whom we identify as belonging to 'our' community

- to initiate programmes of action which will build peace and promote reconciliation in our divided society

We recognise that all of this can only be done in the power of the Holy Spirit and pray that the life of our Parishes and our Diocese may be a witness to God's kingdom of right relationships as we exercise the ministry of Reconciliation.

### 3. A Personal Story About Peacemaking in Northern Ireland

PAKT - Parents and Kids Together.

PAKT (Parents and Kids Together) is a grassroots family led initiative, based on Christian values, which seeks to provide both parents and children with support and information relevant to their needs. The family is absolutely central to the development of PAKT. PAKT is also inclusive in that it reaches out to all sections of the community. PAKT aims to involve people from all types of backgrounds (social class, religion, and political.) PAKT believes that people can learn a significant amount from others who might be perceived as different and that communities can perform a useful role in promoting increased mutual understanding between people of different cultural and religious traditions. In Northern Ireland PAKT is, therefore, providing children and families "support and information relevant to their needs."

The first PAKT project was established in Lurgan in 1994. Shankill Parish in Dromore Diocese of the Church of Ireland have been involved in it from the beginning. for them it is one example of Community Bridge Building. (See article above.)Against a background of extremely poor community relations PAKT has achieved cross-community support both in terms of religion and social class, from parents and children alike. At present there are 200 children and about 160 families participating. Membership reflects the 50/50 split between Catholic and Protestant in the population of the town. Most activities are targeted at 6-10 year-olds, believing in intervention at an early stage before entrenched attitudes gain hold. A new 10-13 year-old group is under development to provide for progression and longer-term support of participants.

The Community Relations Programme within PAKT aims to promote diversity and difference as a cause for celebration by focusing on the positive elements within each tradition and by encouraging people to accept and understand these positive elements. The Community Relations Programme is not exclusive, but rather is integrated into all the various activities within the Children's Programme, Adult Programmes and Family Events. Activities aimed at understanding and appreciating

different cultural traditions in Ireland include work through sport, music, dance, arts and crafts, and workshops on focused issues.

One firm belief of PAKT is that community relations work must begin with the management committee of a project itself. Such a group must work out its own inter-relationships prior to promoting the message of community relations and reconciliation with children and families. Some other convictions include:

- Christians believe in and promote love, tolerance and friendship. Therefore, in a project based on Christian values and standards good community relations practice is not optional - it is an imperative.
- Community relations should permeate all activities. It should not be a subject/theme apart - rather, efforts should be made to integrate community relations into all activities.
- Diversity and difference are things to be celebrated and have the potential to enrich and inspire the lives of ordinary citizens. It is important to focus upon the positive elements within each tradition and encourage people to accept and understand these positive aspects.
- Community relations can be enjoyable and fun. it is good to inject creativity, enthusiasm and energy into community relations activities, and try to ensure that community relations is interesting and interactive, not boring and passive/sterile.
- Community relations involves a considerable amount of trust building and mutual understanding. People involved in the process need to have a sense that some discussion and conversations will be private and confidential. Groundrules relating to the issues of confidentiality and trust should be worked out at an early stage.
- Contact by itself is not enough to build good community relations. There are additional needs relating to systematic and structured programmes and interventions , with direct community relations work built into projects in a meaningful and substantial way.

PAKT has now gone nationwide with PAKT Projects now up and running in Bangor, Carrickfergus and Ballincolig (Cork), with further PAKT projects planned for several other locations.

#### 4. News About Conferences and Publications

##### Conferences Courses

TRANSFORMING CONFLICT TRAINING by the Mediation Network for NI  
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

##### COPING WITH CHANGE

The Irish School of Ecumenics is offering two courses which consider the dynamics of change and how to deal with it creatively in interpersonal and communal relationships. Entitled "Faith for a Change",

the course will be particularly relevant to those working in local communities or churches.

The course runs from 20 January to 24 February. The courses consist of weekly Wednesday sessions from 7.30 - 9.30 pm at the Irish School of Ecumenics premises, 48 Elmwood Avenue, Belfast. For a brochure outlining the programme content and details of course fees contact Cathy Higgins, ISE, tel:01232-382750.

#### Irish School of Ecumenics Certificate Course

The Irish School of Ecumenics also offers a part-time 2-year course leading to a Certificate in Reconciliation Studies awarded by the University of Ulster. The course, taught in Belfast and Derry, is modular based and explores key themes for a divided community. For further information contact the Administrator, Irish School of Ecumenics, 48 Elmwood Avenue, Belfast BT9 6AZ, tel 01232-382750.

#### New Books and Resources:

"A Tapestry of Belief: Christian Traditions in Northern Ireland," edited by Norman Richardson. Representatives of each Christian tradition in Northern Ireland dispel much of the misinformation and myth with clear statements of their actual beliefs, practices and structures. Cost 9.99.

"A Cultural Traditions Dictionary," edited by Gary Law both published by the Northern Ireland Community Relations Council in conjunction with Blackstaff Press. For further information contact: [info@community-relations.org.uk](mailto:info@community-relations.org.uk)

"Mediation: The Search for Common Ground" is a new 30-minute video produced by INCORE. Includes reflections on both personal and political mediation (particularly focusing on family mediation and mediation on contentious marches in Northern Ireland.) Includes international as well as Northern Ireland perspectives and comments on the limitations and parameters of mediation. Contact: INCORE, Aberfoyle House, Northland Road, Londonderry BT48 7JA. Phone 44-1504-375500. E-mail [Incore@incore.ulst.ac.uk](mailto:Incore@incore.ulst.ac.uk)

#### 5. Suggestions From Our Readers

The future of policing is one of the big contentious issues which Northern Ireland faces. Community Dialogue has produced a very useful 4 x A5 sheet to help facilitate group discussion on the issue, pinpointing different views and questions. Community Dialogue, 373 Springfield Road, Belfast BT12 7DG. Phone 01232-329995 Fax 330482. E-mail: [commdial@ibm.net](mailto:commdial@ibm.net) Web-site: <http://www.megabytes.org/dialogue/>

---

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](mailto: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: Mon, 16 Nov 1998 09:15:55 -0500  
From: Bill Robinson <plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>  
Organization: Project Ploughshares  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: NAC Vote at U.N.  
To: Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,  
Abolition Canada <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>

Subject: NAC Vote at U.N.  
Date: Mon, 16 Nov 1998 06:18:08 -0700  
From: Doug Roche <djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca>

Reflections on the New Agenda Coalition vote at the U.N.  
by Senator Douglas Roche, O.C., Chairman, Middle Powers Initiative

1. The New Agenda Coalition's resolution, L.48, "Towards a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World: The Need for a New Agenda," was voted on November 13, 1998 in the U.N. First Committee. The vote was 97 in favour, 19 opposed and 32 abstentions. Since 12 NATO nations abstained, the vote was a significant defeat of the Western NWS, who campaigned hard around the world and especially in the NATO states against L.48. The vote firmly established NAC as a formidable governmental instrument challenging the NWS hold on nuclear weapons. This action gives immense encouragement to those who have been working for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

2. The centrepiece of L.48 was Operative Paragraph 1, which: "Calls upon the Nuclear Weapons States to demonstrate an unequivocal commitment to the speedy and total elimination of their respective nuclear weapons and without delay to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to the elimination of these weapons, thereby fulfilling their obligations under Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)."

3. This was correctly perceived by the NWS as challenging the military doctrine of nuclear deterrence, which remains the cornerstone of their security policies notwithstanding actual reductions in their nuclear arsenals. No matter how much sugar was put into the various drafts of L.48 by the NAC sponsors (e.g. reducing No-First-Use to merely an examination of "further interim measures"), the core of L.48 was incompatible with

NATO's continued insistence that nuclear weapons are "essential."

4. The U.S., U.K. and France were not willing merely to dissent from L.48, they vigorously attacked it and sent demarches around the world to seek (ask, urge, cajole, intimidate -- depending on the nature of the country) a no vote. A U.S. spokesman went to NATO headquarters in Brussels to tell the NATO allies to vote against it. At the U.N. itself, just before the vote, the U.S. spokesman denounced L.48 because it challenged nuclear deterrence, which has, under the terms of Article 51 of the U.N. Charter, "kept the peace." The international security climate would have to improve before elimination could be considered, he said, and L.48 was only "a feel good" arms control measure that will likely delay the disarmament process. Although L.48 does not mention the words "Nuclear Weapons Convention," the U.S. spokesman said the U.S. considers the affirmation that a nuclear world would require (in the words of L.48) "a universal and multilaterally negotiated legally binding instrument" completely premature. As for the NAC's de-alerting proposal, that would "lead to instability."

5. The strength of the opposition can be measured in terms of two countries, Canada and Germany, that are themselves strong. Foreign Minister Lloyd Axworthy of Canada wanted to vote for L.48. The U.S. went into the Canadian government at the highest levels, just as they have three times protested the Canadian Foreign Affairs Parliamentary Committee's review of Canada's nuclear weapons policies. Canada let it be known that it would vote for L.48 if one more NATO nation would join it. Canada then sent demarches to nine important countries, most of them in NATO. Mr. Axworthy met with Foreign Minister Fischer of Germany, who had a problem of his own. He had just visited Washington and had received viewpoints. However, the foreign policy of the new German government states: "The new Federal Government sticks to its goal of complete disarmament of all weapons of mass destruction and will take part in initiatives, together with Germany's partners and allies, to achieve this end." How could Germany vote against L.48 and thus be seen around the world as repudiating its own -- new -- policy? The joint abstention strategy decided on by Axworthy and Fischer doubtless swayed other NATO states that had, until the last moment, been stating they would vote no. While MPI wished them to vote yes, the fact that the majority of NATO NNWS moved en bloc has

shifted

NATO from its previously unassailable hard-line retention of nuclear weapons.

6. In the end, 12 NATO states abstained: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain.

Their abstention told the U.S, U.K., and France that negotiations toward nuclear disarmament would have to be taken seriously by NATO and that the current review of NATO's Strategic Concept would not necessarily lead to a foregone conclusion that NATO's possession of nuclear weapons is permanent.

7. Other notable votes: Austria voted yes. China abstained. Japan abstained. Several East European states abstained. Turkey was the only NNWS in NATO to join the NWS in no. Slovenia, an original member of NAC, withdrew under NWS pressure and abstained.

8. The no votes had four principal categories: a) the NWS: U.S., U.K., France, Russia; b) the states soon to join NATO: the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland; c) the states hoping to join NATO: Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania; d) the new nuclear: India, Pakistan, Israel; others: Armenia, Bulgaria, Monaco, Romania, Slovakia.

9. The states that co-sponsored L.48 were: Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Ireland, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, Samoa, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela.

10. Maintaining proper perspectives of objectivity and modesty, MPI has every right to share in the elation of the vote. It was MPI that sent a high-powered and heavily publicized delegation to Canada on September 29 in support of the NAC resolution. MPI sent a delegation to Germany and the Netherlands a week before the vote. In both Bonn and the Hague, we were told the vote would be no and, in the case of Germany, the Explanation of the No Vote had already been written. In The Hague, leading officials in the foreign ministry, openly sneered at L.48. MPI, working closely with NGOs on the ground, alerted parliamentarians in both countries who had not previously been aware of the implications of L.48. Debates took place in both countries. The governments of Germany and the Netherlands changed their votes to abstention.

11. At the U.N. in New York, Jim Wurst, working for MPI under Alyn

Ware's  
direction, maintained an inter-related set of actions:

- a) co-operating with national NGOs in key European countries to inform their governments about the resolution and encourage them to vote yes.
- b) Informing government officials at the U.N. on the NAC resolution.
- c) Helping U.N. delegations to ensure that accurate information was sent to their capitals.
- d) Keeping delegations informed as to when the vote on L.48 would be held so that the maximum number of states would actually be present in the hall (in fact, the 148 nations that voted on L.48 were the most that voted at any meeting this session).

12. MPI cannot, and does not, claim credit for the profound shift in the NATO countries. The ground had been prepared by domestic NGOs. The NAC leadership worked extremely hard. But it is evident that MPI played a dynamic and perhaps even a pivotal role in the representations we made at high political and official levels of the abstaining countries. Nor can sight be lost of the effect of the MPI's extensive consultations in Japan in August to break through Japan's regular accession to U.S. nuclear interests. Just as NAC proved its salt in the first five months of its existence, so too did MPI in the first eight months of our existence. That such a deep impact on the NWS and the international system could be made by those -- both governments and leading organizations of civil society -- in so short a time on so monumental a challenge ought to fill everyone seeking the abolition of nuclear weapons with a deep sense of encouragement to persevere against obstacles that no longer seem impervious. The role of MPI grows.

13. There were 36 countries that, for one reason or another, were not present to vote in the Disarmament Committee. When L.48 goes to the U.N. General Assembly in the first week of December for the official U.N. vote, the potential for swelling the yes vote is considerable, since most of the absent countries would normally vote for such a resolution. We can expect the NWS to pressure these countries to vote no. I have therefore authorized the retention of Jim Wurst for these next three weeks to maintain the MPI presence at the U.N. in order to inform these delegations, and indeed all delegations, of the date of the U.N. vote, and to provide a factual basis of new information for them, such as media accounts of the

meaning of the first L.48 vote, e.g. the front-page article that appeared in the Globe and Mail, Canada.  
(<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/docs/news/19981114/GlobeFront/UNUKEN.html>)

--

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](mailto: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: <marissa@vi.org>  
From: marissa <marissa@vi.org>  
To: "'banminesusa'" <banminesusa@vi.org>  
Subject: December NGO Sign -on letter  
Date: Mon, 16 Nov 1998 11:44:30 -0500

To: USCBL Endorsing Organizations and Campaigners  
From: Marissa A. Vitagliano  
Date: November 16, 1998  
Re: NGO Sign-on letter to President Clinton on First Anniversary of the Mine Ban Treaty

Friends,

As part of USCBL activities to commemorate the first anniversary of the Mine Ban Treaty, we are sending a letter to President Clinton to continue to urge him to sign the treaty. We would like to have the letter signed by all of the over 300 endorsing organizations of the USCBL. It is imperative that we show our full and diverse strength as we celebrate the Mine Ban Treaty and express our disappointment in the US's failure to sign.

In the interest of having as many organizations sign as possible and cutting through some administrative red tape, we will be listing organization names only on this letter, not organization heads as on previous sign-on letters.

If you would like your organization listed please email, phone, or fax me at the numbers listed below. The deadline for reply is December 1, 1998; so that the letter may be delivered on December 3 to coincide with the grassroots call-in day (thank you to everyone who has distributed information about this activity far and wide-it is shaping up remarkably!) Thank you in advance for your participation and continuing support. I look forward to hearing from everyone.

Best regards,  
Marissa  
(please excuse multiple copies of this message)

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

December 2, 1998

Dear President Clinton:

We, the undersigned members of the U.S. Campaign to Ban Landmines, write on the occasion of the first anniversary of the signing of The 1997 Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction ("Mine Ban Treaty") to respectfully urge you to join this important treaty, now signed by nearly 140 countries.

The U.S. Campaign to Ban Landmines- a coalition of over 300 educational, development, medical, religious, veteran, disability, and peace organizations- welcomes U.S. leadership in the area of demining and survivor assistance, and we are grateful as well for your promise to work towards developing alternatives to the weapon so that the U.S. might be able to sign

the treaty by the year 2006. However, we believe that withholding U.S. support for the Mine Ban Treaty for as long as eight years is detrimental to the cause of banning the use, transfer, stockpiling, and production of antipersonnel landmines. We are concerned that other countries might emulate the U.S. position that alternatives are required before signing and withhold their support from the treaty. Standing outside the treaty weakens U.S. authority in denouncing the use of the weapon by others.

The Mine Ban Treaty will enter into force this March, and governments around the world will now be held to its terms with regard to demining, destruction of stockpiles, prohibition of transfers, use, and production. A strong U.S. voice and diplomatic presence is urgently needed to hold all parties to their commitments and to encourage recalcitrant nations to join the international effort to prohibit use and eradicate antipersonnel landmines from the earth.

Your leadership on banning this indiscriminate and inhumane weapon is needed today, not eight years from now. We urge you to quickly remove impediments to the United States signing the Mine Ban Treaty so that the U.S. government may be among the adherents to a global ban on antipersonnel landmines when the treaty enters into force this March.

Sincerely

Campaign member organizations listed...

Marissa A. Vitagliano  
Coordinator, US Campaign to Ban Landmines  
Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation  
2001 S Street, NW Suite 740  
Washington, DC 20009  
Tel.: 202 483 9222  
Fax: 202 483 9312 or 202 483 9314  
Email: marissa@vi.org <mailto:jill@vi.org> or banminesusa@vi.org  
<mailto:banminesusa@vi.org>  
<http://www.vvaf.org/landmine/uscbl.htm>  
<<http://www.vvaf.org/landmine/uscbl.htm>>  
\*\*Ban Mines, Clear Mines, Help Survivors\*\*

To: marissa <marissa@vi.org>>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: December NGO Sign -on letter  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 11:44 AM 11/16/98 -0500, marissa wrote:

>To: USCBL Endorsing Organizations and Campaigners  
>From: Marissa A. Vitagliano  
>Date: November 16, 1998  
>Re: NGO Sign-on letter to President Clinton on First Anniversary of the Mine  
>Ban Treaty

>  
>Friends,  
>As part of USCBL activities to commemorate the first anniversary of the Mine  
>Ban Treaty, we are sending a letter to President Clinton to continue to urge  
>him to sign the treaty. We would like to have the letter signed by all of  
>the over 300 endorsing organizations of the USCBL....

Dear Marissa:

I'll sign the letter in behalf of our organization.

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

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Tue, 17 Nov 1998 15:43:07 +0100  
From: Beatrice MERAHI <bem@wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Cc: missionsakademie@on-line.de, impress@slt.lk  
Subject: pov-1: November bulletin from Kingston, Jamaica  
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Reply-To: Beatrice MERAHI <bem@wcc-coe.org>

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

## Kingston Peace to the City Campaign November Bulletin

In this issue:

1. Peace between Elders and Youth
2. Football for Peace
3. Demo Tape
4. Corporate Goodwill
5. S-Corner, Moving On
6. Parliament Bombed

### 1. Peace Between Elders and Youth

The month of November was one which was the S-Corner community had been living for a long time; the area which has been torn by months of strife and uncertain peace finally experienced the proverbial light at the end of the tunnel . This light shone brightly because the youth themselves who were most affected by the violence, came to the Clinic to request a meeting with all of the elders. It was a magical fusion of the past and the future in the present; the ancestors would have endorsed this course of action in a moment of crisis and surely this action also points the way to the future course for conflict resolution.

In the last full week of October, the S-Corner staff found their role as community mediators being fulfilled to the greatest extent. Director of the project, Angela Stultz Crawlle was sensitive to the pregnant opportunities with which the moment was imbued. "It was up to us to see the opportunity for its significance and seize the chance to get youth and elders together under one roof," she said. "We realised that such a meeting would provide the space for the voicing of grievances and griefs and explore what it means to live in a community that is so divided by war. At the same time, they could address what it meant to also be trying to deal with the harsh realities of living in a community that is stigmatised by outsiders as one of the worst places to live."

The community activist went on to emphasise that doors automatically closed for the frustrated hopefuls who emerge from inner-city communities, notwithstanding their qualifications. These are also the same youth who daily confront police brutality. "Their main crime," Stultz-Crawlle observed, "is just cooling out on the corner, in escape

from their hot one bedroom shacks that they call home.

"For the women, young and old," she continued, "the forum provided the longed for chance to air their fears about merely walking across borders deemed to be enemy territory; they could be seen as direct and indirect targets in the sense that they could be used as conduits for messages to so-called enemies." Angela Stultz-Crawle remarked that "it is amazing how many women described similar experiences of their children wetting the beds or running under the beds at the sound of a shot." Mind you, during the times of war, these shots ring out with monotonous regularity.

On the day of the Forum November 7, people sat for four hours and talked and shared in a way which they had never done before, assured of the safety of their privacy and the sincerity of the expressions of goodwill. The meeting resolved that for every lane where there was an influential leader, they would work directly with the S-Corner lane leader to maintain the peace. It was felt that if every corner maintained the peace in their corner and abided by the law of the ghetto, then automatically, in every area everyone would be enjoying a state of peace. So far so great; some of the specific ghetto laws constructed to maintain the peace include:

1. no housebreaking,
2. no rape
3. no forced tax - which is extortion of money from business people.

Addressing the contradictions inherent in the condition of people residing in the inner city communities of Kingston and St. Andrew in general and the S- Corner area in particular, the community activist in charge of the S-Corner project pointed out that "we have to recognise that the youth in question are unemployed and poor; we are now looking for legal alternatives to this syndrome of collective non-activity. We have written letters to the Member of Parliament, Portia Simpson-Miller, with an invitation to meet with a representative delegation in order to discuss how we can access some of the funds allocated to M.P.s for poverty alleviation and we are awaiting her response."

The unprecedented community meeting was carried live on Roots FM, community radio station dubbed the "Voice of the Innercity, for the role that it is playing in facilitating the politicisation of voices of the poor. "We used the opportunity of being on the radio," Stultz-Crawle explained, "to talk about the campaign organised by the World Council of Churches to address peace in seven major cities across the world. I also spoke about the scheduled trip to Zimbabwe in December to participate in the Eight Assembly for World Peace. The snowball effect took over; a number of other community leaders who heard the programme, called us to congratulate us on the programme and to seek advice how to replicate the process.

As a result, we were invited to be on a panel at the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of the West Indies, Mona, Kingston. Fourteen other communities who have initiated peace and have had some degree of success in maintaining social equilibrium, were invited to the November 15 meeting. The S-Corner delegation included Director, Angela

and three other community leaders.

Saturday the seventh of November was a night the S-Corner community is bound to remember for a long time. In a spontaneous outburst of goodwill, the men came out with their music boxes, the women came out with their pots and pans filled with soup and other delectables, celebrated the coming to fruition of their sustained efforts to maintain the positive vibrations permeating the community.

## 2. Football For Peace

The football competition which we mentioned in the last bulletin continues and the excitement has reached crescendo levels as the finals draw near. The football team from the top section of the community lost their match last Sunday and was therefore eliminated from the final. However, the bottom section has maintained a good goal average and are still in contention for the cup which their former enemies at the top are now supporting them to win. If it means losing to win that kind of camaraderie between the factions, it seems, ironically, to be worth it. The team lost but the community won in every other respect.

## 3. Demo Tape

On very short notice, we agreed to produce the Peace to the City theme song for the upcoming Assembly. Although quite enthusiastic about the prospect of taking on the responsibility, we recognised our limited expertise in this area and identified a competent coordinator who agreed to do the job for the limited resources which we had. We promised a chartbuster and intend to live up to this expectation; the proof of the pudding will be in the singing!

## 4. Corporate Goodwill

The Grace and Staff Community Development Foundation has agreed to sponsor a community road sign which will reinforce the message of forgiveness and peace which the S-Corner organisation has been reiterating over the past year and a half. "We are excited that we are also in the process of constructing our banner," Stultz Crawlle noted. "In preparation for the imminent Zimbabwe event, we are doing a banner for the "Peace Line," she said.

## 5. S-Corner, Moving On

While this hubbub of activities is taking place, the show is also going on for the regular programme activities. This background reference is not to trivialise the importance of the other activities. On the contrary, we are facilitating a number of discussion activities to sensitise the community about issues of social concern. The education component of the project continues to move apace and according to the hard-working dreadlocked Rastafari director, "can only be described as a bomb." In local parlance, a bomb is a metaphor for something explosive but as in this case, not necessarily detrimental.

## 6. Parliament Bombed

Speaking of a bomb, we have to also note that the House of Parliament which legitimises the law and order of our legal lives, was unceremoniously bombed in the same time period when we were deploying maximum energies to peace maintenance. It was refreshing to note that while this initiative of lawlessness had its own diabolic magnetism, it was not powerful enough to infiltrate the positive atmosphere which was prevailing, due to the peace encounter. We would like to think that the recent acceptance of a community youth into the employ of Power 106 FM's prestigious media environment is a direct result of the positive things which we have been doing which have been highlighted by the media.

"Usually, the jobs that we get for our male youth," Stultz-Crawlle concluded, "are not of this calibre, irrespective of the qualifications offered. It is therefore encouraging and we intend to pursue the private sector organisations to encourage them to go the extra mile and reproduce this experience as many times over as they can. Nuff Respect to the Peace Process! See You in Two Weeks Time!

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: [scorner@cwjamaica.com](mailto:scorner@cwjamaica.com)  
Web: <http://www.scorner.com.jm/>

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

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 17 Nov 1998 11:05:28 -0800 (PST)  
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: U.S. Should Cut Nukes Unilaterally  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, bannanas-ana@igc.apc.org

To : Abolitionists everywhere  
From: Bruce Hall at Peace Action  
Date: November 17, 1998  
Re : Senator wants US to de-alert nuclear weapons

Dear Friends -

In a speech today in front of the Council on Foreign Relations Nebraska Senator Bob Kerrey is calling on President Clinton to unilaterally reduce the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

In addition, Kerrey feels the United States should remove many of the U.S. nuclear weapons from hair trigger alert.

Kerrey announced his intention to undo current U.S. law which prohibits the United States from reducing its arsenal below the levels set forth in the START I treaty.

The Clinton administration is apparently considering various proposals under the broadly defined rubric of "de-alerting" and might discuss them at the State of the Union address this January.

See below!

Bruce  
Kerrey: U.S. Should Cut Nuclear Arms  
Unilaterally

By Walter Pincus  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Tuesday, November 17, 1998; Page A13

Sen. Bob Kerrey (D-Neb.) today plans to call on President Clinton to order immediate unilateral reductions in U.S. strategic nuclear forces and to remove the hair trigger from many of those that remain.

The \$25 billion now spent to maintain the current U.S. nuclear arsenal "is diverting resources from real and imminent threats," Kerrey said, suggesting reduction of the stockpile "would free money and resources to confront other, newer, threats from regional war to ethnic conflict to international terrorism."

The Nebraska Democrat, who said yesterday in an interview that he expects to make a decision by December on whether to run for the presidency in 2000, also said that "our maintenance of a nuclear

arsenal larger than we need provokes Russia to maintain one larger than she can control." With Russia short of funds to keep its weapons secure, "keeping massive nuclear arsenals far in excess of what we need is an accident waiting to happen," Kerrey said.

"We need a new nuclear policy to confront new nuclear dangers," Kerrey said, because nuclear weapons represent the "one big threat left [from the Cold War] and we are not paying enough attention to it." Terrorism, drug trafficking and political instability "are pale worries in comparison to the number of Americans who would die if just one of Russia's nuclear weapons were to be launched at the United States," he said.

In a speech scheduled to be delivered today before the Council on Foreign Relations in New York City, Kerrey says he will seek repeal of a congressional ban on reducing U.S. warheads below the 6,000 level set by the START I arms reduction accord before the Russian Duma approves START II. The United States is currently waiting for the Russian Duma to approve START II before continuing further with traditional arms negotiations.

The Clinton administration has been quietly exploring in an interagency group various proposals involving de-alerting forces and reducing warhead numbers and may include the ideas in next January's State of the Union message. Kerrey's proposal would reduce today's roughly 6,000 U.S. warheads deployed on strategic missiles to "no more than" the proposed START III amounts of 2,000 to 2,500 warheads, and would immediately take all missiles above that level off of hair-trigger alert by removing their warheads. He wants Clinton to "seriously explore" negotiating with Moscow "standing down all forces from hair-trigger alert."

Kerry also called for sharply increased funding for the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program that helps fund Russian dismantling of nuclear weapons and securing of their fissionable materials.

"A bold gesture of friendship and leadership that does not threaten our security would give Russia the confidence to significantly reduce her own nuclear arsenal," Kerrey said. As a precedent, he pointed to President George Bush's decision in 1991 to order the unilateral elimination of thousands of tactical nuclear weapons, deactivation of 450 ICBMs and the standing down of the strategic bomber fleet, many of which were on 15-minute alert.

Copyright 1998 The Washington Post Company



To: btiller@psr.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Response to Grey on de-alerting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Bob and Alistair:

As part of a longer communication to President Clinton (through Sandy Berger), I said the following regarding Grey's statement at the UN on de-alerting.

This is an astounding statement. On two counts it reverses the truth.

First, it's not wholesale de-alerting that is unverifiable, but rather it is de-targeting that you have touted in your speeches. Moreover, de-targeting is secretly reversible in a few seconds.

Wholesale de-alerting would consist of removing warheads from delivery vehicles and storing them separately at a considerable distance. This course of action has been recommended by such eminent military authorities as Admiral Noel Gayler, Admiral Stansfield Turner, and General Lee Butler, by the Canberra Commission and other study bodies, and by such civilian experts as Bruce Blair, Frank von Hippel, and Arjun Makijani. This approach to wholesale de-alerting is highly verifiable.

It is the halfway (or quarter-way) measures of de-alerting that may raise a verification concern. For example, temporarily disabling missiles on submarines at sea with relatively short time required for re-arming. Thus, for de-alerting boldness is far superior to timidity.

Second, it's not wholesale adoption of de-alerting measures that could cause instability. Rather the present posture of hair-trigger alert is inherently unstable. Although we have lucked out so far, we perpetually run the risk of accidental or unauthorized launchings. This combines with steady deterioration of the Russian early warning system that could lead to misjudgment and disastrous responses (as it almost occurred in January 1995 with the Norwegian missile). The situation of uncertainty is compounded by the unpredictability of the Y2K computer problem. Wholesale de-alerting would produce a vast increase of stability.

The analogy of August 1914 mobilization must have been written by a nuclear deterrence theorist who ran out of other arguments. It's another in a long history of deductive and sometimes circular reasoning, derived from fallacious hypotheses, untested by pragmatic observation and reasoning, leading to false conclusions.

Therefore, I urge you to cut away from the theorists and listen to the numerous practical military leaders and civilian authorities who advocate de-alerting and who have developed practical ideas on how de-alerting can be achieved.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 17 Nov 1998 12:31:51 -0800 (PST)  
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Kerrey's speech  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

To : Abolitionists all over  
From: Bruce Hall  
Date: November 17, 1998  
Re : The speech

Hey,

There's something in this speech for everyone (the Republicans, the military, and weapons contractors) which means parts of it might make you wretch violently. However, there is an excellent and chilling description of what a single nuclear warhead could do to a city like Chicago, and some very good points about the need to drastically reduce our arsenal as "low as the Russians are willing to go." This speech, with its gesture of cooperation toward the Republicans, along with new rumblings from the Russian дума about START II ratification indicate that we could see real movement on the nuclear front in 1999. Roll up the sleeves!

Bruce

"Toward A New Nuclear Policy: Reducing The Threat To American Lives"

Senator Bob Kerrey (D-NE)

Prepared Text -- Speech to the Council on Foreign Relations

November 17, 1998

Good afternoon. At the beginning of this talk let me say I am grateful for this opportunity to speak to you today and hope that at the conclusion of my remarks you will feel some gratitude as well. Either for my coming or my departure. It is an honor for me to be introduced by Warren Rudman, with whom I had the great honor of serving. Two other former colleagues, Jim Exon and Sam Nunn, have been instrumental in helping me learn more about, and keeping America safe from, nuclear dangers. They have my thanks as well. Special thanks are also in order for other members of the Council on Foreign Relations, especially my friend Skip Stein, who helped organize this lunch. Michael Krepon of the Henry L. Stimson Center in Washington has been generous with both his time and his creativity on the topic I will address today, as has Bruce Blair of the Brookings Institution and many others.

The most important business of the Federal government must be to keep the people of the United States of America safe. The President

and Congress have the responsibility of assessing the threats to our country and designing an appropriate response to minimize them.

At the dawn of our Republic the thirty- nine men who drafted our Constitution defined this objective as "providing for the common defense." They envisioned this purpose as little more than defending our territory against outside invaders. Over time, as our nation has grown, this mission has grown. We have learned from bitter experience that our interests extend beyond our borders. We have learned that diplomacy backed by a credible military force can prevent wars from happening. We have learned that good intelligence can help us build and direct that force so that threats are accurately assessed.

In these times, devastatingly hovering over mankind are three weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological. They have the dynamics of plunging the world suddenly in an unimaginable war aimed more at civilians than military casualties.

A commission created by my colleague, Arlen Specter, is engaged in an in-depth study of this three fold threat. It is headed by chairman John Deutch and its report is expected shortly. I hope we have learned the importance and value of a credible military force -- but I do not assume it.

The history of this century should keep us vigilant against the tendency to want to disarm. We disarmed and came home after the Great War, the war to end all wars. We responded to the military actions of Japan and Germany with words which were not enough to prevent 50 million people from dying in the Second World War. Little remembered is this fact: After the second world war we slashed our defense budgets again. We withdrew our forces from Europe and Asia. And though it is an open question as to what might have happened to Eastern Europe had a credible military force faced the Soviet Union or a credible force been close to the Korean peninsula, there can be no doubt it would have had a deterrent impact on the decisions made by Soviet and North Korean leaders. They did not believe we would respond and so they acted.

Today the United States of America is the most important arbiter of world peace. The measure of our success can be seen around the world. More people are living in free and democratic nations than ever before. The cold war is over. Today, when the word "Russia" is spoken, we think of economic problems and not espionage or proxy wars or nuclear weapons. The global economy -- frustrating, confusing and challenging -- is making us more interdependent and reducing the old territorial and military tensions between nation-states. But please observe: It is the threat of conventional force deployment which produced the Dayton Accords and the agreement in Kosovo and, hopefully, Iraq's compliance with United Nations Resolutions.

Still, threats remain. Not only do they remain, but the nature of the threat has changed radically from what it was as recently

as 10 years ago. Because of that, there is a clear and present need for constant re-examination of policies to ensure we are not using yesterday's strategy and/or force structure on today's and tomorrow's threats. Never before has thinking outside the old box that confined our plans been so important.

That is my purpose here today: To step outside of the old way of meeting the one threat with the potential of killing every single American: nuclear weapons. I begin by describing that threat. Consider this scenario, which could unfold by sundown today:

A peaceful scientific rocket is launched off the coast of Norway. To the east, in Russia, radar operators mistake the launch for a nuclear attack by the West. A deadly process -- nearly on auto-pilot -- is triggered. Within minutes President Yeltsin has been alerted of the attack. For the first time in history, the Russian nuclear briefcase is activated. With thousands of nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert around the world, commanders tell Yeltsin he has just minutes -- three minutes, five at most -- to decide whether to launch a retaliatory strike against American cities. Like a raft on a raging river, Yeltsin is being carried away by events. Literally minutes before a retaliatory strike is ordered, military commanders realize the rocket is peaceful. They had been given advance warning of the scientific launch. They had simply failed to pass it on to the duty officers who evaluate warning indicators.

In the chaos, though, it is too late: After a breakdown in discipline or communication within Russia's underpaid and poorly equipped command structure, one SS-25 missile with a 550-kiloton warhead has been launched at Chicago. The missile rockets north over the top of the world, across the arctic pole, and inside an hour detonates over Chicago within -- even on a bad day -- a few hundred yards of its intended target.

The surrounding air is instantaneously heated to 10 million degrees Celsius. The fireball shoots outward at a rate of a few hundred kilometers per second. A mushroom cloud dozens of miles across and high rips up from the explosion. Everything within miles of the detonation site is vaporized. In the immediate blast zone nearly everyone is killed. The radius of destruction reaches out for miles. Even in the farthest reaches of the blast zone, structures are severely damaged, thousands are dead, half are injured and most survivors have suffered second and third-degree burns.

If that sounds like a fantasy cooked up in a Hollywood studio, consider this: According to public reports, every event I have just described to you, right up until the actual launch of one missile, occurred on January 25, 1995, with the Soviet Union three years in the grave.

This scenario will probably not happen, but it most assuredly could. It is at least as plausible as any number of other threats that absorb the attention and rhetoric of our policy makers. And as

important as it is to mount a good defense against terrorism, narcotics traffickers, or political instability in the Middle East or Balkans, they are pale worries in comparison to the number of Americans who would die if just one of Russia's nuclear weapons were to be launched at the United States. Chinese weapons get more attention today, but it is Russia's, not China's, that are accurate and capable of being launched across an ocean and hitting a hard target.

The topic of this speech is reducing nuclear dangers. By the end of it, I intend to leave you with three ideas:

First, the several thousand nuclear warheads on Russian soil are the gravest, most imminent threat to the security of the United States.

Second, our old policies of arms control and deterrence no longer work and may be increasing the danger, both by making nuclear threats worse and by diverting money and resources away from the conventional forces that are the key to our safety in the post-Cold War world.

Third, we are confronted by both an urgent danger and an urgent opportunity. The danger is obvious; the opportunity is not. The opportunity is a window of time during which we can significantly reduce the danger nuclear weapons pose to American lives. But this window is closing. We must act now, and we must act boldly.

I call this nuclear threat to your attention with such an urgent tone because I fear that Americans, amidst our well earned joy in the victory of freedom in the Cold War, have been lulled into a false sense of security about it. What America needs from its leaders today is not a lullaby, but a wake-up call. I am not here to tell you to cast off old suspicions, but to replace them with new ones, suspicions in many ways graver than the old ones and less curable by the incentives for rational behavior on which our strategy of deterrence has historically relied. We need a new nuclear policy to confront new nuclear dangers.

What are these new nuclear dangers?

I see four scenarios in which nuclear weapons threaten American lives. First is an authorized launch, which is to say a deliberate attack by Russia on the United States. Even in the unlikely event of a throwback totalitarian regime in Russia, there is little reason to fear such an attack. Second is the acquisition of weapons in the Russian arsenal by rogue groups or individuals, whether they be terrorist states or their clients or simply a disgruntled Russian soldier. Third is an accidental launch, like the one I just described, based on technological error or miscalculation. Fourth is another country acquiring nuclear weapons, either through proliferation or their own nuclear program.

Today we must deal with nuclear threats differently. The policy of Mutual Assured Destruction, or deterrence, protected us from the

old threat -- deliberate attack. But it does not protect us from these new ones. In fact, I will argue, it makes them worse.

The underlying assumption of deterrence is rational behavior on the other side. None of these potential new nuclear powers -- whether they be terrorist groups or rogue states or desperate individuals -- can be counted on to respond rationally to the threat of retaliation.

In addition, leaving nuclear missiles on hair-trigger alert is a recipe for miscalculation caused by events controlling leaders rather than leaders controlling events. In the case I mentioned to you earlier, President Yeltsin had a matter of minutes to react. The combination of hair-trigger alert, deadly weapons and the potential for human or technological error is a combustible mixture with lethal consequences.

The threats either of proliferation or the seizure of nuclear materials by criminals inside Russia are real. Russia's economy is failing, creating an economic incentive to proliferate. The physical and human infrastructure responsible for safeguarding her nuclear arsenal are in dangerous disrepair.

You do not need the warnings of a senator responsible for oversight of our highly secret intelligence community to know this threat exists. According to the Los Angeles Times, last month a 19-year-old Russian sailor killed eight crewmen on his nuclear submarine near Murmansk, seized control of the sub and held it for 20 hours. Said one former Russian Navy captain: "It is really scary that one day the use of nuclear arms may depend on the sentiments of someone who is feeling blue, who has gotten out of bed on the wrong side and does not feel like living. The probability of this today is higher than ever before."

Mutual Assured Destruction is no deterrent to such problems, and the massive, redundant arsenals this policy has produced may be making them worse. Our maintenance of a nuclear arsenal larger than we need provokes Russia to maintain one larger than she can control. In the wake of these kinds of threats, from proliferation to loose weapons, keeping massive nuclear arsenals far in excess of what we need is an accident waiting to happen. Every weapon we maintain that we do not need to defend ourselves provokes the Russians to maintain another to match it. This is a simple mathematical proposition: If what we most fear is a mistake, rather than a deliberate attack, the probability of that threat grows with every weapon in the arsenal of either side. In this environment, every nuclear weapon in those arsenals is like another round loaded into the chamber in what is a literal and deadly game of Russian roulette.

Nor can the United States ignore the power of our example in influencing others' behavior. Our heavy reliance on these weapons ... despite the vastly diminished threat they were created to deter ... has helped make nuclear arms the Rolex wristwatch of

international relations: a costly purchase whose real purpose is not the service it provides, but the prestige it confers. It was status, not just security, that the one billion citizens of India sought in electing a government that had made clear its intention to make their nation a nuclear power. It is nationalism, not just national security, that has hogtied START TWO in the Russian Duma.

And, finally, the passing of Cold War threats has given rise to new ones, ranging from ethnic or regional conflict to international terrorism. The \$25 billion we reportedly spend every year to maintain our nuclear arsenal is diverting resources from those real and imminent threats to fight an old one. If America is to be engaged in the world today, it will be with the threat or use of conventional, not nuclear, force. Maintaining massive nuclear forces while trimming the conventional forces that are the real tool of American leadership is an act of retrenchment at a time when the world desperately needs our engagement.

By alerting you to these dangers, I do not mean to disparage the extraordinary Russian experiment with democracy. Russia's progress, economic and political, must be measured in decades, not years. The courageous pro democracy leaders there are navigating a complex obstacle course of domestic politics, international diplomacy and, most important, the friction between new ideas and the old.

Indeed, I underscore our friendship with Russia to suggest that history presents no better time than right now to reduce nuclear danger. But that opportunity comes with this warning: At the dawn of the millennium, history travels in high gear at high speed. The rapid pace of change within Russia and around the world will not shift into neutral while we debate whether to seize this opportunity. I expect our friendship with Russia to endure. I expect their experiment with democracy to succeed. But the road to that destination will take us around a few curves, into a few potholes and over a few speed bumps. We know what our relationship with Russia is like today. We can predict, but cannot know, what it will be in a year, or two, or five, or 10. We do not know whether the circumstances for reducing nuclear dangers will be as favorable then as they are now, and therefore it is incumbent on us to act boldly and to act swiftly. History will judge us harshly if we ignore this opportunity when it is open to us.

The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, or START, process has taken us in the right direction. It has marked a steady series of steps back from the brink of nuclear conflagration. But even after START ONE is fully implemented and six thousand warheads are left, the walk back to that brink would be a short trip. More important, I fear the pace of change in Russia could overtake us and the opportunity before us could close before the START process has time to run its lengthy course. This process takes so long because its safeguards were erected under a cloud of fear of a first strike by a Cold War enemy. The result is a cumbersome treaty, more than 250 pages long, that makes the journey back from the brink long, laborious and expensive.

Today our open friendship with Russia and the technology of intelligence allow us to move more swiftly. We need a new nuclear policy that protects us from new nuclear dangers, and we need a new framework for enacting it that moves at the pace of world change and can seize this opportunity before it is gone.

To that end I am proposing the following:

First, the President of the United States should work with Congress to remove legislative restraints on reducing deployed strategic U.S. forces below the START ONE level of 6,000 warheads. This deployed arsenal no longer serves our national security interests, and it is provoking Russia to maintain an arsenal that undermines our national security interests.

Simultaneous with this request, the president should agree with Republican leadership to build a defined, rigorously tested strategic missile defense. He should make clear to Russia's leaders we would build it for accidental and rouge nation threats.

The president should couple this request with a request for such funds as necessary to make certain Russia knows that Nunn-Lugar will be fully funded to go to START THREE levels.

Second, acting in his capacity as Commander in Chief and in an act of international leadership, the President should immediately order the reduction of American nuclear forces to no more than the proposed START THREE levels. The two thousand to twenty-five-hundred nuclear warheads that would remain are more than enough -- many, many times over -- to destroy any nation, any where, any time, that threatens us. And the diversity of our triad -- nuclear weapons on air, land and sea -- protects us against the risk of a first strike destroying our capacity to retaliate. If we can reduce farther without endangering our security, we should.

Third, because the complete and verifiable dismantling of those weapons will take time, the President should immediately stand down weapons in excess of START THREE levels from their hair-trigger alert. Warheads should be physically separated from delivery vehicles. Our national security will not be endangered by leaders having two days, rather than two minutes, to make life-and-death decisions about nuclear war. While this proposal would apply only to warheads in excess of START THREE levels, we should seriously explore the possibility of the United States and Russia standing down all forces from hair-trigger alert.

Fourth, this reciprocal reduction to START THREE levels should be only a way station, not an end point. We should continue to supplement the START process with a series of mutual, transparent and reciprocal steps between the United States and Russia to reduce nuclear arsenals and alert levels. We should be willing to go as low as Russia wants to go, as low as we can verify they are going, and as low as we can go without risking our security either from

Russia or other nuclear powers.

To enable this process of mutual, transparent steps, we should greatly expand funding for the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program. We should spend whatever is necessary to help Russia dismantle and secure her nuclear arsenal. Nunn-Lugar is one of the great acts of post-Cold War statesmanship, and it defies understanding that we are engaged in a year-to-year battle to fund it. If we can spend \$25 billion a year on a nuclear policy that is making people less safe, surely we can spend a fraction of that on an investment that is making us more safe.

There is precedent for action like I have described. On September 27, 1991, with the Soviet Union still intact and before the Soviet parliament ratified START ONE, President Bush went on national television to announce he was ordering the elimination of thousands of tactical nuclear weapons, deactivating 450 ICBMs, standing down our bomber fleet, and ordering a stop to Pentagon development of a short-range ballistic missile. President Gorbachev reciprocated nine days later. Likewise President Clinton showed courageous leadership by first unilaterally rescinding our nuclear testing, and, second, by providing the leadership that culminated in the signing of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty at the United Nations. I will urge the Republican Senate leadership to bring that treaty up for Senate approval as soon as possible. Today it is clear Russia not only wants to follow our lead, but must. Russia's own defense minister recently said, publicly, that Russia is thinking of its long-term nuclear arsenal in terms of hundreds, not thousands. Our action would give Russia the confidence to do what the unbearable cost of maintaining nuclear arsenals already dictates that she must do.

The approach I have outlined would have the following benefits.

First, a bold gesture of friendship and leadership that does not threaten our security would give Russia the confidence to significantly reduce her own nuclear arsenal, strengthen the position of our pro-democracy friends there and send a signal to the world that nuclear weapons are a sign of peril, not prestige, in the post-Cold War era.

Second, by reducing the number of nuclear weapons around the world, we would reduce the new nuclear dangers of accidental launch, proliferation or acquisition by rogue groups or individuals.

Third, by de-alerting weapons in excess of what we need to defend ourselves -- and perhaps the rest of the world's arsenals -- we would reduce the new nuclear danger of total war being dictated by a time-line that prevents rational deliberation.

Fourth, our reduction of our own stockpile would free money and resources to confront other, newer, threats, from regional war to ethnic conflict to international terrorism. We would, quite simply, be getting more safety for less money. This last point is crucial.

The \$25 billion a year it is estimated we spend maintaining our nuclear arsenal adds far less value to the safety of Americans today than \$25 billion spent on our Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps and the intelligence gathering that support these and other pillars of our national security infrastructure.

No President can take such bold action without domestic support. Our ability to forge a new nuclear policy for the post-Cold War era hinges on our ability to thaw the Cold War between those on opposite sides of the ideological divide in our own country. We must realize that we share a common goal: reducing nuclear dangers. I am eager to build partnerships that seize on that common ground while reducing ideological differences. If, for example, some of my Republican colleagues will support me in seeking steep cuts in nuclear arsenals, I am open to working with them on the deployment of a defined, rigorously tested missile defense. Whether it be through this or other means, those with a common goal -- reducing nuclear dangers -- must find common ground. If we elevate imagination over ideology, we can do it.

Imagination seems like a good note on which to end this speech. I opened by telling you we need a new nuclear policy to confront new nuclear dangers. I close by telling you that to do it, we need something that isn't new at all. The same courage, creativity and leadership that won the Cold War are exactly the ingredients we need to keep our people safe in its aftermath. It is clear to me that our nuclear arsenal and the policies which controlled these weapons of mass destruction helped keep our safety and the world's peace for 40 years. It is equally clear that we need a new policy -- one which will seize an opportunity to make the world safer still. Thank you.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
X-Sender: aslater@gracelinks.org  
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3  
Date: Tue, 17 Nov 1998 16:18:05 -0500  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) ACTION ALERT-UN NAC resolution  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id NAA29837

Dear Friends,

As you may have read on this list, the vote on the UN resolution for a New Agenda for rapid nuclear disarmament was the first breach in the NATO coldwar wall. While the US lobbied furiously in all the NATO capitals, Canada (in a replay of its landmines role) lobbied against the US and all of the NATO nations (except for Turkey, UK and France) abstained on the vote instead of voting NO as the US requested! (Canada, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Greece, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Luxembourg, Iceland, Italy, Denmark) Also abstaining were Japan and Australia. The final vote was 97 yes, 19 no, and 32 abstentions. The Resolution was voted on in the UN's First Committee which deals with disarmament issues and will be voted on by the full General Assembly, probably the first week in December. Listed below is the disgraceful US speech explaining its vote against the resolution.

**WRITE A LETTER TO PRESIDENT CLINTON ASKING HIM TO CHANGE THE US VOTE FROM NO TO YES!**

**TELL HIM THAT NUCLEAR ABOLITION'S TIME HAS COME AND WE CAN NO LONGER HOLD ON TO OUR OLD COLDWAR POLICIES AND EXPECT THAT OTHER COUNTRIES WILL NOT ALSO WANT TO JOIN THE NUCLEAR CLUB**

If you have international contacts ask them to write their governments: in the countries which abstained, to change their vote to YES; in the countries which voted YES, to thank them; in countries which were absent, to vote YES in the General Assembly vote. (the full voting list will be posted later)

Explanation of Vote on L.48

**BEFORE THE VOTE**

**Towards a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World: The Need for a New Agenda**

Mr. Chairman,

Since the United States has already spoken at some length on the reasons for its opposition to L.48, I will be brief. We have two major concerns:

--first, this resolution calls into question a fundamental doctrine of our defense and that of our allies and

--second, far from advancing the nuclear disarmament agenda, it will in all probability delay it.

Mr. Chairman,

As to the first point, the representative of one of the original sponsors could not have been clearer when, in response to the statement of our British colleague, he said that the resolution was intended to call into question the doctrine of deterrence.

This doctrine has stood in the United States and indeed, the world in good stead for the past half century. It has kept the peace and ended the Cold War. Along with our allies we reviewed it recently and concluded that it should remain the basis for our defense. Article 51 of the Charter gives us all the right to take measures for individual and collective self defense. My country will continue to exercise that right.

Beyond this, the sponsors of this resolution seem to believe that the doctrine of deterrence is a major obstacle to more rapid progress on nuclear disarmament and conversely that if only it were abandoned, the nuclear powers would disarm speedily. We disagree. Nuclear weapons and nuclear disarmament do not exist in a vacuum. The nuclear disarmament process can take place only in the context of national security interests; the dramatic progress we have made to date has been possible because of changes in the international security climate, even as it has contributed to the increased stability that make further progress possible.

The United States intends to continue to move towards greater security and stability at lower levels of weapons in a step-by-step process towards the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. But the security and stability would be empty concepts without nuclear deterrence. Let me be clear: you will not make nuclear disarmament occur faster by suggesting that a fundamental basis of our national security for more than fifty years is illegitimate.

Mr. Chairman,

As to the second point, we have already noted that far from a new agenda this resolution contains a mix of items already on the arms control/disarmament agenda; proposals of which de-alerting is one we have already considered and rejected; and suggestions such as the call for a nuclear disarmament conference that will lead nowhere. Indeed, if the purpose of this resolution is to speed the nuclear disarmament process, it can only be counter-productive.

--By lecturing the nuclear weapons states about their inadequacies, while neglecting to criticize the actions of states that have conducted recent nuclear weapons tests and have thereby damaged the global non-proliferation regime, the resolution will hardly encourage the entry into force of the CTBT or START II. Instead, it will only give aid and comfort to those who are skeptical about multilateral arms control and disarmament.

--By seeming to require a new commitment to nuclear disarmament as a

prerequisite to further steps to reduce nuclear weapons, it will only provide an excuse for delay.

--Finally, by proclaiming the need for a new agenda and for still another conference on nuclear disarmament, it calls into question the agendas on which the international community already agrees, such as the "Principles and Objectives for Disarmament and Non-Proliferation" and tends to undermine existing forums, such as the CD, the enhanced NPT review process, and the First Committee and other UN disarmament machinery, including a possible SSOD-IV. We do not understand how this would promote speedier progress on disarmament.

Mr. Chairman,

This resolution is still another example of "feel good" arms control. The proponents may believe they will accomplish something, but the resolution destroys no weapons, prevents no proliferation and makes the world no safer. My delegation hopes that many of our friends and allies decide they can not support this unnecessary and potentially harmful resolution. The United States for its part will continue to pursue meaningful measures to reduce and eliminate weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems, as well as preventing the proliferation of such weapons.

Alice Slater  
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment (GRACE)  
15 East 26th Street, Room 915  
New York, NY 10010  
tel: (212) 726-9161  
fax: (212) 726-9160  
email: [aslater@gracelinks.org](mailto:aslater@gracelinks.org)

GRACE is a member of Abolition 2000, a global network working for a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons.

-

To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "[majordomo@xmission.com](mailto: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: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Wed, 18 Nov 1998 12:48:39 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Missing Check  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Dorothy Belz of Foundry just called me to advise that her check for \$25 written on June 5 has never cleared. Would you please check nooks and crannies on your desk?

Perhaps shortly after June 5 you noted that Dorothy had made a membership contribution thereby keeping her current. If so, that would suggest that we had the check at one time. Otherwise it might have been lost in the mail or at Foundry.

Please let me know what you find.

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Wed, 18 Nov 1998 15:13:26 -0500  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: NEWS & ACTION ALERT,  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

Senator Kerrey (D-NE) Calls for Unilateral Reductions & De-Alerting

Dear Nuclear Disarmament Advocates:

ENCLOSED IN THIS E-MAIL:

- 1) NEWS ALERT - SEN. KERREY (D-NE) CALLS FOR UNILATERAL REDUCTIONS & DE-ALERTING
- 2) ACTION ALERT - WHAT YOU CAN DO TO ENCOURAGE PROGRESS
- 3) WASH. POST ARTICLE ON KERREY'S CALL
- 4) KERREY'S SPEECH TO THE COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

#### NEWS ALERT

In a speech yesterday in front of the Council on Foreign Relations, Nebraska Senator Bob Kerrey (D-NE) called upon President Clinton to take unilateral measures to reduce the U.S. nuclear arsenal and remove nuclear weapons from hair-trigger alert.

Many thanks to Bruce Hall at Peace Action for posting the speech and the Washington Post Article.

Bruce notes that:

"There's something in this speech for everyone (the Republicans, the military, and weapons contractors) which means parts of it might make you wretch violently. However, there is an excellent and chilling description of what a single nuclear warhead could do to a city like Chicago, and some very good points about the need to drastically reduce our arsenal as "low as the Russians are willing to go." This speech, with its gesture of cooperation toward the Republicans, along with new rumblings from the Russian duma about START II ratification indicate that we could see real movement on the nuclear front in 1999. \*Roll up the sleeves!\*"

\*\*\*\*\*

#### ACTION ALERT

- 1) Send a letter of encouragement to Senator Kerrey. Since he is considering running for President, he should be interested in hearing even from "non-constituents" outside of Nebraska. (I urge you to emphasize the positive elements of the speech on unilateral reductions and de-alerting)

Address: The Honorable Robert Kerrey (D-NE)  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, DC 20515

Phone: 202 224 6551  
Fax: 202 224 7645

\*\*\*\*\*

SAMPLE LETTER:

Dear Senator Kerrey:

[I, your organization] was pleased to hear about your recent speech to the Council on Foreign Relations calling upon President Clinton to order immediate unilateral reductions in U.S. strategic nuclear forces, and to take nuclear weapons off of hair-trigger alert. [Your organization/ I] strongly support these measures as significant steps away from the threat of nuclear weapons, and also as steps toward the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

[Your organization/ I] encourage you to continue to work with your Senate colleagues, and President Clinton on both de- alerting and immediate reductions of strategic nuclear forces. These measures will significantly enhance the security of Americans and citizens worldwide.

(For information and assistance with your letters, contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse)

\*\*\*\*\*

2) Learn more about De-alerting, and What You Can Do to inform your Senators, Members of Congress and work with the media by ordering your De-Alerting Resource and Action Kit. Contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

\*\*\*\*\*

3) Stay tuned for additional actions that will build momentum for de-alerting, and additional unilateral measures to reduce nuclear arsenals. (Keep your fingers crossed/ pray that the Russian Duma does in fact ratify START II in December)

\*\*\*\*\*

Kerrey: U.S. Should Cut Nuclear Arms  
Unilaterally

By Walter Pincus  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Tuesday, November 17, 1998; Page A13

Sen. Bob Kerrey (D-Neb.) today plans to call on President Clinton to order immediate unilateral reductions in U.S. strategic nuclear forces and to remove the hair trigger from many of those that remain.

The \$25 billion now spent to maintain the current U.S. nuclear arsenal "is diverting resources from real and imminent threats," Kerrey said, suggesting reduction of the stockpile "would free money and resources to confront other, newer, threats from regional war to ethnic conflict to international terrorism."

The Nebraska Democrat, who said yesterday in an interview that he

expects to make a decision by December on whether to run for the presidency in 2000, also said that "our maintenance of a nuclear arsenal larger than we need provokes Russia to maintain one larger than she can control." With Russia short of funds to keep its weapons secure, "keeping massive nuclear arsenals far in excess of what we need is an accident waiting to happen," Kerrey said.

"We need a new nuclear policy to confront new nuclear dangers," Kerrey said, because nuclear weapons represent the "one big threat left [from the Cold War] and we are not paying enough attention to it." Terrorism, drug trafficking and political instability "are pale worries in comparison to the number of Americans who would die if just one of Russia's nuclear weapons were to be launched at the United States," he said.

In a speech scheduled to be delivered today before the Council on Foreign Relations in New York City, Kerrey says he will seek repeal of a congressional ban on reducing U.S. warheads below the 6,000 level set by the START I arms reduction accord before the Russian Duma approves START II. The United States is currently waiting for the Russian Duma to approve START II before continuing further with traditional arms negotiations.

The Clinton administration has been quietly exploring in an interagency group various proposals involving de-alerting forces and reducing warhead numbers and may include the ideas in next January's State of the Union message. Kerrey's proposal would reduce today's roughly 6,000 U.S. warheads deployed on strategic missiles to "no more than" the proposed START III amounts of 2,000 to 2,500 warheads, and would immediately take all missiles above that level off of hair-trigger alert by removing their warheads. He wants Clinton to "seriously explore" negotiating with Moscow "standing down all forces from hair-trigger alert."

Kerry also called for sharply increased funding for the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program that helps fund Russian dismantling of nuclear weapons and securing of their fissionable materials.

"A bold gesture of friendship and leadership that does not threaten our security would give Russia the confidence to significantly reduce her own nuclear arsenal," Kerrey said. As a precedent, he pointed to President George Bush's decision in 1991 to order the unilateral elimination of thousands of tactical nuclear weapons, deactivation of 450 ICBMs and the standing down of the strategic bomber fleet, many of which were on 15-minute alert.

Copyright 1998 The Washington Post Company

\*\*\*\*\*

"Toward A New Nuclear Policy: Reducing The Threat To American Lives"

Senator Bob Kerrey (D-NE)

Prepared Text -- Speech to the Council on Foreign Relations

November 17, 1998

Good afternoon. At the beginning of this talk let me say I am grateful for this opportunity to speak to you today and hope that at the conclusion of my remarks you will feel some gratitude as well. Either for my coming or my departure. It is an honor for me to be introduced by Warren Rudman, with whom I had the great honor of serving. Two other former colleagues, Jim Exon and Sam Nunn, have been instrumental in helping me learn more about, and keeping America safe from, nuclear dangers. They have my thanks as well. Special thanks are also in order for other members of the Council on Foreign Relations, especially my friend Skip Stein, who helped organize this lunch. Michael Krepon of the Henry L. Stimson Center in Washington has been generous with both his time and his creativity on the topic I will address today, as has Bruce Blair of the Brookings Institution and many others.

The most important business of the Federal government must be to keep the people of the United States of America safe. The President and Congress have the responsibility of assessing the threats to our country and designing an appropriate response to minimize them.

At the dawn of our Republic the thirty-nine men who drafted our Constitution defined this objective as "providing for the common defense." They envisioned this purpose as little more than defending our territory against outside invaders. Over time, as our nation has grown, this mission has grown. We have learned from bitter experience that our interests extend beyond our borders. We have learned that diplomacy backed by a credible military force can prevent wars from happening. We have learned that good intelligence can help us build and direct that force so that threats are accurately assessed.

In these times, devastatingly hovering over mankind are three weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological. They have the dynamics of plunging the world suddenly in an unimaginable war aimed more at civilians than military casualties.

A commission created by my colleague, Arlen Specter, is engaged in an in-depth study of this three fold threat. It is headed by chairman John Deutch and its report is expected shortly. I hope we have learned the importance and value of a credible military force -- but I do not assume it.

The history of this century should keep us vigilant against the tendency to want to disarm. We disarmed and came home after the Great War, the war to end all wars. We responded to the military actions of Japan and Germany with words which were not enough to prevent 50 million people from dying in the Second World War. Little remembered is this fact: After the second world war we

slashed our defense budgets again. We withdrew our forces from Europe and Asia. And though it is an open question as to what might have happened to Eastern Europe had a credible military force faced the Soviet Union or a credible force been close to the Korean peninsula, there can be no doubt it would have had a deterrent impact on the decisions made by Soviet and North Korean leaders. They did not believe we would respond and so they acted.

Today the United States of America is the most important arbiter of world peace. The measure of our success can be seen around the world. More people are living in free and democratic nations than ever before. The cold war is over. Today, when the word "Russia" is spoken, we think of economic problems and not espionage or proxy wars or nuclear weapons. The global economy -- frustrating, confusing and challenging -- is making us more interdependent and reducing the old territorial and military tensions between nation-states. But please observe: It is the threat of conventional force deployment which produced the Dayton Accords and the agreement in Kosovo and, hopefully, Iraq's compliance with United Nations Resolutions.

Still, threats remain. Not only do they remain, but the nature of the threat has changed radically from what it was as recently as 10 years ago. Because of that, there is a clear and present need for constant re-examination of policies to ensure we are not using yesterday's strategy and/or force structure on today's and tomorrow's threats. Never before has thinking outside the old box that confined our plans been so important.

That is my purpose here today: To step outside of the old way of meeting the one threat with the potential of killing every single American: nuclear weapons. I begin by describing that threat. Consider this scenario, which could unfold by sundown today:

A peaceful scientific rocket is launched off the coast of Norway. To the east, in Russia, radar operators mistake the launch for a nuclear attack by the West. A deadly process -- nearly on auto-pilot -- is triggered. Within minutes President Yeltsin has been alerted of the attack. For the first time in history, the Russian nuclear briefcase is activated. With thousands of nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert around the world, commanders tell Yeltsin he has just minutes -- three minutes, five at most -- to decide whether to launch a retaliatory strike against American cities. Like a raft on a raging river, Yeltsin is being carried away by events. Literally minutes before a retaliatory strike is ordered, military commanders realize the rocket is peaceful. They had been given advance warning of the scientific launch. They had simply failed to pass it on to the duty officers who evaluate warning indicators.

In the chaos, though, it is too late: After a breakdown in discipline or communication within Russia's underpaid and poorly equipped command structure, one SS-25 missile with a 550-kiloton warhead has been launched at Chicago. The missile rockets north

over the top of the world, across the arctic pole, and inside an hour detonates over Chicago within -- even on a bad day -- a few hundred yards of its intended target.

The surrounding air is instantaneously heated to 10 million degrees Celsius. The fireball shoots outward at a rate of a few hundred kilometers per second. A mushroom cloud dozens of miles across and high rips up from the explosion. Everything within miles of the detonation site is vaporized. In the immediate blast zone nearly everyone is killed. The radius of destruction reaches out for miles. Even in the farthest reaches of the blast zone, structures are severely damaged, thousands are dead, half are injured and most survivors have suffered second and third-degree burns.

If that sounds like a fantasy cooked up in a Hollywood studio, consider this: According to public reports, every event I have just described to you, right up until the actual launch of one missile, occurred on January 25, 1995, with the Soviet Union three years in the grave.

This scenario will probably not happen, but it most assuredly could. It is at least as plausible as any number of other threats that absorb the attention and rhetoric of our policy makers. And as important as it is to mount a good defense against terrorism, narcotics traffickers, or political instability in the Middle East or Balkans, they are pale worries in comparison to the number of Americans who would die if just one of Russia's nuclear weapons were to be launched at the United States. Chinese weapons get more attention today, but it is Russia's, not China's, that are accurate and capable of being launched across an ocean and hitting a hard target.

The topic of this speech is reducing nuclear dangers. By the end of it, I intend to leave you with three ideas:

First, the several thousand nuclear warheads on Russian soil are the gravest, most imminent threat to the security of the United States.

Second, our old policies of arms control and deterrence no longer work and may be increasing the danger, both by making nuclear threats worse and by diverting money and resources away from the conventional forces that are the key to our safety in the post-Cold War world.

Third, we are confronted by both an urgent danger and an urgent opportunity. The danger is obvious; the opportunity is not. The opportunity is a window of time during which we can significantly reduce the danger nuclear weapons pose to American lives. But this window is closing. We must act now, and we must act boldly.

I call this nuclear threat to your attention with such an urgent tone because I fear that Americans, amidst our well earned joy in the victory of freedom in the Cold War, have been lulled into a false sense of security about it. What America needs from its leaders today is not a lullaby, but a wake-up call. I am not here to tell you to cast off old suspicions, but to replace them with

new ones, suspicions in many ways graver than the old ones and less curable by the incentives for rational behavior on which our strategy of deterrence has historically relied. We need a new nuclear policy to confront new nuclear dangers.

What are these new nuclear dangers?

I see four scenarios in which nuclear weapons threaten American lives. First is an authorized launch, which is to say a deliberate attack by Russia on the United States. Even in the unlikely event of a throwback totalitarian regime in Russia, there is little reason to fear such an attack. Second is the acquisition of weapons in the Russian arsenal by rogue groups or individuals, whether they be terrorist states or their clients or simply a disgruntled Russian soldier. Third is an accidental launch, like the one I just described, based on technological error or miscalculation. Fourth is another country acquiring nuclear weapons, either through proliferation or their own nuclear program.

Today we must deal with nuclear threats differently. The policy of Mutual Assured Destruction, or deterrence, protected us from the old threat -- deliberate attack. But it does not protect us from these new ones. In fact, I will argue, it makes them worse.

The underlying assumption of deterrence is rational behavior on the other side. None of these potential new nuclear powers -- whether they be terrorist groups or rogue states or desperate individuals -- can be counted on to respond rationally to the threat of retaliation.

In addition, leaving nuclear missiles on hair-trigger alert is a recipe for miscalculation caused by events controlling leaders rather than leaders controlling events. In the case I mentioned to you earlier, President Yeltsin had a matter of minutes to react. The combination of hair-trigger alert, deadly weapons and the potential for human or technological error is a combustible mixture with lethal consequences.

The threats either of proliferation or the seizure of nuclear materials by criminals inside Russia are real. Russia's economy is failing, creating an economic incentive to proliferate. The physical and human infrastructure responsible for safeguarding her nuclear arsenal are in dangerous disrepair.

You do not need the warnings of a senator responsible for oversight of our highly secret intelligence community to know this threat exists. According to the Los Angeles Times, last month a 19-year-old Russian sailor killed eight crewmen on his nuclear submarine near Murmansk, seized control of the sub and held it for 20 hours. Said one former Russian Navy captain: "It is really scary that one day the use of nuclear arms may depend on the sentiments of someone who is feeling blue, who has gotten out of bed on the wrong side and does not feel like living. The probability of this today is higher than ever before."

Mutual Assured Destruction is no deterrent to such problems, and the massive, redundant arsenals this policy has produced may be making them worse. Our maintenance of a nuclear arsenal larger than we need provokes

Russia to maintain one larger than she can control. In the wake of these kinds of threats, from proliferation to loose weapons, keeping massive nuclear arsenals far in excess of what we need is an accident waiting to happen. Every weapon we maintain that we do not need to defend ourselves provokes the Russians to maintain another to match it. This is a simple mathematical proposition: If what we most fear is a mistake, rather than a deliberate attack, the probability of that threat grows with every weapon in the arsenal of either side. In this environment, every nuclear weapon in those arsenals is like another round loaded into the chamber in what is a literal and deadly game of Russian roulette.

Nor can the United States ignore the power of our example in influencing others' behavior. Our heavy reliance on these weapons ... despite the vastly diminished threat they were created to deter ... has helped make nuclear arms the Rolex wristwatch of international relations: a costly purchase whose real purpose is not the service it provides, but the prestige it confers. It was status, not just security, that the one billion citizens of India sought in electing a government that had made clear its intention to make their nation a nuclear power. It is nationalism, not just national security, that has hogtied START TWO in the Russian Duma.

And, finally, the passing of Cold War threats has given rise to new ones, ranging from ethnic or regional conflict to international terrorism. The \$25 billion we reportedly spend every year to maintain our nuclear arsenal is diverting resources from those real and imminent threats to fight an old one. If America is to be engaged in the world today, it will be with the threat or use of conventional, not nuclear, force. Maintaining massive nuclear forces while trimming the conventional forces that are the real tool of American leadership is an act of retrenchment at a time when the world desperately needs our engagement.

By alerting you to these dangers, I do not mean to disparage the extraordinary Russian experiment with democracy. Russia's progress, economic and political, must be measured in decades, not years. The courageous pro democracy leaders there are navigating a complex obstacle course of domestic politics, international diplomacy and, most important, the friction between new ideas and the old.

Indeed, I underscore our friendship with Russia to suggest that history presents no better time than right now to reduce nuclear danger. But that opportunity comes with this warning: At the dawn of the millennium, history travels in high gear at high speed. The rapid pace of change within Russia and around the world will not shift into neutral while we debate whether to seize this opportunity. I expect our friendship with Russia to endure. I expect their experiment with democracy to succeed. But the road to that destination will take us around a few curves, into a few potholes and over a few speed bumps. We know what our relationship with Russia is like today. We can predict, but cannot know, what it will be in a year, or two, or five, or 10. We do not know whether the circumstances for reducing nuclear dangers will be as favorable then as

they are now, and therefore it is incumbent on us to act boldly and to act swiftly. History will judge us harshly if we ignore this opportunity when it is open to us.

The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, or START, process has taken us in the right direction. It has marked a steady series of steps back from the brink of nuclear conflagration. But even after START ONE is fully implemented and six thousand warheads are left, the walk back to that brink would be a short trip. More important, I fear the pace of change in Russia could overtake us and the opportunity before us could close before the START process has time to run its lengthy course. This process takes so long because its safeguards were erected under a cloud of fear of a first strike by a Cold War enemy. The result is a cumbersome treaty, more than 250 pages long, that makes the journey back from the brink long, laborious and expensive.

Today our open friendship with Russia and the technology of intelligence allow us to move more swiftly. We need a new nuclear policy that protects us from new nuclear dangers, and we need a new framework for enacting it that moves at the pace of world change and can seize this opportunity before it is gone.

To that end I am proposing the following:

First, the President of the United States should work with Congress to remove legislative restraints on reducing deployed strategic U.S. forces below the START ONE level of 6,000 warheads. This deployed arsenal no longer serves our national security interests, and it is provoking Russia to maintain an arsenal that undermines our national security interests.

Simultaneous with this request, the president should agree with Republican leadership to build a defined, rigorously tested strategic missile defense. He should make clear to Russia's leaders we would build it for accidental and rouge nation threats.

The president should couple this request with a request for such funds as necessary to make certain Russia knows that Nunn-Lugar will be fully funded to go to START THREE levels.

Second, acting in his capacity as Commander in Chief and in an act of international leadership, the President should immediately order the reduction of American nuclear forces to no more than the proposed START THREE levels. The two thousand to twenty-five-hundred nuclear warheads that would remain are more than enough -- many, many times over -- to destroy any nation, any where, any time, that threatens us. And the diversity of our triad -- nuclear weapons on air, land and sea -- protects us against the risk of a first strike destroying our capacity to retaliate. If we can reduce farther without endangering our security, we should.

Third, because the complete and verifiable dismantling of those weapons will take time, the President should immediately stand down weapons in excess of START THREE levels from their hair-trigger alert.

Warheads should be physically separated from delivery vehicles. Our national security will not be endangered by leaders having two days, rather than two minutes, to make life-and-death decisions about nuclear war. While this proposal would apply only to warheads in excess of START THREE levels, we should seriously explore the possibility of the United States and Russia standing down all forces from hair-trigger alert.

Fourth, this reciprocal reduction to START THREE levels should be only a way station, not an end point. We should continue to supplement the START process with a series of mutual, transparent and reciprocal steps between the United States and Russia to reduce nuclear arsenals and alert levels. We should be willing to go as low as Russia wants to go, as low as we can verify they are going, and as low as we can go without risking our security either from Russia or other nuclear powers.

To enable this process of mutual, transparent steps, we should greatly expand funding for the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program. We should spend whatever is necessary to help Russia dismantle and secure her nuclear arsenal. Nunn-Lugar is one of the great acts of post-Cold War statesmanship, and it defies understanding that we are engaged in a year-to-year battle to fund it. If we can spend \$25 billion a year on a nuclear policy that is making people less safe, surely we can spend a fraction of that on an investment that is making us more safe.

There is precedent for action like I have described. On September 27, 1991, with the Soviet Union still intact and before the Soviet parliament ratified START ONE, President Bush went on national television to announce he was ordering the elimination of thousands of tactical nuclear weapons, deactivating 450 ICBMs, standing down our bomber fleet, and ordering a stop to Pentagon development of a short-range ballistic missile. President Gorbachev reciprocated nine days later. Likewise President Clinton showed courageous leadership by first unilaterally rescinding our nuclear testing, and, second, by providing the leadership that culminated in the signing of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty at the United Nations. I will urge the Republican Senate leadership to bring that treaty up for Senate approval as soon as possible. Today it is clear Russia not only wants to follow our lead, but must. Russia's own defense minister recently said, publicly, that Russia is thinking of its long-term nuclear arsenal in terms of hundreds, not thousands. Our action would give Russia the confidence to do what the unbearable cost of maintaining nuclear arsenals already dictates that she must do.

The approach I have outlined would have the following benefits.

First, a bold gesture of friendship and leadership that does not threaten our security would give Russia the confidence to significantly reduce her own nuclear arsenal, strengthen the position of our pro-democracy friends there and send a signal to the world that nuclear weapons are a sign of peril, not prestige, in the post-Cold War era.

Second, by reducing the number of nuclear weapons around the world, we would reduce the new nuclear dangers of accidental launch, proliferation or acquisition by rogue groups or individuals.

Third, by de-alerting weapons in excess of what we need to defend ourselves -- and perhaps the rest of the world's arsenals -- we would reduce the new nuclear danger of total war being dictated by a time-line that prevents rational deliberation.

Fourth, our reduction of our own stockpile would free money and resources to confront other, newer, threats, from regional war to ethnic conflict to international terrorism. We would, quite simply, be getting more safety for less money. This last point is crucial. The \$25 billion a year it is estimated we spend maintaining our nuclear arsenal adds far less value to the safety of Americans today than \$25 billion spent on our Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps and the intelligence gathering that support these and other pillars of our national security infrastructure.

No President can take such bold action without domestic support. Our ability to forge a new nuclear policy for the post-Cold War era hinges on our ability to thaw the Cold War between those on opposite sides of the ideological divide in our own country. We must realize that we share a common goal: reducing nuclear dangers.

I am eager to build partnerships that seize on that common ground while reducing ideological differences. If, for example, some of my Republican colleagues ill support me in seeking steep cuts in nuclear arsenals, I am open to working with them on the deployment of a defined, rigorously tested missile defense. Whether it be through this or other means, those with a common goal -- reducing nuclear dangers -- must find common ground. If we elevate imagination over ideology, we can do it.

Imagination seems like a good note on which to end this speech. I opened by telling you we need a new nuclear policy to confront new nuclear dangers. I close by telling you that to do it, we need something that isn't new at all. The same courage, creativity and leadership that won the Cold War are exactly the ingredients we need to keep our people safe in its aftermath. It is clear to me that our nuclear arsenal and the policies which controlled these weapons of mass destruction helped keep our safety and the world's peace for 40 years. It is equally clear that we need a new policy -- one which will seize an opportunity to make the world safer still. Thank you.

--

DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE  
Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools  
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator  
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)

<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtactionh.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 18 Nov 1998 16:03:48 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: November 24 meeting  
References: <2.2.16.19981117134215.4c4f54e8@pop.igc.org>

Howard, I will not be able to attend the Interfaith meeting as I'll be out of town on my way to Chicago for Thanksgiving. I believe Marie will be there. Bob Tiller will be posting soon the results/ minutes from our strategy meeting on Nov. 3.  
Kathy

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

> Dear Colleagues:

>  
> There will be a meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT on Tuesday,  
> November 24, 1998 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the conference room of the  
> Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington,  
> D.C. The agenda will include the following items:

>  
> 1. Final review of the petition for the CTBT and accompanying documents.  
> The petition is intended to be circulated in churches, synagogues, mosques,  
> meetings, and other religious gatherings during the first three months of  
> 1999 and to be presented directly to home-state offices of U.S. senators.  
> You will receive a draft prior to the meeting.

>  
> 2. The possibility of sending delegations of religious leaders to members  
> of President Clinton's cabinet to press for strong leadership for CTBT  
> ratification.

>  
> 3. Feedback from the November 3 meeting on evaluation of experience with  
> the CTBT campaign and consideration of priorities for 1999.

>  
> 4. Setting a regular time for monthly meetings of the Interfaith Group for  
> the CTBT in 1999. If you cannot come on the 24th and have a preference for  
> a meeting time or have particular times when you cannot attend, please let  
> me know.

>  
> Earlier I had indicated that there would be a meeting on December 2 for a  
> further round of discussion on CTBT strategy for 1999. The Coalition to  
> Reduce Nuclear Dangers has taken charge of this meeting and has decided to  
> limit attendance to members of the Coalition plus chosen guests. This will  
> not include most faith-based organizations working for CTBT ratification.  
> Sorry about that. I've been invited but will decline the invitation to this  
> closed meeting.

>  
> I assume that the Coalition will publish and circulate its 1999 CTBT  
> strategy. When this information is available, we will want to relate  
> efforts of the faith-based community to what others will be doing.

>

> Shalom,  
> Howard

--

DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE

Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools

Kathy Crandall, Coordinator

1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)

<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Thu, 19 Nov 1998 12:45:45 +0100  
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-l: Bulletin from Colombo, Sri Lanka  
Sender: owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Reply-To: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>

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

Colombo Peace to the City Campaign  
November 1998 Bulletin

Contents:

1. Muslim Refugees Say They Want to Go Home
2. An Alliance for Peace .... Attacked by war mongers
3. NPC Press Releases

## 1. MUSLIM REFUGEES SAY THEY WANT TO GO HOME

Over 5000 men, women and children, most of them internally displaced Muslims, gathered in Puttalam in North West Sri Lanka to call for an end to the war that had led to their displacement since 1990. The mass event was organised by the Northern Muslim Rights Organisation in collaboration with the National Peace Council. It was held on October 31 to coincide with the 8th year anniversary of the expulsion by the LTTE of nearly 100,000 Muslims from their homes in the north. It is believed that the Muslims were expelled from the north because the LTTE suspected that they would collaborate with the Sri Lankan army and provide the army with information.

The programme of activities lasted for a week, and ended on October 31. It provided the refugees with an opportunity to present their plight and aspirations in a manner that empowered them while announcing their situation to the larger world. The main thrust of the week's events was to call on both the government and LTTE to end the war so that the Muslim population could go back to their homes in the north. Presently there is a population of 65,000 Muslim refugees living in temporary camps in the Puttalam district.

Among the activities that took place were a mass rally and procession, a banner and poster exhibition that highlighted the plight of the refugees, and essay and poetry competition for children, the production and launch of an audio cassette which contains songs of remembrance and the presentation of educational booklets to the people.

The mass rally culminated with the adoption of a resolution which demanded that the government and LTTE to end the war through negotiations, called on the opposition to join hands in the peace effort, rejected the notion of a "war for peace" that was being touted by the

government, called on the religious leadership to actively contribute towards the peace process and demanded better treatment for internally displaced persons.

In the peace procession that took place various slogans were displayed on banners which give a flavour of the mood of the people. The slogans included, "Do not wage war in the name of the people", "War is yours, suffering is ours", "Refugees are also human beings", "War does not win peace" and "End the war and the culture of violence."

This peace event in Puttalam is a follow up to the National Peace Delegates Convention of January 1998, in which 1700 delegates from all parts of the country passed a resolution calling for an end to the war through a negotiated political settlement. It was also proposed at the Convention that the process of mobilisation and discussion aimed at building a national consensus on a political solution should continue with the holding of mass events.

## 2. AN ALLIANCE FOR PEACE .... Attacked by war mongers

A meeting of a broad coalition of religious dignitaries, peace activists, academics, trade unions, women's and youth organisations, professionals, business groups and civic organisations took place on November 11 (Armistice Day, the day of remembrance of the costs and losses of the First World War). The National Peace Council was a joint convenor of the meeting which took place after over four months of planning.

The original purpose of the organisers of the "Alliance for Peace" had been to try to build up public pressure on the government and opposition to enter into a bipartisan consensus on ending the war in the north-east. Initially, the thrust of the Alliance was to request the two major political parties to appoint two members each to form a "Peace Task Force" to work out the basic principles on which a lasting solution to the ethnic conflict could be found.

However, just as the business leaders who organised a highly successful "all party conference" last month are sadly realising, the two largest political parties in the country are not very enthusiastic about collaborating together in endeavours that they cannot monopolise. In a letter circulated to over a thousand key individuals and organisations, the convenors of the Alliance virtually admitted their failure and appealed for more support from civil society.

"Since our last communication to you on the above subject," they wrote, "the Organising Committee tried very hard to get the cooperation of the main political parties to set up a National Peace Task Force. It would now appear that from within our Alliance it is necessary to set up a Task Force that would operate in an unofficial capacity to facilitate the coming together of the main actors that can influence events, particularly the PA and UNP. The factual situation is that the two main political parties seem to have put back the solution of the ethnic conflict from their political agenda and given priority to preparing for elections. The recent developments on the war front (ie. the massive bloodletting at Killinochchi) do not appear to have made a significant change in this

attitude."

The response to their letter was extremely heartening. By 3:30 pm on the day of the meeting, over 600 persons were in attendance, representing over 75 organisations, and including very well known and respected personalities from different fields of non-violent endeavour. The attendees included the Ven Malwatte Wimalabuddhi Nayake Thero, the Ven. Madhithiyawela Vijithasena Nayake Thero, former Vice Chancellor of the Vidyodaya University, Ven. Prof. Kamburugamuwe Vajira Nayake Thero, the Ven. Diviyagahe Yasassi, the Ven Pallekande Ratanasara, Bishop Winston Fernando, the internationally renowned theologian Fr Tissa Balasuriya, Human Rights Commissioner Javid Yusuf, Northern Muslim Rights Organisation Secretary Moulavi Sufiyan, former President of the International Bar Association Desmond Fernando, UN Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women Dr Radhika Coomaraswamy, Marga Institute head Godfrey Gunatilleke, Head of the Sociology Department of the University of Colombo Prof Siri Hettige, former diplomat Stanley Jayaweera, Hindu Council President Yogendra Duraiswamy and Hindu Congress President Kandiah Neelankanthan.

As the gathering was much too large in order to have the type of informal discussion that had originally been envisaged, it was decided to form two smaller groups to facilitate discussion in which all voices could be heard. The main topic was to promote a bi-partisan political approach to finding a solution to the ethnic conflict while preparing the groundwork for a negotiated political settlement that would end the war in the country. Thereafter the two groups re-convened in the plenary session, at which time the two chairmen of the small groups, both of whom were venerable Buddhist monks, took the stage to read out the conclusions of their respective groups. It was at this stage that the totally unexpected disruption began.

A member in the audience with the group of youthful disrupters stood up and asked whether the steps prescribed for peace would make the LTTE leader Mr Prabakaran lay down arms and talk peace. As if on cue, others stationed within the audience began to chant slogans in concert. "Death to Prabakaran. We want terrorism destroyed. The war must go on till the end. We do not want peace till the terrorists are eliminated," they said. The disrupters who had stationed themselves in strategic positions within the Public Library Auditorium where the meeting was held sought to create the impression that the protests were coming from every place in the hall.

This was followed by moves on the part of the disrupters to forcibly take over the stage, at which point the organisers and others present moved to expel the disrupters. The group was then gradually pushed out of the hall. The pushing and shoving went on for a while, with a few policemen trying to stand inbetween the participants and the disrupters. There was a great deal of shouting, abusive language and chanting of slogans by the disrupters who claimed to be from the National Movement Against Terrorism, a shadowy group of unknown influence and contacts.

The disrupters also distributed a leaflet under the name of the National Movement Against Terrorism, calling for the investigation and if need be,

the arrest of certain prominent journalists writing for both the independent and state press who were deemed to be offenders under the ban on the LTTE. "Put the LTTE ban law into effect, investigate and if need be arrest them," the statement demanded. Ironically, all the journalists named were those writing solely in the English language press, which certainly gives a flavour of the English-language elitist bias of the National Movement Against Terrorism. On the other hand, their storm troopers were mono-lingual Sinhala-educated youth. The leaflet also called for the investigation of the National Peace Council which it claimed was a "War Council of the LTTE."

Much to their credit, the vast majority of the participants at the meeting stayed until the end, despite the attempted disruption. Many of them, despite their greying hair, also stood up to physically resist the disrupters who were less than half their age (and weight, for the most part) and were successful in evicting them from the Auditorium. The disrupters were kept out of the auditorium until the close of the meeting, at 6:30 pm with the appointment of a national committee to coordinate the programmes of the Alliance. The action plans presented by the working groups were also adopted for future implementation.

### 3. PRESS RELEASES

#### 27.10.98 - Children of Northeast Trapped in War

Clear evidence of the recruitment of children by the LTTE has surfaced following the surrender of 26 child cadre to the security forces at Mankulam. The National Peace Council condemns the recruitment of children for fighting purposes. This is an act that cannot be condoned. There are further reports of the LTTE following a policy of conscripting children in the areas under its control to replenish its ranks in the aftermath of the costly battles at Kilinochchi and Mankulam.

The plight of these children is tragic. They grow up with minds that are conditioned towards hating other communities. They are deprived of family lives and the love and security that comes from it. They have little or no future prospects either in education or employment due to the ongoing war. They are not permitted free mobility to other safer southern parts of the country by the security forces. When they are captured following recruitment by the LTTE they are used by the government for its own propaganda purposes.

The massive costs of the war were highlighted recently by the loss of life, exceeding two thousand, in the recent battles in the north-east. Government leaders sought to justify these brutal losses as bearable in percentage terms. Despite attempts to justify the human costs on either side the military status quo remains, although at a higher level of cost which includes the recruitment of child soldiers.

It has been reported that the government is re-thinking its strategies regarding the ethnic conflict and the war. We note that the government's concern for children prompted it to invite Mr Olara Otunnu, the UN Special Envoy on children affected by armed conflict. The NPC is concerned that

even debacles and tragedies such as the recent one at Kilinochchi have failed in the past to impact on government policies and change them. The NPC rejects the entire brutal process of war that the government and LTTE are engaged in, and which has led to this miserable trap for the children of the north-east. As the only way to spare the country's children, the NPC reiterates its call for a negotiated political settlement and an end to the war.

### 23.10.98 - Business Leaders Set Example of Other Social Sectors

The National Peace Council applauds the forthright declaration by the country's business leaders that they would make the issue of peace their number one priority in the days ahead. The heads of chambers of commerce and industry announced that all other issues, including those of economic and business importance, would take second place in their calculations. They also called on the government and opposition to nominate two representatives each to work out modalities to ending the war and achieving peace.

The NPC agrees with the business leaders that a mechanism, such as a bipartisan "Peace Task Force", could provide an institutional framework outside of the petty party political rivalries that continue to stand in the way of a solution to the conflict in the country. We call on the political parties that failed to attend the inaugural meeting to join the business leaders and any others working for peace. The issues of peace and a political settlement to the ethnic conflict cannot be allowed to suffer because of mere political and electoral calculations or personality clashes.

The sentiments expressed by the business leaders about the need for political unity and a humanitarian approach in working towards a peaceful settlement of the ethnic conflict echoes the sentiments of the vast majority of people all over the country with whom we have been conducting our programmes of work. The NPC takes this opportunity to offer its moral and logistical support to the business community in working towards a peaceful resolution of the war.

National Peace Council  
291/50 Havelock Gardens  
Colombo 6  
Phone/Fax: +94-1-502522  
Email: [peace2@sri.lanka.net](mailto:peace2@sri.lanka.net)  
<http://www.peace-srilanka.org/>

Colombo Peace to the City Campaign Local Coordinator:  
Priyanka Mendis  
Email: [impress@slt.lk](mailto:impress@slt.lk)

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

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 19 Nov 1998 14:55:25 -0500 (EST)  
From: Jan Lonn <jlonn@undp.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Support needed for three nuclear disarmament resolutions  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Support needed for three nuclear disarmament resolutions.

The efforts by Abolition members to secure support for the so called  
New

Agenda resolution is much welcome. However we must not forget to give equal attention to the three major nuclear disarmament resolutions: the resolution on the ICJ, the NAC resolution and the resolution sponsored by non-aligned countries (L.47) which contain the basic Abolition 2000 agenda for nuclear disarmament. This resolution was first introduced as a non-aligned resolution in 1995 and has been updated with a number of new elements this year. While we all appreciate and support the NAC resolution as an additional track to break the wall of resistance of the nuclearists we must not forget the resolution which contain the most comprehensive nuclear disarmament positions upheld by the abolition 2000. It is critical that publicity for the NAC resolution with its limited agenda does not downgrade our support for the comprehensive nuclear disarmament positions we share with the great majority of member states.

---

First Committee 20 Press Release GA/DIS/3128 23rd Meeting (AM) 4  
November  
1998

#### ANNEX IV

#### Vote on Nuclear Disarmament

The draft resolution on nuclear disarmament (document A/C.1/53/L.47) was approved by a recorded vote of 87 in favour to 40 against, with 15 abstentions, as follows:

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chad, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet

Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

Abstain: Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Chile, Cyprus, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malta, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, San Marino, South Africa, Ukraine, Uzbekistan.

Absent: Afghanistan, Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Bhutan, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Comoros, Cote d'Ivoire, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkmenistan, Vanuatu.

---

## Nuclear Disarmament

U.N. General Assembly, First Committee - draft resolution

Co-sponsors: Algeria, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, VietNam, Zambia and Zimbabwe

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 49/75 E of 15 December 1994 on a step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat and its resolutions 50/70 P of 12 December 1995, 51/45 O of 10 December 1996 and 52/38 L of 9 December 1997 on nuclear disarmament,

Reaffirming the commitment of the international community to the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free world,

Bearing in mind that the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention and the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention have already established legal regimes on the complete prohibition of biological and chemical weapons, respectively, and determined to achieve a Nuclear Weapons

Convention on the prohibition of the development, testing, production, stockpiling, loan, transfer, use and threat of use of nuclear weapons and on their destruction, and to conclude such an international Convention at an early date,

Recognizing that there now exist conditions for the establishment of a world free of nuclear weapons,

Bearing in mind paragraph 50 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the first special session devoted to disarmament, calling for the urgent negotiations of agreements for the cessation of the qualitative improvement and development of nuclear-weapon systems, and for a comprehensive and phased programme with agreed time-frames, wherever feasible, for the progressive and balanced reductions of nuclear weapons and their means of delivery, leading to their ultimate and complete elimination at the earliest possible time,

Reiterating the highest priority accorded to nuclear disarmament in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly and by the international community,

Recognizing that the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and any proposed treaty on fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices must constitute disarmament measures, and not only non-proliferation measures, and that these measures, together with an international legal instrument on the joint undertaking of no first use of nuclear weapons by the Nuclear Weapon States and on adequate security assurances of non-use and non-threat of use of these weapons for non-nuclear-weapon States, respectively, and an international convention prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons, should be integral measures in a programme leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time,

Welcoming the entry into force of the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, to which Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, Ukraine and the United States of America are States parties,

Welcoming also the conclusion of the Treaty on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms by the Russian Federation and the United States of America and the ratification of that Treaty by the United States of America, and looking forward to the full implementation of the START I and START II Treaties by the State parties, and to further concrete steps for nuclear disarmament by all the Nuclear Weapon States,

Noting with appreciation the unilateral measures by the nuclear-weapon States for nuclear arms limitation, and encouraging them to undertake further such measures,

Recognizing the complementarity of bilateral and multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament, and that bilateral negotiating can never replace multilateral negotiations in this respect,

Noting the support expressed in the Conference on Disarmament and in the General Assembly for the elaboration of an international convention to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, and the multilateral efforts in the Conference on Disarmament to reach agreement on such an international convention at an early date,

Recalling the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, issued on 8 July 1996, and welcoming the unanimous reaffirmation by all Judges of the Court that there exists an obligation for all States 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,

Mindful of paragraph 114 and other relevant recommendations in the Final Document of the Twelfth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Non-aligned Countries, held at Durban, South Africa, from 29 August to 3 September 1998, calling upon the Conference on Disarmament to establish, on a priority basis, an ad hoc committee to commence negotiations in 1998 on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament and for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time,

Bearing in mind the proposal of twenty-eight delegations to the Conference on Disarmament that are members of the Group of 21 for a programme of action for the elimination of nuclear weapons, and expressing its conviction that this proposal will be an important input and will contribute to negotiations on this question in the Conference,

Commending the initiative by twenty-six delegations to the Conference on Disarmament that are members of the Group of 21 proposing a comprehensive mandate for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament, which includes negotiations for, as a first step, a universal and legally binding multilateral agreement committing all States to the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons, an agreement on further steps required in a phased programme with time-frames leading to the total elimination of these weapons and a convention on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices taking into account the report of the Special Coordinator on that item and the views relating to the scope of the treaty,

Taking note of the Declaration issued on 9 June 1998 by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa and Sweden, entitled "Towards a World Free of Nuclear Weapons: the Need for a New Agenda", supported and responded to by a number of States including some members of the Non-Aligned Movement,

1. Recognizes that, in view of recent political developments, the time is now opportune for all the Nuclear Weapon States to

undertake effective disarmament measures with a view to the total elimination of these weapons with a specified framework of time;

2. Recognizes also that there is a genuine need to de-emphasize the role of nuclear weapons and to review and revise nuclear doctrines accordingly;

3. Urges the Nuclear Weapon States to stop immediately the qualitative improvement, development, production and stockpiling of nuclear warheads and their delivery systems;

4. Urges also the Nuclear Weapon States, as an interim measure, to immediately de-alert and de-activate their nuclear weapons;

5. Calls for the conclusion, as a first step, of a universal and legally binding multilateral agreement committing all States to the objective of the total elimination of nuclear weapons;

6. Reiterates its call upon the Nuclear Weapon States to undertake the step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat and to carry out effective nuclear disarmament measures with a view to the total elimination of these weapons with a specified framework of time;

7. Calls upon the Nuclear Weapon States, pending the achievement of a total ban on nuclear weapons through a Nuclear Weapons Convention, to agree on an internationally and legally binding instrument of the joint undertaking not to be the first to use nuclear weapons; and calls upon all States to conclude an internationally and legally binding instrument on security assurances of non-use and threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon States;

8. Welcomes the establishment in the Conference on Disarmament of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prohibition of the Production of Fissile Material for Nuclear Weapons and other Nuclear Explosive Devices, and urges for a speedy conclusion of a universal and non-discriminatory convention thereon; and also welcomes the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on Effective International Arrangements to Assure Non-nuclear Weapon States Against the Use or Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons; and urges to pursue efforts in this regard as a matter of priority:

9. Expresses its concern at the continuing opposition by some Nuclear Weapon States to the establishment of an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament, as called for in General Assembly resolution 52/38 L;

10. Reiterates its call upon the Conference on Disarmament to establish, on a priority basis, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament to commence negotiations early in 1999 on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament and for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time through a Nuclear Weapons Convention;

11. Urges the Conference on Disarmament to take into account in this regard the proposal of the twenty-eight delegations for a programme of action for the elimination of nuclear weapons, as well as the mandate for the ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament, proposed by the twenty-six delegations;

12. Calls for the convening of an international conference on nuclear disarmament at an early date with the objective of arriving at an agreement on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament and for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time through a Nuclear Weapons Convention;

13. Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its fifty-fourth session a report on the implementation of the present resolution;

14. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its fifty-fourth session the item entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

To: amillar@fourthfreedom.org, btiller@psr.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: De-alerting event  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Allistair and Bob:

Yesterday, November 18, Bob Tiller and I met with Wayne Glass on Senator Bingaman's staff. He is interested in helping us put on a de-alerting event on Capitol Hill and will help get a room. When we offered our idea of doing something in early January, he responded that when Congress returns there will be many people seeking attention on various issues. He suggested instead that we try to set up something for congressional staff some time between now and Friday, December 18 when people start departing for the holidays. He said that the foreign relations and defense committee overseas tours are over so that committee staff and defense aides should be around in December. He also suggested that we stage a debate rather than have a one-sided presentation. He thinks we have a better chance of drawing in Republican staff that way. He is willing ask Senator Bingaman be a sponsor or host of an event and make a brief appearance if he is town.

After we left Wayne, Bob and I discussed how we should proceed. We are sold on the idea of an event for congressional staff the second or third week in December and believe that it would be feasible to organize a briefing that would use such persons as Bruce Blair, Admiral Turner, and Arjun Makijani and also some audio-visual aides along the lines of our discussion. The moderator could be somebody like Jo Husbands. We would try to get C-Span coverage. We don't think it would be feasible to organize a debate by then. However, a debate format might be a possibility in late January or February.

Later I talked on the phone with Elizabeth Turpen on Senator Domenici's staff. She will check with persons above her in the staff hierarchy to see if the senator might be willing to serve as a co-host or co-sponsor.

This morning I read in the Post about Senator Lugar's and Senator Levin's tour of Russian nuclear weapon decommissioning sites. This makes me wonder whether we might ask their staffs to discuss safety concerns with Russian nuclear arsenal and use their report as a set up for discussion of de-alerting as one respond. Or at least we might ask the two senators to join as sponsors of the briefing. If you think this is worth exploring, I would be willing to talk to Ken Meyer on Senator Lugar's staff. Let me know what you think.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Fri, 20 Nov 1998 17:17:14 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: De-alerting event

Howard,

1. I learned today that Arjun Makhijani will be out of the country for most of December.
2. I have another idea for a speaker -- one of the physicians who authored last April's article. Actually two or three of them would be excellent, but I have one in mind who is a wonderful speaker. His name is Ira Helfand, and he just went to France to talk with IPPNW people and government people there about de-alerting. His schedule is such that he can usually come to D.C. for a Wednesday morning presentation. So think about it.

Shalom,  
Bob T.

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Fri, 20 Nov 1998 17:20:35 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
CC: amillar@fourthfreedom.org  
Subject: Re: De-alerting event  
References: <2.2.16.19981120135807.36376b06@pop.igc.org>

It would be great if Lugar and/or Levin would co-sponsor the event. But we don't want them determining content, because they might want to praise deterrence.

Shalom,  
BT

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>  
> Dear Allistair and Bob:  
>  
> Yesterday, November 18, Bob Tiller and I met with Wayne Glass on Senator  
> Bingaman's staff. He is interested in helping us put on a de-alerting event  
> on Capitol Hill and will help get a room. When we offered our idea of doing  
> something in early January, he responded that when Congress returns there  
> will be many people seeking attention on various issues. He suggested  
> instead that we try to set up something for congressional staff some time  
> between now and Friday, December 18 when people start departing for the  
> holidays. He said that the foreign relations and defense committee overseas  
> tours are over so that committee staff and defense aides should be around in  
> December. He also suggested that we stage a debate rather than have a  
> one-sided presentation. He thinks we have a better chance of drawing in  
> Republican staff that way. He is willing ask Senator Bingaman be a sponsor  
> or host of an event and make a brief appearance if he is town.  
>  
> After we left Wayne, Bob and I discussed how we should proceed. We are sold  
> on the idea of an event for congressional staff the second or third week in  
> December and believe that it would be feasible to organize a briefing that  
> would use such persons as Bruce Blair, Admiral Turner, and Arjun Makijani  
> and also some audio-visual aides along the lines of our discussion. The  
> moderator could be somebody like Jo Husbands. We would try to get C-Span  
> coverage. We don't think it would be feasible to organize a debate by  
> then. However, a debate format might be a possibility in late January or  
> February.  
>  
> Later I talked on the phone with Elizabeth Turpen on Senator Domenici's  
> staff. She will check with persons above her in the staff hierarchy to see  
> if the senator might be willing to serve as a co-host or co-sponsor.  
>  
> This morning I read in the Post about Senator Lugar's and Senator Levin's  
> tour of Russian nuclear weapon decommissioning sites. This makes me wonder  
> whether we might ask their staffs to discuss safety concerns with Russian  
> nuclear arsenal and use their report as a set up for discussion of

> de-alerting as one respond. Or at least we might ask the two senators to  
> join as sponsors of the briefing. If you think this is worth exploring, I  
> would be willing to talk to Ken Meyer on Senator Lugar's staff. Let me know  
> what you think.  
>  
> Shalom,  
> Howard

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Fri, 20 Nov 1998 17:24:16 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: mupj@igc.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org  
Subject: de-alerting

Two more pieces of information:

1. 20/20 Vision is going to do their December postcard on de-alerting.
2. ANA is doing lots of stuff on de-alerting, including:
  - postcards for grassroots to send to Clinton
  - a sign-on letter to be sent to Congress in the next few days
  - packets that will be ready in March

I think we should invite Laura Kriv (of 20/20) and Brad Morse (of ANA) to come to our Tuesday meeting. What do you think?

Shalom,  
Bob T.

To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, mupj@igc.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: de-alerting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 05:24 PM 11/20/98 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Two more pieces of information:

>

> 1. 20/20 Vision is going to do their December postcard on  
>de-alerting.

>

> 2. ANA is doing lots of stuff on de-alerting, including:

> -postcards for grassroots to send to Clinton

> -a sign-on letter to be sent to Congress in the next few days

> -packets that will be ready in March

>

>I think we should invite Laura Kriv (of 20/20) and Brad Morse (of ANA)

>to come to our Tuesday meeting. What do you think?

>

>Shalom,

>Bob T.

>

>Bob,

Please invite them. I've been thinking that ANA should be co-sponsor and 20/20, too, if they are interested.

Shalom,

Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sat, 21 Nov 1998 13:48:42 +0100  
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Vigil and fast started in Brussels  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, fme@motherearth.org  
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

Dear friends,

Following a meeting with the Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs Thursday evening, I started the vigil and fast in front of the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Brussels Friday morning.

We met Mr. Eric Derijcke with a delegation of Abolition 2000 Belgium for one hour. It was an open and honest meeting. The Minister stated to be tied down by the nuclear weapon states (NWS) in this matter.

Further he stated very openly that the NWS abuse and use the UN Security Council whenever it suits their interests. He stated that the NWS are not interested in the UN General Assembly (UNGA), the most democratic worldbody for nations created to this day.

He also shared that the abstention of Belgium and most other non nuclear NATO member states for the New Agenda Coalition (NAC) resolution last week meant the most important dissendancy ever met by the western NWS to date within NATO and in the UN. He however feared economic reprisals from the US if Belgium would initiate and make new further steps, as they did with the anti-personnel mines.

It was finally very positive that he wants us to invite international law experts to his office to give their interpretation of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ).

Though Eric Derijcke is probably the best Foreign Minister we've had for decades to move nuclear disarmament matters, he clearly lacked some of the Abolition 2000 visions and mostly courage.

This is also why I started this action : I wish to remind him on the importance of the issue, and encourage him to take a more independent policy.

It was a special moment to eat my last dinner and breakfast. Sometimes the idea feels very intimidating. I feel however very determined and hopeful when I posted myself in front of the Ministry. I started by handing over an envelope for the Minister, containing a letter announcing the reasons to start with the vigil and fast, and ask for a different Belgian vote for the ICJ and NAC resolution when they receive a final vote next month in the UNGA. I wrote that I will stop the fast and vigil as soon as I hear that Belgium will give more importance to the ICJ ruling and the public opinion, and change its vote in the UNGA.

Here I feel very much backed by the opinion poll published last september 21st concerning Belgian initiatives for a Convention banning nuclear

weapons. 72% declared to be in favor while only 10% was opposed. With the letter I also enclosed a new book containing the full Dutch translation of the ICJ advisory opinion and all separate opinions from all the judges involved in shaping the advisory opinion.

I was lucky starting the vigil under a clear blue sky at 10 a.m. I displayed enlargements of the UN resolution with votes in First Committee and the opinion poll. But it are especially the pictures from the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombing which catch the first attention from the people who walk by and stop. Most of the time they end up signing the Abolition 2000 petition. And it was good to have the first visitors, including friendly undercover police and the Belgian TV and a newspaper. The reactions of the public, often being shocked to learn about the Belgian votes in the UN, are very positive and encouraging. I also count already some supporters amongst the Foreign Department personnel and Belgian diplomats.

So the spirit is good after this first day of vigiling, even if my feet were frozen when I stopped. Will get warmer ones for when I post myself again when the offices open Monday morning.

And I want to use this time to network a call to fax the Belgian Foreign Minister. Please fax the Belgian Foreign Minister encouraging him to take the lead amongst NATO states to vote in favor of the ICJ and NAC resolutions. I will also network a call amongst Belgian MP's and NGO's to do the same. But I am sure that international solitarity will have an impact.

Send your message to :

Mr. Erik Derycke  
MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
Rue des Petits Carmes/Karmelietenstraat 15  
1000 Brussels, Belgium

Tel. +32-2-501.82.11  
Fax +32-2-511.63.85

I will be happy to receive a cc. by E-mail from your message.

In peace,

Pol D'Huyvetter

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Sat, 21 Nov 1998 13:09:06 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: btiller@psr.org  
Subject: Notes from Nov. 3rd meeting on CTBT  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id KAA15996

## PUBLIC ADVOCACY FOR THE CTBT

A Review and Planning Session  
November 3, 1998  
(Notes by Bob Tiller)

### 1. LESSONS LEARNED

State organizers were very helpful, resulting in more meetings with Senators and more letters to Senators, and also in building structures for future work. Try to do the same thing next year. Kathy Crandall may set up a conference call of the state organizers in January.

Our state contact system did not work as well as we had hoped, but it was better than nothing.

Kathy Crandall — The "CTBT-Organize" list serve is not doing very well, because few people post things.

Howard Hallman — Success: we defeated Sen. Lott on the funding vote, though by a small margin.

David Culp — focus on 20 Senators whose votes will be needed. Get more mainstream groups involved in talking to the Senators.

Tom Collina — What needs to happen next year? We need to have both the micro and the macro conversations. This year we never received Presidential support.

Marie Rietmann — Some of our efforts should be directed toward getting the President to express support.

Fran Teplitz — Helpful things this year: (1) more people on the Hill, (2) May 28th demonstrations, (3) linking religious and secular communities, (4) Disarmament Clearinghouse tracking. There is growing grassroots disillusionment, we need to figure out how to shape the message.

Daryl Kimball — Get more involvement of veterans, enviros, other communities. Perhaps we need to have an outreach person to many mainstream constituencies.

Tom Collina — Polling was helpful, showing overwhelming support for CTBT.

David Culp — Polling results helped us to have conversations with

Republican staff, helped prevent erosion among Republicans after India-Pakistan tests.

Kimberly Robson — Frustration in Utah because there was little media coverage of polls.

Daryl Kimball — We tried for more coverage, but the context was difficult. The benefits of polling were not so tangible, but nevertheless useful.

Kathy C — Perhaps we should use grassroots people next time poll results are released.

Tom C — We did a good job getting CTBT in the media, even though there were few hooks. We did a poor job of gauging Administration commitment to CTBT. Maybe we should hold back our resources until the Administration decides to put effort into it.

Daryl K — Coordinated delivery of grassroots message, including postcards, was good.

Marie R — Grassroots conference calls were good, especially the Mississippi call which linked up lots of people who did not know each other.

Mark Brown — Postcards are useful to those with limited resources. The religious leaders sign-on was useful, but we got a strange mixture of sign-ons.

## 2. EVENTS IN 1999

- India and Pakistan, including possible Clinton visit
- Duma action on START II
- Administration actions
- NPT PrepCom in April
- Special conference on CTBT entry-into-force

3. PROPOSED 1999 ACTIVITIES — We named 28 actions and strategies, then combined a few, then took a straw poll to see which of those had the most support among those present. This is only a straw poll.

Five top-rated actions and strategies:

A. Lobby Days in DC — Third week of April suggested, get people from the states of the key Republican Senators we need to reach, don't try for large numbers of people, try to meet with Senators themselves, also visit Gore.

B. Outreach to new constituencies, e.g. women's groups, enviros, — briefings at conferences, sign-ons (both local and national), etc.

C. Campaign flyer/postcard — produce large numbers for groups to mail, design for long shelf life, can also be used for tabling.

D. Homestate grassroots lobby visits, esp. during Feb. President's Day recess — promote the formation of delegations and track them.

E. Hire field organizers for key states, similar to this past summer.

Others receiving some support:

- Update and reissue the CRND brochure (mention an 800 number)
- Focus on Clinton and get him to make this a higher priority
- Focus on Lott
- Focus on Helms — make him an issue, possible sit-ins
- Devise a Senator-by-Senator strategy for key Republicans
- Video for use at conferences, esp. religious assemblies
- Public access TV
- Build media into everything, get editorials written
- State-by-state work with religious communities, including state-by-state petitions (U)
- Compile a list of all conferences (not just religious) — contact the organizer and offer resources
- Set up a toll-free number — perhaps with a recording on CTBT, perhaps with a feature for contacting Senators
- Student organizing — set up a DC subgroup
- Hill briefings and other Hill events (U)
- More state-by-state conference calls (U)
- National poll right before the Senate vote (U)
- Focus on Presidential candidates
- Organize around "Sleepwalking to Armageddon" TV show

It was agreed that all of the top five actions/strategies must be carried out by working groups and coalitions; none of the top five can be undertaken by a single group. Several of the second-tier suggested activities are already underway, or will be undertaken by a specific group, noted by a (U).

#### 4. ORGANIZING AND STRUCTURING OURSELVES FOR 1999

It was proposed that we have a single working group on CTBT and do all our work there. Several people pointed out problems with that approach. After some discussion it was agreed that we will continue to deal with CTBT in several working groups.

To: relctbt  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Notes from Nov. 3rd meeting on CTBT  
Cc: btiller@psr.org  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

I would like to share with you Bob Tiller's notes from the November 3 meeting on the CTBT. Please note in particular the straw poll on top priorities for 1999. This poll isn't binding, but it does give a sense of direction for the CTBT campaign.

Shalom,  
Howard

>Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
>Date: Sat, 21 Nov 1998 13:09:06 -0500  
>From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
>Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
>To: btiller@psr.org  
>Subject: Notes from Nov. 3rd meeting on CTBT  
>X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id KAA15996

>  
>PUBLIC ADVOCACY FOR THE CTBT

> A Review and Planning Session  
> November 3, 1998  
> (Notes by Bob Tiller)

>  
>1. LESSONS LEARNED

>  
>State organizers were very helpful, resulting in more meetings with  
>Senators and more letters to Senators, and also in building structures  
>for future work. Try to do the same thing next year. Kathy Crandall  
>may set up a conference call of the state organizers in January.

>  
>Our state contact system did not work as well as we had hoped, but it  
>was better than nothing.

>  
>Kathy Crandall — The "CTBT-Organize" list serve is not doing very well,  
>because few people post things.

>  
>Howard Hallman — Success: we defeated Sen. Lott on the funding vote,  
>though by a small margin.

>  
>David Culp — focus on 20 Senators whose votes will be needed. Get more  
>mainstream groups involved in talking to the Senators.

>  
>Tom Collina — What needs to happen next year? We need to have both the  
>micro and the macro conversations. This year we never received  
>Presidential support.

>  
>Marie Rietmann — Some of our efforts should be directed toward getting

>the President to express support.

>

>Fran Teplitz — Helpful things this year: (1) more people on the Hill,  
>(2) May 28th demonstrations, (3) linking religious and secular  
>communities, (4) Disarmament Clearinghouse tracking. There is growing  
>grassroots disillusionment, we need to figure out how to shape the  
>message.

>

>Daryl Kimball — Get more involvement of veterans, enviros, other  
>communities. Perhaps we need to have an outreach person to many  
>mainstream constituencies.

>

>Tom Collina — Polling was helpful, showing overwhelming support for  
>CTBT.

>

>David Culp — Polling results helped us to have conversations with  
>Republican staff, helped prevent erosion among Republicans after  
>India-Pakistan tests.

>

>Kimberly Robson — Frustration in Utah because there was little media  
>coverage of polls.

>

>Daryl Kimball — We tried for more coverage, but the context was  
>difficult. The benefits of polling were not so tangible, but  
>nevertheless useful.

>

>Kathy C — Perhaps we should use grassroots people next time poll results  
>are released.

>

>Tom C — We did a good job getting CTBT in the media, even though there  
>were few hooks. We did a poor job of gauging Administration commitment  
>to CTBT. Maybe we should hold back our resources until the  
>Administration decides to put effort into it.

>

>Daryl K — Coordinated delivery of grassroots message, including  
>postcards, was good.

>

>Marie R — Grassroots conference calls were good, especially the  
>Mississippi call which linked up lots of people who did not know each  
>other.

>

>Mark Brown — Postcards are useful to those with limited resources. The  
>religious leaders sign- on was useful, but we got a strange mixture of  
>sign-ons.

>

## >2. EVENTS IN 1999

> -India and Pakistan, including possible Clinton visit

> -Duma action on START II

> -Administration actions

> -NPT PrepCom in April

> -Special conference on CTBT entry-into-force

>

>3. PROPOSED 1999 ACTIVITIES — We named 28 actions and strategies, then  
>combined a few, then took a straw poll to see which of those had the

>most support among those present. This is only a straw poll.

>

>Five top-rated actions and strategies:

> A. Lobby Days in DC — Third week of April suggested, get people from

>the states of the key Republican Senators we need to reach, don't try

>for large numbers of people, try to meet with Senators themselves, also

>visit Gore.

> B. Outreach to new constituencies, e.g. women's groups, enviros, —

>briefings at conferences, sign-ons (both local and national), etc.

> C. Campaign flyer/postcard — produce large numbers for groups to

>mail, design for long shelf life, can also be used for tabling.

> D. Homestate grassroots lobby visits, esp. during Feb. President's

>Day recess — promote the formation of delegations and track them.

> E. Hire field organizers for key states, similar to this past

>summer.

>

>Others receiving some support:

> -Update and reissue the CRND brochure (mention an 800 number)

> -Focus on Clinton and get him to make this a higher priority

> -Focus on Lott

> -Focus on Helms — make him an issue, possible sit-ins

> -Devise a Senator-by-Senator strategy for key Republicans

> -Video for use at conferences, esp. religious assemblies

> -Public access TV

> -Build media into everything, get editorials written

> -State-by state work with religious communities, including

>state-by-state petitions (U)

> -Compile a list of all conferences (not just religious) — contact

>the organizer and offer resources

> -Set up a toll-free number — perhaps with a recording on CTBT,

>perhaps with a feature for contacting Senators

> -Student organizing — set up a DC subgroup

> -Hill briefings and other Hill events (U)

> -More state-by-state conference calls (U)

> -National poll right before the Senate vote (U)

> -Focus on Presidential candidates

> -Organize around "Sleepwalking to Armageddon" TV show

>

>It was agreed that all of the top five actions/strategies must be

>carried out by working groups and coalitions; none of the top five can

>be undertaken by a single group. Several of the second-tier suggested

>activities are already underway, or will be undertaken by a specific

>group, noted by a (U).

>

>4. ORGANIZING AND STRUCTURING OURSELVES FOR 1999

>

>It was proposed that we have a single working group on CTBT and do all

>our work there. Several people pointed out problems with that approach.

>After some discussion it was agreed that we will continue to deal with

>CTBT in several working groups.

>

>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sun, 22 Nov 1998 04:00:52 GMT  
From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: First Committee summary  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host [194.69.97.56] claimed to be acronym  
X-Sender: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org

Dear friends,  
just to let you know that my summary of all the resolutions to the First Committee will be put on our website Monday (all being well). It is not completely finished, as I ran out of time before going the UN Disarmament Conference in Nagasaki, but it is substantially there. The analysis will be finalised and published in Disarmament Diplomacy 32 after the UN General Assembly vote in December.  
Hope it is useful in this 'raw' form.

I would also like to take this opportunity for congratulating all those who campaigned so well to shift the no votes on the NAC resolution in the key NATO countries, Japan and elsewhere. Having worked closely with a number of you on this, and been aware of how much hard work it took for you to get parliamentary debates and meetings with key officials to bring this important resolution to their attention and force a change in their official positions, I couldn't help feeling that the MPI report did not do justice to the enormous effort of NGOs on the ground and our own, long-standing (though often very informal) networks for mobilising, informing, strategising and changing policies. From my vantage point working with the First Committee delegations, it is clear to me who really made the difference and shifted those NATO votes. It was a cooperative effort working simultaneously on several levels, and I hope it can be properly acknowledged as such.

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>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: "Ausfem-Polnet" <ausfem-polnet@postoffice.utas.edu.au>  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 14:46:06 +1030  
From: "Ron Gray" <r-grayle@msn.com.au>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Oz nuclear weapons poll; and Senate vote  
To: "Abolition Caucus" <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

The Roy Morgan Research Company was commissioned by the Australian Peace Committee (South Australian Branch) and the Australian Anti-Bases Campaign to carry out a poll throughout every state and territory of Australia on the question of nuclear weapons. The survey was carried out on the 11th and 12th of November, and the results of the survey were faxed to the Australian Government before the vote on Resolution L.48 was taken at the United Nations on Friday 13th.

The people polled were asked to think about nuclear weapons in the world today.

Q1 was: All nuclear weapons should be destroyed. Do you agree or disagree?

The results were:

Strongly Agree: ..... 72%  
Mildly Agree: ..... 15%  
Mildly Disagree: ..... 9%  
Strongly Disagree: ..... 3%  
Can't Say: ..... 1%

(i.e. 87% of people agreed)

Q2 was: Australia has signed treaties banning chemical and biological weapons. Australia should help negotiate a global treaty to ban and destroy all nuclear weapons. Do you agree or disagree?

The results were:

Strongly Agree: ..... 75%  
Mildly Agree: ..... 17%  
Mildly Disagree: ..... 5%  
Strongly Disagree: ..... 2%  
Can't Say: ..... 1%

(i.e. 92% of people agreed)

Q3 was: Australia should keep its military alliance with the United States even though the United States is the biggest

nuclear power in the world. Do you agree or disagree?

The results were:

Strongly Agree: ..... 48%

Mildly Agree: ..... 32%

Mildly Disagree: ..... 8%

Strongly Disagree: ..... 6%

Can't Say: ..... 6%

(i.e. 80% of people agreed)

Dr Hannah Middleton of the AABC said, "We call upon the Howard Government to stop dragging its feet at the UN. Instead of doing what the United States wants, Australia should vote for the resolution, reflecting the will of the Australian people. We have lived under the shadow of nuclear annihilation since 1945. We have never had a better chance than now to get rid of them. This is what the Australian people want. This is what our Government should vote for at the United Nations."

Irene Gale of the APC commented, "Although Australians wish to maintain an alliance with the United States, they overwhelmingly desire that alliance to be nuclear weapons free. They also overwhelmingly desire the Australian Government to work earnestly to remove nuclear weapons from the world, and to help negotiate a global treaty to achieve this end. This attitude of the Australian people is reflected by the fact that 144 Local Authorities and many thousands of individuals have endorsed the Abolition 2000 campaign by calling upon the Australian Government to work to remove nuclear weapons from the world. It clearly follows that the Australian Government must vote in favour of resolution L.48 when it is voted upon in the UN General Assembly in December."

-----  
THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION WAS PASSED BY THE AUSTRALIAN SENATE ON 12 November 1998

Senator Margetts to move -

That the Senate-

(a) Notes

(i) that a resolution numbered L48 and titled 'Towards A Nuclear – Weapon Free World: The need for a New Agenda' will be voted on in the United Nations General Assembly in the week beginning 8 November 1998,

(ii) that the resolution recalls the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice in its 1996 advisory opinion 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,

(iii) that the resolution calls on the nuclear weapon states to demonstrate an unequivocal commitment to the speedy and total elimination of their respective nuclear weapons and without delay to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to the elimination of these weapons, thereby fulfilling their obligations under Article VI of the treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT),

(iv) that the resolution also calls on the three states that are nuclear weapons capable and that have not yet acceded to the NPT to clearly and urgently reverse the pursuit of all nuclear weapons development or deployment and to refrain

from any actions which could undermine regional and international peace and security and the efforts of the international community towards nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear weapons proliferation,

(v) that the resolution contains a large number of other measures designed to bring about the goal of nuclear disarmament, including a call for the Russian Federation and the United States of America to bring START-II into force without further delay and immediately proceed thereafter with negotiations on START-III with a view to its early conclusion,

(vi) that the resolution incorporates a call for an international conference on nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, which would effectively complement efforts being undertaken in other settings and which could facilitate the consolidation of a new agenda for a nuclear weapon-free world,

(vii) that the resolution is sponsored by Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa-Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Ireland, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, Samoa, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Uruguay, and Venezuela,

(viii) that the resolution is broadly consistent with the recommendations of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, and

(ix) with concern that there are indications that Australia may not vote in favour of resolution L48 and

(b) urges the Australian Government to support this resolution at the United Nations General Assembly.

The resolution was passed 'on the voices' without a division, the government seemingly convinced that it did not have the numbers. THE FOLLOWING PRESS RELEASE WAS ISSUED BY SENATOR DEE MARGETTS AFTER THE RESOLUTION WAS PASSED

#### SENATE URGES GOVERNMENT TO CHANGE POSITION ON UNITED NATIONS NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT VOTE

Greens Senator Dee Margetts welcomed the support of her non-government colleagues in the Senate this morning for a motion calling on the government to change its position and support a resolution in the United Nations General Assembly tomorrow on nuclear disarmament.

"The resolution in the United Nations is titled 'Towards a nuclear-weapon free world: The need for a new agenda' and that title says it all" Senator Margetts stated. "The current frameworks in the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) have failed to provide any meaningful move toward nuclear disarmament

"The resolution to be debated in the UN tomorrow calls for real and urgent action towards nuclear disarmament by the nuclear weapons states and the three nations that are nuclear-capable

"The action called for includes implementation of the START-II treaty between the United States and the Russian federation and an international conference on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation."

"Recent events in India and Pakistan confirm that the nuclear threat is still very real.

"I am therefore extremely disappointed that the Australian government has not committed to this new initiative which may form the basis for a new international framework which could rid us forever of this insidious threat" Senator Margetts concluded.

-----  
Australian Peace Committee (South Australian Branch) Inc.



disagree?

The results were:

Strongly Agree:  
&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;. 75%

Mildly Agree:  
&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;  
17%

Mildly Disagree:  
&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip; 5%

Strongly Disagree:  
&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;. 2%

Can't Say:  
&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;.. 1%

(i.e. 92% of people agreed)

Q3 was: Australia should keep its military alliance with the United States even though the United States is the biggest nuclear power in the world. Do you agree or disagree?

The results were:

Strongly Agree:  
&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;  
48%

Mildly Agree:  
&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;...  
32%

Mildly Disagree:  
&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;.. 8%

Strongly Disagree:  
&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;.. 6%

Can't Say:  
&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;&hellip;  
6%

(i.e. 80% of people agreed)

Dr Hannah Middleton of the AABC said, "We call upon the Howard Government to stop dragging its feet at the UN. Instead of doing what the United States wants, Australia should vote for the resolution, reflecting the will of the Australian people. We have lived under the shadow of nuclear annihilation since 1945. We have never had a better chance than now to get rid of them. This is what the Australian people want. This is what our Government should vote for at the United Nations."

Irene Gale of the APC commented, "Although Australians wish to maintain an alliance with the United States, they overwhelmingly desire that

alliance to be nuclear weapons free.&nbsp; They also overwhelmingly desire the Australian Government to work earnestly to remove nuclear weapons from the world, and to help negotiate a global treaty to achieve this end.&nbsp; This attitude of the Australian people is reflected by the fact that 144 Local Authorities and many thousands of individuals have endorsed the Abolition 2000 campaign by calling upon the Australian Government to work to remove nuclear weapons from the world.&nbsp; It clearly follows that the Australian Government must vote in favour of resolution L.48 when it is voted upon in the UN General Assembly in December.&quot;</FONT></P></FONT>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2><FONT color=#000000></FONT></FONT><FONT color=#000000 size=2>-----</FONT></P>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2>THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION WAS PASSED BY THE AUSTRALIAN SENATE ON 12 November 1998</FONT></P><FONT size=3>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2>Senator Margetts to move - </FONT></P>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2>That the Senate- </FONT></P>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2>(a) Notes</FONT></P>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2>(i) that a resolution numbered L48 and titled 'Towards A Nuclear &ndash; Weapon Free World: The need for a New Agenda' will be voted on in the United Nations General Assembly in the week beginning 8 November 1998,</FONT></P>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2>(ii) that the resolution recalls the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice in its 1996 advisory opinion 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,</FONT></P>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2>(iii) that the resolution calls on the nuclear weapon states to demonstrate an unequivocal commitment to the speedy and total elimination of their respective nuclear weapons and without delay to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to the elimination of these weapons, thereby fulfilling their obligations under Article VI of the treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT),</FONT></P>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2>(iv) that the resolution also calls on the three states that are nuclear weapons capable and that have not yet acceded to the NPT to clearly and urgently reverse the pursuit of all nuclear weapons development or deployment and to refrain from any actions which could undermine regional and international peace and security and the efforts of the international community towards nuclear disarmament and the prevention of nuclear weapons proliferation,</FONT></P>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2>(v) that the resolution contains a large number of other measures designed to bring about the goal of nuclear disarmament, including a call for the Russian Federation and the United States of America to bring START-II into force without further delay and immediately proceed thereafter with negotiations on START-III with a view to its early conclusion,</FONT></P>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2>(vi) that the resolution incorporates a call for an international conference on nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, which would effectively complement efforts being undertaken in other settings and which could facilitate the consolidation of a new agenda for a nuclear weapon-free world,</FONT></P>

<P><FONT face=Arial size=2>(vii) that the resolution is sponsored by Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Costa-Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Guatemala, Ireland, Lesotho, Liberia, Malaysia, Mali, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria, Peru, Samoa, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Uruguay, and Venezuela,</FONT></P>

(viii) that the resolution is broadly consistent with the recommendations of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, and

(ix) with concern that there are indications that Australia may not vote in favour of resolution L48 and

(b) urges the Australian Government to support this resolution at the United Nations General Assembly.

The resolution was passed 'on the voices' without a division, the government seemingly convinced that it did not have the numbers.

THE FOLLOWING PRESS RELEASE WAS ISSUED BY SENATOR DEE MARGETTS AFTER THE RESOLUTION WAS PASSED

SENATE URGES GOVERNMENT TO CHANGE POSITION ON UNITED NATIONS NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT VOTE

Greens Senator Dee Margetts welcomed the support of her non-government colleagues in the Senate this morning for a motion calling on the government to change its position and support a resolution in the United Nations General Assembly tomorrow on nuclear disarmament.

"The resolution in the United Nations is titled 'Towards a nuclear-weapon free world: The need for a new agenda' and that title says it all," Senator Margetts stated. "The current frameworks in the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) have failed to provide any meaningful move toward nuclear disarmament

"The resolution to be debated in the UN tomorrow calls for real and urgent action towards nuclear disarmament by the nuclear weapons states and the three nations that are nuclear-capable

"The action called for includes implementation of the START-II treaty between the United States and the Russian federation and an international conference on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation."

"Recent events in India and Pakistan confirm that the nuclear threat is still very real."

"I am therefore extremely disappointed that the Australian government has not committed to this new initiative which may form the basis for a new international framework which could rid us forever of this insidious threat," Senator Margetts

concluded.

-----

Australian Peace Committee (South Australian Branch) Inc.

11 South Terrace, Adelaide SA 5000, Australia

Ph: (+61-8) 8212 7138 &nbsp; Fax: (+61-8) 8364 2291 &nbsp; email: &nbsp; <[r-grayle@msn.com.au](mailto:r-grayle@msn.com.au)>

&nbsp;

Return-Path: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "START II Recipients" <dculp@igc.org>  
Subject: NYT: Pentagon Ready to Shrink Arsenal of Nuclear Bombs  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 08:16:15 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800

PENTAGON READY TO SHRINK ARSENAL OF NUCLEAR BOMBS  
Monday, November 23,  
1998 New York Times

By STEVEN LEE MYERS

WASHINGTON -- Driven by budget constraints as much as diminishing security threats, Pentagon officials are quietly recommending that the Clinton administration consider unilateral reductions in the nation's nuclear arsenal.

Since the United States has already committed itself to drastic cuts in its nuclear arsenal, the Pentagon believes that the unilateral reductions would have no effect on America's ability to deter a nuclear adversary. The recommendations, if adopted, would reduce the American arsenal below the 6,000 nuclear warheads allowed by the first strategic arms reduction treaty, or START I, senior administration officials said. The United States and Russia have signed a second arms treaty, START II, that would cut their arsenals even more sharply, to between 3,000 and 3,500 warheads. But for nearly six years, Russia's Parliament has refused to approve START II.

Because of Russia's delay, and U.S. legislation blocking unilateral cuts, the Pentagon faces the prospect of paying hundreds of millions of dollars to maintain -- and soon to rebuild -- nuclear weapons that the United States has already agreed to scrap.

The Pentagon has spent \$95 million more over the past two years than it would have if START II had taken effect. Next year it would cost \$100 million more, and the year after that, \$1 billion. The Navy, in particular, could be forced to pay more than \$5 billion between now and 2003 to refuel nuclear reactors and install new missiles on four Trident ballistic-missile submarines that would otherwise be dismantled. With this budget crunch looming, the Pentagon submitted to Congress a highly classified report last April that outlined nine proposals for reducing the strategic arsenal unilaterally.

Neither President Clinton nor Secretary of Defense William Cohen has made a decision on the recommendations, and a senior White House official said they would not do so until Russia's Communist-dominated Parliament completes its latest deliberations on START II, which was signed in 1993.

Although Russia's nationalists and Communists have vehemently opposed the treaty, the lower house has begun debate and could vote as soon as December.

The Pentagon's recommendations underline the stakes: START II's ratification would not only rid the world of thousands of nuclear warheads, but would also save the United States billions of dollars that the Pentagon would rather spend elsewhere or that Congress might allocate to other programs. Officials in Washington and Russia agree that prospects for ratification have improved as the realization sinks in that Russia's economic problems have left the country hard pressed to maintain a nuclear force as large as that allowed by START I.

"I'm reluctant to discuss at all Plan B," one White House official said of the Pentagon's recommendations, "when we have the best on-course momentum here in a long, long time for Plan A."

But if the Russian Parliament again rejects the treaty, officials in the Pentagon plan to recommend that Clinton seek permission from Congress to move ahead with unilateral reductions. The officials said a decision could come as part of the budget Clinton will submit to Congress early next year. Adm. Richard Mies, the new commander of the nation's strategic arsenal, said the United States was committed to maintaining a "robust and credible force." But he suggested that this effort did not preclude unilateral cuts in warheads or the systems to deliver them.

"I think you will inevitably see us take some unilateral actions that we have to take to modernize our forces and maybe streamline our forces to some degree," Mies said in an interview last week at the U.S. Strategic Command headquarters at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska. "We're driven by our own imperatives."

Mies did not elaborate on what steps were under consideration. In recent weeks, however, Pentagon and administration aides have begun discussions with congressional staff members as they draw up next year's budget and decide whether to set aside enough money for a larger nuclear force, the officials said.

In each of the last two years, Republicans in Congress have put language in the Department of Defense's budget bills explicitly prohibiting reductions below START I levels by the United States alone.

Some administration officials and members of Congress have argued that the legislation is necessary to press the Russians to ratify START II. Others dispute the effect that such legislation has had on the Russian Parliament's deliberation, and argue that unilateral reductions could revive a stagnant arms control process.

"The issue is, how much longer are we going to pay to stay at a higher level to retain some leverage over the Russians to ratify the treaty," a senior defense official said.

Under START I, which was signed in 1991, the United States has drastically reduced its arsenal of strategic nuclear warheads, from more than 10,000 to about 7,000 today. In Helsinki, Finland, in March 1997, Clinton and President Boris Yeltsin agreed that once the lower house approved START II, the United States and Russia would begin talks on still further reductions, to 2,000 to 2,500 warheads.

Political pressures for slashing the number of warheads have begun to grow here. In a speech to the Council on Foreign Relations in New York last week, Sen. Bob Kerrey, D-Neb., called on the administration to make unilateral reductions and take other steps that would reassure Russia, including removing remaining warheads from the highest state of alert. Kerrey said he would seek to repeal the congressional limits on further reductions, arguing that among other things, the higher levels of weapons sapped money from efforts to combat "newer threats" like terrorism and ethnic wars.

"Our old policies of arms control and deterrence no longer work and may be increasing the danger," he said, "both by making nuclear threats worse and by diverting money and resources away from the conventional forces that are the key to our safety in the post-Cold War world."

In its budgets, the Pentagon has already anticipated reducing the arsenal to START II levels over the next several years. Likewise, strategists have concluded that a nuclear force as small as that planned under START III, which has not yet been negotiated, can adequately defend the United States, making spending on anything more seem wasteful.

Administration officials declined to spell out the proposals under consideration should the Russian Parliament fail to ratify START II. But one senior military official said some options would allow the Pentagon to reduce the number of warheads to 5,000 to 6,000 and reduce or eliminate some categories of strategic weapons.

Under these plans, the Navy would move ahead with its current plan to reduce its fleet of 18 Trident submarines by retiring the four oldest by 2003. The Air Force would be able to reduce or eliminate the stockpile of 50 intercontinental ballistic missiles that it is now financing in its budget year to year.

In both cases, Congress has prohibited reductions in those forces. The senior military official called the money spent on updating those forces as "rat hole dollars."

"We don't necessarily feel we should be locked into a certain force structure," the official said. "We want to have flexibility."

Copyright 1998 The New York Times Company

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 14:07:57 +0100  
From: Beatrice MERAHI <bem@wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-1: November bulletin from Rio de Janeiro, Brazil  
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Reply-To: Beatrice MERAHI <bem@wcc-coe.org>

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

Rio de Janeiro Peace to the City Campaign  
November 1998 Bulletin

In this issue:

Viva Rio launches the English Teacher Volunteer Program: bringing together English teachers and youth from Rio\*s poor communities

"Fight for Peace": a new sports program created by Viva Rio to boost support for boxing in Brazil while using the sport to reduce social violence

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

1) Viva Rio launches the English Teacher Volunteer Program: bringing together English teachers and youth from Rio\*s poor communities

What is The English Teacher Volunteer Program?

Organised by Viva Rio and supported by The British Council, the English Teacher Volunteer Program establishes free language courses in poor communities by sending part time volunteer language teachers to community schools throughout Rio de Janeiro city.

Why is it needed?

With the increasing pace of globalisation, there is a growing professional need for English and Spanish, the two most important business languages. In order to fully function in this new working environment all workers need basic competence in one or both of these languages. For example, receptionists, computer operators, taxi drivers, tour guides, hotel employees, telephone operators and waiters will all have a need for English or Spanish at some stage in their working lives. Furthermore, a lack of basic English/Spanish can count against job seekers, and a solid grounding in them may lead to real opportunities in the job market.

Obviously, youth living in Rio\*s shanty towns and poor communities cannot afford to learn foreign languages through private language schools. The English Teacher Volunteer Program offers them this important opportunity.

The program also goes beyond language teaching. The aim is to bring together people from different socio-economic backgrounds working

towards a common goal, knowing that the experience will prove valuable and rewarding for all concerned. The social integration of Rio's shanty town population into mainstream Brazilian society is a fundamental part of Viva Rio's working philosophy. This program aims to continue putting this philosophy into practice.

Who can teach on The English Teacher Volunteer Program?

The program is open to qualified language teachers, high level language students and English-speaking natives. Teaching experience is not a prerequisite to join the program, as a course structure has been designed and an introductory teacher training course will be offered to those who have never taught before.

After teaching training courses have been completed, there will be continued technical support for those teachers who may need help in lesson planning, content or class management. The courses are to be a minimum of six months in length. Teachers will have a trial period of two weeks to decide if they want to continue with the program. However, as teachers become increasingly involved with their students and their communities, we hope that they will keep teaching for as long as they are able.

How are the courses organized?

Viva Rio works with over 400 local community organisations. The Program to Expand Schooling / O Programa de Aumento de Escolaridade (PAE) is Viva Rio's biggest educational project and is currently operating in 225 community organisations in shanty towns and poor communities throughout Rio de Janeiro city. The English Teacher Volunteer Program is being implemented through these partner organisations, all of which are experienced in running educational courses. Viva Rio is the only non-governmental organisation in Brazil allowed to award basic education certificates to students who pass these courses through its educational programmes.

When teachers volunteer to join this program, and a suitable location is found for them, Viva Rio's partner community organisation in that area is approached and offered the chance to establish a language course. The organisation is responsible for advertising the course within the community, enrolling students and organising with the teacher and students when the course is to be held. Initial research into this project demonstrated a huge demand for language courses amongst youth living in shanty towns.

"The school where I teach in Rocinha \* sits amidst a scene of frantic activity and endless noise, a world away from the orderly environment of a conventional language school! In a favela (shanty-town) you work with people whose lives are completely different from those of the average middle class English student, and from the lifestyles of most foreigners here, and yet more representative of Rio de Janeiro as a whole. When teaching within the favela, you can be sure of getting to know the kind of people who you otherwise would probably never meet."

Mike, English teacher

\* Rocinha is Latin America's largest shanty town, with an estimated population of over 100,000.

2) "Fight for Peace": a new sports program created by Viva Rio to boost support for boxing in Brazil while using the sport to reduce social violence

\*\* When it comes to boxing, Brazil has never punched its weight. With the exception of early 60's lightweight fighter, Eder Jofre, Brazil has never produced a truly great boxer -- despite having a population of some 160 million, one of the worst income distributions in the world and a host of social problems that would normally create an ideal breeding ground for hungry fighters.

"We have the talent, says Brazil's cruiserweight champion Fernando Oliveira, "but we don't get the help from the government or business that we need to give it a push." In the true spirit of a come-forward fighter, Oliveira has decided to do something about it. He has teamed up with English anthropologist and social worker, Luke Dowdney. Aside from his work with Viva Rio in Rio de Janeiro, Luke is also former British Universities light-middleweight champion. Together they have formed Fight for Peace, a project aimed both at giving boxing a boost and at using the sport as a means of reducing social violence in Rio de Janeiro's deprived areas.

Oliveira and Dowdney are setting up a boxing club for 30 boys in the Acari shanty town, where the Brazilian champion has lived all his life. A few miles from Rio's elegant beach neighborhoods, Acari is worlds apart on any other scale. Spiralling poverty and unemployment afflict a population torn between armed gangs of drug smugglers and a violent and frequently corrupt police force. Oliveira fights under the title of 'The Beast of Acari' - not because he takes a macho pride in the hardship of his home streets, but because he sees himself as a beast with a burden. He wants to make a difference. He runs a community newspaper, and a walk around the block is a quick demonstration of his popularity in the area. Acari's youth shout out his name and run to greet him, and Oliveira is convinced that their lives can benefit from boxing. He is an elegant spokesman for the cause. "Who is Fernando Oliveira?" he asks. "The son of a cook who left the house before dawn every day to go to work and keep the family alive. But God gives us a calling, and mine was in the ring. Boxing inspires a strong desire to be someone. That's what happened to me. I wanted to copy Mike Tyson. If boxing hadn't entered my life I could have lost my way -- maybe I wouldn't even be here today." Oliveira does not mind the risks involved in boxing: "I know that if it wasn't for boxing I could be running much bigger risks. I could have taken a bullet from a drug smuggler or a cop."

"The Beast of Acari" dreams of a big fight abroad. "It would be great for me and also for the people of Acari. People here will think: 'if he can do it then I can do it too.' It's a message for all those adolescents - if they drop

drugs they can become winners in life."

The world of Brazil's deprived youth is also well known to Luke Dowdney. It was the subject of his thesis, and he is well aware that these youth grow up in an incredibly violent environment. "Just to give you an idea, in the first six months of this year, 250 kids met violent deaths in Rio. Most of them were shot. Education and leisure facilities are non-existent. The kids see no way out, and become drug dealers", says Dowdney. "It's a brutal and short life. The kids with the spirit to stand up are the ones who might express themselves through criminality. If they don't make a wrong turn early on, they could be potential leaders, and we want to offer an alternative. They often say that they're angry at the world. If we can catch them young, we can harness that anger, channel it, make it positive and transform it into a powerful force for good. It will help the kids and reduce the crime rate in their area. That's what Fight for Peace is all about."

His own experience in the ring leaves Dowdney in no doubt that boxing can rise to the challenge. "Boxing clubs give people a sense of direction in their lives and strengthen their self confidence", says Dowdney. "Boxing develops discipline, a don't-give-up spirit, and the intelligence to change strategy if things aren't working out. All of that is valid outside the ring. Our main aim is to use boxing to produce good citizens who can fulfill their potential. Through their interest in boxing, we can bring them into contact with social workers and then get them on to educational or vocational projects. Keep in mind that these are kids who normally wouldn't go near a social worker, and if we incorporate them into a project they generally want to disrupt everything. But I believe that after 6 months in a boxing club -under proper supervision - you've moved that kid into a new situation, to the point where he realizes that it's wrong to disrupt."

The club will have a resident social worker who will hold sessions of conflict resolution. "It's a technique that has been used very successfully with street gangs in Los Angeles by a group called Street Law," explains Dowdney. He expects similar results in Acari. "These kids have seen enough people shot and mutilated to know that violence is not something to glorify. They just need a way out, a framework which explains to them that they don't need to use violence to get what they want."

The idea of using boxing to reduce violence has raised eyebrows in some quarters, but Dowdney puts the program into another perspective: "It's controlled aggression. We accept that violence exists. What we want to do is channel it in the proper direction. The ring is the place for channelling this violence. It works like this: 'we teach you to box and your promise to us is that you're going to be an ambassador for the club'. Their actions will be watched within the community. Fernando knows what's going on in his neighborhood. If the kids are involved in fighting outside the ring, he's going to know about it. My hope is that after 6 months of working out in the club, we will have a small group of young men who know how to fight but who behave themselves really well, peacefully and respectfully. People will take notice of that."

\*\*excerpts from an article written by Tim Vickery for British boxing

magazine, "Boxing Monthly" available in the newsstands in December, 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.com.br/vivario/rio>

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

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sun, 22 Nov 1998 09:02:37 -0500  
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@pgs.ca>  
Importance: Normal  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: FW: opinion poll in Japan and Russia  
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

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

Non-member submission from [Hiro Umabayashi <CXJ15621@nifty.ne.jp>]  
Date: Sun, 22 Nov 1998 21:36:46 +0900  
From: Hiro Umabayashi <CXJ15621@nifty.ne.jp>  
Subject: opinion poll in Japan and Russia  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, robwcpuk@gn.apc.org

Dear friends,

Recently I found a joint Russo-Japan opinion poll which was conducted by Asahi-Shimbun and Itar-TASS (spelling uncertain, please tell me if you know the correct one.). In Japan it was conducted by Asahi-Shimbun on Oct. 4 and 5, 1998, sampling 3000 constituents, and in Russia it was conducted by a poll service company Volks Populi (spelling uncertain, please tell me if you know the correct one.), which was commissioned by Asahi-Shimbun and Itar-TASS, during the period between late September and October, 1998, sampling 2400 people older than 18 from Russian cities of various size. The purpose of the poll is to compare the people's perception of both nations on variety of matters like living condition, marriage and occupation. Among many other questions, there are following questions related to nuclear weapons. (Unofficial translation from a Japanese article in the Asahi-Shimbun, Nov. 7, 1998)

Do you feel threats from Russian military forces? (to Japanese)

1. Yes, I do. 52 %; 2. No, I don't. 39 %; 3. Others or no answer. 9 %.

Do you feel threats from Japan-US military alliance? (to Russians)

1. Yes, I do. 42%; 2. No, I don't. 38%; 3. Others or no answer. 20 %.

Do you think that all the nuclear weapon states should eliminate such weapons of their possession whatever rationale they may have? Or, do you think it is permissible that some states possess nuclear weapons for their own defense purposes?

Japan:

1. They should eliminate nuclear weapons. 78 %; 2. It is permissible. 18 %; 3 Others or no answer. 4 %.

Russia:

1. They should eliminate nuclear weapons. 61 %; 2. It is permissible. 31 %; 3 Others or no answer. 8 %.

In peace,

Hiro Umabayashi

Hiro Umebayashi  
International Coordinator, PCDS/Executive Director, Peace Depot  
3-3-1 Minowa-cho, Kohoku-ku, Yokohama, 223-0051 Japan  
tel: 81-45-563-5101, fax: 81-45-563-9907  
e-mail: CXJ15621@niftyserve.or.jp

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 09:24:36 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Proposed agenda for tomorrow

Howard,

Have you heard from Wayne Glass since our meeting with him? He said (several times) that he would contact Elizabeth Turpen on Thursday afternoon and get back to one of us about what she said. If we don't hear from him by this afternoon, do you think one of us should call him?

Here is my proposed agenda for tomorrow morning's meeting. Please give me feedback. Also, what do you think about inviting Brad Morse and Laura Kriv for tomorrow?

1. De-alerting event on the Hill
  - a. report on Glass meeting
  - b. purpose and audience
  - c. debate format?
  - d. set date
  - e. speakers
  - f. moderator
  - g. slides and other visuals
  - h. obtaining NGO cosponsors
  - i. invitations to Members and staff
  - j. followup calls to Members offices
  - k. ad in Roll Call?
  - l. press work
  - m. C-SPAN
  - n. materials to hand out
  - o. refreshments
2. Other activities
  - a. reports from other organizations: PSR,20/20,ANA,IEER
  - b. letters to editor, op-eds, editorial boards
  - c. pursuing Berger, Bell, etc.

Shalom,  
Bob T.

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

At 09:24 AM 11/23/98 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Howard,  
>  
>Have you heard from Wayne Glass since our meeting with him? He said  
>(several times) that he would contact Elizabeth Turpen on Thursday  
>afternoon and get back to one of us about what she said. If we don't  
>hear from him by this afternoon, do you think one of us should call him?  
>

Answer: I talked with Elizabeth Turpen on Thursday, as I reported. I'll call her and Wayne this afternoon. I have calls into Richard Fieldhouse and Ken Meyers to get a feel for Sen. Levin's and Sen. Lugar's position on de-alerting and learn about their trip to Russia. I'll hold off the possibility of participation in the December event until after we meet tomorrow, November 24.

>You wrote: Here is my proposed agenda for tomorrow morning's meeting. Please give  
>me feedback. Also, what do you think about inviting Brad Morse and  
>Laura Kriv for tomorrow?

Answer: I've previously replied, agreeing that Brad and Laura should be invited. I'm glad you drafted an agenda. I was going to call you about this after I looked for e-mail. On the agenda I offer suggested modifications in [brackets].

Also, who is presiding at Tuesday's meeting?

- >1. De-alerting event on the Hill
  - > a. report on Glass meeting
  - > b. purpose and audience [Hill staff, NGOs]
  - > c. [Format: briefing or debate]
  - > d. set date[, obtain room]
  - > e. speakers
  - > f. moderator
  - > g. slides and other visuals
  - > [\_. handling Q and A]
  - > h. [hosts and sponsors
  - > senators
  - > NGOs
  - > obtaining them]
  - > i. invitations to Members and staff[, to NGOs]
  - > j. followup calls to Members offices
  - > k. ad in Roll Call?
  - > l. press work
  - > m. C-SPAN[, other TV]
  - > n. materials to hand out
  - > o. refreshments
- >2. Other activities
  - > a. reports from other organizations: PSR,20/20,ANA,IEER
  - > b. letters to editor, op-eds, editorial boards

> c. pursuing Berger, Bell, etc.

>

Shalom,

Howard

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 09:38:34 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: arjun@ieer.org  
Subject: De-alerting stuff

Arjun,

That was a good conference call on Friday afternoon. Thanks for your leadership on de-alerting.

I was reviewing my notes from the de-alerting meeting we had at PSR on 9-11-98, and I found this sentence: "IEER will produce both a fact sheet and a plan for accomplishing de-alerting by 12-31-99." That got me excited, and then I was wondering about them. Have you finished those two items, or are they still in process? I don't recall seeing either one. If they are done, I would enjoy seeing them (by e-mail or fax, or bring them to tomorrow's meeting). If they are not done, are you still thinking of doing them? Thanks, Arjun.

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller

Return-Path: <Dringler@umc-gbcs.org>  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 09:29:25 -0500  
From: Robin Ringler <Dringler@umc-gbcs.org>  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Tues. meeting  
Content-Disposition: inline

Hi Howard,

Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend the meeting tomorrow. I will look forward to hearing from you about what happened, what I need to know about, etc.

Just an FYI - In my newsletter (which I'm finishing up) I am including a copy of the Jay Lintner-proposed petition on the CTBT with an article explaining what needs to be done with it. I've been trying to FAX Jay a copy of it, but I think their office is being renovated and therefore neither the phone nor the FAX are answering. I'll keep trying to send it to him today and tomorrow.

Thanks for everything you do, Howard!

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 09:57:21 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: btiller@psr.org  
Subject: Nuclear weapons

Friends and colleagues,

Last week I was talking with a Senate staffer who is knowledgeable on nuclear issues and for whom I have high regard. He said that he had just come back from the Pantex, where he was told that they have 11,000 nuclear weapons to refurbish, spruce up, replace/remanufacture old parts etc.

This seems like an absurdly high number to me, and the Senate staffer was likewise shocked at this number. I thought that 11,000 was a ballpark number for the entire U.S. nuclear arsenal, including deployed weapons and those awaiting dismantlement. So how can Pantex have 11,000 awaiting refurbishing?

Am I missing something here? Does anyone have information on this, either confirmation or refutation of the number of weapons awaiting refurbishing at Pantex?

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 12:38:33 -0500  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: NATO USE Policy, Pentagon -START Moving  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

RTos 11/23 1151 U.S. Rejects Move To Change NATO Nuclear Strategy

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - The United States Monday rebuffed a suggestion by Germany's new government that NATO change its policy and declare it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons in a conflict.

"It is an integral part of our strategic concept and we think it should remain exactly as it is," Defense Secretary William Cohen told reporters. "It is something that is integral to the NATO strategic doctrine. There is good rationale for keeping it as it is."

German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer said over the weekend he wanted to open a discussion about NATO's readiness to be the first to use nuclear weapons. He told Der Spiegel magazine that he had signaled to NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana that Bonn wanted to discuss the issue "because we see things differently."

The Western military alliance says it has the right to be the first side in any conflict to unleash atomic weapons, but some critics want it to pledge only to use them in response to nuclear attack.

Cohen, speaking at a Pentagon news conference as new German Defense Minister Rudolf Scharping met Secretary of State Madeleine Albright at the State Department, rebuffed any change in responding to reporters' questions.

"We think that the ambiguity involved in the issue of the use of nuclear weapons contributes to our own security, keeping any potential adversary who might use either chemical or biologicals (weapons) unsure of what our response would be," Cohen said. "We think that it is a sound doctrine. It was adopted certainly during the Cold War, but modified and reaffirmed following the end of the Cold War."

RTos 11/23 0450 Pentagon Asks Clinton To Consider Arms Cuts - NY Times

NEW YORK (Reuters) - The Pentagon has quietly recommended consideration of unilateral cuts in the nation's nuclear arsenal because of weakening security threats and growing budget concerns, the New York Times reported Monday.

The proposed cuts would reduce the U.S. arsenal below the 6,000 nuclear warheads allowed by the first strategic arms reduction treaty, or START I, senior Clinton administration officials told the newspaper.

START II, signed by the United States and Russia in 1993 but held up by the Russian parliament, would cut their arsenals to between 3,000 and 3,500 warheads.

The Times said the Pentagon believes that the unilateral reductions would have no effect on the ability to deter a nuclear adversary.

With the delay over START II, the Pentagon faces paying hundreds of millions of dollars to maintain and eventually rebuild nuclear weapons that it expected to scrap.

The Times said the Pentagon has spent \$95 million more over the past two years than it would have if START II had taken effect.

The Pentagon in April submitted to Congress a highly classified report outlining nine proposals for reducing the strategic arsenal unilaterally, the newspaper said.

A senior White House official told the Times neither President Clinton nor Secretary of Defense William Cohen has made a decision on the Pentagon's recommendations and would not do so until Russia's Communist-dominated Parliament completes its latest deliberations on START II.

--

#### DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE

Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools

Kathy Crandall, Coordinator

1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)

<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 13:35:19 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: btiller@psr.org  
Subject: Clinton Administration view on de-alerting

Friends and colleagues,

You will remember that in August Howard Hallman and I organized a sign-on letter to Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin about de-alerting nuclear weapons. Many of you signed onto it.

The sign-on letter was faxed to the two presidents on August 26th, and today I received a response by snail mail from the Pentagon. I am reproducing it here, complete with astounding claims and typos. Feel free to pass it along to others. At least we now know what their ridiculous arguments are.

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
-----

Dear Mr. Tiller:

Thank you for your recent letter to President Clinton concerning the de-alerting of nuclear weapons.

De-alerting U.S. and Russian nuclear forces by separating warheads from their delivery vehicles as you propose is a serious issue and one of on-going discussion and debate in the U.S. government. It is a vitally important that we thoroughly understand the implications and increased vulnerability of the United States should we de-alert as you propose.

Our nuclear capability and readiness have prevented major world war for decades. Departing from that strategy could adversely impact our ability to respond in a timely fashion to threats to the U.S. or our allies. It could result in a highly destabilizing situation. De-alerting appears to be a straightforward solution to an obvious threat, but the impacts on our national security could be severe. It is a step not taken lightly.

Earlier this year, after a firsthand view of Russian nuclear command and control systems, General Eugene Habiger, former Commander in Chief for U.S. Strategic Command, reported that Russian nuclear safety and security were excellent. He found them comparable to U.S. systems. You can read an account of his finding on the Internet at <http://www.stratcom.af.mil/testimony/cinc-16%20jun.htm>. While Gen. Habiger's report does not address the broader issue of de-alerting, it provides some assurance that the danger of accidental or unauthorized launch of missiles kept on alert is low.

Thank you for your interest in national security and this vitally important topic.

Sincerely,  
Fred S. Celec  
Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of Defense  
Nuclear Matters



Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 14:21:14 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Proposed agenda for tomorrow  
References: <2.2.16.19981123135201.2bdfdf5a@pop.igc.org>

Howard,

I know that you talked with Elizabeth. I was wondering about getting a report on Wayne's conversation with her.

Yes, I got your response about Laura and Brad, but not until after I sent out this repeat query this morning. Brad will come. Laura can not come but may send someone.

We did not appoint anyone to preside at tomorrow's meeting. How about you?

Thanks for the agenda additions. I will print out copies.

Shalom,  
Bob T.

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>  
> At 09:24 AM 11/23/98 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:  
>>Howard,  
>>  
>>Have you heard from Wayne Glass since our meeting with him? He said  
>>(several times) that he would contact Elizabeth Turpen on Thursday  
>>afternoon and get back to one of us about what she said. If we don't  
>>hear from him by this afternoon, do you think one of us should call him?  
>>  
>  
> Answer: I talked with Elizabeth Turpen on Thursday, as I reported. I'll  
> call her and Wayne this afternoon. I have calls into Richard Fieldhouse and  
> Ken Meyers to get a feel for Sen. Levin's and Sen. Lugar's position on  
> de-alerting and learn about their trip to Russia. I'll hold off the  
> possibility of participation in the December event until after we meet  
> tomorrow, November 24.  
>  
>>You wrote: Here is my proposed agenda for tomorrow morning's meeting.  
> Please give  
>>me feedback. Also, what do you think about inviting Brad Morse and  
>>Laura Kriv for tomorrow?  
>  
> Answer: I've previously replied, agreeing that Brad and Laura should be  
> invited. I'm glad you drafted an agenda. I was going to call you about

> this after I looked for e-mail. On the agenda I offer suggested  
> modifications in [brackets].  
>  
> Also, who is presiding at Tuesday's meeting?  
>  
>>1. De-alerting event on the Hill  
>> a. report on Glass meeting  
>> b. purpose and audience [Hill staff, NGOs]  
>> c. [Format: briefing or debate]  
>> d. set date[, obtain room]  
>> e. speakers  
>> f. moderator  
>> g. slides and other visuals  
> [\_ handling Q and A]  
> h. [hosts and sponsors  
>> senators  
> NGOs  
> obtaining them]  
> i. invitations to Members and staff[, to NGOs]  
>> j. followup calls to Members offices  
>> k. ad in Roll Call?  
>> l. press work  
>> m. C-SPAN[, other TV]  
>> n. materials to hand out  
>> o. refreshments  
>>2. Other activities  
>> a. reports from other organizations: PSR,20/20,ANA,IEER  
>> b. letters to editor, op-eds, editorial boards  
>> c. pursuing Berger, Bell, etc.  
>>  
> Shalom,  
> Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 20:23:30 +0100  
From: CESD <cesd@agoranet.be>  
Organization: Centre for European Security and Disarmament  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: European Parliament on NAC  
To: Abolition Server <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,  
Abolition Europe <abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de>

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

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id LAB18627

Dear friends,

I have the pleasure of sending you a copy of a resolution passed 19 November by the European Parliament (EP) supporting the NAC initiative and consequent resolution in the UNGA. It explicitly calls for a 'yes' vote from all European Union member states, reasserts its call for a nuclear-weapon-free world, reiterates support for the NPT especially Article VI, calls for improved verification, supports de-alerting and requests all states that oppose the resolution to specifically name the paragraphs in question.

I am hopeful that this measure will assist in efforts to convince some countries to demonstrably increase their support for the UNGA resolution, specifically changing to 'yes' votes.

Background on EP resolution

CESD works with the EP quite a bit, and I must admit to being skeptical when I first approached parliamentarians with the idea for this resolution. However, with some work, good information and growing public concern for this issue, it managed to come to fruition yesterday. I see it as a victory for the aims of the NAC, as well as a reflection of the increasing streamlined efficiency of NGOs working together around the world.

Throughout the days of the First Committee, CESD was linked into what was happening in New York, through NGOs and directly with the delegations themselves. It was that information and co-ordination that made possible our effectiveness here in Brussels. I must especially thank Rebecca Johnson of the Acronym Institute, whose detailed, timely and exhaustive updates kept us in the flow. In Europe, many of us were co-ordinating minute-by-minute our country debates and opportunities for action. In my experience, this has been the most gratifying co-operative effort I have been involved in with other NGOs. I learned a lot this time around, bits of which I'm sharing here.

As you know, 12 of the 16 NATO countries abstained, with much agonising in capitals. Blowing another horn, Karel Koster of AMOK/Working Group Eurobomb did a phenomenal job in exploiting every opportunity in Holland. I am convinced that one of the pivotal moments before the dominoes began to fall within NATO is when Karel convinced the Dutch Parliament to take up the debate openly. It is there that the Foreign Minister publicly announced that Holland was abstaining and who was voting how, opening the way for other European countries to abstain instead of voting against. Again, this wouldn't have been possible without considerable pressure from other arenas, but I wanted to mention this as a good example of NGO action leading to concrete results.

I know that others were working in their respective constituencies on this as well. I hear MPI did some things, as well as LCNP, and others, which I am sure also contributed to the overall NAC success.

#### Implications for the future

Although the EP resolution does not cover all topics exhaustively, the fact that it explicitly states its support for the NAC statement and the resolution opens up all sorts of avenues. We had originally drafted language that included mention of the ICJ opinion, for example, but that was taken out of the final. However, since it is contained in the UN resolution, their support is still explicit.

It is significant that this is the first time, according to my information, that NATO has not voted en bloc on an important nuclear resolution. This obviously reflects a difference of opinion within NATO and could very well impact the discussion currently underway on the Alliance's Strategic Concept review. With the German and Canadian governments now pushing for change on No First Use, and armed with the votes in First Committee and UNGA pressure could be mounted in NATO capitals to force the hand of government negotiators to push for change.

In the Conference on Disarmament as well, as a result of the First Cttee vote, the urgency is increased to create some type of structure, like an ad hoc group, to discuss aspects of nuclear disarmament, especially if the South African formula were used. NATO has been a block there and in other fora, but the eventual separation of the nuclear aspect of NATO from its other core tasks could very well be what we will be seeing in future. This should be exploited now.

There are also implications for the NPT, and its Arts. I & II. As colleagues have pointed out, and I agree, pushing the removal of US tactical nuclear warheads from European soil should be the priority over talks of No First Use. Or so was

my opinion until today, when the Germans are now explicitly supporting discussions within NATO on NFU. While this is not a possibility for the new Concept, it does create pressure that could be exploited to change some aspects of NATO's nuclear posture.

It is a strategic decision over how to make NATO non-nuclear. The only way NFU will see the light of day in NATO is if they renounce deterrence completely. Doing that in one fell swoop is all but impossible at this point. However, if tactical nuclear weapons were recalled, that would lay the groundwork for practical discussions on the whys and hows of NATO nuclear sharing. We see from the NAC resolution that not everyone in NATO is in agreement 100% on nuclear policy, and there is more and more talk behind the scenes on how one would withdraw tac nukes without causing a crisis of confidence in the transatlantic link.

Implications for the 1999 NPT PrepCom? It is still a bit early to tell, but if this NAC resolution reflects a real shift in political will, or at least a reinforcement of previous convictions, we could have a more interesting PrepCom than could have been expected before. We have of course been seeing the increased isolation of the NWS from NNWS since PC97, undoubtedly this gap will now increase. The 'coalitions of the willing', like the NAC, that are becoming more prevalent in every forum will impact the dynamics, and perhaps the outcome, of this PrepCom—and more importantly the 2000 Review Conference.

Well, that's it for the long analysis. I would be interested to hear what others have to say. I hope you found this information useful.

Yours sincerely,

Sharon Riggle  
Acting Director  
CESD

P.S. If anyone cannot open the attached Word document, please let me know and I will send it in a friendlier format.

--

Centre for European Security and Disarmament (CESD)  
115 rue Stévin  
1000 Brussels  
Belgium  
Tel: +32-2-230.07.32  
Fax: +32-2-230.24.67

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\FINALNAC.doc



Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 1998 17:04:18 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: amillar@fourthfreedom.org  
Subject: Tuesday morning meeting

Alistair,

Since we will probably have six or seven people at the de-aerting meeting, we may need to have a chairperson. So I suggested to Howard that he might fill that role tomorrow. I hope that is OK with you. I will bring copies of the printed agenda.

Shalom,  
Bob T.

To: phil  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Request for payment  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

1. Now that the MUPJ treasury is relatively full, I would like to request reimbursement for the remaining balance on the bill for the NPT Preparatory Committee reception. The total bill, which was paid through my Visa account, was \$3,538.19. Previous reimbursements total \$3,000, leaving a balance of \$538.19. I suggest payment from the Education Fund, unless you feel that the General Fund would be better.

2. Please draw up a check for \$15.00, payable to Christian Social Action for renewal of our subscription.

3. I can find no record of a membership contribution by Dorothy Beltz. It must have gone astray.

Thanks for all the volunteer work you do for MUPJ.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: lintnerj@uc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Today's meeting on CTBT  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Jay:

I hope that you will be able to attend today's meeting on the CTBT at FCNL at 1:00 p.m. Will you please provide copies of the final draft of the petition and background documents?

Thanks,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-newscape@ecunet.org>  
To: newscape@ecunet.org (Newscape subscribers list)  
From: owner-newscape@ecunet.org (Newscape subscribers list)  
Reply-to: owner-newscape@ecunet.org (Newscape subscribers list)  
X-send-unsubscribe-to: newscape-request@ecunet.org  
X-Disclaimer: Views are those of the author, not necessarily Ecunet  
Subject: [newscape] note 412  
Date: Mon, 23 Nov 98 17:17:27 EST

"NEWSCOPE" by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on July 21, 1993 at 21:36 Eastern, about  
SUBSCRIPTION-ONLY WEEKLY NEWS SOURCE (412 notes).

Note 412 by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on Nov. 23, 1998 at 16:52 Eastern (3206  
characters).

Dear Member of the Newscape Family:

Okay, here's the deal.

I started out by sending Newscape by e-mail to about 25 people who were on Ecunet. I later found I could send Newscape to persons outside Ecunet. Well, that list of 25 has now grown to over 3,000, but unlike our well-oiled circulation department downstairs that handles regular mail subscriptions, I am still handling this list as I did with 25 subscribers.

To make an impossible job a little more possible, I set this up so everyone's subscription would expire at the same time -- December 31 of each year.

The next steps are relatively easy for both you and me.

1. If you agree that your subscription expires on December 31, just send a check for \$15 payable to Newscape, to 201 Eighth Ave. So., Nashville, TN 37203, marked to the attention of Rich Peck.
2. If you want to pay for your subscription through your Cokesbury account, send that number by e-mail to RPeck@UMPublishing.Org.
3. If you paid for a year's subscription and you haven't received 50 issues, drop a note by e-mail to RPeck@UMPublishing.Org and I will extend your subscription to Dec. 31, 1999.

This, folks, is an honor system. If you tell me you deserve another year, I'll believe you. If you feel inclined to pay for a portion of a year, just send any portion of the \$15 annual fee you feel is fair.

However, please be warned. This is as automated as I can get it. If I don't hear from you in any way, your subscription will be canceled in January.

The only exceptions to this rule are the following e-mail addresses that will be extended through 1999. If your address is in this list you don't need to

do a thing.

adosuper@aolcom

borykmuch@mail.bigplanet.com

conwayb@umr.edu

kentreck1@juno.com

alburk@earthlink.net

gpalmer@bw.edu

gpalmer1@ix.netcom.com

glser@dmapub.dma.org

jccsc@gpcom.net

jimsmith@arn.net

RinaTerry@aol.com

revrew@zianet.com

kathyumc@southwind.net

nmoffatt@athenet.net

MVose@compuserve.com

fparish@bethelumc.org

Jacobal@postoffice.ptd.net

NorthAIUMF@aol.com

ihgclove@eastky.net

bills@accn.org

johnandjennifer@juno.com

bpegg@frontiernet.net

fenumc@juno.com

dhwally@aol.com

ElginDist@aol.com

umccleveland@wingnet.net

rmoorlach@santel.net

jlarrym@prodigy.net

groves@transport.com

cbbrdwy@radiks.net

TMcAnally@UMCOM.UMC.ORG

wmckelvey@itc.edu

joejnich@ipa.net

joann@strato.net.

bweaver@netins.net

WendyW@GBGM-UMC.Org

KMERTUE@JUNO.COM

Etathree@aol.com

dcajr@bgo.cyberspace

113316.3531@compuserve.com

sabc@juno.com

BISHOPCOYNER@JUNO.COM

gldavis@earthlink.net

jhopkins@msn.com

umbishopn5@aol.com

bishop.jordan@iaumc.org

HAEJONG@aol.com

imumuz@imumuz.uem.mz

bishop@umcneb.org

bishop.awf@worldnet.att.net

MAREAUMC@tir.com

SZRADER@aol.com

bishopsano@cal-pac.org

mo\_bishop\_sherer\_umc.parti@eucnet.org

BISHOP@mcumc.com

CANVBISHOP@AOL.COM

UMC.VAXBY@KOLUMBUS.TI

UMethWV@AOL.Com

umcombwc@aol.com

SPEEK@UMCOM.UMC.ORG

If your address is not on this list, your subscription will be canceled in January if I don't hear from you.

Have a happy Thanksgiving day. We all have much for which to be truly thankful, and I'm grateful for each of you.

All the best, Rich Peck

~~~~~  
This note sent to subscribers of the newscope list.  
To unsubscribe DO NOT REPLY TO THIS NOTE! Instead,  
create a new note to newscope-request@ecunet.org  
containing just the word

unsubscribe

If you have trouble with the automated routine there, please send copies of error messages and other notes to owner-newscope@ecunet.org and a real person will assist. Here are links if your mailer supports that sort of thing.

unsubscribe notices: <mailto:newscope-request@ecunet.org>

human intervention: <mailto:owner-newscope@ecunet.org>

To: phil  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: [newscope] note 412  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

Please provide a \$15 check payable to Newscope, as explained below.

Shalom,  
Howard

>Return-Path: <owner-newscope@ecunet.org>  
>To: newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
>From: owner-newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
>Reply-to: owner-newscope@ecunet.org (Newscope subscribers list)  
>X-send-unsubscribe-to: newscope-request@ecunet.org  
>X-Disclaimer: Views are those of the author, not necessarily Ecunet  
>Subject: [newscope] note 412  
>Date: Mon, 23 Nov 98 17:17:27 EST  
>  
>  
>"NEWSCOPE" by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on July 21, 1993 at 21:36 Eastern, about  
>SUBSCRIPTION-ONLY WEEKLY NEWS SOURCE (412 notes).  
>  
>Note 412 by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on Nov. 23, 1998 at 16:52 Eastern (3206  
>characters).  
>  
>Dear Member of the Newscope Family:  
>  
>Okay, here's the deal.  
>  
>I started out by sending Newscope by e-mail to about 25 people who were on  
>Ecunet. I later found I could send Newscope to persons outside Ecunet. Well,  
>that list of 25 has now grown to over 3,000, but unlike our well-oiled  
>circulation department downstairs that handles regular mail subscriptions, I  
>am still handling this list as I did with 25 subscribers.  
>  
>To make an impossible job a little more possible, I set this up so everyone's  
>subscription would expire at the same time -- December 31 of each year.  
>  
>The next steps are relatively easy for both you and me.  
>  
>  
>  
>1. If you agree that your subscription expires on December 31, just send a  
>check for \$15 payable to Newscope, to 201 Eighth Ave. So., Nashville, TN  
>37203, marked to the attention of Rich Peck.  
>  
>2. If you want to pay for your subscription through your Cokesbury account,  
>send that number by e-mail to RPeck@UMPublishing.Org.

>

>3. If you paid for a year's subscription and you haven't received 50 issues,  
>drop a note by e-mail to RPeck@UMPublishing.Org and I will extend your  
>subscription to Dec. 31, 1999.

>

>This, folks, is an honor system. If you tell me you deserve another year,  
>I'll believe you. If you feel inclined to pay for a portion of a year, just  
>send any portion of the \$15 annual fee you feel is fair.

>

>However, please be warned. This is as automated as I can get it. If I don't  
>hear from you in any way, your subscription will be canceled in January.

Return-Path: <lwyolton@prodigy.net>  
Date: Tue, 24 Nov 1998 08:01:49 -0500  
From: "L. William Yolton" <lwyolton@prodigy.net>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Today's meeting  
X-Corel-MessageType: EMail

I will miss the CTBT meeting today. I'm on a team to interview candidates for the position of Medical Director at the Northern Virginia Mental Health Institute. The interview have been scheduled for today.

Do let others know that I am not "flagging in zeal." Just can't be two places at once.

Thanks for the notes from the Nov. 3 meeting.

--Bill Yolton

Return-Path: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "Howard Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Meeting Time for February  
Date: Tue, 24 Nov 1998 16:12:46 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800

Howard --

We also need to move the time for the Tuesday, February 16 Interfaith CTBT meeting by one-half hour to 1:30 p.m. Monday Lobby will be meeting that day, as the Monday is Presidents Day. The rest the meetings through July would be fine at 1 p.m. Just January and February need to be moved back one-half hour.

Thanks for a good meeting and have a great Thanksgiving!

David

Return-Path: <owner-act-now-napf@lists.xmission.com>  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com  
Date: Tue, 24 Nov 1998 16:02:09 -0800  
To: act-now-napf@lists.xmission.com  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Subject: (act-now-napf) The Time is Ripe to Rid This Planet of Nuclear Weapons  
Sender: owner-act-now-napf@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: act-now-napf@lists.xmission.com

The Time Is Ripe; The Momentum Is There to  
Rid This Planet Of Nuclear Weapons, Once And For All

ISSUE: December 10th marks the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In early December, the UN General Assembly will vote on furthering the elimination of the most fundamental assault against human rights: nuclear weapons.

BACKGROUND: During the last couple of years support for nuclear weapons abolition has been gaining momentum with support from more than 1,200 citizen action groups in 83 countries, more than 60 retired generals and admirals from 17 countries, more than 130 civilian and religious leaders, 33 Nobel Laureates, professional associations, and more. This year, nation states have joined the increasingly vocal demand of citizens worldwide. In May, Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden formed the New Agenda Coalition (NAC), calling upon the nuclear-weapon states to "demonstrate an unequivocal commitment to the speedy and total elimination of their respective nuclear weapons." The Middle Powers Initiative is attempting to gather support from additional states such as Australia, Austria, Canada, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, etc. Very recently opposition to the U.S. strategy of nuclear deterrence has been mounting within NATO. Twelve of 16 NATO members expressed their opposition to U.S. nuclear policy by abstaining on an important vote (in the First Committee of the UN) on a resolution introduced by the NAC countries which calls for rapid nuclear disarmament. In early December the UN General Assembly will vote on the NAC resolution together with a Malaysian resolution that calls for an international nuclear weapons convention.

ARGUMENTS: UN General Assembly support for a New Agenda in favor of rapid nuclear disarmament is crucial for the following reasons:

- Of all weapons of mass-destruction nuclear weapons are the most fundamental assault against human rights.
- The International Court of Justice has declared nuclear weapons illegal since they violate international humanitarian law.
- Of all weapons of mass-destruction, nuclear weapons are the only kind that is not controlled by international treaty.
- The post-Cold War years offer a unique chance to rid the planet of the only weapon that challenges the very existence of humankind. Nation states should grasp this historic moment before the window of opportunity closes.
- As with the anti-landmine treaty, only the combined force of citizen action and nation states will bring about the necessary momentum to facilitate nuclear abolition.

#### ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE:

Fax a letter to the embassies of the following countries to sway their crucial vote in favor of the two resolutions: for rapid nuclear disarmament (L.48) and the goal of "multilateral negotiations in 1999 leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention" (L.47).

Thank you very much for your support. Please send us copies of your letters.

(abstaining from vote in First Committee of the UN were:)

Belgium: Fax: (202) 333-3079; Email: washington@diplobel.org

Canada: Fax: (202) 682-7726

China: Fax: (202) 328-2582

Denmark: Fax: (202) 328-1470

Germany: Fax: (202) 298-4249

Greece: Fax: (202) 939-5824  
Iceland: Fax: (202) 265-6656  
Italy: Fax: (202) 462-3605  
Japan: Fax: (202) 328-2187  
Luxembourg: Fax: (202) 328-8270  
Netherlands: Fax: (202) 363-1032  
Norway: Fax: (202) 337-0870  
Portugal: Fax: (202) 462-3726  
Spain: Fax: (202) 833-5670

(No votes on the two resolutions in the First Committee of the UN were:)

Armenia: Fax: (202) 319-2982  
Bulgaria: Fax: (202) 387-7963  
Czech Republic: Fax: (202) 966-8540  
Estonia: Fax: (202) 588-0108  
France: Fax: (202) 944-6166  
Hungary: Fax: (202) 966-8135  
India: Fax: (202) 939-7027  
Israel: Fax: (212) 499-5615  
Latvia: Fax: (202) 726-6785  
Lithuania: Fax: (202) 328-0466  
Pakistan: Fax: (202) 387-0484  
Poland: Fax: (202) 328-6271  
Romania: Fax: (202) 232-4778  
Russia: Fax: (202) 232-4544  
Slovakia: Fax: (202) 965-5166  
United Kingdom: Fax: (202) 898-4273  
United States: Fax: (212) 415-4443

=====  
S P O N S O R  
=====

List service is being sponsored by  
XMission, 51 East 400 South Suite 200,  
Salt Lake City, UT. 84111  
voice: 801/539-0852 fax:801/539-0853  
URL: <http://www.xmission.com>

\*\*\*\*\*  
NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION  
International contact for Abolition 2000  
a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons  
\*\*\*\*\*  
1187 Coast Village Road, Box 123  
Santa Barbara, CA 93108-2794  
Phone (805) 965-3443 \* Fax (805) 568-0466  
e- <mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org>  
URL <http://www.wagingpeace.org>  
URL <http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>  
\*\*\*\*\*

- To unsubscribe to act-now-napf, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com" with "unsubscribe act-now-napf" in the body of the message. For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send "help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Wed, 25 Nov 1998 12:25:15 +0100  
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-1: November bulletin from Durban  
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  
November 1998 Bulletin

Promoting Peace through religion and culture

An exhibition on religion and culture entitled " A Celebration of the Right to Be", opened on Sunday 26 August at the Durban Jewish Club. The exhibition consisted of an introductory video, a series of some 74 posters as well as artifacts from various religions and also two models dressed as a Sangoma (Zulu traditional healer) and a member of an African independent church, the Shembe Community.

The exhibition was created by Paddy Meskin, a member of the Durban Chapter of the World Conference on Religion and Peace (WCRP). It was held in association with the Diakonia Council of Churches and Ningizimu Specially Mentally Handicapped School's A4 Art Exhibition.

Although the general theme was the celebration of Human Rights, the main focus was on the rights of freedom of religion, language and culture, health and illness prevention (specifically AIDS) and the right to freedom of expression, regardless of race, creed, colour or gender.

The exhibition was introduced with an excellent video entitled " Flowers are Red", a delightful cartoon about a little boy who goes to school and wants to paint flowers all the colours of the rainbow, but is brainwashed into using only red. When he does find a school that allows for the colours, he doesn't know how to do so. It is a very apt introduction and the final wish in the video - that our children should be able to paint flowers with all the colours of the rainbow is an excellent way of introducing interfaith ideas and multi-culturalism to young people.

The exhibition is divided into different sections:

1. Introduction of the Bill of Rights and in particular, the clause dealing with freedom of religion and culture.
2. What is religion? Why do we need it? How did it begin?
3. A look at the similarities that all religions share.
4. Five of the major religions are looked at in pictures and text, each dealing with belief and concept of God, history, philosophy, Rites of Passage, main festivals and special factors. The religions dealt with are:

Buddhism  
Christianity  
Hinduism  
Islam  
Judaism

5. The next section dealt with African Cultures and the following were investigated:

The Zulus  
The Xhosas  
The Ndebeles  
The Bushmen

6. Finally issues which are confronting all communities today were looked at very briefly, e.g. world poverty and the environment.

We had about 800 people come through the exhibition during the 5 days--12 school groups and a group of Norwegian students studying for the ministry. Although the turnout at the actual exhibition was not what we had hoped for, the spin off has been excellent.

We have already been asked to loan it to four schools so that all their students will have an opportunity to see it.

Arrangements are being made to take it beyond Durban to Port Shepstone and the Tembeletu Community Centre in Pietermaritzburg where Paddy Meskin will give guided tours. There is also a possibility that it might go to Cape Town next year to the Conference of the Parliament of World Religions.

Paddy says that the exhibition has been a very positive experience and like two other exhibits of Anne Frank and Apartheid which comprised the "When Racism Becomes Law" exhibition, this one will continue to be used for some time. It is intended that the exhibition will be expanded to include other cultures and religions of our country.

Future exhibitions:

10 December 1998:

The exhibition will be displayed in association with Amnesty International, to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the signing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Amnesty International have invited Erica Mott from Washington DC to be at this commemoration. Ms Mott works in theatre and drama for young people at risk, she has created programmes for abused young people, drug addicts, disabled and those who have been imprisoned. She also teaches Human Rights through theatre and performance in schools.

Paddy Meskin

-----  
Peace to the City! - Durban

Visit our Website:  
<http://www.durbanpeace.org.za>

Coordinator: Mike Vorster  
coord@durbanpeace.org.za  
Tel: +27-31-305-6001  
Fax: +27-31-306-2486

-----

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

To: relctbt  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: December 2 strategy meeting on CTBT  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers has decided to open the December 2 Briefing and Strategy Meeting on the CTBT in 1999 to all faith-based organizations working for CTBT ratification. The meeting will take place from 8:00 to 11:30 a.m., Wednesday, December 2 at Resources for the Future Conference Room C, 1400 16th Street, NW (at corner of 16th and P). If you want to attend, please RSVP to Jenny Smith at 202 546-0795, ext, 137 (jsmith@clw.org).

The agenda is as follows:

8:00 Coffee and light breakfast  
8:30 Welcome and introductions  
8:40 Report on White House plans on the CTBT  
    Robert Bell, National Security Council  
    Outlook for Senate action on the CTBT  
    Randy DeValk, Office of Minority Leader  
    Edward Levine, Minority Staff of Senator Foreign Relations Committee  
9:15 Questions and discussion  
9:45 Break  
10:00 Moderate discussion of public education plans and strategy options  
10:30 Adjourn

I hope you can join me in participation in this strategy session on the CTBT.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: jsmith@clw.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: December meeting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Jenny:

I plan to attend the December 2 strategy session on the CTBT.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: bmorse@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, btiller@psr.org, hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, disarmament@igc.org, laura@2020vision.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: December forum on de-alerting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

Here are my notes on decisions made on November 24 when we met to discuss a de-alerting event on Capitol Hill. Participants included Brad Morse, Fran Teplitz, Jonathan Dean, Bob Tiller, Hisham Zerriffi, Alistair Millar, and myself.

The event will be a forum on de-alerting and will present a range of views on the subject. It will take place in a Senate office building. Preferred dates are Wednesday, December 16 or 9. Alternatives are Tuesday or Thursday, December 15 or 17, 8 or 10. Choice will be determined by availability of speakers. [Note: The House Judiciary Committee plans to meet on December 7 to make its decision on President Clinton; possibly the House will convene the following week to consider the Committee's recommendation. This may effect our timing, but we need to go ahead with our plans anyway.]

Suggested speakers: Bruce Blair or Frank von Hippel; Admiral Stansfield Turner; Admiral Hank Childs or Fred S. Celec (Pentagon); a Russian representative; Ira Helfand; Dick Garwin. There will be no more than four. Alistair has responsibility to contact them. He will start with Bruce Blair to find out his availability. [Note: Wayne Glass will find out when Senator Bingaman will be in town in December and whether he would offer greetings. I'll share his dates with Alistair.]

Jonathan Dean agreed to be moderator. After initial presentations he will open the proceedings for questions from the press and from others in the audience.

Sponsors: Senator Bingaman seems willing to serve as a sponsor or host, according to Wayne Glass on his staff. He would sign a "Dear Colleague" letter of invitation. We are exploring whether Senator Domenici will do likewise. If he doesn't, we will seek another Republican, such as Senator Chaffee. I am handling this.

Organizations present agreed to serve as co-sponsors of the event. Bob will contact several more organizations to be co-sponsors.

The audience will be Senate staff, selected House staff, and NGOs (Monday Lobby, members of Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, organizations from the faith community). Bob will develop a flyer which can serve as an invitation to Hill staff and NGOs. [Will you also handle the mailing, Bob?] Brad will take the lead in follow-up calls to Hill staff, with help from PSR and Peace Action.

Fran will find out the cost of an ad in Roll Call. If cost is reasonable, she will place it.

We believe that we might attract 45-50 people. I am working with Wayne Glass to arrange for a room. The room will need suitable microphones for the panel, questions from the floor, and connections for TV cameras. I will also talk to Wayne about how to obtain light refreshments (rolls, coffee, juice).

I will seek coverage by C-Span (with help from Senator Bingaman's office). UCS will develop and send out a media advisory. [Query: Who will follow up on contacts with key media persons?]

Hisham will develop visuals on poster boards. IEER has resources. CDI might also be tapped. [We will need to work out how they tie into the presentations.] Kathy Crandall has agreed to produce handout material.

To pay costs, PSR is willing to contribute \$500 and Fourth Freedom Forum \$500 to \$1,000.

If I have anything wrong or have left out anything, please reply to all. Likewise if you think of anything we have left out in our plans.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 25 Nov 1998 12:21:26 -0800  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Ten Reasons to Abolish Nuclear Weapons  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Here is a recent article summarizing some of the major reasons for abolition.

## TEN REASONS TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS by David Krieger\*

1. Existing Obligations. The nuclear weapons states have made solemn promises to the international community to negotiate in good faith to achieve nuclear disarmament. Each of the nuclear weapons states accepted this obligation when it signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and extended this promise at the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference. India and Pakistan, which are not signatories of the NPT, have committed themselves to abolish their nuclear arsenals if the other nuclear weapons states agree to do so. The only nuclear weapons state that has not made this promise is Israel, and surely it could be convinced to do so if the other nuclear weapons states agreed to the elimination of their nuclear arsenals. The International Court of Justice, the world's highest court, unanimously highlighted the obligation for nuclear disarmament in its 1996 Opinion: "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."
2. Nuclear Weapons Proliferation. The failure of the nuclear weapons states to act to eliminate their nuclear arsenals will likely result in the proliferation of nuclear weapons to other nations. If the nuclear weapons states continue to maintain the position that nuclear weapons preserve their security, it is only reasonable that other nations with less powerful military forces will decide that their security should also be maintained by nuclear arsenals. Without substantial progress toward nuclear disarmament, the Non-Proliferation Treaty will be in jeopardy when the parties to the treaty meet for the NPT Review Conference in the year 2000.
3. Nuclear Terrorism. The breakup of the former Soviet Union has weakened the command and control system relied upon by the Russians. This could lead to nuclear weapons or weapons-grade materials falling into the hands of terrorists or criminals. Because terrorists and criminals are not easily locatable, they are not subject to deterrence, which relies upon the threat of retaliation. It isn't possible to retaliate against a party that is not locatable.
4. Nuclear Accidents. The breakup of the former Soviet Union has also weakened Russia's early warning system, since many parts of this system were located outside of Russia. This could result in the launching of nuclear weapons by accident or miscalculation, given the short time periods available in which to make decisions about whether or not a state is under attack.
5. Immorality of Threatening Mass Murder. It is highly immoral to base the security of a nation on the threat to murder hundreds of millions of people. This immoral policy is named deterrence, and it is relied upon by all nuclear weapons states. Deterrence is a theory that in implementation places humanity and most of creation in jeopardy of annihilation.
6. Undermining Democracy. Nuclear weapons undermine democracy by placing the power to destroy the world as we know it in the hands of a very few individuals. No one should have this much power. If these individuals make a mistake, everyone in the world will pay for it.
7. Secrecy from Public. Decisions about nuclear weapons have been made largely in secrecy with little involvement from the public. In the United States, for example, nuclear weapons policy is set forth in a Presidential Decision Directive, which is not made available to the public. On this most important of all issues facing humanity, there is no

informed consent to presidential policy.

8. Drain on Resources. Nuclear weapons have drained resources, including scientific resources, from other more productive uses. A recent study by the Brookings Institution found that the United States alone had spent more than \$5.5 trillion on nuclear weapons programs since the beginning of the Nuclear Age. The United States continues to spend some \$25-\$35 billion annually on maintaining, testing and developing its nuclear arsenal. All of these misspent resources represent lost opportunities for improving the health, education and welfare of the people of the world.

9. Warnings by Distinguished Leaders. Distinguished leaders throughout the world, including generals, admirals, heads of state and government, scientists, and Nobel Peace Laureates, have warned of the dangers inherent in relying upon nuclear weapons for security. These warnings have not been heeded by the leaders of nuclear weapons states.

10. It Is Our Responsibility. We have a responsibility to our children and grandchildren to end the threat that nuclear weapons pose to humanity. If we do not accept responsibility to speak out and act for a world free of nuclear weapons, who will?

\*David Krieger is president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, and a founder of Abolition 2000, a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons. He can be contacted at Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa Barbara, CA 93108, or by email at [dkrieger@napf.org](mailto:dkrieger@napf.org). Further information on achieving a nuclear weapons free world may be found at the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation web site at [www.wagingpeace.org](http://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/>

\*\*\*\*\*

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Wed, 25 Nov 1998 16:26:57 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: 12/2 CTBT Strategy Mtg. Materials

November 24, 1998

TO: December 2nd CTBT Strategy Meeting Attendees  
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: Meeting Reminder and Background Information

The Coalition's CTBT Working Group Chair, Tom Collina, and I are looking forward to seeing you at the Coalition's CTBT Briefing and Strategy Meeting Wednesday, December 2, from 8:30 to 11:30am at Resources for the Future Conference Room C, 1400 Sixteenth St. NW (at corner of 16th & P) .

The purpose of this special meeting is to learn from key White House officials and Senate staff about their plans for CTBT ratification and implementation in 1999 and to reach agreement on enhancing our joint public education strategies. Attached below is a draft CTBT strategy outline paper prepared by Tom Collina. Please take time to review this document, which will provide the basis for much of our strategy discussion in the second half of the meeting.

The agenda is as follows:

- 8:00 Coffee and light breakfast
- 8:30 Welcome and Introductions
- 8:40 Report on White House Plans on the CTBT - Robert Bell or Steve Andreasen, NSC & Outlook for Senate Action on the CTBT - Randy DeValk, Office of the Minority Leader and Edward Levine, Minority Staff of SFRC
- 9:15 Questions and Discussion
- 9:45 Break
- 10:00 1999 CTBT Strategy Planning Discussion
  - Review, Discussion and Agreement on Strategy Objectives (see attached draft paper)
  - Discussion & Planning of Key Activities Necessary to Accomplish Strategic Objectives (i.e. soliciting opinion-elite support, organizing "grassroots" support, encouraging editorial support and media coverage, etc.)
- 11:30 Adjourn

If you have not already done so, please RSVP to Jenny Smith at 202-546-0795 x137 as soon as possible. If you have further questions or suggestions, please contact me (546-0795 x136 or <dkimball@clw.org>) or Tom Collina at UCS (332-0900 or <tcollina@ucsusa.org>).

\*\*\* THE FOLLOWING IS CONFIDENTIAL: do not circulate; for internal use only \*\*\*

## How to get the CTBT ratified in 1999: A Draft Strategy Outline

What we need (and have some control over):

- \* CTBT as #1 Clinton foreign policy priority, involvement of key cabinet officials
- \* Special CTBT envoy for administration's effort
- \* Support of senior GOP senators
- \* Aggressive support of Democratic senators
- \* Deadline of for action through high profile special conference in late 1999
- \* India and Pakistan to sign and ratify
- \* START II ratification in Duma (to trade for vote on ABM protocols with Lott, Helms)

What we don't need (and have no control over):

- \* Impeachment and/or extended impeachment process
- \* U.S. war with Iraq
- \* NATO airstrikes in Kosovo
- \* Other major foreign policy distractions/political scandals

How to get there from here:

1. CTBT as #1 Clinton foreign policy legislative priority, involvement of key officials, special CTBT envoy for administration effort.

We need to lay out the minimum requirements for the admin to meet to convince the Senate (and us) that they are serious. We make it clear that major portions of our action plan with the Senate (see 2 and 3 below) will be ineffective unless the White House:

- a. declares CTBT to be the primary foreign policy legislative goal for 1999
- b. appoints a special CTBT envoy, or at least a point person in State (Holum?)
- c. demonstrates engagement of key officials: Clinton, Gore, Berger, Albright.
- d. begins serious efforts to negotiate with Senate GOP leadership

How to get it: Seek Coalition meeting with Berger, Gore as first step in this process (Daryl K., Tom C.).

Key to this process will be convincing the political side of the White House that this is a legacy issue for Clinton. We need to seek a meeting with Paul Begala and/or other White House political advisors (John I.).

2. Support of senior GOP senators (beyond Specter and Jeffords)

How to get it: Only achievable once Clinton shows strong involvement, serious commitment, engagement with Senate leadership. If so, then:

- a. meetings with key senators
- b. grassroots work focused on key senators: lobby days in DC, outreach to

new constituencies, campaign flyer/postcard, home state lobby visits, hire field organizers in key states (these were the main recommendations of the Nov. 3 meeting on CTBT Public Advocacy work).

- c. polling
- d. media/op-eds/editorials
- e. support of key opinion elites

### 3. Aggressive support of senate Democrats

How to get it: Only achievable once Clinton shows strong involvement, serious commitment. If so, then:

- e. meetings with key senators
- f. grassroots work: see above
- g. polling
- h. media/op-eds/editorials

### 4. Special conference in late 1999; high profile deadline for action

How to get it: It looks as though this conference will take place next October-November, although the location and content are undecided. We must work with admin and other nations to make this a high-profile event that draws media attention and senior officials from many nations. It must also be perceived as an event where the ability to vote (a distinction of ratifiers only) is significant and that U.S. interests could be hurt if the US participates as just a signatory (non-voter). We need to:

- a. send Coalition letter to embassies supporting the special conference and calling for it to be held in New York with senior officials. (sent in November)
- b. visit DC embassies to emphasize importance of this issue (Daryl K., Tom C., Michael K., others) (November/December)
- c. visit key capitals to meet with decision-makers (January?)
- d. continue to track developments

### 5. India and Pakistan signature and ratification

How to get it: Hope that Strobe Talbott's talks produce signatures, which could be used to push for US ratification which, in turn, is a likely prerequisite for Indian and Pakistani ratification. Seek meeting with Talbott.

### 6. START II ratification in Duma

START II ratification by the Duma could open up a long-awaited dialog between the White House and Jesse Helms/Trent Lott on trading a vote on START II/ABM for a vote on CTBT. If we don't get START II, it is not clear what the administration has to offer in exchange for CTBT (other than the ABM treaty by itself).

How to get it: Hope. Continue other Coalition efforts to improve the environment for START II in the Duma by pushing de-alerting and START III talks, limiting NATO enlargement and blocking the deployment of national missile defenses.

Draft, November 24, 1998

Tom Z. Collina, UCS, 202-332-0900, [tcollina@ucsusa.org](mailto:tcollina@ucsusa.org)

---

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

110 Maryland Ave. NE #201

Washington DC 20002

p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142

website: <<http://www.crnd.org>>

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

---

Return-Path: <arjun@ieer.org>  
Date: Wed, 25 Nov 1998 14:10:11 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: arjun@pop.igc.org  
To: Arjun@igc.org Makhijani  
From: Arjun Makhijani <arjun@ieer.org>  
Subject: NIF and CTBT Compliance Sign-On Letter

IEER doesn't initiate letters for signature often. But I think the problem of CTBT compliance and fusion explosions is a very crucial question that may, if not satisfactorily resolved now, result in irreversible negative consequences later on for the viability of the CTBT as an effective treaty. It is also of importance to academia since UC is involved in a CTBT violation by building NIF, in my view. I hope that you will sign on to this letter and also pass it on to your colleagues for consideration.

Thanks a lot.

Arjun

-----

Dear Friends,

Recent research by the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER) has determined that proposed fusion experiments at a US government laboratory would violate the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). This issue needs to be resolved through an appropriate international forum. In the interim, we believe that the University of California should suspend work on this project. To that end, we are circulating this letter for the signature of as many scientist, engineers, community activists, and other concerned people in the United States. As you know, the University of California is the contractor operating Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and the Regents are the governing body of the university. The letter also calls on the Regents to initiate a public debate about the continuing role of the university in nuclear weapons research.

Background: The National Ignition Facility (NIF) is a multi-billion dollar laser fusion facility being constructed at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. NIF is designed to create fusion explosions of 10 pounds of TNT or even more. While the US government asserts this research is exempt from the CTBT, our research has shown these explosions are "nuclear explosions" covered by the CTBT and are therefore banned. In fact, since the treaty bans planning for such explosions, the current construction is in violation of the treaty. Moreover, if NIF is successful in creating fusion explosions using lasers, it would establish the scientific feasibility of designing pure fusion weapons. Such weapons would not require plutonium or highly enriched uranium and would radically alter the threat of nuclear weapons. Most of IEER's report, Dangerous Thermonuclear Quest, is on our website (<http://www.ieer.org>). If you would like a hard copy please let us know.

If you would like to add your name to the list of signatories, please contact Hisham Zerriffi at IEER by e-mail ([hisham@ieer.org](mailto:hisham@ieer.org)) or phone (301/270-5500).

Thank you,

Arjun Makhijani, President  
Hisham Zerriffi, Project Scientist

-----  
Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER)  
6935 Laurel Ave., Suite 204  
Takoma Park MD 20912

John G. Davies  
Chairman of the Board  
University of California Regents  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th floor  
Oakland, CA 94607

Dear Mr. Davies,

We, the undersigned, are writing to urge the University of California Regents to declare a moratorium on construction of the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The facility, being built and to be operated by the University of California, is designed to conduct contained thermonuclear explosions, experiments which may be considered illegal under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The CTBT prohibits "any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion." The CTBT also requires parties to "prevent" nuclear explosions in their jurisdictions.

A July 1998 report by the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER), Dangerous Thermonuclear Quest, determined that the planned explosions in NIF are banned under the CTBT. While NIF cannot be miniaturized into a weapon, research on it would establish the scientific feasibility of creating fusion explosions without a primary fission trigger -- a first step toward establishing the feasibility of pure fusion weapons. It would feed directly into research at Los Alamos and Sandia on technologies which have the potential for miniaturization.

If the scientific and engineering barriers to pure fusion weapons are overcome, a new class of weapons could emerge that would radically increase the nuclear threat. Pure fusion weapons would not require plutonium or highly enriched uranium, the acquisition of which is one of the main obstacles to nuclear proliferation. These weapons could also be made in various sizes, from very small to very large, and would not produce the highly radioactive fallout of current nuclear weapons. At the same time, the release of large numbers of neutrons would make them very effective at killing people while minimizing blast effects.

Given the grave implications of this research and the troubling questions surrounding its legality, we strongly urge the UC Regents to take immediate action. As the governing body of the University of California overseeing its contract to operate national laboratories, the Regents should take

whatever action is necessary for the Laboratory to suspend work on the NIF project until the legal questions are resolved by the CTBT review conference or other appropriate international body. The Regents could also use the time during the work suspension to conduct a university-wide debate on the appropriateness of one of the world's greatest universities continuing with nuclear weapons research. This should be a matter of far wider public debate within the academic community and the country as a whole. We urge that you use the occasion of the NIF review to initiate that debate. We would appreciate receiving your response, which should be sent to Arjun Makhijani and Hisham Zerriffi of IEER at 6935 Laurel Ave., Suite 204, Takoma Park, MD 20912.

Sincerely,

Arjun Makhijani  
President, IEER  
Ph.D., UC Berkeley, 1972

Hisham Zerriffi  
Project Scientist, IEER

Cc: All members of the University of California Board of Regents.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Arjun Makhijani  
President, Institute for Energy and Environmental Research  
6935 Laurel Ave., Suite 204  
Takoma Park, Maryland 20912, U.S.A.  
Phone 301-270-5500  
Fax: 301-270-3029  
e-mail: [arjun@ieer.org](mailto:arjun@ieer.org)  
web page: <http://www.ieer.org>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 25 Nov 1998 16:20:42 -0800  
From: Andrew Lichterman <alichterman@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Germany backs away from no first use debate  
To: Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
X-Accept-Language: en

The following NY Times article shows the continuing power of the United States to set the limits of debate in NATO on nuclear weapons policy. I would be interested in reports from our colleagues in Germany on how this debate is being presented there, and what contacts they have had with the new government on this issue.

November 25, 1998

## Germany Drops Call to NATO on Nuclear Use

By PHILIP SHENON

WASHINGTON -- Germany's newly elected government Tuesday backed away from a threat to press NATO to renounce a central tenet of its strategy and to pledge never to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

After meeting at the Pentagon with Defense Secretary William Cohen, German Defense Minister Rudolf Scharping said that "there is no intention in my government to question any core element of NATO strategy, including the fact that nuclear forces play a fundamental political role."

American officials said they were alarmed when the new German foreign minister, Joschka Fischer, a member of the environmentalist Green Party, suggested in a magazine interview published this week that Germany would press NATO to renounce the possible first use of nuclear arms.

Cohen publicly rebuffed the German proposal. Welcoming Scharping's remarks Tuesday, Cohen said that NATO's nuclear policy should remain unchanged.

"Based on my conversations with Minister Scharping," Cohen said, "I think that we have a meeting of the minds -- that the strategic concept is critical for NATO's security, that the strategic concept as far as the nuclear component should not be altered."

The United States is firmly opposed to any change in the doctrine allowing NATO to make first use of nuclear weapons in a war, arguing that it proved an effective deterrent during the cold war and remains one today against small, non-nuclear nations that might develop chemical or biological weapons.

"We believe it continues to serve a vital security purpose for the NATO organization and should not be changed," Cohen said, standing next to Scharping at the news conference at the Defense Department.

The public debate within Germany in recent days over nuclear strategy suggests new rifts in the government coalition between the Social Democrats and the Greens. In a coalition agreement reached last month, the two parties agreed that NATO should renounce the possible first use of nuclear weapons, a clear concession to the Greens.

But it had been unclear to American officials whether Gerhard Schroeder, the Social Democrat who is the new chancellor, had accepted the declaration as an empty concession to the Greens or would in fact move to question one of the central tenets of NATO doctrine.

Scharping, a Social Democrat on his first visit to Washington as defense minister, said that the new German government had no intention of creating a rift with NATO by acting unilaterally on the issue.

"NATO is the most successful alliance we have ever seen in history so the main goal of our government in Germany is to strengthen NATO and its cohesion and to make NATO able to face the challenges for the next century," he said.

Still, he said that his government "is following the vision of a nuclear-weapons free world" and that "the necessity to use them may be extremely remote as it is written down in the actual NATO strategy."

Copyright 1998 The New York Times Company

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
CC: Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 26 Nov 1998 10:25:39 +0100  
From: Regina Hagen <regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de>  
References: <365C9EDA.5DB95842@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Germany backs away from no first use debate  
To: Andrew Lichterman <alichterman@igc.apc.org>

Andrew Lichterman wrote:

> The following NY Times article shows the continuing power of the United States to set the limits of  
> debate in NATO on nuclear weapons policy. I would be interested in reports from our colleagues in Germany on  
> how this debate is being presented there, and what contacts they have had with the new government on this issue.

Dear Andrew,

The coalition contract of the Social Democrats and the Greens in Germany clearly says they want the first use doctrine changed and promote de-alerting. It also says they want steps to get rid of all weapons of mass destruction. As I see it, there is currently no such thing as "the German government". As yet, there is a bunch of individuals who became Chancellor and ministers and have yet to get used to being in power and working together and being "government". The change of power came to a surprise not only to many of us but also to them. Originally, the Greens were part of the peace movement and opposed nuclear weapons. Many of them still are part of the peace movement today and I guess all oppose nuclear weapons. So it is exactly what I would expect from the Green Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer to speak out against first strike and nuclear weapons in general. This is not true for the Social Democrats. During the early 80s, many of them believed in the propaganda and voted for the deployment of the Pershing II intermediate missiles in Germany. In addition, Rudolf Scharping, the new Defense Minister, is not a member of the left wing of the Social Democrats. So I am not surprised that he contradicts Fischer.

In addition it seems there is a tradition of contradictions between the Defense and the Foreign Minister. I guess the real value of Fischer's speaking out is that he started a public debate within Germany, Europe, and also NATO (i.e. in the U.S.). I subscribe to two newspapers and both of them had long articles about the nukes issue and one even a long interview with Fischer. This is more about nuclear weapons than during the last five years or so (with the exception of last spring when India and Pakistan tested their nuclear warheads.) And never before did I read "nuclear weapons free world" in articles before unless they talked about the peace movement. In my tiny peace group we wrote to Fischer twice backing him in his decision to get started with a nuclear weapons free world. I think that's what the Green need: clear and regular signs that many people in Germany EXPECT them to act. That we expect a change in the politics from the new government. Groups like mine are not influential. But if many of us speak up, we might be heard. And we must start to also contact the Ministry of defense. In addition, the larger organizations are in touch with the Foreign Ministry and the Ministry of Defense on several occasions and levels. So they do their part in briefing the influential politicians and their secretaries of state (who are the primary consultants of the German ministers.)

!!! We must build up public pressure for a change before the politicians decide about the future NATO strategy in spring 1999 - here in Germany and in the other NATO states !!!

I hope this helps you to get a picture. Others might want to add to it - or contradict...

Friedliche Gruesse

Regina Hagen

Darmstaedter Friedensforum

Return-Path: <DE534@prodigy.net>  
From: "Harry Engster" <DE534@prodigy.net>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: December 2 strategy meeting on CTBT  
Date: Thu, 26 Nov 1998 23:50:17 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

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

I will try to make the meeting on December 2. I was at interviews with the candidates for Medical Director at the Northern Virginia Mental Health Institute at the time of the Tuesday meeting.

Will you be sending out a summary of the meeting?

in peace...Bill

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 26 Nov 1998 21:48:09 -0800 (PST)  
From: flick@igc.apc.org (flick)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Where to have the Annual General Meeting?  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: flick@pop.igc.apc.org

Hello All,

The Annual Meeting working group is there to advertise the meeting, prepare the meeting and assist in its smooth running, but its up to everyone to decide on the venue...

There seems to be three ideas floating around about where to hold the Annual General Meeting - any other ideas/opinions?

1. The Hague Appeal for Peace, 11-16 May, 1999. Whether we do or not, a splendidly loud sunflower presence should be there. The possibility of having an ongoing Annual Meeting on the 10 day Walk of 2000 people from the ICJ to NATO headquarters is an opportunity to avoid the "never enough time" syndrome that plagues us.
2. A localtion in India or Pakistan to engage with the emerging movements in South Asia
3. The NPT in April, New York. This last one has the least amount of votes as far as I can see.

can we please have a discussion?

love flick

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 27 Nov 1998 15:07:33 -0800  
From: Jlrge Scheffran <scheffran@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: German INESAP demands No-First-Use  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Dear friends of Abolition 2000,

with this email I send to you a statement of German INESAP members on the current No-First-Use and disarmament debate, induced by the initiative of the German Foreign Minister. In the last few days much has happend, including the very unfortunate visit of the German Minister of Defense to Washington who tried to reverse the previous German initiative. It seems German disarmament policy is in disarray, and therefore any activity pushing into the right direction is important. Therefore Wolfgang Liebert, Martin Kalinowski and me wrote a public statement for wider distribution.

Please be free to use this statement for the purpose you find appropriate.

Best regards,

Juergen Scheffran

-----  
Statement by German Members of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP)

Scientists Demand NATO:  
No First Use of Nuclear Weapons  
as an Essential First Step Towards a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World

The German initiators of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP) demand a No-First-Use pledge for nuclear weapons as an essential step towards a nuclear-weapon-free world. We support the initiative by the German Foreign Minister for a No-First Use in NATO and demand further steps leading to complete nuclear disarmament. The decision of Germany and 11 further NATO member states, not to vote against resolution A/C.1/53/L.48 "Towards a Nuclear Weapon Free World: The Need for a New Agenda" in the UN First Committee on 13. November 1998 is a courageous step and a signal that even within NATO there is opposition against the indefinite reliance on nuclear weapons.

NATO's nuclear first-use doctrine, stemming from the darkest ages of the Cold War, is completely anachronistic. It is based on the premise of a massive conventional attack of the Warsaw Pact in Central Europe. None of the underlying assumptions, which were already questionable in earlier times, have any justifiable basis, neither in Europe nor

elsewhere. Striking first is not defensive, neither against supposed aggressor states nor against terrorists. The threat of striking first is also in complete contradiction to the 1996 Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice which declared the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons to be generally illegal. First use would be illegal in any case. The insistence of the US government on the first-use doctrine is an indicator that the last remaining superpower wants to keep the right to use nuclear weapons any time against any point on this planet. No other country should find this acceptable. As long as this threat persists, more developing countries could follow India and Pakistan to seek reliance on nuclear weapons, undermining the whole non-proliferation regime. A No-First-Use would be the bare minimal step, signalling the willingness of the nuclear weapon states to diminish the nuclear threat.

No-First-Use could be a first but should not be the last step. Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty as well as the International Court of Justice demand complete nuclear disarmament. No nuclear weapons state can change this fact. What is required is an on-going international negotiation process on the step-wise transformation of the insufficient non-proliferation regime into a new regime of a nuclear-weapon-free world. How this could be done was examined in an expert study of INESAP "Beyond the NPT - A Nuclear-Weapon-Free World" that was presented in April 1995 in New York, as well as in a number of studies by other organizations and individuals that followed. This study sketches a path towards a nuclear-weapon-free world, combined with a process of negotiating a Nuclear Weapons Convention (NWC) as a legal framework to ban and eliminate all nuclear weapons. Meanwhile, the call for the NWC has been expressed by more than 1000 international non-governmental organizations and citizen groups (Abolition 2000) as well as by more than two thirds of all States in UN resolutions of the years 1996, 1997 und 1998. A model NWC that was drafted by an international Committee of lawyers, scientists and disarmament experts is now an official UN document (UN doc. A/C.1/52/7).

Even though the path towards a nuclear-weapon-free world cannot be planned in all details in advance, the required steps can only be negotiated and realized if the goal is clear. The necessary political initiatives have to be taken now. As a non-nuclear-weapon state and NATO member, Germany has a considerable political weight and a special responsibility.

Therefore, we urge the new German government to insist on its independent path and to take an active role to initiate negotiations on the elimination of all nuclear weapons, aiming at the Nuclear Weapons Convention as a binding framework of international law. It would be consequent and in accordance with the government coalition agreement if the German delegation at the UN would not only abstain on disarmament resolutions in the UN General Assembly but would vote "Yes". What is most pressing is that Germany makes an end to the first-use doctrine and pushes for the removal of all nuclear weapons from its own territory, a dangerous remainder of past ages.

-----

Dr.Wolfgang Liebert, Dr.Jurgen Scheffran (Darmstadt, Germany), Dr.  
Martin Kalinowski (Vienna, Austria) Nov.27, 1998.  
Contact: INESAP, c/o IANUS, Darmstadt University of Technology,  
Hochschulstr.10, D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany;  
Tel: +49(6151)164368 (secret.), fax: +49(6151)-166039,  
email:liebert@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de,scheffran@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de,  
kalinowski@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de.

To: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Fax to Belgian Foreign Minister  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Pol,

I have great admiration for your vigil and fast as you seek to bring sense to the Belgian government. I hope and pray that it goes well for you.

Attached is my fax to Belgian Foreign Minister Derijkee in support of your action.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

November 27, 1998

To: The Honorable Erik Derycke  
Minister For Foreign Affairs, Belgium,

Fax: 011-32-2-511-63-85                      Pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Mr. Foreign Minister:

The courageous fast by our friend and colleague, Pol D'Huyvetter, highlights the opportunity that Belgium has to be equally courageous by providing leadership for long overdue changes in the nuclear posture of NATO and in the world as a whole.

From our perspective the use of nuclear weapons is immoral. So is the threat to use nuclear weapons through a policy of nuclear deterrence. This viewpoint is shared by the Holy See, the World Council of Churches, numerous religious denominations, and by leaders of other faiths. At the same time numerous military officers and civilian national security experts tell us that nuclear weapons have no military utility. For them all that is left is nuclear weapons deterring nuclear weapons. From both the moral and the practical viewpoints the solution is clear: abolish all nuclear weapons.

What is urgently needed now is for statesmen like yourself to step up and push for nuclear abolition. You now have the opportunity to act in three ways: (1) Have the Belgian delegate to the United Nations vote in favor of the resolution of the New Agenda Coalition calling for steps toward nuclear disarmament.

(2) Have the United States withdraw all nuclear weapons from Belgium, for they have no legitimate use and actually make Belgium a target for Russian missiles. (3) Provide leadership to free NATO from reliance on nuclear weapons by supporting not only a no-first-use policy but also a no-use policy.

As Americans we need your help. Our own government is badly addicted to nuclear weapons. We need outside friends to help our policy makers overcome their addiction. Specifically we hope that Belgium and other friends will have the courage to stand up to the United States and insist upon policy changes that lead to the abolition of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

Shalom,  
Howard W. Hallman

To: Delongs <delong@nucleus.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Nukes in audio?  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 11:36 AM 10/26/98 -0700, Delongs wrote:

>Dear Howard,  
>Our most recent brochure includes this statement:  
>"the over 30,000 nuclear weapons remaining in the world today  
>....contain the destructive power of more than 500,000 Hiroshima bombs."  
>  
>How much does a bee-bee cost? 500,000 bee-bees would take some time to  
>drop I suspect...  
>Thanks for your note!  
>Bev Delong  
>  
>  
>Dear Bev,

I've been hanging on to your letter with hopes that I would be able to find our old material on the beebie demonstration. I have now done so. It is a two-page description in hard copy (before e-mail). If you will provide me with a fax number or mailing address, I'll send it to you.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: "Carol Zearing" <czearing@hotmail.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: information about caucus  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 08:39 AM 11/25/98 PST, Carol Zearing wrote:

>Hi! My name is Carol Zearing. I am a seminary student at Drew  
>Theological School. I am currently taking a class on United Methodist  
>History, Doctrine, and Polity. Our final project is to write a 15 page  
>investigative report on 1 of the caucuses. I chose this one to get  
>information about so I was wondering if you could send me some. I would  
>really appreciate it.....

Dear Carol:

From your letter, I'm not sure how much information you want on Methodists United for Peace with Justice. For general background I'm attaching a summary of our activities that I have used with a foundation proposal. Although we don't have an archive with readily reproducible documents, such as annual reports, I could send you a sample of past reports, copies of Peace Leaf, our quarterly bulletin, etc.

We have been active at the last three United Methodist General Conferences. At all three we put on a Peace with Justice Breakfast for delegates on morning of the second full day to lay out our agenda and other peace and justice matters that would becoming before the General Conference. At all three we had legislative proposals which we successfully shepherded through committees. The results show up in the Book of Resolutions, as follows:

1988 -- "Peace with Justice as a Special Program" pp. 555-561. In the resolution on "Christian Faith and Disarmament", the following language: "We especially affirm and support the statements of the Council of Bishops in their 1986 pastoral letter, 'In Defense of Creation', and the accompanying foundation document...." and the next two sentences (pp. 503-4).

1992 -- "Nuclear Disarmament: the Zero Option" pp. 600-605. We also supported continuation of Peace with Justice Sunday and the special offering.

1996 -- "Nuclear Abolition: Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence" pp. 556-561. Again we supported continuation of Peace with Justice Sunday.

For the 2000 General Conference we intend to offer a resolution updating "Nuclear Abolition: Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence". We'll also support Peace with Justice Sunday and special offering.

Please let me know how I can help you further.

Shalom,  
Howard W. Hallman, Chair

###

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Methodists United for Peace with Justice organized in 1987 as a national association of laity and clergy. Stimulation for organizing was the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. This document offered a theological basis for

saying "no" to nuclear deterrence, and it set forth policy recommendations for moving toward nuclear disarmament. It also called for greater witness and action for peace and justice. We organized in response to this call.

## Issue Focus

From the beginning nuclear abolition has been our central focus. Initially we worked for better US-Soviet relations in the waning days of the Cold War, particularly through citizen exchanges, and we have a continuing interest in US-Russian relationships. In 1990-91 we opposed U.S. participation in the Gulf War. We support measures to curtail international arms trade and to eliminate land mines throughout the globe. As a linkage of peace and justice concerns, we favor shifts in federal budget priorities to reduce military spending and increase spending to meet urgent human and community needs. We support the United Nations and other international organizations that can peaceably resolve international conflict.

To achieve nuclear abolition we favor a dual track approach that (i) advocates far-reaching global initiatives, such as a Nuclear Abolition Convention, and (ii) simultaneously works for incremental steps, such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties (START I, II, III), zero alert for nuclear weapons, nuclear free zones, and termination of nuclear weapons research and development activities. Earlier this year we helped develop grassroots support for Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), important both in its own right and as a precursor of the CTBT. We are presently engaged in a grassroots campaign for ratification of the CTBT. At the same time we are part of a broader project mobilizing world religious leaders to urge the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee to set up a means for the beginning of negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

## Work within Methodism

As our name "Methodists United" indicates, we seek participation from the entire Methodist family, including African Methodist Episcopal, African Methodist Episcopal Zion, Christian Methodist Episcopal, Free Methodist, United Methodist, and Wesleyan Churches. Most of our members are United Methodists, but other Methodist denominations are represented on our board of directors and national advisory committee. As an incorporated, nonprofit association, we are not an official part of any Methodist denomination but have a cooperative relationship with denominational agencies.

Recognizing the importance the quadrennial United Methodist General Conference (the denomination's official governing body), we put on Peace with Justice Breakfasts at the 1988, 1992, and 1996 gatherings and lobbied for resolutions on nuclear abolition and other peace issues. We are in regular contact with bishops and peace and justice leaders in the 66 annual conferences, the denomination's main geographic unit. To reach out to the entire Methodist family, we have held a Gathering on Peace and Justice that brought together persons from the six Methodist denominations. During the past year we have sought ways to draw AME, AMEZ, and CME leaders into work for nuclear abolition.

## Modes of Operation

**Education.** We provide information on national policy issues and pending legislation to people around the country who are active in local churches, Methodist district and conference organizations, and on college campuses. We use a network approach, seeking to reach bishops and conference leaders who have responsibility for reaching out to many more people. We publish Peace Leaf, a quarterly bulletin, and occasional Peace/Justice Alerts. We also join in joint postal card alerts, such as those that 20/20 Vision initiates.

**Public policy advocacy.** In Washington, D.C. we engage in public policy advocacy directed toward Congress and the federal executive. We do this on our own and also as signers of joint letters to Congress, the president, and other executive officials. We provide timely information on legislative issues to grassroots Methodists and urge them to contact their elected representatives and participate in call-in days.

**Coalitions.** We constantly work through coalitions of like-minded agencies, including the Monday Lobby of peace

and disarmament organizations, the Abolition 2000 network, working groups on the CWC (now completed) and the CTBT, and the Citizens Budget Campaign. We are one of the leaders in establishing a Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition as part of the Abolition 2000 network. We constantly try to serve as a bridge between religious organizations and secular peace organizations.

Religious networks. In Washington we work closely with various Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish denominational offices and peace fellowships, and we also reach out to key staff persons at denominational headquarters if located elsewhere. From time to time we have circulated sign-on letters to heads of religious communion.

#### Legal Status

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a nonprofit corporation, established under laws and regulations of the District of Columbia. The corporation has status as a 501(c)(4) organization under the Internal Revenue Code. We have established the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, which the Internal Revenue Service has recognized as a 501(c)(3) organization and a public foundation under section 509(a)(1). IRS letters are attached.

December 1997

To: bmc <bmc@NetHeaven.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: HKH Foundation -- Peace Project  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 09:50 AM 10/27/98 -0400, bmc wrote:

>HKH Foundation (peace project)  
>c/o Blue Mountain Center  
>Blue Mountain Lake, NY 12812

>

>

>

>Dear Development Director,

>

>The HKH Foundation, in collaboration with several other small family  
>foundations, is attempting to assemble an on-line directory of  
>grass-roots groups working on a variety of peace/disarmament  
>issues. We would appreciate it very much if you could do us three favors.....

>

>Dear Amy Johnson:

Here is the information you requested. Please let me know if you want any more information.

Shalom,  
Howard W. Hallman, Chair

>

>Organization Name Methodists United for Peace with Justice

>Contact Name Howard W. Hallman

>Title Chair

>Address 1600 15th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

>Phone 301 896-0013

>Fax same

>Email mupj@igc.org

>Web Site none

>Organization Notes

Methodists United for Peace with Justice organized in 1987 as a national association of laity and clergy. Stimulation for organizing was the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace. This document offered a theological basis for saying "no" to nuclear deterrence, and it set forth policy recommendations for moving toward nuclear disarmament. It also called for greater witness and action for peace and justice. We organized in response to this call.

From the beginning nuclear abolition has been our central focus. To achieve nuclear abolition we favor a dual track approach that (i) advocates far-reaching global initiatives, such as a Nuclear Abolition Convention, and (ii) simultaneously works for incremental steps, such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties (START I, II, III), zero alert for nuclear weapons, nuclear free zones, and termination of nuclear weapons research and development activities.

We publish a quarterly newsletter, Peace Leaf, and from time to time send out Peace/Justice Alerts.

To: smirnowb@ix.netcom.com (Robert Smirnow)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Article on de-alerting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 11:40 PM 10/26/98 -0600, Robert Smirnow wrote:

>  
>  
> Dear Howard,  
> Thank you for this posting & certain specifics & ideas  
>you discussed, particularly the fact that if there's a Russian launch,  
>it will automatically re-target.I have forwarded your posting to a  
>number of other organizations,individuals, & media outlets.Can you pass  
>your information packet along to me? .....

Dear Bill,

During Thanksgiving vacation I'm playing catch up with my e-mail correspondence. I've forward your request for the information packet on de-alerting to Kathy Crandall of the Disarmament Clearinghouse. Your query on mobilizing religious leaders is more complicated. It will take more time for me to reply, but I will when I can.

Shalom,  
Howard  
>

To: disarmament@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Request for de-alerting information  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Kathy,

Would you please send a copy of the De-Alerting Activist Kit to Bill Smirnow, 168 Maple Hill Road, Huntington, NY 11743.

Thanks,  
Howard

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Sat, 28 Nov 1998 14:17:59 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Membership record  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Alas, I don't record all the names so I have no record of named donors in November except Margaret Hamra whose form I filled out from the return address on her envelope. I happened to notice that she had not fill out the form but I thought that was an aberation.

Sorry,

Phil

To: tcollina@ucsusa.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Draft Strategy Outline for CTBT  
Cc: dkimball@clw.org  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Tom,

Your draft strategy outline for the 1999 CTBT campaign is a useful document for bringing into focus our activities in the coming year. If you are making any final revisions before the December 2 meeting, I suggest adding a couple of items to achieve more completeness.

#1 - focusing on Clinton administration. You can note that in addition to the Coalition, the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is committed to seeking appointments with cabinet officers and political advisors at the White House in order to urge vigorous support for the CTBT.

#2 - focus on Senators. As part of the faith community's grassroots efforts for the CTBT, 12 to 15 religious organizations will circulate petitions in churches, synagogues, and other religious gatherings during January and February and will present them to home-state offices of senators in February and March.

#4 - It would be clearer if you added "international" to the description of the special conference.

I'll see you on Wednesday.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <tcollina@ucsusa.org>  
From: tcollina@ucsusa.org  
Date: Mon, 30 Nov 98 09:33:54 -0500  
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re:Draft Strategy Outline for CTBT  
Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

Hi Howard. Thx for the useful comments. I will incorporate them. see you wednesday, tom

\_\_\_\_\_Reply Separator\_\_\_\_\_

Subject: Draft Strategy Outline for CTBT  
Author: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Date: 11/30/98 6:04 AM

Dear Tom,

Your draft strategy outline for the 1999 CTBT campaign is a useful document for bringing into focus our activities in the coming year. If you are making any final revisions before the December 2 meeting, I suggest adding a couple of items to achieve more completeness.

#1 - focusing on Clinton administration. You can note that in addition to the Coalition, the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is committed to seeking appointments with cabinet officers and political advisors at the White House in order to urge vigorous support for the CTBT.

#2 - focus on Senators. As part of the faith community's grassroots efforts for the CTBT, 12 to 15 religious organizations will circulate petitions in churches, synagogues, and other religious gatherings during January and February and will present them to home-state offices of senators in February and March.

#4 - It would be clearer if you added "international" to the description of the special conference.

I'll see you on Wednesday.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <delong@nucleus.com>  
Date: Mon, 30 Nov 1998 09:28:21 -0700  
From: Delongs <delong@nucleus.com>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Nukes in audio?  
References: <2.2.16.19981128151003.298f3d1c@pop.igc.org>  
X-Corel-MessageType: EMail

Dear Howard,  
My fax number is 403-282-8260. Will look forward to your information.  
We priced out bee-bees and figure it would cost over \$200 Cdn. to buy 1  
per weapon. Will have to think further!  
Sorry if this is slow getting to you - I've been away for the past week.

Best wishes for a meaningful Christmas season,  
Bev  
Howard W. Hallman wrote:

> At 11:36 AM 10/26/98 -0700, Delongs wrote:  
> >Dear Howard,  
> >Our most recent brochure includes this statement:  
> >"the over 30,000 nuclear weapons remaining in the world today  
> >...contain the destructive power of more than 500,000 Hiroshima  
> bombs."  
> >  
> >How much does a bee-bee cost? 500,000 bee-bees would take some time  
> to  
> >drop I suspect...  
> >Thanks for your note!  
> >Bev DeLong  
> >  
> >  
> >Dear Bev,  
>  
> I've been hanging on to your letter with hopes that I would be able to  
> find  
> our old material on the beebee demonstration. I have now done so. It  
> is a  
> two-page description in hard copy (before e-mail). If you will provide  
> me  
> with a fax number or mailing address, I'll send it to you.  
>  
> Shalom,  
> Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 30 Nov 1998 18:20:03 GMT  
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: URGENT ALERT:  
To: Abolition-Caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: geowcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org (Unverified)

GF/9838

Dear Abolitionists

Pol's fast and vigil at the Belgian Foreign Ministry is in its 11th day. I have just spoken to him on his mobile. He has a fire next to him, is receiving much support and media coverage (politicians are joining him for brief periods), and is in good spirits. He is, as we have come to expect, full of ideas and enthusiasm. He is also quite determined to maintain his fast until there are results.

But we must not allow this to go on for too much longer. Pol has been meeting the Foreign Minister and it is quite clear that Belgium's vote on the NAC resolution will not alter. On the other hand, he will listen to suggestions on other moves which Belgium could make - especially on European NFZs and No First Use.

I am therefore putting out an appeal. Could you send ideas for action which Belgium can take on one of these issues to the Foreign Ministry (fax +32-2-514.30.67). Copy this to Pol's email on pol@motherearth.org. Suggestions should involve a move forward which is within Belgium's capabilities and which could be announced very quickly. If you want to discuss ideas with Pol his mobile is: 00 32 95 28 02 59.

Please act now. Pol says that he would love the opportunity to break his fast by celebrating a modest but definite move by Belgium with the Foreign Minister on the steps of his Ministry.

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: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sun, 29 Nov 1998 10:47:32 +0100  
From: For Mother Earth International <pol@motherearth.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: 10 days fast/Info & fax alert  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, fme@motherearth.org, a-days@motherearth.org,  
2000walk4abolition@motherearth.org, tp2000.lst.grp@gn.apc.org,  
induran@motherearth.org, abolition-2000@agoranet.be,  
vredeslijst@ddh.nl  
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

Dear friends,

I wish to thank all the people who have taken the time to fax very substantial letters to the Belgian Minister of Foreign Affairs. The adviser of the Minister told me already last Tuesday to be impressed by the amount of faxes flowing in from all over the globe. Thank you as well for all the ones who have send words of encouragement and respect. It touched me deeply, and mostly, it gave me confidence and strenght to continue this justified action, and your energy and presence is with me as I continue the fast and vigil. Tomorrow, Monday, I will post myself again at the main entrance of the Ministry, and start the 11th day of the fast.

The past week I have had three meetings with Mr. Patrick De Beyter, the top level adviser of Minister Derycke in this matter, and two with Ms. Danielle Haven, chief responsible for disarmament in the administration. It were all open, friendly and honest meetings.

The news from the European Parliament resolution has been very useful in my negotiations, and added pressure. Belgium is put on a hot spot : they will have to choose between democracy (our opinion poll & EP resolution) and International Law ... or they will have to choose for their loyalty to the United States of America, UK and France.

>From this weeks meetings, I gathered that Belgium will probably choose and succomb to the dictate of the US, Britain and France when they will give their final vote in the UN General Assembly in New York next Thursday December 3.

I told them clearly that a negative vote or abstention would not stop my vigil or fast, as this vote would be both undemocratic, and going against NPT Art. VI and international law.

They agree ... and we all agree that Belgian politics lacks courage !!!

I feel this is a very good basis for further negotiations. I do however want to solicit your further support.

1. Please fax Minister Derycke if you have not done so (fax # at end of message)  
or network this fax alert to other people/NGO's
2. I am also looking for very concrete steps which Belgium could make at this

point, such as the NWFZ and/or the No First Use option for NATO.

\* Nuclear Weapon Free Zone :

Minister Derycke is in favor of Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in Central Europe, as proposed by Belarus, but it seems he only talks about it, and stopped working on it following the fact that some CEE countries oppose such a zone (i.e. Poland). Any ideas which you develop(ed) which would be helpful to activate Minister Derycke in this matter are welcome ASAP.

\* NATO's No First Use

The No-First Use proposal of Minister J. Fisher from Germany is also extremely important. Also here I welcome any contributions in which Minister Derycke could help to promote this idea as we go towards NATO's Strategic Review and 50th birthday party in Washington next April.

\* Others ??

Let me know if you think that I could (also) focus on other issues which could be taken up by Belgium on a short term.

I have been clear with the Foreign Dept., that I will only break the fast, after a very concrete step forward. Recently Germany has shown a clear example with the NFU. I am hopeful that Belgium will make a step forward ... and look forward to the first meal of fruits and veggies.

Peace,

Pol D'Huyvetter  
For Mother Earth

---

Mr. Erik Derycke  
MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
Rue des Petits Carmes/Karmelietenstraat 15  
1000 Brussels, Belgium

Tel. +32-2-501.82.11  
Fax +32-2-511.63.85

I will be happy to receive a cc. by E-mail from your message.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 30 Nov 1998 08:52:27 GMT  
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: UK Statement on NAC Resolution  
To: Abolition-Caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: geowcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org (Unverified)

Dear Abolitionists

World Court Project UK has organised a faxing campaign to selected states in connection with the imminent NAC vote in UNGA. However, prior to this several of them wrote to the Foreign Office in London about the resolution. They received quite detailed replies which contained the following "explanation of vote". This is more or less what was reported in Rebecca Johnson's Acronym report from NY of a few days ago. As correspondents will be anxious to follow up the exchange of views I would be grateful for any comments you have which they could incorporate into their replies.

Thanks

George Farebrother

.....

UK Government Explanation of Vote Explanation Of Vote in UN First Committee on the New Agenda Coalition Resolution. November 1998  
The United Kingdom is wholly committed to nuclear disarmament and to our obligations under Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. This commitment has been restated many times and given practical expression by the measures undertaken in our Strategic Defence Review, which included significant reductions in and unprecedented transparency about the British nuclear deterrent and, for example, by our ratification of the CTBT.

The 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference agreed Principles and Objectives setting the next steps towards nuclear disarmament. We do not believe that the sponsors of the resolution, all of whom are party to the NPT, are, by setting out a different agenda, making a constructive contribution. The agreed next step is the negotiation of an FMCT, for which an ad hoc committee has been re-established in Geneva. We will work hard for the success of these negotiations. The resolution also advocates measures which were examined in our Strategic Defence Review, and which we concluded are, at the present time, inconsistent with the maintenance of a credible minimum deterrent. The resolution neither condemns nor even mentions the nuclear tests carried out by India and Pakistan. It is difficult to see how it can be reconciled with the provisions of UNSCR 1172 on those tests. We remain ready to support any measure that will make a practical contribution to advancing nuclear disarmament.

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: <hisham@ieer.org>

Date: Mon, 30 Nov 1998 13:35:23 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: hisham@pop.igc.org

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>, bmorse@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, btiller@psr.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, disarmament@igc.org, laura@2020vision.org

From: Hisham Zerriffi <hisham@ieer.org>

Subject: Re: December forum on de-alerting

Hello. This is just to let you know I have just received 60 copies of the UNIDIR newsletter on de-alerting from the UN for the briefing.

Hisham.

At 01:27 PM 11/25/98 -0800, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>Here are my notes on decisions made on November 24 when we met to discuss a  
>de-alerting event on Capitol Hill. Participants included Brad Morse, Fran  
>Teplitz, Jonathan Dean, Bob Tiller, Hisham Zerriffi, Alistair Millar, and  
>myself.

>

>The event will be a forum on de-alerting and will present a range of views  
>on the subject. It will take place in a Senate office building. Preferred  
>dates are Wednesday, December 16 or 9. Alternatives are Tuesday or  
>Thursday, December 15 or 17, 8 or 10. Choice will be determined by  
>availability of speakers. [Note: The House Judiciary Committee plans to  
>meet on December 7 to make its decision on President Clinton; possibly the  
>House will convene the following week to consider the Committee's  
>recommendation. This may effect our timing, but we need to go ahead with  
>our plans anyway.]

>

>Suggested speakers: Bruce Blair or Frank von Hippel; Admiral Stansfield  
>Turner; Admiral Hank Childs or Fred S. Celec (Pentagon); a Russian  
>representative; Ira Helfand; Dick Garwin. There will be no more than four.  
>Alistair has responsibility to contact them. He will start with Bruce Blair  
>to find out his availability. [Note: Wayne Glass will find out when Senator  
>Bingaman will be in town in December and whether he would offer greetings.  
>I'll share his dates with Alistair.]

>

>Jonathan Dean agreed to be moderator. After initial presentations he will  
>open the proceedings for questions from the press and from others in the  
>audience.

>

>Sponsors: Senator Bingaman seems willing to serve as a sponsor or host,  
>according to Wayne Glass on his staff. He would sign a "Dear Colleague"  
>letter of invitation. We are exploring whether Senator Domenici will do  
>likewise. If he doesn't, we will seek another Republican, such as Senator  
>Chaffee. I am handling this.

>

>Organizations present agreed to serve as co-sponsors of the event. Bob  
>will contact several more organizations to be co-sponsors.

>  
>The audience will be Senate staff, selected House staff, and NGOs (Monday  
>Lobby, members of Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, organizations from  
>the faith community). Bob will develop a flyer which can serve as an  
>invitation to Hill staff and NGOs. [Will you also handle the mailing, Bob?]  
>Brad will take the lead in follow-up calls to Hill staff, with help from PSR  
>and Peace Action.  
>  
>Fran will find out the cost of an ad in Roll Call. If cost is reasonable,  
>she will place it.  
>  
>We believe that we might attract 45-50 people. I am working with Wayne  
>Glass to arrange for a room. The room will need suitable microphones for  
>the panel, questions from the floor, and connections for TV cameras. I will  
>also talk to Wayne about how to obtain light refreshments (rolls, coffee,  
>juice).  
>  
>I will seek coverage by C-Span (with help from Senator Bingaman's office).  
>UCS will develop and send out a media advisory. [Query: Who will follow up  
>on contacts with key media persons?]  
>  
>Hisham will develop visuals on poster boards. IEER has resources. CDI  
>might also be tapped. [We will need to work out how they tie into the  
>presentations.] Kathy Crandall has agreed to produce handout material.  
>  
>To pay costs, PSR is willing to contribute \$500 and Fourth Freedom Forum  
>\$500 to \$1,000.  
>  
>If I have anything wrong or have left out anything, please reply to all.  
>Likewise if you think of anything we have left out in our plans.  
>  
>Shalom,  
>Howard  
>  
>  
>

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Hisham Zerriffi \*  
\* Project Scientist Phone: (301) 270-5500 \*  
\* Institute for Energy Fax: (301) 270-3029 \*  
\* and Environmental Research E-mail: hisham@ieer.org \*  
\* 6935 Laurel Ave. Suite 204 Web: www.ieer.org \*  
\* Takoma Park, MD 20912 \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Return-Path: <paprog>  
Date: Mon, 30 Nov 1998 14:46:20 -0800 (PST)  
From: Fran Teplitz <paprog@igc.apc.org>  
To: amillar@fourthfreedom.org, bmorse@igc.org, btiller@psr.org,  
disarmament@igc.org, hisham@ieer.org, jdean@ucsusa.org,  
laura@2020vision.org, mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: December forum on de-alerting

The Roll Call ad would range in cost from \$4,200 for a half-page to slightly over \$2,000 for 1/4 page. (This is black and white.) Pretty pricey. Let me know if there's additional follow-up on this. I've faxed the deadline information to Allistair.

Thanks,  
fran Teplitz

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
Date: Mon, 30 Nov 1998 16:44:29 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: a2000@mail.silcom.com  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: Sue Broidy <a2000@silcom.com>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) Abolition 2000 December Newsletter  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

ABOLITION 2000

INTERNATIONAL GRASSROOTS NEWSLETTER DECEMBER 1998

PLEASE GIVE US SOME FEEDBACK

Please check our website which is now at [www.abolition2000.org](http://www.abolition2000.org) and let me know what features you would like to see added.

We have a site search engine, we have news, articles, a Citizen Action Guide, and campaign activist documents for you to download, copy, and distribute as widely as possible!

In addition, for those of you who are interested in having our new posters and leaflet, we can send you the Pagemaker files by email!

PETITION COUNT

We remind you that we need you to count up the petitions sitting in your offices and let us know the totals.

We welcome the following: Another 6 signatures from Costa Rica, 11 from Greece, 65 from Mt Diablo Peace Center, Walnut Creek CA, 120 signatures from Southern California Federation of Scientists, 13 from Great Neck NY, a grand total reported from Santa Cruz of 3,561 and 662 postcards to Clinton. We also got a call from Claire Nason in Berkeley, pledging 1000 signatures by the end of the year .

**BUT THIS IS NOT ENOUGH** if we are to achieve anything like 2 million by the end of the year 2000.

So please visit our website, download the petition form at <http://www.napf.org/intpetition.html>, copy it and distribute it as widely as possible. This is more than just a petition - it is public education and also great political strategy because when copied and included with your letters, it is another way of impressing our Congressional Representatives that we mean business!

Items of Interest

1. Welcome to our new Latin America Coordinator.
2. Peace Walk for A2000 in 1999
3. Protesters held at N-Base

4. Local action in Santa Cruz CA
5. Nuclear Free Norwich CT
6. Other Municipal Resolution Action
7. Churches and Abolition 2000
8. Nuclear Reactor in Cambridge, Mass.
9. Municipal Action in Canada
10. New Organizations in Abolition 2000
11. Recent Polls
12. Letter from India
13. Video Available

## WELCOME RUBEN ARVIZU

We welcome Ruben Arvizu who has been appointed the International Coordinator of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation for A2000 activities in Latin America. Ruben has arranged for the publication of several articles on nuclear weapons abolition in Spanish including OXIDO magazine and a website containing information and translations of Abolition 2000 material. The petition is available in Spanish and we hope for a new interest from Spanish organizations wishing to join the A2000 network. The website is <http://www.ciudadfutura.com/oxido>.

## PEACE WALK FOR ABOLITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Between May 16 and May 26 1999 the international For Mother Earth network is convening a major end-of-the-millennium Peace Walk for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons. For Mother Earth wants to mobilize 2000 walkers linking the UN World Court (ICJ) in The Hague (Netherlands) to NATO headquarters in Brussels (Belgium). The event will end with a four days international peace camp in Brussels on May 30th 1999.

Pol D'Huyvetter, campaigner at For Mother Earth, and initiator of the walk stated :

"Our dream is for the peace walk to count 2,000 participants walking for the immediate start of multilateral negotiations for a Treaty Banning All Nuclear Weapons by the year 2000. We demand the NATO member states to abide by their international treaty obligations as confirmed by the ICJ in July 1996. NATO's nuclear policy is hypocritical and criminal. It is time for the world to realize that NATO is the main obstacle for negotiating a treaty banning nuclear weapons. With this walk we will take international law to the ones breaking the law in Brussels."

Pol d'Huyvetter is at present taking a dramatic and heroic action - he is fasting in protest of the Belgian government's lack of support for the New Agenda Coalition. The network is responding to a call to send letters and faxes to the Belgian Foreign Minister in support of Pol's dramatic and courageous act. Send faxes to: MR ERIK DERYCKE, MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS, BELGIUM, 0011+32-2-514.30.67.

## PROTESTERS HELD AT N-BASE

On 19 November, nine anti-nuclear demonstrators were arrested at the shipyard where Britain's fourth and final Trident submarine is nearing completion. Security officers at the former VSEL yard in Barrow-in-Furness, Cumbria, found them in a car park and handed them over to police. The demonstrators were three Britons, five Swedes, and an American.

#### SANTA CRUZ ABOLITION 2000 HOLDS A PUBLIC FORUM

About seventy-five people attended the Santa Cruz Abolition 2000 Committee's first public forum on Sunday, November 8th, at Veterans Memorial Hall. Marion Vittitow was the skilled facilitator who introduced the speakers: Jackie Cabasso and John Burroughs, of Western States Legal Foundation, original founders of Abolition 2000, and Joann Fuller, of Peace Action '98. A video was shown on the medical effects of nuclear war, "The Last Epidemic," and there were questions and comments from the audience.

Mayor Celia Scott presented Abolition 2000 with a Mayor's Proclamation declaring that the City of Santa Cruz has designated November 8, 1998, as "Abolition 2000 Day," and thanking them for their work in educating people about the dangers of nuclear war and proliferation.

The hall was brightly decorated with masses of sunflowers, two large sunflower oil paintings by Lynn Zachreson, and a number of bright textile hangings, as various members of Abolition 2000, including Nadine Winslow of WILPF and Susy Sherman of Peace Action, explained what members of this community can do to aid in the goal of a complete worldwide abolition of nuclear weapons.

The Committee is already at work on its next projects, a teach-in at UCSC, and a speaker's bureau. Anyone who is interested may contact Jan Harwood at [jahn@cruzio.com](mailto:jahn@cruzio.com)

#### NUCLEAR FREE NORWICH CT

We are pleased to report that Norwich City Council in Connecticut endorsed the Abolition 2000 Municipal Resolution unanimously on Monday November 9th. Nancy Neiman Hoffman has been working on this project with the Hartford AFSC and reports that at first they were concerned that it would not pass because Norwich is in a heavy defense industry area. However, by patient lobbying, meeting individually with Council members and sending them material, a unanimous vote of 11 was achieved. They also got townspeople to write to the Council and make phone calls.

"It was a very satisfying experience" Nancy said, "and before the vote was taken, five of the Council members actually spoke enthusiastically in support of Abolition 2000." A key element in their success was the involvement with a local High School. A 16 year-old student made a statement at the Council meeting and presented 447 signatures on petitions from the Norwich Free Academy.

This is the way to go! Congratulations Nancy and colleagues. Let us hope for more similar action throughout the nation - and we will be waiting for

word from West Hartford City Council who will be presented with the Abolition 2000 resolution on November 24th.

## OTHER MUNICIPAL RESOLUTION ACTION

On Monday evening, November 2, the City Council of Portland, Maine unanimously passed the Nuclear Abolition Resolution presented to the City Council by the Maine Chapter of Physicians for Social Responsibility. Portland is the largest city in Maine and the first to pass a Nuclear Abolition Resolution.

Abolition 2000 is working in Vermont in 62 towns to put the Municipal Resolution on the March Town Meeting ballot. They hope for 200 towns by the end of the year 2000 - great work! The Vermont initiative is working through a coalition of The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, American Friends Service Committee, Unitarian-Universalist Church and others.

Look for a photo of Vermont activists marching for abolition on our website [www.abolition2000.org](http://www.abolition2000.org)

## CHURCHES AND ABOLITION 2000

Recently Christ Episcopal Church Vestry, in Pasadena, CA signed on to Abolition 2000. In addition, the resolution was voted affirmatively by the Episcopal Diocese (the CA state organization) at their convention on November 14, 1998.

The resolution included an educational resolve "that each parish plan an educational program to help its parishioners understand the present dangers of nuclear war and the concept that nuclear proliferation is a crime against God and humanity."

Also in Santa Barbara, the congregation of the Unitarian Society recently endorsed the Abolition 2000 Resolution. This is significant action from churches and should encourage more abolitionists to take the Resolution to their own congregations.

## CAMBRIDGE MA VOTES TO MOVE MIT NUCLEAR REACTOR OUT OF RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD

By a vote of 5791 to 2889, a ratio of more than 2 to 1, voters in Cambridge, Massachusetts voted to move the MIT Nuclear Reactor out of the city. Seeking to ignore this referendum vote, MIT plans to double the capacity of its Nuclear Reactor, and to maintain the reactor in this thickly settled residential neighborhood.

"Most Cambridge residents are unaware there is a Nuclear Reactor in Cambridge, on Albany Street near Mass. Ave, in the middle of Greater Boston," says attorney David A. Hoicka. "There was no public discussion or locationing decision open to residents of Cambridge, when the Reactor was built.

"We put the Nuclear Reactor on the ballot so the public policy of having such a facility in residential Cambridge may be publicly reviewed," says Attorney Hoicka. "The first chance Cambridge Voters got to review the Nuclear Reactor, they firmly rejected it.

"Cambridge Voters have decided that a Nuclear Reactor does not belong among homes, schools, small businesses, playing fields, parks with features for small children, basketball and tennis courts," says Hoicka. "This is a decision that should have been made in the first place by Cambridge residents and voters, not by technocrats and bureaucrats who live elsewhere."

"Of course, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology claims its Nuclear Reactor is perfectly safe," says Hoicka. "MIT has not in the past disclosed the details of classified research. The public policy question, regardless of MIT's claim of complete nuclear safety, is whether a Nuclear Reactor properly belongs in a residential neighborhood, or should be moved to a safer and less densely populated area."

This Cambridge "Move the Nuke Ballot Initiative" is the only referendum question this year relating to Nuclear Reactors in Massachusetts or anywhere in the United States. Through this Ballot Initiative, 5,791 Cambridge residents voted directly to show the State House that moving the Nuclear Reactor out of Cambridge is critical to health and well-being.

By contrast, if a Harris poll of only a few hundred people is statistically significant, a vote of 5,800 Cambridge Voters, should carry weight in the state legislature and even have national impact.

We will be watching this issue as it develops - a very interesting example of democracy at risk. Our congratulations to those involved!

## MUNICIPAL ACTION IN CANADA

On Nov.2, both Kitchener and Waterloo Councils voted unanimously to support the Resolution of the Kitchener-Waterloo Roundtable on Nuclear Weapons. The group supported by PGS Waterloo and Project Ploughshares presented the following resolution:

"that the City calls upon the Government of Canada to take a leadership role in abolishing nuclear weapons by calling on nuclear-weapons states to commit themselves unequivocally to the elimination of their nuclear arsenals and to agree to start work immediately on the practical steps and negotiations required to achieve this goal. (An example of such leadership would see Canada's joining with the recently-formed New Agenda Coalition of eight middle power states-Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden. This coalition of like-minded countries is actively working towards the goal of nuclear weapons elimination.); and THAT our Cities invite all the members of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to pass similar motions and by so doing support our Country's efforts to make the World a more secure place for its citizens."

Bill Robinson and Grant Birks did a great job presenting to the Councils.

Both mayors introduced the resolutions. There was support voiced from councilors who had participated in the Roundtables and finally, with little debate the resolution passed unanimously at both meetings. It does show that indeed, the tide has turned. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities is meeting in two days to consider this request.

## CHILLING THOUGHT

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission reported in October more than 300 positive tests for cocaine abuse by nuclear workers in 1996-1997.

## ORGANIZATIONS SIGNING ON IN NOVEMBER:

Welcome to two groups from Greece, Women for Security and the Association of Women in the Mediterranean Region. Welcome also to the Friend's Society Monthly Meeting from Rutherford Place, New York. The 50 groups from Egypt, Middle East and Africa were welcomed in a separate posting - it is good to be getting feedback from some of them already. We also welcome Abolition 2000 -Bergen County Chapter (Bergen County, New Jersey), the Youth Leadership Support Network/USA, two new groups from India, the Open University of Alternative Medicine in Calcutta and the National Women's Welfare Center in Kerala, and also the United Youths Association from Sri Lanka. Two organizations based in London also signed on -- the Sudanese Committee against the Violation of Human Rights and the Sudanese Womens Union. We now have a total of 1197 - three more will give us 2000!

## RECENT POLLS

A joint Russo-Japan opinion poll was conducted recently and asked the following questions related to nuclear weapons.

Do you feel threats from Russian military forces? (to Japanese)  
Yes 52 % No 39 % Others or no answer. 9 %.

Do you feel threats from Japan-US military alliance? (to Russians)  
Yes 42% No 38% Others or no answer. 20 %.

Do you think that all the nuclear weapon states should eliminate such weapons in their possession whatever rationale they may have? Or, do you think it is permissible that some states possess nuclear weapons for their own defense purposes?

Japan: They should eliminate nuclear weapons. 78 % It is permissible 18 %; Others. 4 %.

Russia: They should eliminate nuclear weapons. 61 %; It is permissible 31% Others 8 %.

The Australian Peace Committee (South Australian Branch) and the Australian Anti-Bases Campaign commissioned a poll recently throughout every state and territory of Australia on the question of nuclear weapons. The survey was carried out on the 11th and 12th of November, and the results of the survey

were faxed to the Australian Government before the vote on Resolution L.48 was taken at the United Nations on November 13th.

87% of people agreed that all nuclear weapons should be destroyed.

92% of people think that Australia should help negotiate a global treaty to ban and destroy all nuclear weapons.

80% of people agreed that Australia should keep its military alliance with the United States even though the United States is the biggest nuclear power in the world.

Irene Gale of the APC commented, "Although Australians wish to maintain an alliance with the United States, they overwhelmingly desire that alliance to be nuclear weapons free. They also overwhelmingly desire the Australian Government to work earnestly to remove nuclear weapons from the world, and to help negotiate a global treaty to achieve this end. This attitude of the Australian people is reflected by the fact that 144 Local Authorities and many thousands of individuals have endorsed the Abolition 2000 campaign by calling upon the Australian Government to work to remove nuclear weapons from the world. It clearly follows that the Australian Government must vote in favor of resolution L.48 when it is voted upon in the UN General Assembly in December."

LETTER FROM INDIA, from Dr. Balkrishna Kurvey, Regional Contact

"After attending the International conference of Peace Museums in Osaka, Kyoto and Okinawa, I returned to India safely on November 19, 1998. I read my paper "Nuclear tests by India and Pakistan and its effects on Regional Security" and presented my posters for peace in India.

I have decided to establish the Peace Museum in Nagpur. In India, we do not have peace museums. Our peace museum will initially be based on the theme of "No more Hiroshima: No more Nagasaki, Peace Museum" the beginning will be on a modest scale."

VIDEO AVAILABLE

We strongly recommend a video produced by the CDI called "Can We Learn to Live Without Nuclear Weapons?" The video features Jonathan Schell, Alan Cranston, Admiral Stansfield Turner and Admiral Noel Gayler. An excellent resource for town and campus meetings, it can be ordered from the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation for \$18.00 including postage. Visit the website <http://www.wagingpeace.org/store/> to order online.

Sincerely,

Sue Broidy  
Coordinator, Abolition 2000  
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation  
1187 Coast Village Road  
Santa Barbara CA 93108

Phone (805) 965 3443 FAX(805) 568 0466  
Email: A2000@silcom.com  
Website <http://www.abolition2000.org>

To subscribe to the abolition-usa listserve, send a message (no subject) to  
abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com  
To post to the list, mail to: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

To subscribe to the international abolition-caucus, send a message (no  
subject) to majordomo@igc.org  
To post to the list, mail to: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.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: <epf@peacenet.org>  
Date: Wed, 2 Dec 1998 12:02:08 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: epf@pop.igc.org (Unverified)  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
From: "Mary H. Miller" <epf@peacenet.org>  
Subject: Meeting with Secretary Albright

Dear Howard,

I've talked again with Tom Hart about working on a meeting of religious leaders with Secretary Albright, to seek Administration energy for the ratification of the CTBT. Tom would appreciate it very much if you would help him by drafting the initial letter to Albright requesting a meeting, since you have a better grounding in the language of what we've been working on than he can have, or than I have. He'll take it from there, using Episcopal Church letterhead - that's what he and I perceive as the group's intent, that the overture come from the Episcopalians.

Tom was specific about one aspect of the letter and that is that Secretary Albright is very conscious of her own Jewish, Catholic and "Protestant" (Episcopalians tend to want a separate Anglican category...) connections, so he suggests that all three groups be mentioned somehow as members of the religious leaders' group who'd come see her.

I hope this isn't too much of an additional burden for you. I really didn't feel competent to get the language right - and neither did Tom quite. Thanks.

Hope Thanksgiving was good for you.

Mary Miller  
EPF

Return-Path: <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
Date: Thu, 3 Dec 1998 10:41:56 -0500  
From: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
Subject: MUPJ  
Sender: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

I guess I am getting forgetful. When did we say we would send out another Peace Leaf? The first of the year is in my mind, but I have a feeling that maybe we talked about doing it before the first of the year. The Holston Conf. is talking restructuring. I think this is going on in a number of conferences. They want to eliminate the Social Concerns and Peace Issues and burry they in an Outreach dimension that sounds as if they want to eliminate social issues completely except for food pantrys, etc. If so , it seems to me our mission could be more important than ever. How is the Gen. Bd. of Church and Society dealing with this? Have this discussed it at all? Send me an E-Mail and I will move. We will be leaving TN for OH over Christmas. We will probably be back here on 26th or 27th Dec. We have both been battling colds and flu but it appears we have conquered them and now on the mends.

Hope you and family have a fulfilling Christmas.

Jim and Char

To: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: MUPJ  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 10:41 AM 12/3/98 -0500, James Hipkins wrote:

>Howard,  
> I guess I am getting forgetful. When did we say we would send out  
>another Peace Leaf? The first of the year is in my mind, but I have a  
>feeling that maybe we talked about doing it before the first of the year.

Jim,

We talked about a January issue on what to expect from Congress, etc. in 1999. I haven't thought much about it, but I could have something to work with you after you're back from your Christmas vacation.

You wrote: >The Holston Conf. is talking restructuring. I think this is going on in a  
>number of conferences. They want to eliminate the Social Concerns and  
>Peace Issues and burry they in an Outreach dimension that sounds as if they  
>want to eliminate social issues completely except for food pantrys, etc.  
>If so , it seems to me our mission could be more important than ever. How  
>is the Gen. Bd. of Church and Society dealing with this? Have this  
>discussed it at all?

Jim: I can't answer specifically. I know that GBCS is aware of this and tries to keep up with whoever has church and society functions in annual conferences. There have been cases before the Judicial Council, which has ruled that conferences cannot eliminate functions required by the Discipline. But that leaves them flexibility in structure. Clearly there is a trend away from strong advocacy for justice and peace, but most conferences have peace with justice coordinators who Robin Ringler is in touch with.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: relctbt  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Notes on November 24 meeting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

Here are some notes from the November 24 meeting of Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

1. Looking ahead, we agreed that the Interfaith Group for the CTBT would meet on the third Tuesday of each month in 1999. This will be January 19, February 16, March 16, April 20, May 18, June 15, July 20, September 21, and October 19 (the latter dates will be cancelled if the CTBT is ratified sooner). Ordinarily the meeting will run from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. However, on January 19 and February 16 it will run from 1:30 to 3:00 because the Monday Lobby will meet from 12 noon to 1:00 those days due to a Monday holiday. We have requested the FCNL conference room for January 19 and will work out the location of subsequent meetings. We believe that this schedule misses the ordinary meeting times of such groups as Churches for Middle East Peace, the Latin America Task Force, and Monday Lobby working groups. If this is wrong, please let me know.

2. The cost of the conference call the day of the Jeffords breakfast is slightly under \$300. We raised \$550 in donations, which were deposited in an account of Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Donors present on November 24 agreed that rather refunding prorated shares the money should be held in that account and earmarked for the cost of similar use in the future. (Do other donors agree?)

3. The petition on the CTBT to circulate in churches, synagogues, and meetings and at other religious gatherings is ready to be sent out along with background information. (If you need a copy, please let me know.) The intent is to obtain signatures in January and February and present the petitions to home state offices of senators in March. We will make an effort to put persons from various denominations and religious groups in touch with one another in the respective states so that they may join together in making presentations.

So far we know that the following groups will participate: Church of the Brethren, Church Women United, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Mennonite Central Committee, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, Presbyterian Church, NETWORK, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, United Methodist Church. We will check with other prospective participants, especially those whose leaders signed the letter to the Senate last spring.

3. We are moving ahead with our effort to obtain appointments with cabinet secretaries to urge the Clinton Administration to step up its push for CTBT ratification. Larry Egbert has tried through Unitarian circles to set up an appointment with Secretary Cohen but has so far been unsuccessful. Mary Miller will talk with Tom Hart about the Episcopal Office taking the lead to get an appointment with Secretary Albright. NETWORK will take the lead in approaching Secretary Richardson. We will also try to meet with Sandy Berger and one of President Clinton's top political advisors. It is understood that these will be small delegations, in some cases heads of communion if possible, and will not necessarily involve every member of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

4. Daryl Kimball invited members of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT to participate in a strategy session organized by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers on December 2. David Culp indicated that a new swing list of senators will be available in December. I'll send out further information about campaign strategy for 1999.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Appointment secretaries  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Daryl,

I believe you said you have names and numbers of appointment secretaries for Secretaries Albright, Cohen, and Richardson. Would you please provide them to me?

Thanks,  
Howard

To: tom.hart@ecunet.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Suggestions for letter to Secy. Albright  
Cc: epf@igc.org  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Tom:

Mary Miller indicated that you wanted some suggestions for a letter to Secretary Albright to request a meeting with an interfaith delegation. The attached is my response. You can use what you want from it or discard it as you choose. Let me know how it comes out.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

Suggestions for a letter to Secretary Albright regarding the CTBT

Dear Madame Secretary:

As you have said on a number of occasions, Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is urgently needed. A broad segment of the religious community in the United States agrees, as illustrated by the attached letter that went to all members of the U.S. Senate last May. We see 1999 as a crucial time for the Senate to complete action on the treaty.

We would like to have an opportunity for a small interfaith delegation of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders to meet with you to discuss the campaign for Senate ratification of the CTBT. We want to urge that the Clinton Administration make CTBT ratification a top priority in its dealings with Congress and in building public support for the treaty. We believe that the CTBT deserves the same all-out effort that the Administration gave to NATO expansion last year. We have several ideas to offer on how this might occur.

When we meet with you, we also want to tell you about activities now underway within the religious community to develop strong grassroots support for the CTBT. We want to discuss how our public advocacy for the CTBT can relate to the Administration's push for CTBT ratification.

[Then something about who the interfaith contact is for setting up this appointment.]

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 3 Dec 1998 11:03:05 -0800 (PST)  
From: marylia@igc.org (marylia)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: (Anti) Nuclear Holiday Postcards/Free Art  
To: marylia@igc.org  
X-Sender: marylia@pop.igc.apc.org (Unverified)

Dear friends:

**HELP DE-ALERT NUCLEAR ARSENALS!**

**GET YOUR FREE ARTWORK AND CAMERA-READY TEMPLATE TO MAKE BEAUTIFUL AND POWERFUL HOLIDAY POSTCARDS TELLING PRESIDENT CLINTON TO TAKE NUCLEAR WEAPONS OFF HAIR-TRIGGER ALERT STATUS AND CHALLENGE OTHER NATIONS TO DO LIKEWISE. "HARD COPY" OF POSTCARD TEMPLATE AVAILABLE BY SNAIL MAIL -- OR USE THE JPEG (OR OTHER FORMAT) FILE AVAILABLE ON OUR WEB SITE. READ ON...**

We ask you to join in our efforts to pressure President Clinton to reduce nuclear risks by taking nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert and by challenging other nations to follow suit. We are launching a campaign of education and citizen advocacy to push for the de-alerting of nuclear weapons and for unilateral reciprocal reductions in the nuclear weapons stockpile.

As a first step, we are working to let President Clinton know that 1999 is the year to make significant changes in our past nuclear weapons policy and to begin the new millennium with the world safer and saner than ever before.

The camera-ready postcard templates can be easily reproduced on card-stock and then distributed to your membership, family and friends. Insert in your newsletters for December or January. The New Year's theme allows for a wide-range of uses. Pass them out at your local events and meetings. Enclose in your holiday greeting cards.

If you have questions or would like additional camera-ready copies of the postcard templates, please contact either the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability at 206-547-3175 or Tri-Valley CAREs at 925-443-7148. Or, reply via email--and, be sure your complete address comes with your message. The templates are also available on our web site at:  
<<http://www.igc.org/tvc>>.

Thanks for your help and participation in distributing these postcards. Let us know what you think of them and how you used them.

Peace,  
Marylia Kelley, Tri-Valley CAREs  
Susan Gordon, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Marylia Kelley  
Tri-Valley CAREs

(Communities Against a Radioactive Environment)  
5720 East Ave. #116, Livermore, CA USA 94550

<<http://www.igc.org/tvc/>> - is our web site, please visit us there!

(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.

Return-Path: <owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 1998 15:42:35 +0000  
From: "Sara Speicher" <ses8@staff.wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-l: "Virtual" Peace to the City  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Sender: owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Reply-To: "Sara Speicher" <ses8@staff.wcc-coe.org>

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

Dear friends,

The Peace to the City global campaign culminates at the Eighth Assembly of the World Council of Churches being held now in Harare, Zimbabwe.

You can also follow the Peace to the City emphases and challenges--and add your own messages of peace and stories of peacemaking, at the special Peace to the City web site for the Assembly.

The site is found at:

<http://www.wcc-coe.org/pov/harare.html>

Join us in Harare over the Web, and add your voice for Peace as we celebrate the Peace to the City Campaign and challenge the Assembly participants to continue and expand ecumenical work to build a culture of peace!

In service and peace,

Sara Speicher  
Programme Assistant  
Programme to Overcome Violence

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

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 1998 17:09:04 +0100  
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Results!! End fast and vigil Brussels  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, fme@motherearth.org, a-days@motherearth.org,  
tp2000.lst.grp@gn.apc.org, 2000walk4abolition@motherearth.org,  
induran@motherearth.org  
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

Dear friends,

First I wish to thank all those of you who have faxed the Belgian Social Democrat Minister of Foreign Affairs in Brussels, as well as you who send me messages of encouragement. They told me they didn't have time anymore to read all the faxes coming in!!

Yesterday there came a break-through in the Belgian House of Representatives when Green MP Hugo Van Dienderen remembered the Minister of Foreign Affairs about 'the faster at his front door since 14 days' and asked the Minister 'which initiatives he would take at the upcoming NATO Ministerial meeting of Foreign Affairs next Tuesday'. He referred especially to the 'No First Use' as discussed both in Germany and Canada. The Minister answered to have respect for the courage of the faster, and said there were continuous communications going on. Further he said that we he will discuss the NFU option informally with both his Canadian and German colleague, and possible join with them if they stand firm themselves on the NFU. We are waiting for the detailed report of the House of Representatives to have a word by word accurate report. Let us know if you want to receive a copy.

As this is the first time that a Belgian Minister questions publically the NFU option, we felt we had a good reason to stop the fast.

Further results are :

- \* a regular consultation at the cabinet of the Minsiter with Abolition 2000 Belgium, which I will discuss in a closing meeting for the fast with an aid of the Minister at 5:30 pm today
- \* the Minister further reacted positively on the proposal for a regular Parliamentary Follow-up report on nuclear disarmament, which was discussed in the Committee of Foreign Affairs yesterday morning
- \* a hearing and debate on the implications of the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in the Committees of Foreign Affairs of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Patrick Hostekint, Social Democrat Senator and MP Hugo Van Dienderen have agreed to table this proposal simultaneously in their respective committees, so they can have a joint session with International Lawyers which will also be invited by Abolition 2000 Belgium

Social Democrat Patrick Hostekint stated that the place of the vigil and

fast was very effective. MP Hugo van Dienderen stated that 'the fast moved more in two weeks, then I have been able to do in years of parliamentary work'.

It definitely was a catalyst, which you were part of. Thank you again.

And for the ones who might worry about my health. Don't worry. I am feeling very good, and enjoyed as never before the taste and essence of foods.

#### ACTION ALERT

And for the ones who can be in Brussels next week Tuesday morning Dec. 8, at 8:15 a.m., please join us at NATO headquarters for a vigil to get our demands out to the Ministers and the world. We will try to get pictures available through E-mail by Tuesday noon. Please contact Sharon Riggle at CESD <cesd@agoranet.be> if you want pictures for newspapers in your area. We will also invite AP, Reuters, AFP and EPA photodesks.

Peace,

Pol D'Huyvetter

To: jdean@ucsusa.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: News from Brussels  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Jonathan,

At the Deep Cuts Working Group I mentioned the fast by Pol D'Huyvetter in Belgium. Here's his latest communication with an indication of breakthroughs with the Belgian government.

Shalom,  
Howard

>Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
>Date: Fri, 04 Dec 1998 17:09:04 +0100  
>From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>  
>Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
>Subject: Results!! End fast and vigil Brussels  
>To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, fme@motherearth.org, a-days@motherearth.org,  
> tp2000.lst.grp@gn.apc.org, 2000walk4abolition@motherearth.org,  
> induran@motherearth.org  
>X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

>Dear friends,

>First I wish to thank all those of you who have faxed the Belgian Social  
>Democrat Minister of Foreign Affairs in Brussels, as well as you who send  
>me messages of encouragement. They told me they didn't have time anymore to  
>read all the faxes coming in!!

>Yesterday there came a break-through in the Belgian House of  
>Representatives when Green MP Hugo Van Dienderen remembered the Minister of  
>Foreign Affairs about 'the faster at his front door since 14 days' and  
>asked the Minister 'which initiatives he would take at the upcoming NATO  
>Ministerial meeting of Foreign Affairs next Tuesday'. He referred  
>especially to the 'No First Use' as discussed both in Germany and Canada.  
>The Minister answered to have respect for the courage of the faster, and  
>said there were continuous communications going on. Further he said that we  
>he will discuss the NFU option informally with both his Canadian and German  
>college, and possible join with them if they stand firm themselves on the  
>NFU. We are waiting for the detailed report of the House of Representatives  
>to have a word by word accurate report. Let us know if you want to receive  
>a copy.

>As this is the first time that a Belgian Minister questions publically the  
>NFU option, we felt we had a good reason to stop the fast.

>Further results are :

>\* a regular consultation at the cabinet of the Minsiter with Abolition  
> 2000 Belgium, which I will discuss in a closing meeting for the fast

> with an aid of the Minister at 5:30 pm today  
>  
>\* the Minister further reacted positively on the proposal for a regular  
> Parliamentary Follow-up report on nuclear disarmament, which was  
> discussed in the Committee of Foreign Affairs yesterdaymorning  
>  
>\* a hearing and debate on the implications of the advisory opinion of the  
> International Court of Justice in the Committees of Foreign Affairs of both  
> the Senate and the House of Representatives. Patrick Hostekint, Social  
> Democrat Senator and MP Hugo Van Dienderen have agreed to table this  
> proposal simultaneously in their respective committees, so they can have a  
> joint session with International Lawyers which will also be invited by  
> Abolition 2000 Belgium  
>  
>Social Democrat Patrick Hostekint stated that the place of the vigil and  
>fast was very effective. MP Hugo van Dienderen stated that 'the fast moved  
>more in two weeks, then I have been able to do in years of parliamentary  
>work'.  
>  
>It definately was a catalyst, which you were part of. Thank you again.  
>  
>And for the ones who might worry about my health. Don't worry. I am feeling  
>very good, and enjoyed as never before the tast and essence of foods.

>  
> ACTION ALERT  
>

>And for the ones who can be in Brussels next week Tuesdaymorning Dec. 8, at  
>8:15 a.m., please join us at NATO headquarters for a vigil to get our  
>demands out to the Ministers and the world. We will try to get pictures  
>available through E-mail by Tuesday noon. Please contact Sharon Riggle at  
>CESD <cesd@agoranet.be> if you want pictures for newspapers in your area.  
>We will also invite AP, Reuters, AFP and EPA photodesks.

>  
>Peace,  
>  
>Pol D'Huyvetter

>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>  
>

Return-Path: <joe@fcnl.org>  
X-Sender: joe@local.fcnl.org  
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 1998 11:38:13 -0500  
To: catherine@fcnl.org  
From: Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>  
Subject: WISC -- Request your help

FCNL EMAIL MEMO

TO: WISC FP/MS WG Date: 12-4-98

(Washington Interreligious Foreign Policy and Military Spending  
Working Group)

cc: other denominational contacts

FROM: Joe Volk

RE: Pinochet -- Request Your Participation in  
Press Conference Monday Dec 7, 12 Noon  
2237 Rayburn House Office Building and/or sign on press statement

-----  
The Letelier and Moffitt families need our support now. The talking points  
memo and press release (below) will give you the details.

You and your denomination can help by doing the following:

1. Sign on Today:

Stand with the families by signing on the attorney's statement below by  
calling Meena Ehandari at IPS 202-234-9382 x 240.

2. Attend the Press Conference:  
(with apologies to Charles McCollough whose sculpture opening I'll get  
to late Monday)

We need some prominent leaders of the religious community present at the  
press conference. With so many in Harare for the World Council of Churches  
conference and others traveling abroad during the Congressional break, we  
need you if you are in town.

3. Call the Comment lines:

White House 202-456-1111 (Comment Line)  
Department of Justice 1-800-LINE-2AG (Comment Line)  
Department of State 202-647-6575 (Public Information)

-----  
Attorney's statement:

At his December 1, 1998 daily press briefing, Department of Justice  
spokesman, James P. Rubin, referring to a Kurdish terrorist, stated U.S.  
policy is "when a terrorist is responsible for the killing of innocents,

they should face justice." Families of victims of the Pinochet regime, together with human rights organizations, religious leaders, and others will hold a press conference at noon on Monday, December 7, 1998, in Washington, D.C. to demand that the same standard be applied to General Pinochet.

The families of the victims will call upon the Clinton Administration to bring General Pinochet to justice for the terrorist act of murdering Orlando Letelier and Ronni Karpen Moffitt on the streets of Washington, D.C., the murders of Americans Charles Horman and Frank Teruggi in Chile and the systematic deprivation of human rights through acts of torture, murder and kidnaping against thousands of Chilean citizens. They will call upon the Administration to:

1. Immediately eliminate international confusion regarding U.S. policy over bringing General Pinochet to justice. The U.S. should promptly indicate its support for General Pinochet being brought to justice in Spain or other forums consistent with international standards of due process.
2. Conduct a complete and full investigation of all documentary and other evidence available to the United States Government regarding General Pinochet's responsibility for terrorist acts and human rights violations and promptly disclose all relevant information.
3. Immediately reopen the investigation of General Pinochet's responsibility for the Moffitt, Letelier, Teruggi and Horman murders as a violation of U.S. law.

-----  
INSTITUTE FOR POLICY STUDIES  
733 15th Street, NW, Suite 1020  
Washington, DC 20005-2112

MEDIA ADVISORY FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 7

CONTACT: Institute for Policy Studies: Meena Ehandari, 202-234-9382 x 240 or  
Martha Honey, x 232;  
Fenton Communications: Laura Burstein, 822-5200 x 222

Families of Pinochet's Victims  
to Hold D.C. Press Conference, Monday, Dec. 7

Urging U.S. to Help Bring Ex-Dictator to Justice  
Days Before British Government Decides On Extradition

Family members of Augusto Pinochet's murder victims will join congressional, religious and human rights leaders to urge the U.S. to support international efforts to extradite the former Chilean dictator to Spain, and try him for his crimes against humanity.

Speakers will include the wife of the American journalist whose story was the subject of the film Missing; wife of former Chilean Ambassador to the

U.S.; and the sole survivor of a Washington, D.C. car bombing carried out by Pinochet's secret police.

The press conference is being held the week Britain's Home Secretary must decide whether to allow General Pinochet to be extradited to Spain, or return to Chile.

The families are calling on the U. S. to publicly express full support for the international legal efforts to bring General Pinochet to justice, and rapidly release all relevant government documents.

WHEN: Monday, December 7, NOON

WHERE: 2237 Rayburn House Office Building  
Judiciary Committee Room

WHO: Michael Moffitt is the sole survivor of a car bomb attack that killed his 25 year- old wife, Ronni, and his colleague, former Chilean Ambassador, Orlando Letelier. Pinochet's secret police carried out the September 1976 assassination — the worst act of international terrorism ever to take place in Washington, D.C.

Murray Karpen is the father of Ronni Moffitt.

Joyce Horman is the wife of American journalist Charles Horman, whose execution by Pinochet's soldiers days after the 1973 coup was the subject of the film Missing.

Isabel Letelier is the wife of Chile's former Foreign Minister and Ambassador to the U.S., who was killed in the same Washington, D.C. car bombing as Ronni Moffitt.

Roberto Leni is a Chilean living in exile in the U.S. His father and four brothers were arrested, detained and tortured by Pinochet's soldiers on the day of the 1973 coup.

Janice Teruggi Page is the sister of Frank Teruggi, an American economics student student studying in Chile who was arrested and executed by Pinochet's police in the days following the coup.

Sam Buffone is the D.C. attorney representing the Letelier and Moffitt families.

Congressman John Conyers (D-MI) is a member of the House Judiciary Committee.

# # #

ATTENTION JOURNALISTS: For more information about the press conference, or to arrange interviews with the family members of Pinochet's victims, please contact  
Meena Ehandari at 202-234-9382 x 240.

VISUALS: Photographs of victims; giant live Pinochet puppet

Joe Volk

Executive Secretary

Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)

245 Second Street, NE

Washington, DC 20002

Phone: 202/ 547-6000

Fax: 202/ 547-6019

E-mail: [joe@fcnl.org](mailto:joe@fcnl.org)

Web page: <http://www.fcnl.org>

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

Date: Fri, 4 Dec 1998 11:56:39 EST

From: LCNP@aol.com

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: UN PLENARY VOTE !!!!!!!

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca,  
katie@chch.planet.org.nz, forum@worldforum.org, wagingpeace@napf.org,  
aslater@igc.apc.org, LCNP@aol.com, mpi@igc.org, jwurst@cepny.org,  
nei.til.atomvapen@sn.no, lars.g.lindskog@slmk.alinks.se,  
JGG786@aol.com, petweiss@igc.org, jsimons@hasimons.com,  
robwcpuk@gn.apc.org, mbkalinowski@yahoo.com, fsbarros@if.ufrj.br,  
MTheorin@europarl.eu.int

The General Assembly has just adopted the New Agenda Coalition Resolution ( L 48 Rev1.) by a vote of 114 in favour , 18 opposed and 38 abstention. This means one no vote has switched.

The resolution on the ICJ Opinion ( L 45) was adopted 123 in favour , 25 opposed, and 25 abstention.

A detailed report will follow shortly

JIM Wurst

UN Coordinator, MPI

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: "CNANW-L" <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>  
Date: Fri, 4 Dec 1998 14:06:11 -0500  
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@pgs.ca>  
Importance: Normal  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: FW: Votes in the UN  
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

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

Non-member submission from [Martin Butcher <mbutcher@basicint.org>]  
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 1998 12:36:18 -0500  
From: Martin Butcher <mbutcher@basicint.org>  
To: Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Votes in the UN

Hello Everyone,

I am sending this out as Flick is unable to get her e-mail out to the world, so she rang to dictate it to me. Questions about this should be directed to her.

Martin Butcher  
New Agenda Coalition Resolution  
For:114, Against: 18, Abstain:38

Operative paragraph 8 - Universality of the NPT  
Yes:160, No:3 (India,Israel,Pakistan), Abstain:2(Cuba,Bhutan)  
Operative Paragraph 17 (Negative Security Assurances)  
Yes:156, No:1 (USA), Abstain: 5(Cuba, Israel, India, Pakistan, DPKR)  
ICJ Resolution  
For:123, Against: 25, Abstain: 25

Operative Paragraph 1 (ICJ unanimous conclusion on the obligation to disarm)  
Yes:118, No:9, Abstain: 33  
Nuclear Testing Resolution  
Yes: 118, No: 9, Abstain: 33

Return-Path: <owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 1998 14:58:58 -0500  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctb-followers@igc.apc.org  
Subject: IPPNW, START 2, NATO and Use Policy  
To: ctb-followers@igc.org

. . . And to prove that we "the forces of good" are alive, well and working hard . . .

AAP(Australian Associated Press) 12/04 1706  
VIC: Nuclear threat more frightening than ever: expert

By Leigh Murray

MELBOURNE, Dec 4 AAP - The worldwide threat from nuclear weapons was greater than ever before, and had been heightened by Pakistan and India's recent weapons tests, experts said today.

Ron McKoy, a member of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, said while the Cold War was over, the threat from nuclear weapons was not.

"The nuclear threat is more complex and more frightening than ever," Mr. McKoy said in a new booklet titled 'Is Everything Secure? - Myths and Realities of Nuclear Disarmament'.

"The volatile mix now includes international terrorism, the threat of accidental nuclear war, the design of new nuclear weapons, the spread of weapons of mass destruction ... an increasingly unstable Russia with its enormous stockpile of nuclear weapons, and a continued commitment to nuclearism by the United States and the world's other declared nuclear powers."

Mr McKoy said there remained 30,000 nuclear warheads around the world and while there had been progress towards their elimination some countries continued to oppose to such a move.

"We either have nuclear abolition or we have a nuclear free-for-all, and you can't afford that," he said.

Mr McKoy is one of more than 300 delegates from more than 40 countries who will attend the 13th World Congress for International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) this weekend.

Michael Christ, IPPNW executive director, said the threat from nuclear weapons had not disappeared, but simply changed.

He said concern over nuclear weapons was highlighted this year when India and Pakistan exploded five and six nuclear bombs respectively in May.

"As deplorable and dangerous as the nuclear arms race in South Asia is, it may just have reawakened a global public to the threat of nuclear war which, sad to say, still hangs over our collective heads at century's end," Mr Christ said.

"The reality is that we are still a planet at risk.

"Having devised the means of our own destruction, we continue to flirt with extinction."

The IPPNW was created in 1981 and won the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize after helping ease tensions between the United States and Russia.

AAP ljm/jlw/rap

\*\*\*\*\*

Earlier information indicated that Russia might ratify START 2 as early as today. Now, it seems that a vote may be expected next week - stay tuned.

RTos 12/03 1439 Russian Minister, U.S. Officials Discuss START-2  
MOSCOW (Reuters) - Russian Defense Minister Igor Sergeev discussed the decommissioning of Soviet nuclear weapons with a visiting group of U.S. congressmen Thursday.

Russian news agency Itar-Tass quoted the Defense Ministry as saying Sergeev had informed the group about Russia's progress toward ratification of the START-2 nuclear arms reduction treaty.

Tass and U.S. embassy officials gave no other details of the meeting with the group of nine members of the U.S. Congress who are in Moscow for consultations with Russian parliamentarians.

The 1993 START-2 treaty would cut U.S. and Russian deployed nuclear warheads by up to two thirds from about 6,000 each to no more than 3,500 each by the year 2007. The U.S. Senate has ratified the treaty but Russia's State Duma, or lower house, has held back for financial and political reasons.

The Duma has accelerated moves toward ratification of START-2 in the last few weeks and more progress was reported Thursday.

Duma officials said the first stage of preparing amendments to a draft bill for ratification had been completed and the proposed amendments would now be sent to Duma committees and parliamentary groups for consideration.

Once approved by the Duma, the draft law goes to President Boris Yeltsin for approval.

\*\*\*\*\*

RTw 12/03 1215 Fischer to push nuclear no-first-use at NATO

By Robert Mahoney

BONN, Dec 3 (Reuters) - Germany's new Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer will call for a no-first-use pledge from Western nuclear powers at a NATO meeting next week, German officials said on Thursday.

But they sought to play down the controversy surrounding the demand which the United States has already strongly rejected.

One senior government official said foreign ministers from the 16-nation North Atlantic Treaty Organisation would not mention the first-use option in their communique after the December 7-8 summit in Brussels.

But Fischer, a leader of the leftwing Greens party, would raise the issue within the debate over NATO's future strategy in a post Cold War world.

"You can bet that the minister will give his opinion on this," one official said.

The Greens are a party with roots in the pacifist, anti-nuclear and ecologist movements. They are the junior partner in Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder's Social Democrat-led coalition which took office just six weeks ago after the defeat of conservative chancellor Helmut Kohl.

Fischer insisted Germany did not want to break ranks in NATO but he wanted an open discussion about the alliance's readiness to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

His stance opened divisions not only between Germany and NATO's nuclear powers -- the United States, Britain and France -- but also between the Greens and SPD.

Defence Minister Rudolf Scharping of the SPD distanced himself from Fischer during a visit to Washington last month when Defence Secretary William Cohen rejected any restrictions on US nuclear policy.

Schroeder on Tuesday defended Fischer's right to raise the issue but he said Germany remained committed to NATO no matter what.

He accused the press of exaggerating the controversy about Fischer's remarks.

Officials said Germany had raised the idea as part of the Western alliance's aim to devise a new strategic concept for itself ahead of a summit in Washington next April to mark the organisation's 50th anniversary.

Western diplomats said the Brussels meeting would prepare the ground for the Washington summit but they noted that NATO's nuclear powers opposed any change to their deterrence strategy.

"Schroeder had to back Fischer on this but that does not mean the Germans are going to push it to the point of creating a rift," said one official from a NATO nuclear member.

\*\*\*\*\*

A letter from General Butler to Fischer , via BASIC:

Dear friends,

What follows is an open letter sent by Lee Butler, General, USAF, (Retired) to Joscka Fischer, German Foreign Minister. Gen. Butler kindly provided us with a copy and told us to make use of it.

Unfortunately, the letter was not dated, but we believe it was sent today, 4 December 1998.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me on 202-785-1266 or on email on: syoung@basicint.org

Yours,

Stephen Young  
Senior Analyst  
British American Security Information Council

+ + + + +

Joschka Fischer  
Foreign Minister  
Auswaertiges Amt  
Adenauerallee 99 - 103  
53001 Bonn  
Germany

Dear Foreign Minister Fischer,

Your suggestion that NATO revise its nuclear doctrine is most welcome. As you discuss these matters with your colleagues it may be that my own

experience in thinking through this question as the Director of Strategic Plans and Policy for the U. S. armed forces during the Gulf war might be helpful. I was equally engaged in the matter of prospective nuclear response to attack by WMD during my tenure as Commander-in-Chief of U. S. Strategic Command during the period 1991 to 1994.

As you are keenly aware, the Gulf War presented us with the very real possibility of confronting such an attack by the forces of Iraq. We went through the exercise of imagining how it might unfold and examining a variety of response options. My personal conclusion was that under any likely attack scenario, a nuclear reply by the United States and its allies was simply out of the question.

First, from a purely military perspective, the coalition forces had the conventional capability to impose any desired war termination objectives on Iraq, to include unconditional surrender and occupation. For a variety of reasons, we elected not to go to that extreme but it was clearly an option in the face of a WMD attack.

Second, given our conventional superiority, and the nature of the war zone, the use of nuclear weapons simply made no tactical nor strategic sense. General Powell noted in his memoirs that several weapons would have been required to mount any sort of effective campaign against military targets, an option that Secretary Cheney immediately rejected - and understandably so. Further, whatever the immediate battlefield effects, the problems of radioactive fall-out carrying over into friendly forces or surrounding countries were unfathomable.

Third, the larger political issues were insurmountable. What could possibly justify our resort to the very means we properly abhor and condemn? How could we hold an entire society accountable for the decision of a single demented leader who holds his own country hostage? Moreover, the consequences for the nonproliferation regime would have been severe. By joining our enemy in shattering the tradition of non-use that had held for 45 years, we would have destroyed U.S. credibility as leader of the campaign against nuclear proliferation; indeed, we would likely have emboldened a whole new array of nuclear aspirants.

In short, in a singular act we would have martyred our principal foe, alienated our friends, destroyed the coalition so painstakingly constructed, given comfort to the non-declared nuclear states and impetus to states who seek such weapons covertly.

In the end, we tried to have it both ways, privately ruling out a nuclear reply while maintaining an ambiguous declaratory policy. The infamous and widely misre-presented letter from Secretary Baker to Baghdad was ill-advised; in fact, Iraq violated with impunity one of its

cardinal prohibitions by torching Kuwait's oil fields.

When I left my J-5 post in Washington and took up this issue as CINCSTRAT, I found all of the foregoing cautions to be relevant across a

wide spectrum of prospective targets in a variety of so-called rogue nations. I ultimately concluded that whatever the utility of a No First Use policy during the Cold War, it is entirely inappropriate to the new global security environment; worse, it is counterproductive to the goal

of nonproliferation and antithetical to the values of democratic societies.

Please forgive this rather abrupt intrusion into your deliberations. Obviously, I would not take such a liberty if I did not believe it was warranted by the import and the urgency of the issue.

Warm regards,

Lee Butler  
General, USAF (Retired)

--

DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE  
Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools  
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator  
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>  
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 1998 15:45:06 -0500  
From: Stephen Young <syoun@basicint.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: ERROR: Correction to Butler letter  
To: Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>  
X-Accept-Language: en

Dear friends,

Please note there is an error in the Butler letter in the second to last paragraph, where it says "No First Use" when it means "First Use".

A corrected version is below.

Sorry for the confusion.

Stephen Young

+ + + + +

Joschka Fischer  
Foreign Minister  
Auswaertiges Amt  
Adenauerallee 99 - 103  
53001 Bonn  
Germany

Dear Foreign Minister Fischer,

Your suggestion that NATO revise its nuclear doctrine is most welcome. As you discuss these matters with your colleagues it may be that my own experience in thinking through this question as the Director of Strategic Plans and Policy for the U. S. armed forces during the Gulf war might be helpful. I was equally engaged in the matter of prospective nuclear response to attack by WMD during my tenure as Commander-in-Chief of U. S. Strategic Command during the period 1991 to 1994.

As you are keenly aware, the Gulf War presented us with the very real possibility of confronting such an attack by the forces of Iraq. We went through the exercise of imagining how it might unfold and examining a variety of response options. My personal conclusion was that under any likely attack scenario, a nuclear reply by the United States and its allies was simply out of the question.

First, from a purely military perspective, the coalition forces had the conventional capability to impose any desired war termination objectives on Iraq, to include unconditional surrender and occupation. For a variety of reasons, we elected not to go to that extreme but it was clearly an option in the face of a WMD attack.

Second, given our conventional superiority, and the nature of the war zone, the use of nuclear weapons simply made no tactical nor strategic

sense. General Powell noted in his memoirs that several weapons would have been required to mount any sort of effective campaign against military targets, an option that Secretary Cheney immediately rejected - and understandably so. Further, whatever the immediate battlefield effects, the problems of radioactive fall-out carrying over into friendly forces or surrounding countries were unfathomable.

Third, the larger political issues were insurmountable. What could possibly justify our resort to the very means we properly abhor and condemn? How could we hold an entire society accountable for the decision of a single demented leader who holds his own country hostage? Moreover, the consequences for the nonproliferation regime would have been severe. By joining our enemy in shattering the tradition of non-use that had held for 45 years, we would have destroyed U.S. credibility as leader of the campaign against nuclear proliferation; indeed, we would likely have emboldened a whole new array of nuclear aspirants.

In short, in a singular act we would have martyred our principal foe, alienated our friends, destroyed the coalition so painstakingly constructed, given comfort to the non-declared nuclear states and impetus to states who seek such weapons covertly.

In the end, we tried to have it both ways, privately ruling out a nuclear reply while maintaining an ambiguous declaratory policy. The infamous and widely misre-presented letter from Secretary Baker to Baghdad was ill-advised; in fact, Iraq violated with impunity one of its cardinal prohibitions by torching Kuwait's oil fields.

When I left my J-5 post in Washington and took up this issue as CINCSSTRAT, I found all of the foregoing cautions to be relevant across a wide spectrum of prospective targets in a variety of so-called rogue nations. I ultimately concluded that whatever the utility of a First Use policy during the Cold War, it is entirely inappropriate to the new global security environment; worse, it is counterproductive to the goal of nonproliferation and antithetical to the values of democratic societies.

Please forgive this rather abrupt intrusion into your deliberations. Obviously, I would not take such a liberty if I did not believe it was warranted by the import and the urgency of the issue.

Warm regards,

Lee Butler General, USAF (Retired)

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 1998 16:11:33 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, mupj@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, disarmament@igc.org,  
btiller@psr.org  
Subject: Plans for our de-alerting event  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id NAA01256

I am addressing this to everyone who was present at the special planning meeting on de-alerting on 11-24-98, plus Kathy Crandall who could not attend. Is there anyone else who should be on this e-mail list?

We now have (thanks to Alistair) firm commitments from Bruce Blair and Stansfield Turner to speak at a Hill briefing (Senate side) at 10:00 a.m. on 12-17-98. Alistair is working to secure other speakers. Jonathan Dean agreed to moderate the panel. So that is our date — put it down in your calendar.

Howard is working with Wayne Glass of Sen. Bingaman's staff to obtain both official sponsorship and a meeting room. After we hear a definite word from Wayne, we will ask some other Senators to cosponsor. We need a Dear Colleague invitation to go out by the middle or end of next week.

(I spoke with Randy DeValck of Daschle's staff today, and he said that he would be glad to send the invitation out by e-mail to the full list of Democratic defense and foreign policy staffers. This will be excellent help, but can not be a substitute for an invitation signed by Bingaman, and perhaps a Republican.)

(I spoke with Peter Tyler of Harkin's staff today, and he said that Harkin would be a backup if Bingaman does not come through. Of course, Peter acknowledges that Bingaman is a much better person to sponsor such a briefing than Harkin.)

Here are my notes on the tasks we agreed to undertake:

- Getting out the invitation (Dear Colleague) from one or two Senators to all Senate offices — Howard
- Refreshments, dais, mikes — Howard
- Pursuing C-SPAN and other TV — Howard
- Visuals: posterboards and slides — Hisham
- Obtaining NGO cosponsors — Bob T.
- Getting out a flyer to Senate, selected House offices, NGOs on Dec. 10-11 — Bob T.
- Followup phone calls to Senate offices on Dec. 15-16 — Brad
- Media advisory — UCS, with PSR also willing to help
- Handouts — Kathy, can you organize this for us? Hisham obtained copies of the UNADIR journal already.

Fran researched the cost of an ad in Roll Call, and it looks way too expensive. I suggest that we skip it. Flyers and followup calls will be adequate, I think.

By the way, the National Security News Service is going to move forward on a packet for editorial boards on de-alerting. I spoke with Steve Raikin and Francyne Harrigan about it today. If we have the Dear Colleague invitation to our briefing by the middle or end of next week, perhaps it could go in the packet.

By the way, I learned today that Lott has reversed himself and said that the Senate will not be in session during the first half of January. He got some significant rebellion in the ranks. They are now looking at a January 19th start. I do not want to reopen our agonizing debate about the date for the briefing, but I wanted you to know the latest on the Hill calendar.

Shalom,  
Bob T.

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 1998 16:02:49 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: mupj@igc.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org  
Subject: Speakers for December 17th

Howard and Alistair,

Good work on getting Bruce Blair for our Dec. 17th briefing! Also good that Stansfield Turner will come, though (as we all know) his strategic escrow proposal is somewhat different from de-alerting.

I want to restate the case for including Dr. Ira Helfand of PSR as one of the presenters. Ira can effectively present the medical consequences of accidental nuclear war, which is one of the main issues pressing us toward de-alerting, and which neither of the others can speak knowledgeably about. Ira has been in France, UK, and Russia this year, talking with government officials and NGOs about de-alerting. Bruce is a very low-key speaker who does not punctuate his presentation with a sense of urgency, whereas Ira can portray the urgency, especially with a "bombing run" presentation about the power and impact of nuclear weapons. Bruce and Ira have spoken on panels together before and also have worked together on the New England Journal article, so they know each other and can work as a team.

What do you say? Can we add Ira Helfand as a third presenter?

We are getting very close to a date when we have to put out a public announcement of the event, with a listing of speakers, so let's try to talk about this on Tuesday.

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller

Return-Path: <rschoenfeld@instituteforworldpeace.com>  
From: Robert Schoenfeld <rschoenfeld@instituteforworldpeace.com>  
To: "'worldpeacemakers@compuserve.com'" <worldpeacemakers@compuserve.com>,  
    "'Sathar3624@aol.com'" <Sathar3624@aol.com>,  
    "'wfa@wfa.org'"  
    <wfa@wfa.org>,  
    "'wcomwf@connect.ab.ca'" <wcomwf@connect.ab.ca>,  
    "'info@wcrp.org'" <info@wcrp.org>,  
    "'wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org'"  
    <wilpfnatl@igc.apc.org>  
To: "'jpope@elca.org'" <jpope@elca.org>,  
    "'jconrad@usoaw.org'"  
    <jconrad@usoaw.org>,  
    "'witness@w4peace.org'"  
    <witness@w4peace.org>,  
    "'wijlv@aol.com'" <wijlv@aol.com>, "'vfp@vfp.org'" <vfp@vfp.org>,  
    "'clarkek@claretianpubs.org'"  
    <clarkek@claretianpubs.org>  
To: "'info@uscj.org'" <info@uscj.org>,  
    "'natchison@igc.org'"  
    <natchison@igc.org>,  
    "'mhoover@uaa.org'" <mhoover@uaa.org>,  
    "'dringler@umc-gbcs.org'" <dringler@umc-gbcs.org>,  
    "'magazine@tikkun.org'" <magazine@tikkun.org>,  
    "'chrisZ@bruderhof.com'" <chrisZ@bruderhof.com>  
To: "'Lranda@aol.com'" <Lranda@aol.com>,  
    "'jlktemple@prodigy.com'"  
    <jlktemple@prodigy.com>,  
    "'wrehberg@spanweb.org'"  
    <wrehberg@spanweb.org>,  
    "'phartigan@aol.com'" <phartigan@aol.com>,  
    "'avra@wiesenthal.com'" <avra@wiesenthal.com>,  
    "'shkhalsa@interaccess.com'" <shkhalsa@interaccess.com>  
To: "'genroca@aol.com'" <genroca@aol.com>,  
    "'shalomctr@aol.com'"  
    <shalomctr@aol.com>,  
    "'leftout@marble.net'" <leftout@marble.net>,  
    "'tsomo@hawaii.edu'" <tsomo@hawaii.edu>,  
    "'jhamel@rivier.edu'"  
    <jhamel@rivier.edu>,  
    "'rakday@aol.com'" <rakday@aol.com>  
To: "'rainbow@cyspacity.com'" <rainbow@cyspacity.com>,  
    "'qunony@pipeline.com'" <qunony@pipeline.com>,  
    "'joonde@aol.com'"  
    <joonde@aol.com>,  
    "'sara\_lisherness@pcusa.org'"  
    <sara\_lisherness@pcusa.org>,  
    "'Doug\_Grace@PCUSA.org'"  
    <Doug\_Grace@pcusa.org>,  
    "'pwork@igc.apc.org'" <pwork@igc.apc.org>  
To: "'prc@wilmington.edu'" <prc@wilmington.edu>,  
    "'pbiusa@igc.apc.org'"  
    <pbiusa@igc.apc.org>

"wilpf@wilpf.org" <wilpf@wilpf.org>,  
"info@paxworld.com" <info@paxworld.com>,  
"info@paxchristiusa.org" <info@paxchristiusa.org>,  
"p4p@igc.apc.org" <p4p@igc.apc.org>  
To: "oepa@oepa.org" <oepa@oepa.org>,  
"waginpeace@napf.org"  
<waginpeace@napf.org>,  
"jkstoner@ptd.net" <jkstoner@ptd.net>,  
"ncjwomen@jon.cjfny.org" <ncjwomen@jon.cjfny.org>,  
"nccw@us.net" <nccw@us.net>,  
"bspitzley@aol.com"  
<bspitzley@aol.com>  
To: "naamatusa@naamat.org" <naamatusa@naamat.org>,  
"mpf@igc.apc.org"  
<mpf@igc.apc.org>,  
"ccosby@dhm.disciples.org"  
<ccosby@dhm.disciples.org>,  
"natchison@igc.org"  
<natchison@igc.org>,  
"pbogdonoff@igc.apc.org"  
<pbogdonoff@igc.apc.org>,  
"ctolopp@mediaone.net"  
<ctolopp@mediaone.net>  
To: "michpeaceteam@igc.apc.org" <michpeaceteam@igc.apc.org>,  
"mupj@igc.apc.org" <mupj@igc.apc.org>,  
"mccwash@igc.apc.org"  
<mccwash@igc.apc.org>,  
"mipe00@aol.com" <mipe00@aol.com>,  
"mupj@bigfoot.com" <mupj@bigfoot.com>,  
"brockway@macronet.org"  
<brockway@macronet.org>  
To: "gandhi@cbu.edu" <gandhi@cbu.edu>,  
"jtelbert@aol.com"  
<jtelbert@aol.com>,  
"jwi@jwi.org" <jwi@jwi.org>,  
"imossman@skipjack.bluecrab.org"  
<imossman@skipjack.bluecrab.org>,  
"iio@iio.org" <iio@iio.org>  
Cc: "RSchoenfeld@instituteforworldpeace.com"  
<RSchoenfeld@instituteforworldpeace.com>  
Subject: One Billion People In Prayer And Meditation  
Date: Fri, 4 Dec 1998 13:10:59 -0800  
Organization: Institute for World Peace  
Encoding: 68 TEXT

The Institute for World Peace  
Through Prayer and Meditation  
"Be a part of one of the most profound events in  
human history - spend 30 minutes on this New Years  
Eve in prayer or meditation with millions of other  
people throughout the world."

Robert Max Schoenfeld  
President

P.O. Box 18499  
Seattle, WA 98118  
Phone: 206-721-1800  
FAX: 206-721-3200  
RSchoenfeld@instituteforworldpeace.com  
mailto:RSchoenfeld@instituteforworldpeace.com

## THE MISSION

The mission of the Institute for World Peace Through Prayer and Meditation is to bring people together in prayer and meditation in order to bring about a more peaceful world. Our goal is to have over 1 million people in prayer and meditation at the same time over New Years Eve 1999, and over 1 billion people in prayer and meditation on New Years Eve 2000, with the goal of creating a more peaceful world.

Many of the great religions of the world believe that when groups of people come together to pray and meditate it has a powerful, positive and cohesive affect on the environment.

All of us are too aware that we live in troubled times - from crime in our neighborhoods to the breakup of many families to tension in the family of Nations. Too often we feel helpless - that we do not possess the tools or the talents to solve these problems.

Here is a wonderful opportunity for us all to come together for the greater good for ourselves, our families, our nation, and for all life on this planet.

## THE TASK

The task is for over 1 million people to be in prayer or meditation on this New Years Eve, December 31st 1998, fifteen minutes before midnight through fifteen minutes after midnight East Coast time (11:45 pm to 12:15 am East Coast time,) and for over 1 billion people on New Years Eve, 2000. Sample times to pray:

Seattle 8:45 - 9:15 pm, December 31st  
Denver 9:45 - 10:15 pm, December 31st  
Chicago 10:45 - 11:15 pm, December 31st  
Washington, D.C. 11:45 pm - 12:15 am, January 1st  
Paris 5:45 - 6:15 am, January 1st  
Jerusalem 6:45 - 7:15 am, January 1st  
Tokyo 12:45 - 1:15 pm, January 1st

We have received a great response from other associations, whom like yours, are working to create a more peaceful world. If we all come together, we can make a profound and positive change for ourselves and future generations. I am asking you to do everything in your power to share this mission with your members as well as other organizations.

Please feel free to print out my website,  
<http://www.instituteforworldpeace.com> to use as a press release for your local television, radio, and newspapers.

I would love to have the opportunity to speak with you about how to make this project a great success.

Warm Regards,

Robert Schoenfeld

[RSchoenfeld@instituteforworldpeace.com](mailto:RSchoenfeld@instituteforworldpeace.com)

<http://www.instituteforworldpeace.com>

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 04 Dec 1998 16:12:35 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
CC: hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, mupj@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org  
Subject: Re: Plans for our de-alerting event  
References: <36685005.624A@psr.org>  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id NAA06485

This sounds like a great event. I am happy to put together handout packets for staff. Are we planning to invite House Staffers too? Even though the House is not as critical as the Senate, I think that it would be useful to include staff members from relevant committees.

Bob Tiller wrote:

> I am addressing this to everyone who was present at the special planning  
> meeting on de-alerting on 11-24-98, plus Kathy Crandall who could not  
> attend. Is there anyone else who should be on this e-mail list?  
>  
> We now have (thanks to Alistair) firm commitments from Bruce Blair and  
> Stansfield Turner to speak at a Hill briefing (Senate side) at 10:00  
> a.m. on 12-17-98. Alistair is working to secure other speakers.  
> Jonathan Dean agreed to moderate the panel. So that is our date — put  
> it down in your calendar.  
>  
> Howard is working with Wayne Glass of Sen. Bingaman's staff to obtain  
> both official sponsorship and a meeting room. After we hear a definite  
> word from Wayne, we will ask some other Senators to cosponsor. We need  
> a Dear Colleague invitation to go out by the middle or end of next week.  
>  
> (I spoke with Randy DeValk of Daschle's staff today, and he said that he  
> would be glad to send the invitation out by e-mail to the full list of  
> Democratic defense and foreign policy staffers. This will be excellent  
> help, but can not be a substitute for an invitation signed by Bingaman,  
> and perhaps a Republican.)  
>  
> (I spoke with Peter Tyler of Harkin's staff today, and he said that  
> Harkin would be a backup if Bingaman does not come through. Of course,  
> Peter acknowledges that Bingaman is a much better person to sponsor such  
> a briefing than Harkin.)  
>  
> Here are my notes on the tasks we agreed to undertake:  
> -Getting out the invitation (Dear Colleague) from one or two Senators  
> to all Senate offices — Howard  
> -Refreshments, dais, mikes — Howard  
> -Pursuing C-SPAN and other TV — Howard  
> -Visuals: posterboards and slides — Hisham  
> -Obtaining NGO cosponsors — Bob T.  
> -Getting out a flyer to Senate, selected House offices, NGOs on Dec.  
> 10-11 — Bob T.

> -Followup phone calls to Senate offices on Dec. 15-16 — Brad  
> -Media advisory — UCS, with PSR also willing to help  
> -Handouts — Kathy, can you organize this for us? Hisham obtained  
> copies of the UNADIR journal already.  
>  
> Fran researched the cost of an ad in Roll Call, and it looks way too  
> expensive. I suggest that we skip it. Flyers and followup calls will  
> be adequate, I think.  
>  
> By the way, the National Security News Service is going to move forward  
> on a packet for editorial boards on de-alerting. I spoke with Steve  
> Raikin and Francyne Harrigan about it today. If we have the Dear  
> Colleague invitation to our briefing by the middle or end of next week,  
> perhaps it could go in the packet.  
>  
> By the way, I learned today that Lott has reversed himself and said that  
> the Senate will not be in session during the first half of January. He  
> got some significant rebellion in the ranks. They are now looking at a  
> January 19th start. I do not want to reopen our agonizing debate about  
> the date for the briefing, but I wanted you to know the latest on the  
> Hill calendar.  
>  
> Shalom,  
> Bob T.

--

#### DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE

Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools

Kathy Crandall, Coordinator

1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)

<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

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

Date: Fri, 4 Dec 1998 17:17:24 EST

From: LCNP@AOL.COM

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: UNGA vote on "New Agenda" Resolution

To: djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca, katie@chch.planet.org.nz,  
forum@worldforum.org, wagingpeace@napf.org, aslater@igc.apc.org,  
LCNP@AOL.COM, mpi@igc.org, jwurst@cepny.org, nei.til.atomvapen@sn.no,  
lars.g.lindskog@slmk.alinks.se, JGG786@AOL.COM, petweiss@igc.org,  
jsimons@hasimons.com, robwcpuk@gn.apc.org, mbkalinowski@yahoo.com,  
fsbarros@if.ufrj.br, MTheorin@europarl.eu.int,  
abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Content-ID: <0\_912809845@inet\_out.mail.aol.com.1>

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

Here is the update on the voting pattern in the GA on the "New Agenda Coalition" resolution.

Content-ID: <0\_912809845@inet\_out.mail.aol.com.2>

Content-type: text/plain;  
name="PLENARY.WPD"

Content-disposition: inline

The "New Agenda Coalition" Resolution in the UN GA

From: Jim Wurst, UN Coordinator,  
The Middle Powers Initiative

The UN General Assembly adopted the New Agenda Coalition resolution by a vote of 114 in favor, 18 opposed, with 38 abstentions. This is an excellent outcome: opponents of the resolution lost one vote while supporters gained 17 votes. The First Committee vote on this draft (L.48/Rev. 1) was 97 in favor, 19 opposed and 32 abstaining. Most of the nations who were absent for the First Committee but attended the GA voted in favor. None of the delegations who voted in favor in the Committee switched votes in the plenary.

Armenia was the nation that switched from "no" to "abstention." Therefore the 18 negative votes were: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Hungary, India, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, Pakistan, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Turkey, UK and US.

The net gain of 17 new "yes" votes was due to 18 nations not present in the First Committee who voted "yes" in the plenary, minus the Democratic Republic of Congo, which voted "yes" in the First Committee but did not attend the plenary. The 18 are: Afghanistan, Belize, Comoros, Gabon, Gambia, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Lesotho, Madagascar, Nicaragua, Rwanda, St. Lucia, St. Vincent-Grenadines, Trinidad-Tobago, Uganda, Vanuatu, and Zimbabwe.

The increase in abstentions from 32 to 38 is due to Armenia and five nations that were not present in the First Committee but abstained in the plenary: Albania, Honduras, Mauritius, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan.

The resolution's official designation is now 53/77/Y.

There were no explanations of vote after the vote on the New Agenda resolution.

The Assembly also adopted the resolution on the ICJ advisory opinion by a vote of 123 in favor, 25 opposed and with 25 abstentions. In the First Committee, this resolution (L.45) was adopted 100 to 25, with 23 abstentions. The Non-Aligned resolution on nuclear disarmament was adopted 110-41-18; the First Committee vote on L.47 was 89-40-15. The Japanese draft on nuclear disarmament "with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons" was adopted 160-0-11; the First Committee vote on L.42/Rev. 1 was 132-0-11.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sun, 6 Dec 1998 10:16:45 -0800 (PST)  
From: marylia@igc.org (marylia)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: web updates + new address for Tri-Valley CAREs  
To: marylia@igc.org  
X-Sender: marylia@pop.igc.apc.org (Unverified)

Dear friends:

Tri-Valley CAREs is excited to announce that we have moved to new, more spacious quarters in downtown Livermore. Please note our new address for your records. It is 2582 Old First Street, Livermore, CA 94550. Our phone, fax and email remain the same. Let me also announce the following updates:

1. We have posted to our website a newly updated letter to protest the soon-to-be-detonated subcritical nuclear test, code-named Cimarron, along with other nefarious nuke projects like the National Ignition Facility. Please download the letter from the web address listed below, sign it and fax or mail it to DOE Secretary Bill Richardson.
2. Our November newsletter, Citizen's Watch is up on the web for your reading enjoyment. Our December newsletter is in writing and production. Look for it soon.
3. We have posted downloadable files on our website for you to use to create postcards to President Clinton asking him to take nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert. Hard copies are available on request from either Tri-Valley CAREs or the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability if you have trouble downloading it.
4. We are having a party December 12 to celebrate our move. If you are in Northern California, you are cordially invited to drop by around 7:30 PM for some eats, conversation, music and fun.

Peace,  
Marylia

Marylia Kelley  
Tri-Valley CAREs  
(Communities Against a Radioactive Environment)  
2582 Old First Street  
Livermore, CA USA 94550

<<http://www.igc.org/tvc/>> - is our web site, please visit us there!

(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.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 07 Dec 1998 11:01:25 +0100  
From: "T.Damjanov" <damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: [Fwd: [csdgen] Urgent: New USA Challenge to NGOs at UN]  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

Return-Path: <csdgen-owner@undp.org>  
Received: from nygate.undp.org (nygate.undp.org [192.124.42.3])  
by GEOMAT.math.uni-hamburg.de (8.8.8/8.8.8) with ESMTP id TAA05795  
for <damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de>; Fri, 4 Dec 1998 19:21:17 +0100 (MET)  
Received: from nywork3.undp.org (nywork3.undp.org [192.124.42.14])  
by nygate.undp.org (8.9.1/8.9.1/1.13) with ESMTP id NAA02763;  
Fri, 4 Dec 1998 13:23:04 -0500 (EST)  
Received: (from daemon@localhost)  
by nywork3.undp.org (8.8.8/8.8.8/1.1) id NAA11048  
for csdgen-outgoing; Fri, 4 Dec 1998 13:14:29 -0500 (EST)  
Date: Fri, 4 Dec 1998 13:14:29 -0500 (EST)  
Message-Id: <199812041814.NAA11048@nywork3.undp.org>  
To: csdgen@undp.org  
From: "William R. Pace" <cdil@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: [csdgen] Urgent: New USA Challenge to NGOs at UN  
Sender: owner-csdgen@undp.org  
Precedence: bulk

During the last week the United States representative in the Fifth (Finance) Committee of the UN General Assembly submitted language to the resolution on "Pattern of Conferences" which would require UN Conference Services to be reimbursed for services to NGOs. If this resolution passes it apparently would result in NGOs being charged for all documents, use of rooms, translations of NGO documents, and any other "costs" of NGOs at the UN. This, presumably would apply to Geneva and Vienna and other UN offices as well. This report was confirmed by US UN Mission officials who themselves do not support the US 5th Committee proposal.

This resolution would be disastrous for NGOs and represent a monumental example of the hypocrisy of governments who constantly talk about how important the enhanced involvement of NGOs is to the UN. The resolution seems in legal conflict with the Charter and ECOSOC resolutions, especially 1996/31, which mandates consultative arrangements and rights of NGOs to participate, speak, receive documentation, circulate and submit documents, etc.

NGOs should contact their governments and the US government to complain about this latest attack on NGOs rights at the UN. Supportive governments from all regions should be alerted to oppose this resolution. The European Union countries often support the "cost-cutting" measures and special efforts should be made with the EU.

In addition to the US UN Ambassador Peter Burleigh, NGOs could contact US Secretary of State Albright, new Under-Secretary of State Loy,

Assistant Secretaries of State Welch and Sheehan.

Regards,

Bill Pace

To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, amillar@fourthfreedom.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Speakers for December 17th  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 04:02 PM 12/4/98 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Howard and Alistair,  
>  
>Good work on getting Bruce Blair for our Dec. 17th briefing! Also good  
>that Stansfield Turner will come, though (as we all know) his strategic  
>escrow proposal is somewhat different from de-alerting.  
>  
>I want to restate the case for including Dr. Ira Helfand of PSR as one  
>of the presenters.....

Monday morning, December 7

Dear Bob and Alistair:

I believe that Dr. Ira Helfand might be a good speaker for the De-alerting Forum. However, I hope that we can first try to get Admiral Childs. Wayne Glass on Senator Bingaman's staff wants this event to present other views in addition to pro-de-alerting. He believes that this would give the event more creditability and draw in more Republican staffers. If Adm. Childs cannot participate, an alternative we discussed is Fred Celec of the Pentagon, who responded to our August sign-on letter Clinton and Yeltsin on de-alerting.

I realize that time is growing short for a forum on December 17. We will need to get out invitations by Wednesday, December 9. I would support Dr. Helfand if we can't get one of the others by Tuesday.

Please see separate communication regarding December 17 and possibility of House convening for impeachment vote.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: btiller@psr.org, hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, bmorse@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, disarmament@igc.org,  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: December 17 forum on de-alerting and impeachment debate  
Cc:  
Bcc: mupj@igc.org  
X-Attachments:

Monday morning, December 7

Dear Colleagues:

I talked with Wayne Glass last Wednesday afternoon about getting confirmation that Senator Bingaman will sponsor the De-Alerting Forum on December 17 and would be willing to send out a "Dear Colleague" letter of invitation. He was supposed to check this out and get back to me. I haven't heard from him. I tried unsuccessfully to reach him on Thursday and Friday. I'll try again today.

Meanwhile, Elizabeth Turpen on Senator Domenici's staff indicated that he would not be a co-sponsor. So we need another Republican. I'll ask Wayne for assistance. Alistair mentioned that Senator Chafee has an interest in de-alerting. Could he be a co-sponsor and sign a "Dear Colleague" letter with Senator Bingaman?

It seems certain that the House Judiciary Committee will vote on impeachment by the end of the week. This raises the possibility that the House will convene next week to consider impeachment. Unknown at this time is the schedule for such proceedings.

There is a possibility that the House will be in session on December 17, the date of our Forum on De-alerting. If that is the case, it would be difficult to generate full attendance because many Senate staffers will be monitoring the House debate. C-Span will be covering the House proceedings, though C-Span II might be available.

Therefore, should we consider postponing the De-alerting Forum until January? Or should we wait a couple more days before deciding? Wednesday is probably the latest day for sending out invitations. Because we may not know the House schedule till the end of the week, we could send out invitations and then cancel next week if necessary.

Please offer your views by replying to all.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <hahn\_andreas@hotmail.com>  
X-Originating-IP: [206.16.112.215]  
From: "Andreas Hahn" <hahn\_andreas@hotmail.com>  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Internship  
Date: Sat, 05 Dec 1998 17:52:32 PST

Who ever it may concern.

My name is Andreas Hahn. I am an exchange student from Germany at the University of La Verne, California.

Before I go back to Germany next summer, I would like to spend the last weeks of my educational stay here in the US to do an internship.

Since I am majoring in political science, I am particularly interested in an internship at a political organization. Lobby groups as an instrument of political participation of social, religious, economical, or other interest groups are totally unknown in Germany.

An internship at the office of the Methodists United for Peace with Justice would therefore give me the unique opportunity to experience the American system of lobbyism. Moreover, it would allow me to study and participate in projects that your organization is working on, which, I am sure, have the goal of making this world worth living.

So far, I have focused my studies on international relations and peace studies, but I am also interested in American domestic politics.

I would appreciate if you could send me more information about the political goals of the Methodists United for Peace and Justice and your internship program, especially about application requirements.

My e-mail address is: hahn\_andreas@hotmail.com

My address on campus:

Andreas Hahn  
University of La Verne  
1950 Third Street  
ULV Box 1091  
La Verne, CA 91750  
Tel: (909)393-6295

I would like to thank you in advance for your consideration and your time.

Yours sincerelly

Andreas Hahn

---

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>

To: "Andreas Hahn" <hahn\_andreas@hotmail.com>, mupj@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Internship  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 05:52 PM 12/5/98 PST, Andreas Hahn wrote:

>Who ever it may concern.

>

>

>My name is Andreas Hahn. I am an exchange student from Germany at the  
>University of La Verne, California.

>Before I go back to Germany next summer, I would like to spend the last  
>weeks of my educational stay here in the US to do an internship....

Dear Andreas Hahn:

Thank you for your letter of inquiry regarding an internship. Unfortunately we do not have such position with your organization.

Shalom,  
Howard W. Hallman

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: wilpf-news@igc.apc.org  
Date: Mon, 7 Dec 1998 07:49:59 -0800 (PST)  
From: flick@igc.org (Felicity Hill)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: GA Res & Disarm. Commission details  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: flick@pop2.igc.org (Unverified)

GA vote on Items 63 - 71

In the 79th meeting of the 53rd General Assembly, the ambassador of Egypt, Mr. Motaz Zahran delivered the report of the 1st Committee (A/53/584 - it should be up on the UN web page [www.un.org](http://www.un.org)) which gives the text for all the resolutions and records the revisions that were made and decided upon.

The voting began on the 48 resolutions and 1 decision taken by the Committee. 26 of the resolutions were adopted without a vote in the 1st Committee and when this was the case, unless a recorded vote was called for, the plenary adopted the resolution without a vote too. The chair seemed fairly nervous about the possibility of long discussion and laid out the rules in no uncertain terms before the voting began, indicating that states were strongly encouraged to explain voting only if it had not been done in the Committee, and if they had to speak, it was limited to 10 minutes only.

Minor Discussion

Before item 71 - which is all the items under General and Complete Disarmament, a number of explanations of votes were given.

Iran decided to co-sponsor the resolutions on Small Arms and Illicit Trafficking in Small Arms.

The DPKR regretted the need it has for the use of landmines until the US leave the DMZ.

Malta spoke against resolution 'h' indicating that NWFZ need to be freely arrived at and because this resolution does not enjoy the support of those in the region of Central and Eastern Europe for a NWFZ.

Hungary spoke on behalf of Albania, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Republic of Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Slovenia and Slovakia against this same resolution.

Botswana and El Salvador withdrew support for this same resolution.

Zambia decided to abstain rather than again vote for the resolution on nuclear testing.

The Russian Federation indicated they would continue to vote for the Central and Eastern European NWFZ

## The Voting

### Item 63

Role of Science and Technology in the Context of International Security, Disarmament and other related fields. ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

### Item 64

Maintenance of international security prevention of the violent disintegration of States

FOR 156 AGAINST 0 ABSTENTION 6 (Armenia, Chile, China, Mexico, Pakistan, Lichenstein)

### Item 65

Reduction of Military Budgets

ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

### Item 66

Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament

FOR 99 AGAINST 45 ABSTAIN 23

### Item 67

Establishment of a NWFZ in the region of the Middle East

ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

### Item 68

Establishment of a NWFZ in South Asia

The plenary took note of the report of the 1st Committee

### Item 69

Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons

FOR 117 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 52

### Item 70

Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space

FOR 165 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 4 (Israel, US, Micronesia, Marshall Islands)

### Item 71

General and Complete Disarmament. 27 draft resolutions

a. Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia

ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

b. Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and collecting them

ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

c. Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes

ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

d. Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status  
ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

e. Small Arms

4th para (re self-determination) FOR 152 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 13  
(Azerbaijan, Georgia, India, Israel, Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation,  
US, Spain, Marshall Islands, France)

Whole FOR 169 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 1 (Russian Federation)

f. Reducing Nuclear Dangers

Paragraph 3 (eliminating nukes) FOR 99 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 68

Whole FOR 108 AGAINST 45 ABSTAIN 17

g. Nuclear Testing

FOR 118 AGAINST 9 (Zimbabwe, Pakistan, India, Angola, Bhutan, Antigua,  
Namibia, Malawi..) ABSTAIN 33

h. Regional Disarmament

FOR 63 AGAINST 44 ABSTAIN 47

i. CD Establishes FMCT

ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

j. Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of  
agreements on disarmament and arms control

FOR 170 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 4 (Israel, US, UK, France)

k. Relationship between disarmament and development

ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

l. Measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol

FOR 168 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 5 (Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, US, DPRK)

m. Consolidation of peace through practical disarmament measures

ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

n. Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and  
Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction

FOR 147 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 21

o. Regional Disarmament

ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

p. Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels

FOR 164 AGAINST 1 (India) ABSTAIN 2 (Cuba, Bhutan)

q. Nuclear Weapons Free Southern Hemisphere

Preambular Paragraph 3 (re SSOD 1 & NPT) FOR 141 AGAINST 2 ABSTAIN 20

Paragraph 3 (re Middle East and South Asia) FOR 146 AGAINST 2 ABSTAIN 15

Whole FOR

154 AGAINST 3 ABSTAIN 10

r. Implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention  
ADTOPEW WITHOUT A VOTE

s. Transparency in Armaments

8th Preamble Para (universality of NPT) FOR 163 AGAINST 2 (India, Israel) ABSTAIN 3 (Cuba, Bhutan, Pakistan)

Paragraph 3 B (further dev of the UN register to include nukes & equipment for development of nukes)

FOR 95 AGAINST 47 ABSTAIN 18

Whole FOR 104 AGAINST 46 ABSTAIN 17

t. Illicit Traffic in Small Arms

ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE

u. Nuclear Disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons

2nd preamble para (re recent tests) FOR 159 AGAINST 1 (India) ABSTAIN (Israel, Bhutan, Pakistan)

Paragraph 1 (universality of NPT) FOR 166 AGAINST 3 (Israel, India, Pakistan) ABSTAIN 2 (Cuba, Bhutan)

Whole FOR 160

AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 11 (Algeria, Bhutan, Myanmar, Israel, DPRK, Iran, Mauritius, Cuba, India, Pakistan...)

v. Transparency in Armaments

Paragraph 4 b (re request to Sec Gen to gather group of govt. experts in 2000 to discuss UN register)

FOR 156 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 10 (China, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, Myanmar, DPRK, Iran, Algeria, Indonesia, Syrian Arab Republic)

Paragraph 6 (inviting CD to continue work on this subject) FOR 155 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 11

Whole FOR 159 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 12

w. Follow up to the advisory opinion of the ICJ on the Legality of the Threat or use of Nuclear Weapons

Paragraph 1 (obligation to negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament)

FOR 159 AGAINST 4 (France, Monaco, Russian Federation, USA) ABSTAIN 8 (Turkey, UK, Uzbekistan, Marshall Islands, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Israel, Gabon)

Whole FOR 123 AGAINST 25 ABSTAIN 25

x. Nuclear Disarmament

FOR 110 AGAINST 4 ABSTAIN 18

Y. Towards a Nuclear Weapon Free World: The need for a new agenda

Paragraph 8 (universality of NPT) FOR 160 AGAINST 3 (India, Israel, Pakistan) ABSTAIN (Cuba, Bhutan)

Paragraph 17 (negative security assurances) FOR 156 AGAINST 1 (USA)

ABSTAIN 5 (Cuba, Israel, India, Pakistan, DPKR)

Whole FOR 114 AGAINST 18 ABSTAIN 38

z. Bilateral arms Negotiations and Nuclear Disarmament  
FOR 165 AGAINST 0 ABSTAIN 8 (Cuba, India, Iran, Lebanon, Tanzania, DPKR,  
Syrian Arab Republic, Pakistan)

AA. Forth Special Session on Disarmament  
ADOPTED WITHOUT A VOTE.

#### Disarmament Commission

The chair of the 1999 Disarmament Commission has still not been decided.  
One of the Vice Chairs will be held by Mexico.

Of the 3 working groups that will be established, 2 chairs were found.

1. Nuclear Weapon Free Zones - Izquierdo of Ecuador will chair
2. Guidelines on Conventional Arms Control - Michael Hoey of Ireland will chair
3. 4th Special Session on Disarmament - nobody volunteered as yet.

Return-Path: <epf@peacenet.org>  
Date: Mon, 7 Dec 1998 08:10:45 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: epf@pop.igc.org  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
From: "Mary H. Miller" <epf@peacenet.org>  
Subject: Re: Suggestions for letter to Secy. Albright

At 10:27 AM 12/3/98 -0800, you wrote: (and copied mm)

>Dear Tom:

>

>Mary Miller indicated that you wanted some suggestions for a letter to  
>Secretary Albright to request a meeting with an interfaith delegation. The  
>attached is my response. You can use what you want from it or discard it as  
>you choose. Let me know how it comes out.

Thanks, Howard. mm

Return-Path: <wand@wand.org>  
X-Sender: wandwill@pop3.clark.net  
Date: Mon, 07 Dec 1998 12:02:45 -0500  
To: mupj@igc.org  
From: Kimberly Robson <wand@wand.org>  
Subject: Religious Leaders

Howard-

Are you working on the religious leaders abolition sign-on letter? I am working with a group in Utah who are interested in doing a sign on letter in Utah for religious leaders. Can you please send me any information you may have.

Thanks

Kimberly

\*\*\*\*\*

Kimberly Robson  
Director of Policy and Programs  
Women's Action for New Directions  
110 Maryland Avenue, Suite 205  
Washington, DC 20002  
202-543-8505  
202-675-6469 - fax  
wand@wand.org  
www.wand.org

To: Kimberly Robson <wand@wand.org>, mupj@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Religious Leaders  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 12:02 PM 12/7/98 -0500, Kimberly Robson wrote:

>Howard-

>

>Are you working on the religious leaders abolition sign-on letter? I am  
>working with a group in Utah who are intersted in doing a sign on letter in  
>Utah for religous leaders. Can you please send me any information you may  
>have.

Kimberly,

I'm not sure I know what you are referring to. I'm aware that Alan Geyer at the Washington National Cathedral and some others with the encouragement of Robert McNamara are working on some kind of a religious leaders statement. However, they are involving the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, which so far has held back from an all-out adoption of the abolitionist position (including saying "no" deterrence). I haven't seen that statement, and I'm not aware of any other letter in circulation.

Please tell me what you know.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "CTBT Calendar Recipients" <dculp@igc.org>  
Subject: CTBT Calendar  
Date: Tue, 8 Dec 1998 14:57:32 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igce.igc.org id LAA02391

CTBT CALENDAR  
December 8, 1998

Revised by David Culp, Plutonium Challenge, <dculp@igc.org>.

- Dec. 10 or 11 DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test  
"Cimmaron" (estimate)
- December 15 Russian Duma, vote on ratification of START II  
(estimate)
- December 20-23 Russian Prime Minister Yevgeny Primakov visits  
India
- December Russian Ministry of Atomic Energy (Minatom)  
conducts a subcritical nuclear test at its  
Novaya Zemlya test site (estimate)
- December Canadian ratification of the Comprehensive Test  
Ban Treaty (estimate)

1999

- January 6 Congress convenes for the swearing in of new  
members and election of leadership, noon (The  
Senate will adjourn until January 19.)
- January 19 Senate reconvenes and begins regular sessions,  
noon
- January 19 President Clinton delivers the State of the  
Union address, 9 p.m. (estimate)
- January Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and  
Indian Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh meet on  
nuclear issues, New Delhi, India
- Feb. 13-21 Senate President's Day recess (estimate)
- Early February Indian-Pakistani talks on confidence-building  
measures and Kashmir, New Delhi, India
- Winter DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test  
"Accordion" (estimate)
- 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))
- Mar. 27-Apr. 11 Senate spring recess (estimate)
- Spring or President Clinton visits India, Pakistan and  
Summer Bangladesh (tentative)

May 7-10 Healing Global Wounds, spring gathering, Nevada  
Test Site, Nev.

May 11 First anniversary of the recent Indian nuclear  
tests at Pokhran ("Pokhran II")

May 18 25th anniversary of the first Indian nuclear  
test (1974) at Pokhran

May 29-June 6 Senate Memorial Day recess (estimate)

July 3-11 Senate Independence Day recess (estimate)

July 16 54th anniversary of the first nuclear test,  
"Trinity," at Alamogordo, N.M.

August 6 Hiroshima Day

Aug. 7-Sept. 7 Senate summer recess (estimate)

August 9 Nagasaki Day

August 29 50th anniversary of the first Soviet nuclear  
test, Semipalatinsk Test Site, Kazakhstan

September 24 Third anniversary of the signing of the  
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)

October 9-12 Senate Columbus Day recess (estimate)

October 16 35th anniversary of the first Chinese nuclear  
test, Lop Nur, China

October 21 U.S. temporary waiver of sanctions against India  
and Pakistan related to their nuclear testing  
expires

Early October First Conference of CTBT Ratification States,  
United Nations, New York or Vienna (estimate)

November 13 Congressional adjournment (target date)

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 07:57:48 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
CC: hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, mupj@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org  
Subject: Re: Plans for our de-alerting event  
References: <36685005.624A@psr.org> <36685043.57B6F4F4@igc.org>  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id EAA14220

Yes, but we will not make a big push for House staffers.

BT

Kathy Crandall wrote:

>  
> This sounds like a great event. I am happy to put together handout packets  
> for staff. Are we planning to invite House Staffers too? Even though the  
> House is not as critical as the Senate, I think that it would be useful to  
> include staff members from relevant committees.  
>  
> Bob Tiller wrote:  
>  
>> I am addressing this to everyone who was present at the special planning  
>> meeting on de-alerting on 11-24-98, plus Kathy Crandall who could not  
>> attend. Is there anyone else who should be on this e-mail list?  
>>  
>> We now have (thanks to Alistair) firm commitments from Bruce Blair and  
>> Stansfield Turner to speak at a Hill briefing (Senate side) at 10:00  
>> a.m. on 12-17-98. Alistair is working to secure other speakers.  
>> Jonathan Dean agreed to moderate the panel. So that is our date — put  
>> it down in your calendar.  
>>  
>> Howard is working with Wayne Glass of Sen. Bingaman's staff to obtain  
>> both official sponsorship and a meeting room. After we hear a definite  
>> word from Wayne, we will ask some other Senators to cosponsor. We need  
>> a Dear Colleague invitation to go out by the middle or end of next week.  
>>  
>> (I spoke with Randy DeValck of Daschle's staff today, and he said that he  
>> would be glad to send the invitation out by e-mail to the full list of  
>> Democratic defense and foreign policy staffers. This will be excellent  
>> help, but can not be a substitute for an invitation signed by Bingaman,  
>> and perhaps a Republican.)  
>>  
>> (I spoke with Peter Tyler of Harkin's staff today, and he said that  
>> Harkin would be a backup if Bingaman does not come through. Of course,  
>> Peter acknowledges that Bingaman is a much better person to sponsor such  
>> a briefing than Harkin.)  
>>  
>> Here are my notes on the tasks we agreed to undertake:

>> -Getting out the invitation (Dear Colleague) from one or two Senators  
>> to all Senate offices — Howard  
>> -Refreshments, dais, mikes — Howard  
>> -Pursuing C-SPAN and other TV — Howard  
>> -Visuals: posterboards and slides — Hisham  
>> -Obtaining NGO cosponsors — Bob T.  
>> -Getting out a flyer to Senate, selected House offices, NGOs on Dec.  
>> 10-11 — Bob T.  
>> -Followup phone calls to Senate offices on Dec. 15-16 — Brad  
>> -Media advisory — UCS, with PSR also willing to help  
>> -Handouts — Kathy, can you organize this for us? Hisham obtained  
>> copies of the UNADIR journal already.  
>>  
>> Fran researched the cost of an ad in Roll Call, and it looks way too  
>> expensive. I suggest that we skip it. Flyers and followup calls will  
>> be adequate, I think.  
>>  
>> By the way, the National Security News Service is going to move forward  
>> on a packet for editorial boards on de-alerting. I spoke with Steve  
>> Raikin and Francyne Harrigan about it today. If we have the Dear  
>> Colleague invitation to our briefing by the middle or end of next week,  
>> perhaps it could go in the packet.  
>>  
>> By the way, I learned today that Lott has reversed himself and said that  
>> the Senate will not be in session during the first half of January. He  
>> got some significant rebellion in the ranks. They are now looking at a  
>> January 19th start. I do not want to reopen our agonizing debate about  
>> the date for the briefing, but I wanted you to know the latest on the  
>> Hill calendar.  
>>  
>> Shalom,  
>> Bob T.  
>  
> --  
> DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE  
> Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools  
> Kathy Crandall, Coordinator  
> 1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005  
> TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
> E-MAIL: disarmament@igc.org  
> <http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>  
> <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>  
>  
> A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
> and Women's Action for New Directions

To: lintnerj@ucc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: African American church contacts  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Jay:

Here are contacts we have had with leaders of African American denominations in the CTBT ratification campaign. Some of them are promising contacts for getting the petition out. If you would like for me to follow through with your initial contacts with Black Methodists, please let me know.

A. Signed Religious Leaders Statement, May 1992

African Methodist Episcopal Church  
Bishop McKinley Young  
700 Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive SW  
Atlanta, GA 30314

Fax: 404 522-6600

Christian Methodist Episcopal Church  
Bishop Nathaniel Linsey, Senior Bishop  
2815 Melrose Avenue  
Cincinnati, OH 45206

Sent representative to Breakfast with Jeffords

National Missionary Baptist Convention  
Dr. Willie T. Snead, Sr., President  
P.O. Box 2096  
Los Angeles, CA 90001

Progressive National Baptist Convention  
Rev. Tyrone S. Pitts, General Secretary  
601 50th Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20019

B. Has shown some interest

African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church  
Nathaniel Jarrett, President (as of 8-98)  
7322 S. Clyde Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60649

He tried to find a local representative to the Jeffords Breakfast (but didn't)

C. No response to letters and calls

National Baptist Convention of America  
Dr. E. Edward Jones, President  
National Baptist Convention, USA  
Dr. Henry J. Lyons, President

Church of God in Christ  
Bishop Chandler D. Owens, President Bishop

D. Liaison

Archie Le Mone,  
National Council of Churches, Washington Office

Shalom,

Howard

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 09:28:30 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
CC: amillar@fourthfreedom.org  
Subject: Re: Speakers for December 17th  
References: <2.2.16.19981207081601.3f4f8b6e@pop.igc.org>

Howard,

Alistair called me this morning. He is in new York today and unreachable by phone. He will, however, check his e-mail today.

He said that Bruce Blair wants to know soon about what room on Capitol Hill we will be in. [I do not know why this is important to Bruce.] Are you going to nail down a room, with Wayne's help? One of us can leave a voice mail for Bruce as soon as we know which room.

He also said that Adm. Childs is very unlikely to participate. So we need to make a decision about how to proceed with a speakers lineup. I can try to call Celec today, or you can make the call.

I assume that we are moving on two fronts with notices of the event: Dear Colleague from Bingaman (and Chafee?), and a notice from our community (probably generated by PSR).

I am going out from 10:00 to 12:00 today. Let's talk this afternoon.

Shalom,  
Bob T.

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>  
> At 04:02 PM 12/4/98 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:  
>>Howard and Alistair,  
>>  
>>Good work on getting Bruce Blair for our Dec. 17th briefing! Also good  
>>that Stansfield Turner will come, though (as we all know) his strategic  
>>escrow proposal is somewhat different from de-alerting.  
>>  
>>I want to restate the case for including Dr. Ira Helfand of PSR as one  
>>of the presenters.....  
>  
> Monday morning, December 7  
>  
> Dear Bob and Alistair:  
>  
> I believe that Dr. Ira Helfand might be a good speaker for the De-alerting  
> Forum. However, I hope that we can first try to get Admiral Childs. Wayne  
> Glass on Senator Bingaman's staff wants this event to present other views in  
> addition to pro-de-alerting. He believes that this would give the event

> more creditability and draw in more Republican staffers. If Adm. Childs  
> cannot participate, an alternative we discussed is Fred Celec of the  
> Pentagon, who responded to our August sign-on letter Clinton and Yeltsin on  
> de-alerting.  
>  
> I realize that time is growing short for a forum on December 17. We will  
> need to get out invitations by Wednesday, December 9. I would support Dr.  
> Helfand if we can't get one of the others by Tuesday.  
>  
> Please see separate communication regarding December 17 and possibility of  
> House convening for impeachment vote.  
>  
> Shalom,  
> Howard

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 09:33:32 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
CC: hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, bmorse@igc.org, paprog@igc.org,  
panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, disarmament@igc.org  
Subject: Re: December 17 forum on de-alerting and impeachment debate  
References: <2.2.16.19981207081606.3f4f5b50@pop.igc.org>

I vote for going with Dec. 17th, regardless of the House impeachment proceedings. It is too bad to get caught in that buzzsaw, but I do not want to search again for a date that fits our speakers schedules.

I think we should try for Chafee as a cosponsor. The big problem is that time is VERY tight. Maybe Karina Wood can suggest a sympathetic staffer in Chafee's office as a contact.

Shalom,  
Bob T.

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>  
> Monday morning, December 7  
>  
> Dear Colleagues:  
>  
> I talked with Wayne Glass last Wednesday afternoon about getting  
> confirmation that Senator Bingaman will sponsor the De-Alerting Forum on  
> December 17 and would be willing to send out a "Dear Colleague" letter of  
> invitation. He was supposed to check this out and get back to me. I  
> haven't heard from him. I tried unsuccessfully to reach him on Thursday and  
> Friday. I'll try again to day.  
>  
> Meanwhile, Elizabeth Turpen on Senator Domenici's staff indicated that he  
> would not be a co-sponsor. So we need another Republican. I'll ask Wayne  
> for assistance. Alistair mentioned that Senator Chafee has an interest in  
> de-alerting. Could he be a co-sponsor and sign a "Dear Colleague" letter  
> with Senator Bingaman?  
>  
> It seems certain that the House Judiciary Committee will vote on impeachment  
> by the end of the week. This raises the possibility that the House will  
> convene next week to consider impeachment. Unknown at this time is the  
> schedule for such proceedings.  
>  
> There is a possibility that the House will be in session on December 17, the  
> date of our Forum on De-alerting. If that is the case, it would be  
> difficult to generate full attendance because many Senate staffers will be  
> monitoring the House debate. C-Span will be covering the House proceedings,  
> though C-Span II might be available.  
>

> Therefore, should we consider postponing the De-alerting Forum until  
> January? Or should we wait a couple more days before deciding? Wednesday  
> is probably the latest day for sending out invitations. Because we may not  
> know the House schedule till the end of the week, we could send out  
> invitations and then cancel next week if necessary.

>

> Please offer your views by replying to all.

>

> Shalom,

> Howard

To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Speakers for December 17th  
Cc: amillar@fourthfreedom.org  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 09:28 AM 12/8/98 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Howard,  
>  
>Alistair... said that Adm. Childs is very unlikely to participate. So we  
>need to make a decision about how to proceed with a speakers lineup. I  
>can try to call Celec today, or you can make the call.

Bob,

I have another thought about Celec, or at least a question. On the one hand, we want him to provide another view, which would help attract Republican staff and respond to a desire of Wayne Glass. On the other hand, maybe we would be forcing him to make a public statement against de-alerting just when President Clinton is considering the possibility of a de-alerting initiative in his State of the Union Address. A reply to our letter is one thing, but a statement before congressional staff is another.

Let's put this on our agenda when we talk by phone this afternoon.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <paprog>  
Date: Tue, 8 Dec 1998 06:41:27 -0800 (PST)  
From: Fran Teplitz <paprog@igc.apc.org>  
To: btiller@psr.org, mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: December 17 forum on de-alerting and impeachment debate  
Cc: amillar@fourthfreedom.org, bmorse@igc.org, disarmament@igc.org,  
hisham@ieer.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, panukes@igc.org

In follow-up to Bob's email, I'll ask Karina Wood about someone in Chafee's office -- just to get a recommendation, nothing more at this point.

I too think it would be best to keep with the Dec. 17 date. Although I will be gone, please contact Craig Lamberton in our office (202-862-9740 ext. 3003) if calls are needed to ensure turn-out.

Thanks!  
Fran

Return-Path: <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>  
Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 09:46:24 -0500  
From: Alistair Millar <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>  
To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
CC: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Speakers for December 17th  
References: <2.2.16.19981207081601.3f4f8b6e@pop.igc.org> <366D378E.943@psr.org>

Bob Tiller wrote:

>  
> Howard,  
>  
> Alistair called me this morning. He is in new York today and  
> unreachable by phone. He will, however, check his e-mail today.  
>  
> He said that Bruce Blair wants to know soon about what room on Capitol  
> Hill we will be in. [I do not know why this is important to Bruce.]  
> Are you going to nail down a room, with Wayne's help? One of us can  
> leave a voice mail for Bruce as soon as we know which room.  
>  
> He also said that Adm. Childs is very unlikely to participate. So we  
> need to make a decision about how to proceed with a speakers lineup. I  
> can try to call Celec today, or you can make the call.  
>  
> I assume that we are moving on two fronts with notices of the event:  
> Dear Colleague from Bingaman (and Chafee?), and a notice from our  
> community (probably generated by PSR).  
>  
> I am going out from 10:00 to 12:00 today. Let's talk this afternoon.  
>  
> Shalom,  
> Bob T.

> Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>>  
>> At 04:02 PM 12/4/98 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:  
>> >Howard and Alistair,  
>> >  
>> >Good work on getting Bruce Blair for our Dec. 17th briefing! Also good  
>> >that Stansfield Turner will come, though (as we all know) his strategic  
>> >escrow proposal is somewhat different from de-alerting.  
>> >  
>> >I want to restate the case for including Dr. Ira Helfand of PSR as one  
>> >of the presenters.....  
>> >  
>> >Monday morning, December 7  
>> >  
>> >Dear Bob and Alistair:  
>> >  
>> >I believe that Dr. Ira Helfand might be a good speaker for the De-alerting  
>> >Forum. However, I hope that we can first try to get Admiral Childs. Wayne  
>> >Glass on Senator Bingaman's staff wants this event to present other views in  
>> >addition to pro-de-alerting. He believes that this would give the event

>> more creditability and draw in more Republican staffers. If Adm. Childs  
>> cannot participate, an alternative we discussed is Fred Celec of the  
>> Pentagon, who responded to our August sign-on letter Clinton and Yeltsin on  
>> de-alerting.

>>  
>> I realize that time is growing short for a forum on December 17. We will  
>> need to get out invitations by Wednesday, December 9. I would support Dr.  
>> Helfand if we can't get one of the others by Tuesday.

>>  
>> Please see separate communication regarding December 17 and possibility of  
>> House convening for impeachment vote.

>>  
>> Shalom,  
>> Howard

Hi Howard and Bob,

It's not that the room location is that important to Bruce, he just  
wants to know that we have a place set up by now (as do I). Just let me  
know as soon as its sorted out (by e-mail or phone message)and I will  
call Blair and Turner myself directly.

I will touch base with you by phone tomorrow.

Best,

Alistair

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

Dear Colleagues:

I would like to share with you a listing of key senators on CTBT ratification, developed by David Culp. You may want to use this as develop priorities for your grassroots activities, including the petition developed for use in churches, synagogues, and meetings. This is listing is for our internal use and should not be published or broadly circulated.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

## KEY SENATORS ON CTBT

Not for publication. For use only by CTBT campaign supporters.

### 1. Majority Leader (only the majority leader can schedule a floor vote)

Lott (Miss.)

### 2. Respected Republicans who would bring other senators

Domenici (N.M.)

Lugar (Ind.)

Stevens (Alaska)

Warner (Va.)

Gorton (wash.)

### 3. Moderate Republicans who could be early CTBT supporters

Bennett (Utah)

Chafee (R.I.)

Collins (Maine)

Domenici (N.M.) (also above)

Frist (Tenn.)

Gregg (N.H.)

Smith (Ore.)

Snowe (Maine)

Stevens (Alaska) (also above)

Jefforts (Vt.) and Spector (Pa.) are already supporters

### 4. Centrist Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee (by committee seniority)

Lugar (Ind.) (also above)

Hagel (Neb.)

Smith (Ore.) (also above)

Thomas (Wyo.)

Frist (Tenn.) (also above)

Brownback (Kan.)

5. Other Senators who will be key for a floor vote

Abraham (Mich.)  
Bond (Mo.)  
Bunning (Ky.)  
Campbell (Colo.)  
Crapo (Idaho)  
DeWine (Ohio)  
Enzi (Wyo.)  
Fitzgerald (Ill.)  
Grassley (Iowa)  
Hatch (Utah)  
Hollings (S.C.)  
McCain (Ariz.)  
McConnell (Ky.)  
Murkowski (Alaska)  
Roberts (Kan.)  
Roth (Del.)  
Thompson (Tenn.)  
Thurmond (S.C.)  
Voinovich (Ohio)

Compiled by David Culp, December 2, 1998

To: ctb  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Meeting dates for Interfaith Group for the CTBT  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Friends of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT:

I want to share with you notes of the November 24 meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT. Included are the dates for meetings during 1999, set for the second Tuesday of each month. As our cherished advisers, you are cordially invited to attend. So please put these dates on your 1999 calendar.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

To: Interfaith Group for the CTBT

Here are some notes from the November 24 meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

1. Looking ahead, we agreed that the Interfaith Group for the CTBT would meet on the third Tuesday of each month in 1999. This will be January 19, February 16, March 16, April 20, May 18, June 15, July 20, September 21, and October 19 (the latter dates will be cancelled if the CTBT is ratified sooner). Ordinarily the meeting will run from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. However, on January 19 and February 16 it will run from 1:30 to 3:00 because the Monday Lobby will meet from 12 noon to 1:00 those days due to a Monday holiday. We have requested the FCNL conference room for January 19 and will work out the location of subsequent meetings. We believe that this schedule misses the ordinary meeting times of such groups as Churches for Middle East Peace, the Latin America Task Force, and Monday Lobby working groups. If this is wrong, please let me know.

2. The cost of the conference call the day of the Jeffords breakfast is slightly under \$300. We raised \$550 in donations, which were deposited in an account of Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Donors present on November 24 agreed that rather refunding prorated shares the money should be held in that account and earmarked for the cost of similar use in the future. (Do other donors agree?)

3. The petition on the CTBT to circulate in churches, synagogues, and meetings and at other religious gatherings is ready to be sent out along with background information. (If you need a copy, please let me know.) The intent is to obtain signatures in January and February and present the petitions to home state offices of senators in March. We will make an effort to put persons from various denominations and religious groups in touch with one another in the respective states so that they may join together in making presentations.

So far we know that the following groups will participate: Church of the Brethren, Church Women United, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Mennonite Central Committee, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, Presbyterian Church, NETWORK, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, United Methodist Church. We will check with other prospective participants, especially those whose leaders signed the letter to the Senate last spring.

3. We are moving ahead with our effort to obtain appointments with cabinet secretaries to urge the Clinton Administration to step up its push for CTBT ratification. Larry Egbert has tried through Unitarian circles to set up an appointment with Secretary Cohen but has so far been unsuccessful. Mary Miller will talk with Tom Hart about the Episcopal Office taking the lead to get an appointment with Secretary Albright. NETWORK will take the lead in approaching Secretary Richardson. We will also try to meet with Sandy Berger and one of President Clinton's top

political advisors. It is understood that these will be small delegations, in some cases heads of communion if possible, and will not necessarily involve every member of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

4. Daryl Kimball invited members of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT to participate in a strategy session organized by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers on December 2. David Culp indicated that a new swing list of senators will be available in December. I'll send out further information about campaign strategy for 1999.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 10:10:33 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
CC: btiller@psr.org, hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org,  
bmorse@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org  
Subject: Re: De-alerting forum  
References: <2.2.16.19981208093834.299f3a04@pop.igc.org>

We can't just keep postponing this event for the perfect moment. Let's go as planned.

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

> Dear Colleagues:

>

> I still haven't heard from Wayne Glass regarding Senator Bingaman's  
> willingness to sign a "Dear Colleague" letter and about room arrangements.

> He is out of town on Monday and Tuesday, December 7 and 8. I left a message  
> on his voice mail. I'll try him the first thing on Wednesday.

>

> I haven't heard from any of you about the advisability of having the  
> De-alerting Forum next week when the House may be engaged in impeachment  
> debate and vote. What are your views?

>

> Shalom,  
> Howard

--

DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE  
Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools  
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator  
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
E-MAIL: disarmament@igc.org  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>  
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <bmorgan@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Tue, 8 Dec 1998 10:46:21 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: bmorgan@pop.igc.org  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
From: Brad Morse <bmorgan@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: December 17 forum on de-alerting and impeachment debate  
Cc: hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, btiller@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, disarmament@igc.org

I agree. Let's stay with Dec. 17. What are the odds of getting the right folks lined up again?

>Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
>Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 09:33:32 -0500  
>From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
>Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
>To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
>CC: hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, bmorgan@igc.org, paprog@igc.org,  
> panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, disarmament@igc.org  
>Subject: Re: December 17 forum on de-alerting and impeachment debate  
>References: <2.2.16.19981207081606.3f4f5b50@pop.igc.org>

>  
>I vote for going with Dec. 17th, regardless of the House impeachment proceedings. It is too bad to get caught in that buzzsaw, but I do not want to search again for a date that fits our speakers schedules.

>  
>I think we should try for Chafee as a cosponsor. The big problem is that time is VERY tight. Maybe Karina Wood can suggest a sympathetic staffer in Chafee's office as a contact.

>  
>Shalom,  
>Bob T.

>  
>  
>  
>Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>>  
>> Monday morning, December 7

>>  
>> Dear Colleagues:

>>  
>> I talked with Wayne Glass last Wednesday afternoon about getting confirmation that Senator Bingaman will sponsor the De-Alerting Forum on December 17 and would be willing to send out a "Dear Colleague" letter of invitation. He was supposed to check this out and get back to me. I haven't heard from him. I tried unsuccessfully to reach him on Thursday and Friday. I'll try again to day.

>>  
>> Meanwhile, Elizabeth Turpen on Senator Domenici's staff indicated that he would not be a co-sponsor. So we need another Republican. I'll ask Wayne for assistance. Alistair mentioned that Senator Chafee has an interest in de-alerting. Could he be a co-sponsor and sign a "Dear Colleague" letter with Senator Bingaman?

>>  
>> It seems certain that the House Judiciary Committee will vote on impeachment  
>> by the end of the week. This raises the possibility that the House will  
>> convene next week to consider impeachment. Unknown at this time is the  
>> schedule for such proceedings.

>>  
>> There is a possibility that the House will be in session on December 17, the  
>> date of our Forum on De-alerting. If that is the case, it would be  
>> difficult to generate full attendance because many Senate staffers will be  
>> monitoring the House debate. C-Span will be covering the House proceedings,  
>> though C-Span II might be available.

>>  
>> Therefore, should we consider postponing the De-alerting Forum until  
>> January? Or should we wait a couple more days before deciding? Wednesday  
>> is probably the latest day for sending out invitations. Because we may not  
>> know the House schedule till the end of the week, we could send out  
>> invitations and then cancel next week if necessary.

>>  
>> Please offer your views by replying to all.

>>  
>> Shalom,  
>> Howard

>  
>

\*\*\*\*\*

Brad Morse  
Program Assistant  
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability  
1801 18th St., NW  
Suite 9-2  
Washington, DC 20009  
www.ananuclear.org  
ph:(202) 833-4668 fax:(202) 234-9536

To: lintnerj@ucc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: CTBT petition  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Jay,

I've misplaced my copy of the CTBT petition and background information. Will you please send me a copy, via e-mail at mupj@igc.org, or fax at 301 896-0013, or by regular mail to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Thanks,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 21:57:22 +0000  
From: "Sara Speicher" <ses8@staff.wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-1: Reflections on the Impact of the Peace to the City Campaign  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Reply-To: "Sara Speicher" <ses8@staff.wcc-coe.org>

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

During the WCC Assembly currently being held in Harare, Zimbabwe, the local coordinators and other representatives from the cities in the Campaign are sharing their messages of hope and challenge to the ecumenical movement. Here is a reflection from one of the coordinators on the Campaign:

Peace to the City: Durban, KwaZulu Natal, South Africa

For decades our province has been torn apart by violence. Thousands of people have died and many more thousands have been displaced from their homes and severely traumatised.

Many NGOs, and ecumenical agencies, together with civic and political leaders have worked hard for peace. We have been so close to the situation that we often don't see what we have achieved. The Peace to the City campaign has given us the much needed opportunity to reflect on our achievements as peacemakers. This was done through our story in the book: "Peace in Troubled Cities", through a video and monthly stories of peacemaking on the website. This has been useful in realising that in Durban and KwaZulu Natal we have achieved relative peace even though we recognise that we still have a long way to go before we realise the fullness of God's Shalom. We speak of our stories as "peace in the making."

I hope that with the culmination of the Peace to the City at this assembly, that our stories from the seven cities will inspire others to tell their stores of peace so that we can learn from each other and further promote a culture of peace and tolerance.

Mike Vorster  
Local Coordinator for the Durban Peace to the City Campaign  
Diakonia World Council of Churches

Visit the "Virtual Peace to the City" and find out about the WCC Peace to the City Assembly events at <http://www.wcc-coe.org/pov/harare.html>

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

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 16:37:11 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Dr. ira Helfand & Dec. 17th

Howard,

If we are going to include Dr. Ira Helfand on our Dec. 17th panel, I should probably give him that word no later than Wednesday Dec. 9th.

Shalom,  
Bob T.

To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, mupj@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Dr. ira Helfand & Dec. 17th  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 04:37 PM 12/8/98 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Howard,  
>  
>If we are going to include Dr. Ira Helfand on our Dec. 17th panel, I  
>should probably give him that word no later than Wednesday Dec. 9th.  
>

Bob,

It's all right with me to ask Dr. Helfand. You might want to check with Alistair, or just go ahead.

I've faxed Wayne Glass about the room, the "Dear Colleague" letter, etc. I hope he'll respond Wednesday morning.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <wand@wand.org>  
X-Sender: wandwill@pop3.clark.net  
Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 16:30:41 -0500  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
From: Kimberly Robson <wand@wand.org>  
Subject: Re: Meeting dates for Interfaith Group for the CTBT

please send me a copy of the petition on CTBT - maybe that is what I was thinking about.

Thanks  
Kimberly

At 08:15 AM 12/8/98 -0800, you wrote:

>Dear Friends of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT:

>

>I want to share with you notes of the November 24 meeting of the Interfaith  
>Group for the CTBT. Included are the dates for meetings during 1999, set  
>for the second Tuesday of each month. As our cherished advisers, you are  
>cordially invited to attend. So please put these dates on your 1999  
calendar.

>

>Shalom,  
>Howard

>

>###

>

>To: Interfaith Group for the CTBT

>

>Here are some notes from the November 24 meeting of the Interfaith Group for  
>the CTBT.

>

>1. Looking ahead, we agreed that the Interfaith Group for the CTBT would  
>meet on the third Tuesday of each month in 1999. This will be January 19,  
>February 16, March 16, April 20, May 18, June 15, July 20, September 21, and  
>October 19 (the latter dates will be cancelled if the CTBT is ratified  
>sooner). Ordinarily the meeting will run from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. However,  
>on January 19 and February 16 it will run from 1:30 to 3:00 because the  
>Monday Lobby will meet from 12 noon to 1:00 those days due to a Monday  
>holiday. We have requested the FCNL conference room for January 19 and will  
>work out the location of subsequent meetings. We believe that this schedule  
>misses the ordinary meeting times of such groups as Churches for Middle East  
>Peace, the Latin America Task Force, and Monday Lobby working groups. If  
>this is wrong, please let me know.

>

>2. The cost of the conference call the day of the Jeffords breakfast is  
>slightly under \$300. We raised \$550 in donations, which were deposited in  
>an account of Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Donors present on  
>November 24 agreed that rather refunding prorated shares the money should be  
>held in that account and earmarked for the cost of similar use in the  
>future. (Do other donors agree?)

>  
>3. The petition on the CTBT to circulate in churches, synagogues, and  
>meetings and at other religious gatherings is ready to be sent out along  
>with background information. (If you need a copy, please let me know.) The  
>intent is to obtain signatures in January and February and present the  
>petitions to home state offices of senators in March. We will make an  
>effort to put persons from various denominations and religious groups in  
>touch with one another in the respective states so that they may join  
>together in making presentations.  
>  
>So far we know that the following groups will participate: Church of the  
>Brethren, Church Women United, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Friends Committee  
>on National Legislation, Mennonite Central Committee, Methodists United for  
>Peace with Justice, Presbyterian Church, NETWORK, Religious Action Center of  
>Reform Judaism, United Church of Christ, United Methodist Church. We will  
>check with other prospective participants, especially those whose leaders  
>signed the letter to the Senate last spring.

>  
>3. We are moving ahead with our effort to obtain appointments with cabinet  
>secretaries to urge the Clinton Administration to step up its push for CTBT  
>ratification. Larry Egbert has tried through Unitarian circles to set up an  
>appointment with Secretary Cohen but has so far been unsuccessful. Mary  
>Miller will talk with Tom Hart about the Episcopal Office taking the lead to  
>get an appointment with Secretary Albright. NETWORK will take the lead in  
>approaching Secretary Richardson. We will also try to meet with Sandy  
>Berger and one of President Clinton's top political advisors. It is  
>understood that these will be small delegations, in some cases heads of  
>communion if possible, and will not necessarily involve every member of the  
>Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

>  
>4. Daryl Kimball invited members of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT to  
>participate in a strategy session organized by the Coalition to Reduce  
>Nuclear Dangers on December 2. David Culp indicated that a new swing list  
>of senators will be available in December. I'll send out further  
>information about campaign strategy for 1999.

>  
>Shalom,  
>Howard  
>

\*\*\*\*\*

Kimberly Robson  
Director of Policy and Programs  
Women's Action for New Directions  
110 Maryland Avenue, Suite 205  
Washington, DC 20002  
202-543-8505  
202-675-6469 - fax  
wand@wand.org  
www.wand.org

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 16:58:33 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: hisham@ieer.org, bmorse@igc.org  
CC: panukes@igc.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, mupj@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org  
Subject: Sponsoring the Dec. 17th event

Brad and Hisham,

According to my notes, each of you is looking into the question of whether or not your organization will be listed as a sponsor of the de-alerting briefing on the Hill on December 17th. Is that correct? If so, can I get your answer by close-of-business on Thursday, December 10th? Thank you.

Five organizations are already committed as sponsors: PSR, UCS, FFF, MUPJ, PA. I have sent e-mails to several others that were not at our planning meeting.

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>

Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 16:51:46 -0500

From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility

To: wandwill@clark.net, stevenraikin@delphi.com, disarmament@igc.org,  
syoung@basicint.org, dkimball@clw.org, jdi@clw.org, joe@fcnl.org,  
smk@armscontrol.org

CC: paprog@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, jjdean@ucsusa.org

Subject: Hill briefing on de-alerting

Dear Colleagues,

A subgroup of our community has been planning a Hill briefing on de-alerting. We now expect that it will be held at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, December 17th, with Bruce Blair and Stansfield Turner as speakers, and perhaps others. Jonathan Dean will serve as moderator. We are hoping that Sen. Jeff Bingaman will be the principal Senate sponsor, but we do not yet have definite word on that.

The following organizations have signed on as sponsors of the briefing: PSR, Fourth Freedom Forum, Methodists United, UCS, Peace Action. Financial support comes from PSR, FFF and IEER.

Would your organization like to join this list and be listed on the flyer as a cosponsor? If you want to be listed, please reply to me no later than close-of-business on Thursday, December 10th.

If you have questions about the briefing, you may address them to Howard Hallman, Alistair Millar or me.

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>

Date: Tue, 08 Dec 1998 17:46:59 -0500

From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility

To: anitas@ieer.org, btiller@psr.org, bmorse@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, cdavis@clw.org, cpaine@nrdc.org, 73744.3675@compuserve.com, dkimball@clw.org, dculp@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, paexec@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, jsmith@clw.org, disarmament@igc.org, kathy@fcnl.org, wandwill@clark.net, ledwidge@psr.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, stevenraikin@delphi.com, syoung@basicint.org, tperry@ucsusa.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, kathy@fcnl.org, vision@igc.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, meldredge@igc.org, dkimball@clw.org

Subject: NWWG meeting

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id OAA03586

## NOTICE

The Nuclear Weapons Working Group will meet as follows:

-> NOTE THE CHANGE OF TIME — BUT DO NOT BE LATE

Date: Thursday, December 10th

Time: 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Place: Mott House

The agenda will be as follows:

- I. Introductions 9:33
- II. Issues 9:35
  - CTBT
  - De-alerting and deep cuts
  - Nuclear weapons complex
- III. Working group structure 10:30
  - Review decisions made at 11-5-98 planning session
  - Sign-up for co-chairs
  - Sign-up as liaisons for issues and groups
  - January meeting schedule

-----  
Notes from 11-5-98 NWWG planning session:

A. Issue areas:

1. CTBT
2. Nuclear weapons complex — strategic openings
3. De-alerting and Deep Cuts

B. Focus — primarily on the grassroots and the Hill strategy for these issues. Specifically, NWWG will cover field organizing and lobbying matters (especially related to CTBT) that are not addressed at CRND meetings or other meetings.

C. Structure:

1. We will meet the second and fourth Thursdays of each month from 9:30-11:00 AM at the Mott House, with rotating co-chairs.
2. We will establish coordinators for each issue (in addition to facilitators/co-chairs). Their responsibility will be to assure that

timely information is available at the meeting on the issue, and to propose specific assignments, especially when something is hot.

3. The role of the co-chairs will include:

- contact the issue liaisons to find out what should be on the agenda
- publish the agenda for comment by close of business Monday of every other week
- post the final agenda on Wednesday
- move the meeting along
- report to Monday Lobby

4. We will appoint liaisons for other meetings relevant to NWWG work (e.g. Interfaith Working Group, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers). Their responsibility will be to report to NWWG about those groups and vice versa.

-----

Please come to the meeting on 12-10-98 prepared to volunteer as an issue coordinator for one or more issues. (We did not discuss whether we want one person or several for each issue, so we need to resolve that.) The issues listed on our survey were as follows. Clearly some of these do not fit smoothly into the issue scheme that we adopted.

- CTBT
  - Abolition
  - Woolsey Resolution
  - Deep Cuts
  - De-Alerting
  - Use Policy
  - NATO/Europe nukes
  - Nunn-Lugar
  - Missile Defense
  - NPT Prep-Com
  - SSM/Subcriticals
  - Health Effects
  - Fissmat cutoff
  - Tritium
  - MOX/Pu Disposition
  - Reprocessing/Pu
  - DOE Cleanup
  - Nuclear Waste
- 

I will volunteer to create an updated e-mail list for the NWWG, to take account of various staff changes.

See you on Thursday.

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller

Return-Path: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "Monday Lobby" <dculp@igc.org>  
Subject: Monday Lobby Schedule for 1999  
Date: Wed, 9 Dec 1998 11:13:32 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igce.igc.org id IAA01179

Monday Lobby Participants --

Regular Monday Lobby meetings will resume at noon, Tuesday, January 19 at the Mott House, 122 Maryland Avenue, N.E. (We are meeting on Tuesday as Monday is Martin Luther King Day.)

For our Tuesday, January 19th meeting we have invited Steven Kull, Director of the Program on International Policy Attitudes at the University of Maryland to give a brief talk on "The Foreign Policy Gap: How Policymakers Misread the Public." Steven is a political psychologist who specializes in the study of public and elite attitudes on international issues. He recently completed a two-year study on the same topic. A summary of the report is at <<http://www.pipa.org/new.html>>. (Thanks to Joe Volk of FCNL for arranging this.)

Several of us in Monday Lobby have heard his presentation and highly recommend it. You are welcome to invite colleagues.

If you have not registered for the annual Coolfont Retreat, Tuesday evening, January 12 through Thursday noon, January 14, do so NOW. Call Suzy Kerr, Council for a Livable World, at 543-4100, ext. 115. If you can take riders or need a ride, e-mail me a note by Wednesday, December 16.

For those of you who like to mark your calendar in advance, although we usually meet every Monday at noon (at least when Congress is in session) we will meet on Tuesday, February 16 as the Monday of that week is Presidents' Day. We usually meet at the Mott House, 122 Maryland Avenue, N.E.

Kathy Guthrie of FCNL and myself will chair for the month of January. Chairs for the remainder of the year will be recruited at the Coolfont Retreat.

West wishes for the holiday season!

David

-----  
David Culp  
Plutonium Challenge  
245 Second Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20002-5761  
E-mail: dculp@igc.org

CTBT: Ratification in 1999!

-----

\$\$\$\$\$ 1 LINE REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT [igc.apc.org](http://igc.apc.org) \$\$\$\$\$

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Wed, 09 Dec 1998 12:15:38 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: mupj@igc.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org  
Subject: December 17th event

Gentlemen,

The three of us agreed to serve as the core subcommittee for planning the December 17th de-alerting event. That date is just one week from tomorrow. So where do things stand now and what do we need to do next?

- (1) I gather from the responses that I saw that opinions strongly favor staying with the 17th and not looking for another date. Agreed?
- (2) Since we have only two panelists so far (Blair and Turner), I am going to contact Dr. Ira Helfand and invite him to come. Agreed?
- (3) Alistair, are you still pursuing other panelists, or have you ceased that effort? Do you need help from us?
- (4) Should we try to divide the subject matter for the panelists? If so, how can we accomplish that smoothly?
- (5) Howard, do you need help from Alistair and me in nailing down the room and the Dear Colleague? If Glass/Bingaman can't commit today, I suggest that we try to get some other office to do it, e.g. Harkin or Daschle. We need to get some Senator committed before we can go ahead with other steps, such as flyers, followup calls, and media work.
- (6) Would one of you please volunteer to call Hisham and inquire about his progress on visuals? We need to know where that stands.
- (7) I now have the following NGO sponsors: FFF, MUPJ, PSR, PA, UCS, CLW, BASIC and FCNL. I am waiting to hear form some others.

I suggest that you both reply by e-mail and that we talk today around 5:00.

Shalom,  
Bob T.

Return-Path: <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>  
From: "Alistair Millar" <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>  
To: "Bob Tiller" <btiller@psr.org>, <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: December 17th event-- answers  
Date: Wed, 9 Dec 1998 12:41:59 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3

Hi Bob and Howard,

My answers are in capital letters below. Let's talk at 5.00 by phone  
Alistair

- (1) I gather from the responses that I saw that opinions strongly favor staying with the 17th and not looking for another date. Agreed YES! WE CAN'T CHANGE THE DATE ON TURNER AGAIN!
- (2) Since we have only two panelists so far (Blair and Turner), I am going to contact Dr. Ira Helfand and invite him to come. YES
- (3) Alistair, are you still pursuing other panelists, or have you ceased that effort? Do you need help from us? I AM STILL TRYING WITH CHILES, BUT AM NOT PURSUING ANY OTHERS. SHOULD WE ASK MIKE KRAIG FROM BASIC TO SPEAK ABOUT Y-2K IN THIS CONTEXT??
- (4) Should we try to divide the subject matter for the panelists? If so, how can we accomplish that smoothly? I THINK WE SHOULD KEEP THE SUBJECT BROAD : DE-ALERTING -- AND LET BLAIR AND TRUNER ANNOUNCE AND ADDRESS THEIR SPECIALITIES ON THE DAY.
  
- (5) Howard, do you need help from Alistair and me in nailing down the room and the Dear Colleague? If Glass/Bingaman can't commit today, I suggest that we try to get some other office to do it, e.g. Harkin or Daschle. We need to get some Senator committed before we can go ahead with other steps, such as flyers, followup calls, and media work. YES THIS IS ABSOLUTLY A PROIRITY. HOWARD, HAVE YOU CALLED CHAFEE'S OFFICE??
- (6) Would one of you please volunteer to call Hisham and inquire about his progress on visuals? We need to know where that stands. I WILL RIGHT NOW AND LET YOU KNOW LATER
- (7) I now have the following NGO sponsors: FFF, MUPJ, PSR, PA, UCS, CLW, BASIC and FCNL. I am waiting to hear form some others.

To: "Alistair Millar" <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>, "Bob Tiller" <btiller@psr.org>,  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: December 17th event-- answers  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 12:41 PM 12/9/98 -0500, Alistair Millar wrote:

>Hi Bob and Howard,  
>  
>My answers are in capital letters below. Let's talk at 5.00 by phone  
>Alistair  
>  
Hi Bob and Alistair,

For our dialogue I am adding my answers to Alistairs's and identifying them as HWH.  
Howard

>(1) I gather from the responses that I saw that opinions strongly favor  
>staying with the 17th and not looking for another date. Agreed YES! WE  
>CAN'T CHANGE THE DATE ON TURNER AGAIN!  
HWH: I agree to stick with the 17th.

>(2) Since we have only two panelists so far (Blair and Turner), I am  
>going to contact Dr. Ira Helfand and invite him to come. YES  
HWH: Yes

>(3) Alistair, are you still pursuing other panelists, or have you ceased  
>that effort? Do you need help from us? I AM STILL TRYING WITH CHILES, BUT  
>AM NOT PURSUING ANY OTHERS. SHOULD WE ASK MIKE KRAIG FROM BASIC TO SPEAK  
>ABOUT Y-2K IN THIS CONTEXT??

HWH: Adding Kraig would be my choice only if Chiles and Helfand are not available. Three panelists will be enough. Presumably Blair can handle Y2K questions.

>(4) Should we try to divide the subject matter for the panelists? If  
>so, how can we accomplish that smoothly? I THINK WE SHOULD KEEP THE SUBJECT  
>BROAD : DE-ALERTING -- AND LET BLAIR AND TRUNER ANNOUNCE AND ADDRESS THEIR  
>SPECIALITIES ON THE DAY.

HWH: I agree with Alistair. In the Q&A Jonathan Dean can refer questions to particular panelists.

>  
>(5) Howard, do you need help from Alistair and me in nailing down the  
>room and the Dear Colleague? If Glass/Bingaman can't commit today, I  
>suggest that we try to get some other office to do it, e.g. Harkin or  
>Daschle. We need to get some Senator committed before we can go ahead  
>with other steps, such as flyers, followup calls, and media work. YES THIS  
>IS ABSOLUTLY A PROIRITY. HOWARD, HAVE YOU CALLED CHAFEE'S OFFICE??

HWH: Wayne Glass was out of town on Monday & Tuesday. Tuesday afternoon I faxed him a series of questions about arrangements. I called this morning and left my number. I haven't heard. Bob, I suggest that you fax him a copy of an announcement mockup with the room number blank and ask him if he has one to supply. Alistair, I haven't called Chafee's office because I thought you were dealing with them. Since you started, I urge you to go ahead. If we haven't heard from Glass today, I believe we should ask staff of Daschle or Harkin to get us a room.

>(6) Would one of you please volunteer to call Hisham and inquire about  
>his progress on visuals? We need to know where that stands. I WILL RIGHT  
>NOW AND LET YOU KNOW LATER

>(7) I now have the following NGO sponsors: FFF, MUPJ, PSR, PA, UCS, CLW,  
>BASIC and FCNL. I am waiting to hear form some others.

>

HWH: Do one of you have capacity to set up a three-way telephone conversation at 5:00 p.m.

>

Return-Path: <skerr@clw.org>

X-Sender: skerr@[209.8.25.194]

Date: Wed, 09 Dec 1998 11:32:17 -0500

To: heeter@csbahome.com, jdi@clw.org, chellman@cdi.org, joe@fcn.org,  
kathy@fcn.org, bridget@fcn.org, paexec@igc.org, paprog@igc.org,  
btiller@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org, vision@igc.org, wandwill@clark.net,  
AIMbasic@aol.com, pdd@clark.net, disarmament@igc.org, johnpike@fas.org,  
73744.3675@compuserve.com, mupj@igc.org, meldredge@igc.org,  
pogodef@mnsinc.com, ralph@taxpayer.net, tperry@ucsusa.org,  
mupj@igc.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, davidhart@igc.org, jill@vi.org,  
wfa@igc.org, sraikin@aol.com, defense@pogo.org, jaquith@mindspring.com,  
shaer@wand.org, cunr@aol.com, dculp@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org,  
ggilhool@ix.netcom.com

From: Suzy Kerr <skerr@clw.org>

Subject: Coolfont Attendees ToDate

Many of you have asked to have a list of Coolfont participants so here is  
the list todate:

(sorry about the formatting problems)

#### Participants and Organizations

Tim Barner, World Federalist Association

Gordon Clark, Peace Action

Marcus Corbin, Project on Government  
Oversight, Inc

Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse

Peter Davies, Saferworld

Ralph DeGennero, Taxpayers for Common \$ense

Daryl Fagin, Americans for Democratic Action

Gillian Gilhool, Womens International League for Peace and Freedom

Tamar Gablnick, Federation of American Scientists  
Fund

Kathy Guthrie, Friends Committee on National Legislation

Francyne Harrigan, National Security News Service

John Isaacs, Council for a Livable World Education Fund

Suzy Kerr, Council for a Livable World Education Fund

Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

Don Kraus, Campaign for UN Reform

Laura Kriv, 20/20 Vision

Jill Lancelot, Taxpayers for Common \$ense

Brad Morse, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Rachel Phillips, Friends Committee on National  
Legislation

Steve Raikin, National Security News Service

Anna Rich, Federation of American Scientist Fund

Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision

Kimberly Robson, Women's Action for New Directions

Jenny Smith, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

Ned Stowe, Friends Committee on National  
Legislation

Fran Teplitz, Peace Action

Bob Tiller, Physicians for Social Responsibility

Jutka Terris, 20/20 Vision  
Joe Volk, Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Joan Wade, 20/20 Vision  
Chuck Woolery, World Federalist Association  
Jim Wyerman, 20/20 Vision

Guests/Hill Staffers Not all confirmed and other hill staff invited as well.

Jonathan Dean, Union of Concerned Scientists  
Hugh Brady, House Budget Committee  
Ben Cohen,, Business Leaders for Sensible  
Priorities  
Richard Fieldhouse, Senate Armed Services Committee  
Wilton Gaddy, Interfaith Alliance  
Burt Glass, Consultant  
Chris Hellman, Center for Defense Information  
Laurie Schultz Heim, Senator James Jeffords  
Alexander Pikayev, Carnegie Moscow Center (invited)  
Cecile Richards  
Todd Stein, Rep. Tom Allen  
Angela Stent, Georgetown University (invited)  
Peter Tyler, Senator Tom Harkin

To: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Russia conducts subcritical nuclear test  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 01:23 PM 12/9/98 -0500, David Culp wrote:

>Russia conducted a subcritical nuclear test today (Wednesday) at its Novaya Zemlya test site, according to the Russian news agency ITAR-TASS.

>

>As most of you know, DOE announced it will conduct a subcritical nuclear test today at the Nevada Test Site, code-named "Cimarron"....

>

>David,

I received this message from you four times. That's a little redundant and contributes to e-mail overload.

Howard

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Wed, 09 Dec 1998 22:33:44 +0000  
From: "Sara Speicher" <ses8@staff.wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-1: story to add to the Peace to the City  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Reply-To: "Sara Speicher" <ses8@staff.wcc-coe.org>

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

Reflections on the Peace to the City Campaign and WCC Assembly from Kingston, Jamaica

Regardless of which city you come from, the relationship between violence and urban poverty cannot be denied, nor can we close our eyes to the underlying factors of injustices which create and help to maintain this global concern. Current research findings have indicated that the disparity between poor and rich countries are widening and, in some cases, so too is the gap between the rich and the poor in their own countries.

The S-Corner Clinic and Community Development Centre is an NGO which is addressing the issue of social justice through their many programmes aimed to improve people's quality of life. These are education, conflict resolution workshops, mentoring, youth empowerment work and directly working with street gangs. We are happy to be a part of the WCC Programme to Overcome Violence as the participation and exposure has and will significantly enhance our work.

Being here in Harare as part of this POV emphasis at the WCC Assembly has created the space and forum to meet and join with other persons from across the globe who are doing similar work. We learn from each others' struggles and triumphs and by so doing are encouraged and re-energized to carry on this fight for social equity. It is a stimulating experience.

The Church is a major institution which has a lot of influence. I would like out of this Assembly to come tangible recommendations, otherwise it will be just another nice workshop:

- debt cancellation for Africa and third world countries
- Increase aid support by reducing allocation on arms.

Let us start the new millenium as truly emancipated countries. Remove the chains once and for all. Do not just change their position from the ankles to the pocket.

Peace!

Angela Stultz-Crawlle  
Local Coordinator  
Kingston Peace to the City Campaign

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

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 09 Dec 1998 15:25:00 -0500  
From: Bill Robinson <plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>  
Organization: Project Ploughshares  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Roche on Canadian parliament report  
To: cnanw@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca,  
Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,  
Abolition Canada <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>

December 9, 1998

Statement by Senator Douglas Roche, O.C.  
Former Canadian Ambassador for Disarmament and  
Chairman, Middle Powers Initiative

The Report of the Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee on Canada's policies on nuclear weapons is a landmark document and deserves the support of all Canadians.

After two years' study, the Committee has exposed the fallacy that nuclear weapons provide security and urges the Government of Canada to "play a leading role in finally ending the nuclear threat overhanging humanity."

The Report's leading recommendations would, if implemented, put Canada squarely in the body of mounting world opinion that the time has come to move away from the Cold War doctrine of nuclear deterrence.

Specifically, the Committee included in its 15 recommendations:

- \* Canada should work with NATO allies and the New Agenda Coalition to "encourage the nuclear-weapons States to demonstrate their unequivocal commitment to enter into and conclude negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons."
- \* Canada should endorse the concept of taking all nuclear weapons off alert status.
- \* Canada should support the call for the conclusion of a nuclear weapons disarmament convention as the end product of negotiations under Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- \* Canada should "argue forcefully within NATO" that NATO's present reliance on nuclear weapons must be re-examined and updated.

These steps, which reflect the major statements in recent years of the International Court of Justice, the Canberra Commission, leading world military and civilian figures, and the seven-nation New Agenda Coalition, are realistic. They will be supported by the 92 percent of Canadians, as revealed in a 1998 Angus Reid poll, who want Canada to take a leadership role in promoting an international ban on nuclear

weapons.

It is unfortunate that the Reform Party, which forms the Official Opposition in the House of Commons, has filed a Minority Report, which in itself, is mystifying. The Reform Party, which has never mentioned nuclear weapons in its policy papers, did not specifically disagree with any of the Committee's recommendations but did dissent "from the broad conclusions of the Report."

In dissociating itself from the broad conclusions of the Report that nuclear weapons must eventually be eliminated through comprehensive negotiations, the Reform Party ignores the reality that the Non-Proliferation Treaty, signed by 187 nations, imposes a binding legal obligation on all parties to negotiate the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Reform Party's dissent has separated the Party from the specific ruling of the International Court of Justice, which unanimously declared that such comprehensive negotiations must be concluded, and from the body of Canadian public opinion.

The four other parties in the House of Commons, the Liberals, the Bloc Quebecois, the New Democratic Party and the Progressive Conservative Party, which received approximately 80 percent of the popular vote in the 1997 general election, have contributed to the advancement of global security and should be congratulated.

Chairman Bill Graham, M.P., has provided distinguished leadership in steering the Committee, which has now provided a valuable compass for the building of a nuclear weapons-free security architecture for the 21st century.

- 30 -

--

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](mailto: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: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: RE: Appointment with Secretary Albright  
Date: Wed, 9 Dec 1998 15:44:55 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igce.igc.org id MAA21336

> who is the appointment secretary for Albright?

You may not need this anymore, but I called the Secretary's office and they would not give the name of the scheduler. They said to just address the letter to the Secretary. Also Daryl does not have the name.

The two CTBT swing lists have changed with input from people after the CTBT strategy meeting and changes in committee assignments. I will have new lists tomorrow.

What word processor (and version) do you use? I will send them to you and you can reformat the files if you want.

Over and out,

David

To: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: RE: Appointment with Secretary Albright  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 03:44 PM 12/9/98 -0500, David Culp wrote:

>

>The two CTBT swing lists have changed with input from people after the CTBT strategy meeting and changes in committee assignments. I will have new lists tomorrow.

>

>What word processor (and version) do you use? I will send them to you and you can reformat the files if you want....

David,

I use Microsoft Word. Sometimes I can't download attachments, so it's better to send the list to me in a text file.

Thanks,  
Howard

Return-Path: <czearing@hotmail.com>  
X-Originating-IP: [199.95.163.99]  
From: "Carol Zearing" <czearing@Hotmail.com>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: information about caucus  
Date: Wed, 09 Dec 1998 14:24:47 PST

Thank you so much for that information you mailed to me. That will help me a lot with this project. I had a couple of questions or clarifications to ask you for though.

In the e-mail you told me the names of your proposals for conference but I am not sure what they are about. I noticed that 1996 and 2000 are the same name. can you clarify what these are and the differences? and also about the 1992 proposal. The written history helped me to understand the 1988 one for the most part. At this moment, I do not have a Book of Resolutions but I am going to try to see if my pastor has one this weekend that I can look at. I think maybe that will help me to understand all 4 of these.

When you say that they were all successful, does that mean that you got all of your wishes that you asked for? if not which parts did you and didn't you get?

Thank you so much for all of your help with this. I really appreciate it.

God Bless,  
Carol Zearing

---

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 10 Dec 1998 11:19:34 -0500  
From: Bill Robinson <plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>  
Organization: Project Ploughshares  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Roche on Cdn report  
To: cnanw@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca,  
Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,  
Abolition Canada <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>

The following statement comments on "Canada and the Nuclear Challenge," the report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade (<http://www.parl.gc.ca/InfoComDoc/FAIT/Studies/Reports/faitrp07-e.htm>), which was tabled in the House of Commons this morning (10 December 1998). Please feel free to use or redistribute these comments effective immediately.

December 10, 1998

Statement by Senator Douglas Roche, O.C.  
Former Canadian Ambassador for Disarmament and  
Chairman, Middle Powers Initiative

The Report of the Parliamentary Foreign Affairs Committee on Canada's policies on nuclear weapons is a landmark document and deserves the support of all Canadians.

After two years' study, the Committee has exposed the fallacy that nuclear weapons provide security and urges the Government of Canada to "play a leading role in finally ending the nuclear threat overhanging humanity."

The Report's leading recommendations would, if implemented, put Canada squarely in the body of mounting world opinion that the time has come to move away from the Cold War doctrine of nuclear deterrence.

Specifically, the Committee included in its 15 recommendations:

- \* Canada should work with NATO allies and the New Agenda Coalition to "encourage the nuclear-weapons States to demonstrate their unequivocal commitment to enter into and conclude negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons."
- \* Canada should endorse the concept of taking all nuclear weapons off alert status.
- \* Canada should support the call for the conclusion of a nuclear weapons disarmament convention as the end product of negotiations under Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

\* Canada should "argue forcefully within NATO" that NATO's present reliance on nuclear weapons must be re-examined and updated.

These steps, which reflect the major statements in recent years of the International Court of Justice, the Canberra Commission, leading world military and civilian figures, and the seven-nation New Agenda Coalition, are realistic. They will be supported by the 92 percent of Canadians, as revealed in a 1998 Angus Reid poll, who want Canada to take a leadership role in promoting an international ban on nuclear weapons.

It is unfortunate that the Reform Party, which forms the Official Opposition in the House of Commons, has filed a Minority Report, which in itself, is mystifying. The Reform Party, which has never mentioned nuclear weapons in its policy papers, did not specifically disagree with any of the Committee's recommendations but did dissent "from the broad conclusions of the Report."

In dissociating itself from the broad conclusions of the Report that nuclear weapons must eventually be eliminated through comprehensive negotiations, the Reform Party ignores the reality that the Non-Proliferation Treaty, signed by 187 nations, imposes a binding legal obligation on all parties to negotiate the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Reform Party's dissent has separated the Party from the specific ruling of the International Court of Justice, which unanimously declared that such comprehensive negotiations must be concluded, and from the body of Canadian public opinion.

The four other parties in the House of Commons, the Liberals, the Bloc Quebecois, the New Democratic Party and the Progressive Conservative Party, which received approximately 80 percent of the popular vote in the 1997 general election, have contributed to the advancement of global security and should be congratulated.

Chairman Bill Graham, M.P., has provided distinguished leadership in steering the Committee, which has now provided a valuable compass for the building of a nuclear weapons-free security architecture for the 21st century.

- 30 -

--

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](mailto: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: Thu, 10 Dec 1998 11:03:13 -0500  
From: Bill Robinson <plough@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>  
Organization: Project Ploughshares  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Cdn parliament report released  
To: cnanw@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca,  
Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,  
Abolition Canada <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>

The report of the Canadian House of Commons' Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, entitled "Canada and the Nuclear Challenge," was released today (10 December 1998).

The committee's 15 recommendations are reproduced in full below. The entire report, which is over 100 pages long, explains and expands on the committee's recommendations and is valuable reading in itself. It can be found on the Parliamentary website at:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca/InfoComDoc/FAIT/Studies/Reports/faitrp07-e.htm>

\*\*\*\*\*

## LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### RECOMMENDATION 1

The Committee recommends that the Government of Canada adopt the following fundamental principle to guide its nuclear non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament policy, within an overarching framework encompassing all aspects - political, military, and commercial - of Canada's international relations:

\* That Canada work consistently to reduce the political legitimacy and value of nuclear weapons in order to contribute to the goal of their progressive reduction and eventual elimination.

### RECOMMENDATION 2

In order to implement this fundamental principle, the Committee recommends that the Government of Canada issue a policy statement which explains the links between Canada's nuclear non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament policy and all other aspects of its international relations. In addition, it must also establish a process to achieve a basis for ongoing consensus by keeping the Canadian public and parliamentarians informed of developments in this area, in particular by means of:

\* Annual preparatory meetings - held, for example, under the auspices of the Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development - of the type held with non-governmental organizations and representatives of civil society before the annual meeting of the UN Human Rights Commission;

\* An annual public appearance before this Committee by the Ambassador to the United Nations for Disarmament Affairs;

\* Strengthened coordination between the departments of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and National Defence, in the first instance by the inclusion of a representative from National Defence on Canadian delegations to multilateral nuclear non-proliferation fora.

### RECOMMENDATION 3

The Committee recommends that the Government of Canada intensify its efforts, in cooperation with States such as its NATO allies and the members of the New Agenda Coalition, to advance the process of nuclear disarmament. To this end, it must encourage public input and inform the public on the exorbitant humanitarian, environmental and economic costs of nuclear weapons as well as their impact on international peace and security. In addition, the Government must encourage the nuclear-weapon States to demonstrate their unequivocal commitment to enter into and conclude negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. Drawing on the lessons of the Ottawa Process, it should also examine innovative means to advance the process of nuclear disarmament.

### RECOMMENDATION 4

The Committee recommends that the Government of Canada explore additional means of both providing more information to Canadians on civilian uses of nuclear technology, and receiving more public input into government policy in this area. As one means of achieving this, the Committee also recommends that the Parliament of Canada conduct a separate and in-depth study on the domestic use, and foreign export of, Canada's civilian nuclear technology.

## RECOMMENDATION 5

In the interest of increased nuclear safety and stability, and as a means to advance toward the broader goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, the Committee recommends that the Government of Canada endorse the concept of de-alerting all nuclear forces, subject to reciprocity and verification - including the arsenals of the permanent members of the UN Security Council and the three nuclear-weapons-capable States - and encourage their governments to pursue this option.

## RECOMMENDATION 6

The Committee recommends that the Government of Canada take all possible action to encourage the United States and Russia to continue the START process. In particular, Canada should encourage Russia to ratify START II, should provide concrete support towards achieving this objective, and should encourage like-minded states to work with Russia to ensure increased political and economic stability in that country. Beyond this, Canada should urge both parties to pursue progressive and reciprocal reforms to their respective nuclear postures.

## RECOMMENDATION 7

Given its potential contribution to nuclear safety and stability, and the need to act promptly to address the possible implications of the millennium bug, the Committee recommends that the Government of Canada explore further with the United States and Russia the feasibility of establishing a NORAD "hotline" to supplement and strengthen Russia's missile early warning system. Canada should also strongly support the idea of broadening such a mechanism to include other nuclear-weapons-capable States.

## RECOMMENDATION 8

The Committee recommends that the Government reject the idea of burning MOX fuel in Canada because this option is totally unfeasible, but that it continue to work with other governments to address the problem of surplus fissile material.

## RECOMMENDATION 9

In view of their responsibilities as nuclear-weapon States under the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and as Permanent Members of the United Nations Security Council, the Committee recommends that the Government of Canada encourage the United Kingdom, France and China to: increase transparency about their nuclear stockpiles, fissile material and doctrine; support the call of Canada and other States for the substantive discussion of nuclear disarmament issues at the Conference on Disarmament; and explore with the United States and Russia means of preparing to enter nuclear disarmament reductions at the earliest possible moment.

#### RECOMMENDATION 10

The Committee recommends that the Government of Canada continue to support all international efforts to address the underlying regional security issues in South Asia and the Middle East. Working with like-minded States, it should take a more proactive role in stressing the regional and global security benefits of immediately increasing communication and co-operation between States in those regions as a means of building trust. In both regions - but particularly in South Asia given the recent nuclear tests - Canada should also stress: the freezing of nuclear weapon programs; adhering to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty and participating in the negotiation of the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty and; joining the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as non-nuclear-weapon States.

#### RECOMMENDATION 11

The Committee recommends that the Government of Canada work to strengthen international efforts to prevent the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons and missile systems and to ensure adequate funding for verification purposes. In addition to strengthening the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention through the negotiation of a Verification Protocol and continuing to support the operation of the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Government should also examine methods of increasing the effectiveness of the Australia Group and the Missile Technology Control Regime, as

well as cooperation in intelligence and law enforcement to prevent terrorist acquisition of such weapons.

#### RECOMMENDATION 12

The Committee recommends that the Government, having strengthened the international safeguards regime by signing its new Model Protocol with the International Atomic Energy Agency, use all means at its disposal to convince other States to do likewise. Before entering into a future Nuclear Cooperation Agreement with any other State, the Government should, at a minimum, require that State to adopt the new Model Protocol.

#### RECOMMENDATION 13

The Committee recommends that the Government of Canada meet annually with the other parties to all Nuclear Cooperation Agreements to review the application of such Agreements, and table a report on the results of such meetings in Parliament.

#### RECOMMENDATION 14

The Committee recommends that the Canadian Government intensify its efforts, in cooperation with like-minded States, such as our NATO allies, to advance the global disarmament and security agenda:

- \* Canada should reaffirm its support for the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as the centrepiece of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime and should reject any attempt to revise the Treaty to acknowledge India and Pakistan as "nuclear-weapon States" under it. It should also continue to strive to ensure that the nuclear-weapon States honour their commitments to a strengthened review process for the NPT, which will lead to an updated statement of Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament at the 2000 Review Conference. Canada should complete the process of ratifying the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty as quickly as possible and urge all other States to do likewise. Should India and Pakistan refuse to accept the Treaty unconditionally, Canada

should nevertheless encourage the international community to ensure the Treaty's legal entry into force.

\* Canada should play a strong role at the Conference on Disarmament in the forthcoming negotiations for a broad Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty which will serve both non-proliferation and disarmament objectives.

\* Canada should support the establishment of a nuclear arms register to cover both weapons and fissile material as proposed by Germany in 1993.  
\* Canada should support the call for the conclusion of a nuclear weapons disarmament convention.

#### RECOMMENDATION 15

The Committee recommends that the Government of Canada argue forcefully within NATO that the present re-examination and update as necessary of the Alliance Strategic Concept should include its nuclear component.

--

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](mailto: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>)

To: ctbt@2020vision.org, dkimball@clw.org, dculp@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Draft letter to Virginians  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Marie, Daryl, and David:

As a follow-up to today's meeting of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group, I have drafted the attached letter to Virginians, asking them to contact Senator Warner in behalf of the CTBT. I plan to send the final version of this sample letter to members of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT and ask them to send it, or a similar communication, to their constituents in Virginia the first week in January.

Would you please review this draft and, if you choose, offer suggestions for revision. I would like to send the final version to the Interfaith Group on Monday, December 14.

Thanks,  
Howard

###

Sample letter on CTBT for use in Virginia

Dear Virginian:

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is now before the U.S. Senate for ratification. By banning all nuclear explosions, the CTBT will curb the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, help guard against the renewal of the arms race, and establish an extensive global monitoring and verification system. It has been signed by over 150 countries, including the five long-standing nuclear weapon states: United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China. In order for the treaty to enter into force and become international law, it must be ratified by the United States and 43 other nuclear-capable countries. Accordingly, action by the U.S. Senate is urgently needed.

President Clinton submitted the CTBT to the Senate for ratification on September 24, 1997. It was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for consideration, but so far Senator Jesse Helms, committee chair, has refused to schedule hearings on the treaty. Moreover, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott has not been willing to schedule a vote by the Senate on the CTBT. We and other supporters of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty believe that it is important for hearings to start as quickly as possible and for the Senate as a whole to debate and vote on the treaty during the 1999 session.

Therefore, we ask you to get in touch with Senator John Warner and request him to publicly announce his support for the CTBT. Ask him to personally urge Senator Helms and Senator Lott to schedule hearings and floor debate on the CTBT as soon as possible. Furthermore, because Senator Warner is now chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, ask him to have that committee schedule fair and opening hearings on the CTBT in the near future.

You can reach Senator John Warner at Russell Senate Office Building, Room 225, Washington, DC 20500; telephone, 202 224-2023; fax, 202 \_\_\_\_\_; or e-mail: \_\_\_\_\_.

Sincerely yours,

Organizational signer

To: "Carol Zearing" <czearing@Hotmail.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: information about caucus  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 02:24 PM 12/9/98 PST, Carol Zearing wrote:  
>Thank you so much for that information you mailed to me. That will help  
>me a lot with this project. I had a couple of questions or  
>clarifications to ask you for though.

MY ANSWERS ARE IN CAPS.

>In the e-mail you told me the names of your proposals for conference but  
>I am not sure what they are about.  
YOU WILL NEED TO GET COPIES OF THE BOOK OF RESOLUTIONS TO UNDERSTAND THEM. THERE IS  
LIKELY TO BE COPIES IN THE SEMINARY LIBRARY.

I noticed that 1996 and 2000 are the same name. can you clarify what these are and the differences?  
IN 2000 WE WILL BE OFFERING AMENDMENTS TO THE 1996 RESOLUTION ON "NUCLEAR ABOLITION"

>When you say that they were all successful, does that mean that you got  
>all of your wishes that you asked for? if not which parts did you and  
>didn't you get?

THERE WAS SOME EDITING BY THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE AT GENERAL CONFERENCE EACH  
TIME BUT NO SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES. IN 1988 AND 1992 THE RESOLUTIONS PASSED THE  
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE WITH VERY FEW NEGATIVE VOTES. IN 1996 COMMITTEE APPROVAL WAS  
UNANIMOUS. THIS MEANT THAT THE RESOLUTIONS PASSED THE GENERAL CONFERENCE ON THE  
CONSENT CALENDAR, THAT IS, WITHOUT A FORMAL VOTE.

LET ME KNOW IF YOU NEED FURTHER INFORMATION.

Shalom,  
Howard  
>

To: "Kimberly Robson" <wand@wand.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Contacts in western states  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Kim,

United Methodist peace with justice coordinators in the western states we discussed are as follows:

Rev. John Ed Francis     Utah contacts  
4727 Quitman Street  
Denver, CO 80212  
303 733-3736

Kathy Campbell-Barton     Oregon, Southern Idaho  
1230 Highland, NE  
Salem, OR 97303  
(h) 503 399-1584  
(w) 503 364-2844

Robert E. Hughes     Northern Utah contacts  
2707 68th Avenue, SE  
Mercer Island, WA 98040  
206 232-0598

Adrienne Fong     Nevada contacts  
750 Presidio Avenue, #207  
San Francisco, CA 94115  
415 923-1062

Let me know if I can help further.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>  
From: "Alistair Millar" <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>  
To: <btiller@psr.org>  
Cc: <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: status of de-alerting  
Date: Thu, 10 Dec 1998 16:45:09 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3

I just spoke to Howard. He has not heard back from Glass's office yet. So I suggested we all touch- base tomorrow as soon as he hears. I will be out of my office from 10.30 until around 3 tomorrow, but I will be checking my voice mail. Regarding the audio visuals, Hisham has got hold a could of images and hopes to be getting more from Frank von Hippel early next week.

That's all for now....

Best,

Alistair

```
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">  
<HTML>  
<HEAD>
```

```
<META content=text/html;charset=iso-8859-1 http-equiv=Content-Type>  
<META content="MSHTML 4.71.2016.0" name=GENERATOR>  
</HEAD>
```

```
<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>  
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>I just spoke to Howard. He has not heard back  
from Glass's office yet. So I suggested we all touch- base tomorrow as soon as  
he hears. I will be out of my office from 10.30 until around 3 tomorrow, but I  
will be checking my voice mail. Regarding the audio visuals, Hisham has got hold  
a could of images and hopes to be getting more from Frank von Hippel early next  
week.</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>That's all for now....</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>Best,</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>Alistair</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>
```

Return-Path: <delong@nucleus.com>  
Date: Thu, 10 Dec 1998 20:36:06 -0700  
From: Delongs <delong@nucleus.com>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Nukes in audio?  
References: <2.2.16.19981128151003.298f3d1c@pop.igc.org>  
X-Corel-MessageType: EMail

Thank you so much for your fax on the bee-bee strategy. I regret to report that when I sat down to read it, I found that the transmission was poor so that several lines were illegible. I am wondering if you could fax it again? I am terribly sorry to trouble you with this.

We have just received the Report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs from our House of Commons. It urges support for the New Agenda Coalition, work on de-alerting and is a generally positive statement. Hurrah! Two years of hearings have resulted in some well-educated Members of Parliament! Now to sell the recommendations to the Government of Canada - and to urge them to stand up to the nuclear weapons states within NATO as they engage on the review of the NATO Strategic concept...much to be done yet!  
Merry Christmas (somewhat in advance) to you!  
Bev

Howard W. Hallman wrote:

> At 11:36 AM 10/26/98 -0700, Delongs wrote:  
> >Dear Howard,  
> >Our most recent brochure includes this statement:  
> >"the over 30,000 nuclear weapons remaining in the world today  
> >...contain the destructive power of more than 500,000 Hiroshima  
> >bombs."  
> >  
> >How much does a bee-bee cost? 500,000 bee-bees would take some time  
> >to  
> >drop I suspect...  
> >Thanks for your note!  
> >Bev DeLong  
> >  
> >  
> >Dear Bev,  
> >  
> >I've been hanging on to your letter with hopes that I would be able to  
> >find  
> >our old material on the beebie demonstration. I have now done so. It  
> >is a  
> >two-page description in hard copy (before e-mail). If you will provide  
> >me  
> >with a fax number or mailing address, I'll send it to you.  
> >  
> >Shalom,  
> >Howard



Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>  
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)  
Subject: Re: Draft letter to Virginians  
Date: Thu, 10 Dec 1998 19:31:40 -0500

This looks good to me, Howard.

Last line should read "fair and open hearings" (not opening)

Thanks for doing this. And thanks for the ride this morning!

Marie

Marie Rietmann  
CTBT Coordinator  
20/20 Vision and 20/20 Vision Education Fund  
'20 Minutes a Month to Help Save the Earth.'  
1828 Jefferson Place, NW \* Washington, D.C. 20036  
202.833.2020 \* fx 202.833.5307  
<http://www.2020vision.org>

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Fri, 11 Dec 1998 12:58:03 +0000  
From: "Sara Speicher" <ses8@staff.wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-1: Bethlehem Peace to the City (almost) at the Assembly  
Content-Disposition: inline  
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Reply-To: "Sara Speicher" <ses8@staff.wcc-coe.org>

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

Mr. Zoughbi Zoughbi, from the Wi\*am: Palestinian Conflict Resolution Centre in Bethlehem, was to come to the WCC Assembly and participate in the Padare through his centre\*s involvement in the Peace to the City Campaign. However, as he was departing on 5 December, he was detained in the Tel Aviv airport, interrogated by Israeli security officials on the purpose of his trip and the presentation he would be making at the WCC Assembly in Harare. His luggage was searched, and after about six hours with different security officials and checks, and after his plane had already left, he finally was not permitted to travel because he did not have \*adequate papers\*. The WCC, through the Palestinian mission in Harare, secured additional documentation, but at the point, Mr. Zoughbi would have been able to spend only 24 hours in Harare, and with the prospect of a further experience with security checks in addition to the short amount of time at the Assembly, together we decided it was not a helpful use of his time and energy. He sends his regrets and his support to the Assembly and the Programme to Overcome Violence. He has shared his experience in the following \*workshop\* format:

#### NON-VIOLENT TRAINING WORKSHOP

Between the Bethlehem checkpoint and the Tel Aviv airport

- Date: December 6, 1998
- Duration: 8 hours
- Pre-requisite: Permit to travel through the airport
- Preparation: Be ready to answer any questions at the airport because the "new Israeli god of Security" is thirsty for responses to coercive questions.

Reflect on the following story (Take as much time as necessary):

I called a Service to take me to the airport. We departed at 11:45 a.m. The Tantur-Bethlehem checkpoint I was able to cross with no difficulty after a 25 minutes long queue. The next cab that was going to take me to the airport was late however. I started becoming a little anxious. According to Israeli "airport etiquette," everyone traveling outside Israel has to check in at least three hours before the flight's departure. Mine was leaving at 4:30 p.m.

To make the long story short, we left the checkpoint area around 1:00 p.m. and made it to the airport still in time. By this time my adrenaline level was well adjusted. Our car was stopped at the entrance (!!). The security folk checked my luggage \_ my patience. I tried to recall skills for tolerance, productive communication despite the anger I felt

because of the harassment during the checking. Well, after all, I made it through, to the second wave of questioning and suspicious looks. I paid my fare to the cab driver. He wished me good luck. The moment I gathered my luggage to put them on the trolley and go into the Departure Hall I heard, "Sleikha Betakhon!" Despite of my broken Hebrew I understood it: "Excuse me. Security!" I felt VIP (Very Important Person) to be given all this attention. Why not? I am a Palestinian! As such, I am also "honored" by the principle "Everyone is guilty until proven innocent!"

"Where is your passport?" "Where do you travel?" "Why?" "What are you doing there?" \_ Lucky me! My English teacher didn't train me except on wh\_ questions. For a moment I thought the security guy would ask me about my ideas regarding the Wye River Memorandum. I thought WYE belonged to the family of such wh\_ questions. In any case, his questions strongly resonated with ideas formulated at Wye River plantation.

The Palestinian side will apprehend the specific individuals suspected of penetrating acts of violence and terror for the purpose of further investigation, and prosecution and punishment of all persons involved in acts of violence and terror (WYE River Memorandum, II A 1 d).

It seems that being guilty and being Palestinian are the two sides of the same coin. Finally I made it to Area D of the airport without much delay and with an escort. "Do you speak Hebrew?" the person in the next window asked. "English or Arabic please," I responded. "Go there!" I was oriented to another line where I waited almost one and a half hours for my turn. I was the last person in line to be taken aside. "Good afternoon sir! We are from the Security. You understand?" I said, "It is obvious! I know all the smart answers to your questions." It was already 3:45 p.m. "Where are you going?" "Harare." "Why?" "To attend the WCC conference, and take part in the program How to Overcome Violence." "Yes!?! Why through Frankfurt?" "Because there is no other option today." "Do you have a visa?" I showed the documents I had. "Everything is fine. What are you going to talk about?" "Excuse me! This has nothing to do with security!" "Do you have your presentation?" "Yes and No! I have lots of papers and articles published. It is on the Webb if you are interested." I handed her my business card after she asked for one. "Well, how did you get to the airport?" "By car, from Bethlehem." "Who packed your bag?" "I did." "Did you leave it unattended since then?" "No, I didn't." "Did anyone give you anything\_" "No, none." "Do you carry any weapons?" "No, I don't believe in violence, but I have weapons of justice, reconciliation, peace\_"

\_Smiling face\_ "You know Sir, I am just doing my duty."

I understand that part, but I cannot understand any question not related to security. We can talk about security when good neighbors make good fences, not when good fences make good neighbors. You know I have been traveling from this airport

at least thirty times in the last four years. Questions are always the same. Harassment is the name of the game. I said to myself, "Be more creative. Enough is enough!" She took my passport and ticket and asked for my "tasrih"-permit. I handed it to her. After consulting with other four members of the Security, she came back. "Would you follow me Sir?" In the heat of the moment I replied, "Where is the red carpet? Listen! We have only 30 minutes till the plane leaves. Let us hurry!" So we walked from the East wing of the airport to the West wing of the airport. What kind of peace is this, I wondered. "I tell you, I'll lose my plane. Let us rush!" As we were walking toward the other side I told her a story about peace.

One day the jackal approached the hen that was sitting on the top of a sack of wheat. He admired the hen, and thought of how sweet it would taste, but couldn't reach her. So he said to her, "Did you hear Mother of mine, that the great chiefs of the animals declared peace on the whole earth? You can come down safely from up there and we can talk about the matter nicely." "Great peace you mean," pondered the hen while looking into the far distance. "What are you looking at?" asked the jackal a little annoyed. "Oh, just a pack of dogs running towards us." "Do-ogs! Oh Mother of mine, I have some urgent business to take care of. I need to go now." The hen started laughing, "Do you not remember the Big Peace? Why do you run away?" "I don't think those dogs were at the meeting!" replied the jackal and he whirled away.

In the mean time the security officer started searching one of my bags, took it for X-ray\_then the second one\_ "What is in it?"\_She continued searching. "Sorry Sir! I am doing my job." "Listen! This is dangerous! I read things about nazi Germany. Yes! You can carry on with your responsibility with a smile! I am concerned for the security of all. It is the same Never Again not only for Jesus, but for all! Let us be inclusive in our approaches!" By this time we were back at the Lufthansa counter. "Sir, you cannot travel. You don't have the adequate papers. No visa\_no real documents\_no\_no\_" I said, "Listen! Why didn't you tell me earlier?" That was it! I left the Departure Hall to go home via Arrival Hall\_ "Hello! Betikhon! Passport!" a voice stopped me. I said, "Listen! I spent four hours with the Security at the Lufthansa counter. Look at the colorful decorations on my bags! Isn't that enough?" "Your passport, please!" "I cannot give it to you\_" "Whose luggage is this?" Finally I gave him my passport. He said, "Would you follow me Sir?" I refused and asked for his supervisor. The supervisor came. I started explaining the situation all over again. "I am going home to Bethlehem. I lost my flight. I have been checked thoroughly. It was enough. I don't want to go through all that again." I left the airport around 7:30 p.m. and arrived home at 10:00 p.m. My kids and wife were happy to see me return.

Assignments:

· Divide in small groups. Try to place yourself in the story. What feelings does the experience instigate in you? · What happens when victims become victimizers? What do we learn from history? · What should be the proper response to the presented situation? Give examples for peaceful resolution of such conflicts. · Examine the consequences of power inequality. Do you find any similarities between your situation and the studied case?

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

Return-Path: <billing>  
Date: Mon, 14 Dec 1998 02:15:44 -0800 (PST)  
From: IGC Billing Department <billing@igc.org>  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: November use, acct: mupj

-----  
NOTE: If you recently switched to IGC's new unlimited rate, there may be final session charges up until the date you installed our new software and began dialing in to our new access numbers.

If you haven't yet converted to IGC's unlimited rate and received our upgraded software, read all about it at <http://www.igc.org/igc/join>

If there are any changes in your address or phone number as listed below, please send any updates to <billing@igc.org>. Thank you!

-----  
\*\*\*\*\* I N V O I C E \*\*\*\*\*

Howard W. Hallman  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16th St., NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Phone: (301)896-0013

November 1998 activity for your PeaceNet account  
IGC Account: mupj      Invoice date: 11/30/98  
Invoice number: 9811-04129

| Date     | Time | Description                                       | Qty | Cost | Taxable |
|----------|------|---------------------------------------------------|-----|------|---------|
| 11/01/98 | 0100 | Majordomo list monthly fee<br>abolition-religious |     | 9.00 |         |
| 11/01/98 | 1756 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/02/98 | 0619 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/02/98 | 0626 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/02/98 | 0714 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/02/98 | 0732 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/02/98 | 1110 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/02/98 | 1133 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/02/98 | 1207 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/02/98 | 1406 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 2MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/03/98 | 0550 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/03/98 | 1042 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/03/98 | 1410 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/03/98 | 1424 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/04/98 | 1132 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/04/98 | 1143 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/05/98 | 0455 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 2MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/05/98 | 0918 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |
| 11/05/98 | 0943 | Direct Dial: Washington DC Area                   | 1MN | 0.00 |         |

|                            |                    |     |      |
|----------------------------|--------------------|-----|------|
| 11/05/98 1449 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/06/98 0529 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/06/98 1249 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/06/98 1300 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/07/98 0449 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/08/98 1120 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/08/98 1900 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 3MN | 0.00 |
| 11/08/98 1903 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/09/98 0554 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/09/98 0606 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/09/98 1243 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/10/98 0642 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 3MN | 0.00 |
| 11/10/98 0946 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/10/98 1401 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/10/98 1434 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/11/98 0632 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/11/98 0650 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 2MN | 0.00 |
| 11/11/98 1054 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/11/98 1412 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/12/98 0626 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/12/98 0705 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/12/98 1041 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/12/98 1057 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/12/98 1604 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/13/98 1113 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 2MN | 0.00 |
| 11/13/98 1335 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/16/98 0726 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 3MN | 0.00 |
| 11/16/98 1133 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 2MN | 0.00 |
| 11/16/98 1214 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/16/98 1454 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/17/98 0735 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/17/98 1022 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/17/98 1041 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/17/98 1109 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/17/98 1140 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/17/98 1438 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/18/98 0829 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/18/98 1218 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/19/98 0314 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/19/98 0953 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/20/98 0443 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/20/98 1057 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/20/98 1248 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/23/98 0538 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 2MN | 0.00 |
| 11/23/98 0612 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 2MN | 0.00 |
| 11/23/98 1023 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/23/98 1051 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/23/98 1323 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/23/98 1408 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/23/98 1500 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 5MN | 0.00 |
| 11/23/98 1607 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 2MN | 0.00 |
| 11/24/98 0352 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/24/98 0403 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |
| 11/24/98 0546 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area | 1MN | 0.00 |

|                            |                              |      |       |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|------|-------|
| 11/24/98 1301 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/24/98 1401 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/24/98 1427 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/25/98 0349 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/25/98 0947 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/25/98 1004 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/25/98 1327 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/27/98 0734 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 2MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/27/98 0836 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/27/98 1120 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/27/98 1206 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/27/98 1232 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/28/98 1209 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 2MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/30/98 0552 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 2MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/30/98 0604 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/30/98 1142 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/30/98 1406 Direct Dial: | Washington DC Area           | 1MN  | 0.00  |
| 11/30/98                   | Storage fee                  | 27KC | 0.00  |
| 11/30/98                   | Dec 1998 monthly service fee |      | 12.50 |

-----  
Total Current Charges 21.50

|          |                                    |       |        |
|----------|------------------------------------|-------|--------|
| 10/31/98 | Previous Balance                   | 21.50 |        |
| 11/24/98 | Check Payment Received - Thank You |       | -21.50 |

-----  
Grand Total Due 21.50

| Summary for this period: | Minutes | Hourly | Charge |
|--------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|                          | rate    |        |        |
| Extended Services        |         | 9.00   |        |
| Storage fee              |         | 0.00   |        |
| Subscription fee         |         | 12.50  |        |
| Direct-dial              | 110     | 0.00   | 0.00   |
| -----                    |         |        |        |
| Totals:                  | 110     | \$     | 21.50  |

Note: Payments received after this billing period will be reflected on your next invoice. If you receive a paper invoice, or your network usage is paid by your organization, this emailed invoice is for your information only.

If you have any questions about your invoice, please see our web page at: <http://www.igc.org/igc/billing>

Billing Department, Institute for Global Communications  
PO Box 29904, San Francisco, CA 94129-0904 USA  
Phone: (415)561-6100 Fax: (415)561-6101 Email: [billing@igc.org](mailto:billing@igc.org)  
A project of the Tides Center



To: btiller@psr.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: De-alerting forum  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Bob,

Friday eveing you received the same message I did from Wayne Glass: that he still had no confirmation of a room. Maybe he'll have one this morning.

Impeachment debate starts in the House at 10:00 Thursday, the same time as our forum. Assuming that we go ahead, maybe our announcement might state:

Take a break from dwelling on the troubled past to look at a brighter future.

Come to a Forum on De-alerting the Nuclear Arsenal.

Or something like that.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 11 Dec 1998 16:01:56 -0500  
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@pgs.ca>  
Importance: Normal  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Thomas Merton's Prayer for Peace  
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id NAB25365

### Thomas Merton's Prayer for Peace

Almighty and merciful God, Father of all men, Creator and Ruler of the Universe, Lord of History, whose designs are inscrutable, whose glory is without blemish, whose compassion for the errors of men is inexhaustible, in your will is our peace.

Mercifully hear this prayer which rises to you from the tumult and desperation of a world in which you are forgotten, in which your name is not invoked, your laws are derided and your presence is ignored. Because we do not know you, we have no peace.

>From the heart of an eternal silence, you have watched the rise of empires, and seen the smoke of their downfall.

You have seen Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Greece and Rome, once powerful, carried away like sand in the wind.

You have witnessed the impious fury of ten thousand fratricidal wars, in which great powers have torn whole continents to shreds in the name of peace and justice.

And now our nation itself stands in imminent danger of a war the like of which has never been seen! This nation dedicated to freedom, not to power, Has obtained, through freedom, a power it did not desire.

And seeking by that power to defend its freedom, it is enslaved by the processes and policies of power.

Must we wage a war we do not desire, a war that can do us no good, And which our very hatred of war forces us to prepare?

A day of ominous decision has now dawned on this free nation.

Armed with a titanic weapon, and convinced of our own right, We face a powerful adversary, armed with the same weapon, equally convinced that he is right.

In this moment of destiny, this moment we never foresaw, we cannot afford to fail.

Our choice of peace or war may decide our judgment and publish it in an eternal record.

In this fatal moment of choice in which we might begin the patient architecture of peace

We may also take the last step across the rim of chaos.

Save us then from our obsessions!

Open our eyes, dissipate confusions,

Teach us to understand ourselves and our adversary!

Let us never forget that sins against the law of love are punished by loss of faith,

And those without faith stop at no crime to achieve their ends!

Help us to be masters of the weapons that threaten to master us.

Help us to use our science for peace and plenty, not for war and destruction.

Show us how to use atomic power to bless our children's children, not to blight them.

Save us from the compulsion to follow our adversaries in all that we most hate, confirming them in their hatred and suspicion of us.

Resolve our inner contradictions, which now grow beyond belief and beyond bearing.

They are at once a torment and a blessing: for if you had not left us the light of conscience, we would not have to endure them.

Teach us to be long-suffering in anguish and insecurity.

Teach us to wait and trust.

Grant light, grant strength and patience to all who work for peace,

To this Congress, our President, our military forces, and our adversaries.

Grant us prudence in proportion to our power,

Wisdom in proportion to our science,

Humaneness in proportion to our wealth and might.

And bless our earnest will to help all races and peoples to travel, in friendship with us,

Along the road to justice, liberty and lasting peace:

But grant us above all to see that our ways are not necessarily your ways,

That we cannot fully penetrate the mystery of your designs

And that the very storm of power now raging on this earth

Reveals your hidden will and your inscrutable decision.

Grant us to see your face in the lightning of this cosmic storm,

O God of holiness, merciful to men:

Grant us to seek peace where it is truly found!

In your will, O God, is our peace!

Amen

[read in the House of Representatives by Congressman Frank Kowalski (D, Connecticut) April 12, 1962, the Wednesday in Holy Week.]

[See *Passion for Peace: The Social Essays of Thomas Merton*, Crossroad, 1997]

Return-Path: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "Daryl Kimball" <dtkimball@clw.org>, "Marie Rietmann" <ctbt@2020vision.org>,  
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: RE: Draft letter to Virginians  
Date: Mon, 14 Dec 1998 10:14:59 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igce.igc.org id HAA11596

Howard --

Thanks for initiating this "Virginia Campaign".

I would change the order of the request. The most important thing Warner could do is to schedule hearings on the CTBT before his Armed Services Committee sometime this spring. As a new committee chair, I think he is unlikely to ask another committee chair to hold hearings in their committee. Holding hearings in the Armed Services Committee send the same message. I think there is some chance he will hold hearings.

A few wording changes I would make to change slightly the tone

> publicly announce his support for the CTBT

I would drop the word "publicly". It doesn't really matter how he communicates this to other Republican Senators.

> personally urge Senator Helms and Senator Lott

Again I would drop "personally". It doesn't matter how he communicates this to Helms and Lott.

Thanks!

David

\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ 1 LINE REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT igc.apc.org \$\$\$\$\$\$\$

To: skerr@clw.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Coolfont  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Suzy,

I want to go to the Coolfont retreat. You sent me the planning questionnaire, agenda, and enrollee list but not an application. I assume the cost is twice the rate per night. Who does the check go to?

Howard

To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: CTBT strategy outline  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Daryl,

Would you please send me a copy of the CTBT strategy outline via e-mail so that I can forward it to members of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT? Send it as text in your message rather than as an attachment, for sometimes I have trouble downloading attachments.

Thanks,  
Howard

To: Suzy Kerr <skerr@clw.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Coolfont  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Suzy - My fax is 301 896-0013. Howard

At 09:37 AM 12/14/98 -0500, Suzy Kerr wrote:

>Howard - the check goes to me and is made out to the Council for a Livable  
>World Education Fund and send me your fax # and I will send over a  
>registration form that you can send in with your check. SuzyAt 07:29 AM  
>12/14/98 -0800, you wrote:

>>Suzy,

>>

>>I want to go to the Coolfont retreat. You sent me the planning  
>>questionnaire, agenda, and enrollee list but not an application. I assume  
>>the cost is twice the rate per night. Who does the check go to?

>>

>>Howard

>>

>>

>

>

To: phil  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Senator Warner  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

As Virginian, can you find out the fax number and e-mail address for Senator Warner? I'm getting out an alert to Virginians on the CTBT.

Thanks,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 15 Dec 1998 07:54:43 GMT  
From: geowcpuk@gn.apc.org (George Farebrother)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Sir Hugh Beach Article  
To: Abolition-Caucus@igc.apc.org, a-days@motherearth.org  
X-Sender: geowcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org (Unverified)

Dear Abolitionists

Following is part of an article on NATO which twins well with General Lee Butler's to the German Government in arguing authoritatively for no first use. .

George Farebrother  
.....

NATO AND NO FIRST USE: GENERAL SIR HUGH BEACH  
Part of an article published in the Bulletin of Arms Control, Number 32, December 1998, Published by the Centre for Arms Control in Association with the Centre for Defence Studies, Kings College, London.

The NATO Doctrine of Flexible Response

The NATO role deserves further discussion. Under the terms of the North Atlantic Treaty, members undertake to treat an attack upon any one of them as an attack upon all. Supposing that a member country of NATO (take, for example, Hungary) is under threat. For a nuclear response to be considered the assailant must be a nuclear weapon state (eg Russia) or a state acting in association with a nuclear weapon state (eg Ukraine supported by Russia). Otherwise, the assailant is protected from nuclear threat by Britain under the Negative Security Assurance given to all non-nuclear states party to the NPT. Under the present doctrine of flexible response NATO's threat of nuclear 'first use' comes into play when a member state is threatened by a conventional assault so massive that it cannot be fended off by conventional defensive means alone....

... So, we have to believe that in such dire circumstances, rather than see our ally overrun, the British would go it alone and threaten the use of nuclear weapons in order to force the aggressor to desist and come to the negotiating table. The question then arises whether our putative nuclear strike should be targeted on the attacking forces in Hungary, for which the Hungarians might not thank us, or perhaps on Russia as the nuclear backer of the assailant. In either case a likely result would be that Britain, having broken the taboo on nuclear use, would then be subject to massive nuclear retaliation. Putting Birmingham, Manchester and London at hazard in defence of Budapest is a contingency that few Britons would accept if it were spelled out to them. How realistic is such a scenario anyway? A rationale of this kind may have had some plausibility at the height of the Cold War. Today it is flimsy to the point of absurdity.

In any case the first use of nuclear weapons by NATO, in response to a massive conventional attack that could not be contained by other means, is quite outdated. It is NATO that now enjoys the great preponderance of conventional forces in Europe. The existing doctrine of flexible response should logically be replaced in NATO by a policy under which the use of nuclear weapons by any member of the alliance would be countenanced only in retaliation for use of nuclear weapons against a member of the alliance. Russia could then be invited to revert to its own previous No First Use (NW) posture. Since this is already the declared position of China the way would be open for a mutual pledge of NFU among the five nuclear powers together with an undertaking to follow this up with a legally binding treaty. A logical corollary would be the final removal of all American nuclear warheads back to the US. This would open the way to negotiating a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone for Europe, perhaps under the aegis of the UN. The point to repeat is that this would not prejudice in any way the security of any NATO member nor compromise the core concept of deterrence for the nuclear powers. The resulting improved atmosphere via-a-vis the Russians could pay dividends not only in the arms control arena (START) but also in making the expansion of NATO more palpably innocuous, giving more substance to the 'Partnership for Peace' and the 'Foundation Act' between Russia and NATO. This would be good for the future stability of Europe. And, progress along these lines would play well in such areas as the NATO review process, perhaps assisting progress towards a fissile material cut-off and acceptance of the CTBT by India and Pakistan. There is no reason whatsoever why Britain should not give the lead.

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-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Tue, 15 Dec 1998 11:07:33 +0100  
From: Beatrice MERAHI <bem@wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-1: December bulletin from Colombo, Sri Lanka  
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Reply-To: Beatrice MERAHI <bem@wcc-coe.org>

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

Colombo Peace to the City Campaign  
December 1998 Bulletin

In this issue:

1. Programme for peace undertaken by peace organisations on Human Rights Day (December 10, 1998)
2. National Peace Council Delegation told that LTTE is prepared to conditionally give up demand for separate state
3. Report of exposure visit to Mannar for grassroots politicians organised by the National Peace Council (November 17- 20, 1998)
4. Press Release 11.12.98  
Government must respond to LTTE offer

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

1. PROGRAMME FOR PEACE UNDERTAKEN BY PEACE ORGANISATIONS  
ON HUMAN RIGHTS DAY (DECEMBER 10, 1998)

On December 10, International Human Rights Day, more than 5000 people braved the torrential rains that have come unexpectedly in the wake of El Nino. They staged a two hour long march for peace in the heart of Colombo, around the Colombo Municipal Council. The event, which was organised by several civic organisations led by the Movement for Inter Racial Justice and Equality (MIRJE), the National Peace Council and the Centre for Society and Religion (CSR) was yet another manifestation of the steady build up of public opinion against the protracted war in the country.

Those who marched for peace were mostly Sinhalese from the rural parts of the country, many being from the districts bordering the north-east. In addition there were a fair number of Colombo-based peace activists, again mostly Sinhalese. As they marched they shouted slogans, which were also displayed on banners, such as "So many have died, their numbers are unknown," "War does not win peace," and "Don't wage the war on the people's behalf."

Following the march the crowd gathered under umbrellas in the open air

amphitheatre of the nearby Vihara Maha Devi Park to listen to several speeches and exhortations by leading monks such as the Ven. Buddiyagame Chandraratne, intellectuals such as S.G. Punchihewa and journalists such as Sunanda Deshapriya. Said one slogan, "However justified a war may seem, never forget that war is evil." Those involved in fighting a war would surely feel uncomfortable with such a message.

As the peace march took place during the late afternoon, and on a main road, the peace marchers had to compete at times with the traffic. But there seemed to be a general spirit of goodwill. Many drivers slowed down their vehicles to get a better view of the banners. There was some concern among the organisers that an attempt might be made to disrupt the event as had occurred a few weeks earlier at the inaugural meeting of the National Alliance for Peace. But those who had gathered in the cause of peace were too large a number for a few agitators to intimidate them by any threat of violence. No one opposed or questioned the peace marchers who included a large number of women and youth.

## 2. NATIONAL PEACE COUNCIL DELEGATION TOLD THAT LTTE IS PREPARED TO CONDITIONALLY GIVE UP DEMAND FOR SEPARATE STATE

The Bishop of Mannar Rayappu Joseph referring to a letter handed over by the LTTE to the President of South Africa Nelson Mandela said that he believed that the LTTE had given up its demand for a separate state but was demanding that the solution must be based on the Thimpu Principles. He added that for any meaningful discussions to end the conflict there was a need for a "cross party consensus" on the principles for negotiations based on the four Thimpu principles.

The Bishop was addressing a bipartisan delegation of PA and UNP Pradeshiya Sabha members from Matara. The 6 Pradeshiya Sabha members, some of whom were chairmen of their respective Sabhas, were on an exposure visit to see for themselves the situation in the war torn areas of the country with a view to people-to-people bridge building.

Bishop Joseph also said that there was a misperception that the Catholic Church in the north was supportive of violence, but this was not so. "The Church is against violence. The Church is against war. But that does not mean we want the people to be inert. People must have their rights and the Church will be by their side."

It is clear that the Bishop is emerging as the leading spokesman for civil society in Mannar, which is the only district in the country to have a Catholic majority. Senior military sources said even they recognised this fact. The Catholic Church had become the bridge between the army and the people though they suspected some of the clergy to be sympathetic to the LTTE. They said that this role also enabled the Catholic Church to increase the number of adherents.

The delegation from the south also met the Citizens Committee of Mannar who said that if there was a bipartisan consensus on a "genuine federal solution" they would be prepared to take it up with the LTTE leadership.

They said that the government's devolution package was not acceptable as it had been watered down greatly, and also as it did not have a consensus in the south and they feared it would come to nothing.

Several members also expressed their ire at the statement of President Kumaratunga in South Africa that the Tamils were not original inhabitants of the country and were simply a minority. They said that this attitude towards the Tamils was one that informed all actions of the government to their detriment, including indiscriminate aerial bombardment.

Later at a meeting with members of the Mannar town community, the delegation was told that the people would rise against the LTTE if they did not accept a "genuine and just" solution. "We understand that much of our hardships, such as queues for passes and shortages comes from the war situation. What we want are not favours, but we want our rights as an equal people in this country."

### 3. REPORT OF EXPOSURE VISIT TO MANNAR FOR GRASSROOTS POLITICIANS ORGANISED BY THE NATIONAL PEACE COUNCIL (NOVEMBER 17- 20, 1998)

A six member group of Pradeshiya Sabha members from the Matara district both of the UNP and the PA were taken on an exposure visit to Mannar. They were accompanied by representatives of the National Peace Council. The group went in two vans with an authorising letter under the hand of a co-ordinator of the Sudu Nelum Movement of the government, without which it would have been virtually impossible to gain clearance at the main Cheddikulam check-point on the route to Mannar.

The journey to Mannar took an entire day and was an experience in itself. It impressed upon us the very stringent screening system adopted by the government to ensure that there is no infiltration by the LTTE. To civilian eyes the stretch from Cheddikulam to Mannar seems vulnerable with few soldiers stationed at long intervals on either sides of the road. Upon arriving in Mannar we linked with a local NGO Valvuthayam, which arranged accommodation. We regrouped that night after dinner and discussed the programme for the next day.

November 18, 1998

The day commenced with a visit to the main military clearance point to collect a route pass. The route pass was issued for the village we desired to visit, but we were warned by members of the Security Forces that we should not proceed beyond Murunkan the last military check-point on the border of the cleared area. On our way to Murunkan we stopped at the Uyilankulam check-point. This was the entry point for civilians from the uncleared areas. We saw the great numbers of men and women who thronged to the entry point in order to be cleared to proceed to either Mannar or Vavuniya.

Upon conversing with the people we were able to understand better the plight of these people. It appeared that they had to pay a fee to the LTTE in order to be allowed to go to the cleared area. Their journey to reach

the entry point was also an arduous one. There were men past their prime who said that they had cycled a hundred miles to get to Uyilankulam. They were allowed to come to the cleared area on three days a week. But those who failed to make it on time to the check-point often had to turn back and return the next day.

The clearance process we observed was very slow. When asked why the process could not be speeded up, officers at the site said that the troop strength was insufficient. One officer even noted that it was no surprise that the people hated the them. "They hate us for the uniform that we wear. They do not realise that these are systems that we must follow," he said.

Soon after, we went to the village in the Murunkan region. There we met some villagers and the principal of the school. The principal bemoaned that the curtailing of such items as Kerosene impacted adversely on the education of student in the area and generally gave an overview of the shortcomings experienced by them.

We also met a group of villagers whom we asked who they wished their leader to be. Is it Ranil Wickramasinghe?, we asked. No, they replied. Is it Chandrika Kumaratunge? No, they said. Is it Prabhakaran? Their response was a very pregnant silence. One shook his head. But they added that it was all three parties together that could bring about an end to the war. Another we spoke to said that people were disillusioned with the LTTE as the war had gone on for too long. We also inquired whether the women suffered harassment at the hands of the military to which the villagers replied in the negative.

To illustrate the desperation of their situation they said that six-month-old child had died because they had not been able to take her to the hospital for treatment on time. The baby they said had died at the army check-point. The reason for this they said was because the village had no proper medical facility.

Once we had ended our meetings at the village, we returned to Mannar town. The group in the second of the two vehicles stopped at an army camp, where they spent some time with military and visited the Thiruketheeswaran Kovil. The military personnel were pleased to meet civilians from the South and their satisfaction at being able to spend some time with them seemed very evident.

November 19, 1998

The day commenced with a visit to the Bishop of Mannar Dr. Rayappu Joseph. It was midday when we reached his residence that was some distance away from the town within the island itself. The meeting with him was an important in the sense that he seemed to be the civil society leader recognised as such by both the LTTE and the government troops. This also stems from the fact that Mannar is the only district with a majority of Catholics.

The crux of his message was that in his belief the LTTE had given up its demand for a separate state, and also that there must be a cross consensus in the South on the principles of negotiations which must be

based on the Thimpu principles. He said that the view that the Catholic Church was for the war or violence was an erroneous one, but asserted that it did not also encourage the people to be inert. "We are by the people in the demand for their rights," was what he said.

The next stop was in Pesalai, where we first walked along its coast and asked about the problems faced by the people of the who eked out a living through fishing. We then visited a refugee camp in Pesalai where we were discoursed with its inhabitants. The camp consisted of a series of cadjan huts, but the compound was clean. There were those who had lived in the camp for as long as eight years, and others who were transit members awaiting resettlement. Their plight was a sorry one and we were moved by the many tales we heard. It was easy to see that the camp had many visitors, because the little ones were friendly and happy to direct us.

The Pradeshiya Sabha members from the south were visibly moved by what they saw. Many spoke of the shortcomings and the scarcities that they had to cope with. The children, we were told, attended the village school, so that their education was not disrupted.

On our return from Pesalai we met with the Citizens Committee of Mannar, a 15 member body of village elders who included priests. They too spoke of the dire need to end the war and were more specific in terms of the solution they sought. They said that if the South consensually offered a federal form of devolution, they would take up matters with the LTTE and persuade them to accept it. They also raised questions about the statement made by the President in South Africa that the Tamils were not the original people of the country, which they understood as denying their right to the country that they live in.

This meeting was followed by another with the parish members of the principal Mannar church. Among those present were Catholic priests. Here the people expressed their goodwill towards the Sinhala community and said that the personal relationships between the two people were cordial. One speaker said that what the Tamil people desired were not favours in terms of better food, education etc., but their rights. They also articulated the need to defeat extremists on both sides.

#### 4. PRESS RELEASE 11.12.98 GOVERNMENT MUST RESPOND TO LTTE OFFER

The LTTE leader V. Pirapaharan's recent assertion that the doors to peace were not closed and that peace talks with the government could take place with third party mediation poses a challenge to the government. More than two weeks have passed since Mr Pirapaharan's Heroes' Day speech but the government has still not responded in a coherent manner. This is ironic because just a week prior to Mr Pirapaharan's offer, President Kumaratunga assured a delegation of Tamil parliamentarians that the government was prepared to negotiate with the LTTE. The National Peace Council urges the government to respond positively and without further delay to the LTTE leader's significant offer which has been well received in many quarters.

The first step would be for the government and LTTE to create a conducive environment for peace talks by giving utmost priority to the welfare of the civilian population in all parts of the country. A lifting of the government's economic embargo on the north-east, a relaxing of the pass system and a halt to indiscriminate shelling would be essential. Another would be a cessation of LTTE attacks on civilian targets.

The second step, which could also commence immediately would entail the government and opposition coming to a consensus on the basic principles of a negotiated political settlement to which they will be inextricably committed.

At some point, hopefully soon, it would be necessary for the government to revoke the legal ban on the LTTE and recognise it as an organisation with parity of status which would contribute equally, and with equal legitimacy, to the peace process. This third step would be followed by the selection of a national negotiating team which would include the most competent persons for the task, even though they may be from outside the government.

While gestures and statements can be useful in undoing psychological and other blocks in the peace process, the NPC considers the three concrete steps outlined above to be integral parts of a national peace strategy essential in any genuine movement forward towards peace.

National Peace Council  
291/50 Havelock Gardens  
Colombo 6  
Sri Lanka  
Phone/Fax: +94-1-502522  
Email: [peace2@sri.lanka.net](mailto:peace2@sri.lanka.net)  
<http://www.peace-srilanka.org/>

Colombo Peace to the City Campaign Local Coordinator:  
Priyanka Mendis  
Email: [impress@slt.lk](mailto:impress@slt.lk)

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

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

Date: Tue, 15 Dec 1998 18:20:51 GMT

From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: DD 32 on web

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host userp002.uk.uudial.com [193.149.91.1] claimed to be acronym

X-Sender: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org

Dear friends,

this is just to inform you that Disarmament Diplomacy 32 is now on our website. In addition to my comprehensive analysis and summary of the UN first committee debates and votes, with the General Assembly votes on this year's resolutions, there are excellent articles from Lora Lumpe on small arms and by Alexander Kelle on the CWC, as well as the usual news review and documents summary.

Wishing you merry festivities, a relaxing break and a peaceful 1999,  
from

Rebecca Johnson, Sean Howard and Nicola Butler

The Acronym Institute

24, Colvestone Crescent, London E8 2LH, England.

telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857

fax (0) 171 503 9153

website <http://www.gn.apc.org/acronym>

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Tue, 15 Dec 1998 17:04:36 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: btiller@psr.org  
Subject: De-alerting briefing on Hill

Friends,

With regret I must inform you that the projected de-alerting briefing for Senate staffers on Thursday, December 17th has been canceled.

I will spare you the gory details and the gut-wrenching uncertainties that the planners have gone through. Suffice to say that we had problems obtaining a room on the Senate side, we can not make calls to Senate staffers, and the entire press corps will focus on impeachment on Thursday. So, this afternoon the planners made the difficult decision to cancel. We will try to find a date in January or February.

Thanks to all who agreed to cosponsor this event. I am sorry that we had to make this decision, but as of today it seems like the most responsible thing to do.

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller

Return-Path: <panukes>  
Date: Tue, 15 Dec 1998 14:29:47 -0800 (PST)  
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>  
To: amillar@fourthfreedom.org, bmorse@igc.org, btiller@psr.org,  
disarmament@igc.org, hisham@ieer.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, mupj@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org  
Subject: Re: De-alerting briefing on the Hill

While I am also sorry that this event had to be canceled, I feel that you made the absolute right decision.

Bruce

---

> From btiller@psr.org Tue Dec 15 13:02:28 1998  
> Date: Tue, 15 Dec 1998 16:01:16 -0500  
> From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
> Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
> To: hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, mupj@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org,  
> paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, disarmament@igc.org,  
> btiller@psr.org  
> Subject: De-alerting briefing on the Hill  
>  
> Friends,  
>  
> With regret I must inform you that the projected de-alerting briefing  
> for Senate staffers on Thursday, December 17th has been canceled.  
>  
> I will spare you the gory details and the gut-wrenching uncertainties  
> that Howard Hallman, Alistair Millar and I have gone through in the last  
> few days, but I will give you an outline. We never got confirmation of  
> a Senate room for the event, and that meant that we delayed getting  
> notices to Senate offices (and also to NGOs and the media). So we  
> thought we would use the Mott House, even though that meant some loss of  
> prestige. But today the Capitol switchboard is jammed (by impeachment  
> mavens, I suppose), so it is impossible to make telephone calls to  
> inform Senate staffers about the event. That would mean that our  
> attendance would likely be about 2 Senate staffers and 10 NGO people if  
> we went forward with something at the Mott House. I spoke to my media  
> person about putting a major emphasis on getting the press out, and she  
> said forget it. So, this afternoon Howard and Alistair and I made the  
> decision to cancel. We will try to find a date in January or February.  
>  
> I am sorry that we had to make this decision, but as of today it seems  
> like the most responsible thing to do.  
>  
> Shalom,  
> Bob Tiller

---

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Wed, 16 Dec 1998 09:41:42 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: G. Kennan for no-first use

December 15

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Kennan in WP for no-first use

Attached is yet another appeal for a change of the current NATO nuclear policy published in today's Washington Post.

For further commentary, information and documentation relevant to the nuclear first-use/no-first use debate, visit the special section on the Coalition's web site:

<http://www.clw.org/coalition/libiraq.htm>

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

Back To the Nuclear Question

By George F. Kennan

Wednesday, December 16, 1998; Page A31

The press reports of the interest being recently taken by the new German government in the question of "first use of nuclear weaponry" in NATO policies bring to my memory certain happenings of a period a little short of half a century ago, which are not completely irrelevant to that subject.

At the end of 1949, just as I was terminating my period of duty as director of Gen. George C. Marshall's policy planning staff, the United States government was just confronting the question of whether or not to proceed to the development of the hydrogen bomb to replace the less destructive one we had used against the two Japanese cities. Robert Oppenheimer and I, having both been involved with certain of the inner-governmental discussions of this subject, both felt that before taking this fateful step, it would be better for our government to pause a bit and to ask itself just where the adoption and cultivation of this new form of weaponry might lead us. We both recognized the danger that if the weapons of mass destruction were to be built into our regular military posture, we might find ourselves deeply committed to this sort of imagined warfare, and our commitment might stand in the way of further progress in the elimination of weapons of this nature.

In the first days of January 1950, I, having just been relieved of my own official duties and responsibilities, wrote a personal letter to the new secretary of state, Dean Acheson, on this subject. I described the question as I then saw it: Would we proceed to develop this weapon and to build our defense posture around it? Or would we regard it as something to be held, reluctantly, in reserve for use only in response to a nuclear attack against us, but leaving us free to go as far as the other nuclear powers were prepared to go in efforts to eliminate this form of weaponry from international arsenals?

Our public position, I wrote, should be this: "We deplore the existence of all weapons of indiscriminate mass destruction. We regret that we were ever obliged to make use of one. We hope never to have to do so again. We do not propose ever to do so, unless we are forced to it by the use of such weapons against us. Meanwhile, we remain prepared to go very far, to show considerable confidence in others, and to accept a certain risk for ourselves, in order to achieve international agreement on [the removal of such weapons] from international arsenals; for we can think of nothing more dangerous than a continued international competition in their development."

In support of this position I argued, among other things, that no victory and no security were to be won for our people by the sort of destruction these devices were capable of working. The results they could produce would mean at best only a deterioration of the conditions of civilization for people everywhere, including ourselves. The victories that mattered never would be real victories unless they involved changes -- beneficial changes, changes leading in the direction of greater tolerance and forbearance and hopefulness -- in the minds of men; and such changes could never be brought about by sheer destruction, and particularly the destruction of innocent life on so vast and indiscriminate a scale.

I can recall no reply from Mr. Acheson, but some days later, on Jan. 15, 1950, President Truman announced the intention of our government to proceed with the development of the new nuclear weapon.

Were I to be asked how the statements I brought forward in that letter might appear to me today, I would have to say that not only do I stand by every word of them but also I consider their reasoning to have been richly confirmed, reinforced and strengthened by the events of the intervening half-century.

This being the case, I can only commend the insight and courage shown by the new German government in bringing this subject once more to international attention. I hope that all the major nuclear powers will take their policies under scrutiny and will ask themselves today, as we and they might well have done five decades ago, where our rejection of the principle of "no first use" has led us to date, and what effect it promises to have on the development of international security in the future.

-- The writer is a retired American diplomat and a historian.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 15 Dec 1998 16:37:30 -0500  
From: Stephen Young <syoun@basicint.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Butler Letter to NATO Defense Ministers  
To: Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>  
X-Accept-Language: en  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id NAB24892

Dear Friends,

Gen. Lee Butler, who earlier sent a letter to German Foreign Minister Fischer in support of raising no first use issues within NATO, has sent a similar letter to all of NATO's defense ministers.

Please feel free to use this letter in your work.

Stephen Young  
Senior Analyst  
BASIC

+ + + + +

10 December 1998

Jean-Pol Poncelet  
Minister of Defense  
Belgian Ministry of Defense  
Belgium  
Via Fax: 32-2-550-29-19

Dear Defense Minister Poncelet,

German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer's suggestion that NATO revise its nuclear doctrine is most welcome. As you discuss these matters with your colleagues it may be that my own experience in thinking through this question as the Director of Strategic Plans and Policy for the U. S. armed forces during the Gulf war might be helpful. I was equally engaged in the matter of prospective nuclear response to attack by WMD during my tenure as Commander-in-Chief of U. S. Strategic Command during the period 1991 to 1994.

As you are keenly aware, the Gulf War presented us with the very real possibility of confronting such an attack by the forces of Iraq. We went through the exercise of imagining how it might unfold and examining a variety of response options. My personal conclusion was that under any likely attack scenario, a nuclear reply by the United States and its allies was simply out of the question.

First, from a purely military perspective, the coalition forces had the conventional capability to impose any desired war termination objectives on Iraq, to include unconditional surrender and occupation. For a

variety of reasons, we elected not to go to that extreme but it was clearly an option in the face of a WMD attack.

Second, given our conventional superiority, and the nature of the war zone, the use of nuclear weapons simply made no tactical nor strategic sense. General Powell noted in his memoirs that several weapons would have been required to mount any sort of effective campaign against military targets, an option that Secretary Cheney immediately rejected - and understandably so. Further, whatever the immediate battlefield effects, the problems of radioactive fall-out carrying over into friendly forces or surrounding countries were unfathomable.

Third, the larger political issues were insurmountable. What could possibly justify our resort to the very means we properly abhor and condemn? How could we hold an entire society accountable for the decision of a single demented leader who holds his own country hostage? Moreover, the consequences for the nonproliferation regime would have been severe. By joining our enemy in shattering the tradition of non-use that had held for 45 years, we would have destroyed U.S. credibility as leader of the campaign against nuclear proliferation; indeed, we would likely have emboldened a whole new array of nuclear aspirants.

In short, in a singular act we would have martyred our principal foe, alienated our friends, destroyed the coalition so painstakingly constructed, given comfort to the non-declared nuclear states and impetus to states who seek such weapons covertly.

In the end, we tried to have it both ways, privately ruling out a nuclear reply while maintaining an ambiguous declaratory policy. The infamous and widely misre-presented letter from Secretary Baker to Baghdad was ill-advised; in fact, Iraq violated with impunity one of its cardinal prohibitions by torching Kuwait's oil fields.

When I left my J-5 post in Washington and took up this issue as CINCSTRAT, I found all of the foregoing cautions to be relevant across a wide spectrum of prospective targets in a variety of so-called rogue nations. I ultimately concluded that whatever the utility of a First Use policy during the Cold War, it is entirely inappropriate to the new global security environment; worse, it is counterproductive to the goal of nonproliferation and antithetical to the values of democratic societies.

Please forgive this rather abrupt intrusion into your deliberations. Obviously, I would not take such a liberty if I did not believe it was warranted by the import and the urgency of the issue.

Warm regards,

Lee Butler  
General, USAF (Retired)  
11122 Williams Plaza  
Omaha, NE 68144

+ + + + +

The letter was sent to the following officials.

Jean-Pol Poncelet  
Minister of Defense  
Belgian Ministry of Defense  
Belgium  
Via Fax: 32-2-550-29-19

Art Eggleton  
Minister of Defense  
Canadian Department of National Defense  
Canada  
Via Fax: 613-995-8189

Hans Haekkerup  
Minister of Defense  
Royal Danish Ministry of Defense  
Denmark  
Via Fax: 45-33-32-0655

Akis Tsohatzopoulos  
Minister of Defense  
Greek Ministry of Defense  
Greece  
Via Fax: 301-644-3832

Eduardo Serra Rexach  
Minister of Defense  
Spanish Ministry of Defense  
Spain  
Via Fax: 34-91-55-63958

Joris Voorhoeve  
Minister of Defense  
Dutch Ministry of Defense  
The Netherlands  
Via Fax: 31-70-345-9189

Ismet Sezgin  
Minister of Defense  
Turkish Ministry of Defense  
Turkey  
Via Fax: 90-312-418-3384

Jose Veiga Simao  
Minister of Defense  
Portugese Ministry of Defense  
Portugal  
Via Fax: 351-1-301-95-55

Beniamino Andreatta  
Minister of Defense  
Italian Ministry of Defense  
Italy  
Via Fax: 39-06-488-5756

Rudolf Scharping  
Minister of Defense  
German Ministry of Defense  
Germany  
Via Fax: 49-228-12-5255

Dag Jostein Fjævoll  
Minister of Defense  
Norwegian Ministry of Defense  
Norway  
Via Fax: 47-23-09-2323

George Roberston  
Minster of Defence  
UK Ministry of Defence  
United Kingdom  
Via Fax: 44-171-218-7140

Alain Richard  
Minister of Defense  
French Ministry of Defense  
France  
Via Fax: 33-1-47-05-40-91

Halldur Asgrimsson  
Minister of Foreign Affairs  
Icelandic Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Iceland  
Via Fax: 354-562-2373

Alex Bodry  
Foreign Minister  
Ministere de la Force Publique  
Luxembourg  
Via Fax: 352-46-26-82

Return-Path: <skerr@clw.org>

X-Sender: skerr@[209.8.25.194]

Date: Wed, 16 Dec 1998 11:15:03 -0500

To: heeter@csbahome.com, jdi@clw.org, chellman@cdi.org, joe@fcn.org,  
kathy@fcn.org, bridget@fcn.org, paexec@igc.org, paprog@igc.org,  
btiller@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org, vision@igc.org, wandwill@clark.net,  
AIMbasic@aol.com, pdd@clark.net, disarmament@igc.org, johnpike@fas.org,  
73744.3675@compuserve.com, mupj@igc.org, meldredge@igc.org,  
pogodef@mnsinc.com, ralph@taxpayer.net, tperry@ucsusa.org,  
mupj@igc.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, davidhart@igc.org, jill@vi.org,  
wfa@igc.org, sraikin@aol.com, defense@pogo.org, jaquith@mindspring.com,  
shaer@wand.org, cunr@aol.com, dculp@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org,  
ggilhool@ix.netcom.com, brian@taxpayer.net

From: Suzy Kerr <skerr@clw.org>

Subject: Bad News

As bad news goes this year, this is not all that bad, but will be for all a hassle.

Coolfont notified me that I was not given the correct room rates for the conference this year and that in addition there is now a restaurant service charge. It is partly their fault and partly mine -- theirs because they quoted me the wrong amount over the phone so that I could get the forms out to all of you and mine because after all of these years, I never looked over the contract when it arrived. Mea Culpa...

For those who sent in money for DOUBLE OCCUPANCY, you owe an additional \$11.70 total. Please be prepared to pay it at the desk when you check in.

For those who sent in money for SINGLE OCCUPANCY, you owe an additional \$31.70 total. That includes the restaurant charge and an additional \$10 each night. Please be prepared to pay it at the desk when you check in.

I am letting you know now so that you can get a company check made out to Coolfont (be sure the name of the guest is on it somewhere) to bring with you or that you bring your own credit card or check to cover the extra charge.

I am very sorry for the inconvenience. I didn't really lie - you were only misled!

The break down:

|                                    |          |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| Single Occupancy rate: (not \$109) | \$119    |
| Restaurant Service Charge          | \$ 5.85  |
| cost per person, per night:        | \$124.85 |

Double Occupancy Rate:

|                             |          |
|-----------------------------|----------|
| Rate per person, Per night: | \$99     |
| Restaurant Service Charge:  | 5.85     |
| Cost per person, per night: | \$104.85 |

To: phil  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Coolfont  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

I've just been notified that the cost for the Coolfont retreat is \$11.70 more than I specified, or a total of \$209.70. If you haven't drawn up the check I requested, please make it for the higher amount. Otherwise, please draw up a second check for the additional amount.

Thanks,  
Howard

Return-Path: <lparty@pacbell.net>  
Date: Wed, 16 Dec 1998 14:25:41 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: lparty@pacbell.net (Unverified)  
To: MLaff25@aol.com  
From: Da Vid <lparty@pacbell.net>  
Subject: Christmas Gifts That Last

## Christmas Gifts That Last

There's a song about Christmas and "my two front teeth," which we won't repeat here: But it's deeply satisfying to consider a Christmas list of enduring, worthwhile gifts that would fit into any size stocking. Here are several that are at the top of my list:

**JOY:** I would like to recapture some of the exhilaration of the gospel accounts of the birth of Jesus, especially the wonder felt by the shepherds at the angel's "good tidings of great joy." Such gladness would not be confined to any group or time period but enrich the lives of all people. That joy, springing from the changeless unity of God and His children, has proved timeless, and remains central to the lives of millions of believers throughout the world today. Think also of the indescribable joy experienced by the wise men when they caught their first glimpse of the star in the skies over Bethlehem.

**LIGHT:** Mary Baker Eddy, the woman who founded The Christian Science Monitor, wrote of that star: "The star that looked lovingly down on the manger of our Lord, lends its resplendent light to this hour: the light of Truth, to cheer, guide, and bless man as he reaches forth for the infant idea of divine perfection dawning upon human imperfection, - that calms man's fears, bears his burdens, beckons him on to Truth and Love and the sweet immunity these bring from sin, sickness, and death." I'd be delighted to find that light in my stocking!

**WISDOM:** In the second chapter of Luke we read, "And the child (Jesus) grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom." He wasn't just smart for his age; he was filled with wisdom. Just think how much hassle we could avoid if we approached every difficulty with the God-endowed wisdom that Jesus assured us was just as much ours as his. Imagine going through the year ahead enriched by the breadth of God's understanding, the depth of His insight, and the heights attainable through His inspiration. Divine wisdom does this for us. "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom." we are assured in Proverbs, "and the man that getteth understanding... Her ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace" (3:13, 17).

**PEACE:** Wouldn't it be great to find peace on every pathway, with a two-way exchange of friendliness, respect, encouragement? This is the "peace upon earth among men of goodwill" of which Luke spoke (2:14, J. B. Phillips, "The New Testament in Modern English"). And isn't this peace an expression of God's wisdom, which understands there is only one good will, God's will, governing people and nations?

**GRACE:** Along with wisdom and peace, Jesus found that "the grace of God was upon him." Grace is one of those qualities that seem to defy easy

definition. This divine influence flows ceaselessly to us from God, even if unsought or apparently undeserved. But note that in the Gospels it is assumed that recipients of God's grace will perform deeds of grace, as Jesus did - which suggests we might add to our Christmas list a notebook to which to record our good works!

LOVE: Everyone would probably like to have stockings overflowing with love - a quality that Jesus helped us to identify, cherish, and exemplify. This, after all, is the essence of Christmas. The Apostle Paul described the love given to us by God as "slow to lose patience" and one that "looks for a way of being constructive." He said it is "not possessive: it is neither anxious to impress nor does it cherish inflated ideas of its own importance." It is a love that "knows no limit to its endurance, no end to its trust, no fading of its hope; it can outlast anything" (see Phillips, I Cor. 13:1-13). This is the kind of love I'd like to receive every day. The kind that, when truly made our own, we simply cannot resist sharing with others.

Yet, perhaps the best gift of all is the realization that as God's sons and daughters, made in His likeness, we are already beneficiaries of "all things that pertain unto life and godliness" (II Pet. 1:3).

We might even abandon our lists. Our stockings are already full!

(Reprint, The Christian Science Monitor, November 29, 1998 edition)

To: phil  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Coolfont  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

Since writing you, I received the check for \$198 for Coolfont. If you haven't already written the extra check, forget it. I'll pay at the desk at Coolfont and seek reimbursement.

Howard

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Thu, 17 Dec 1998 08:25:24 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Coolfont  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

I'll just send along a check for the balance payable to you based on your two messages.

Merry Christmas!

Phil

To: bmorse@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, btiller@psr.org, hisham@ieer.org,  
amillar@fourthfreedom.org, disarmament@igc.org, laura@2020vision.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Cancelled De-alerting Forum  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

As I watched the House debate on the Iraq resolution, I realized that it was just as well that we cancelled the De-alerting Forum. We couldn't have possibly competed with the "support our armed services" drumbeat and the Republican counterpoint "we have to increase defense spending". In addition, C-Span II, which we hoped to tap, featured the House of Commons debate.

Nevertheless, we have the right idea, so I hope we can reschedule the event in the early months of 1999.

For this first attempt special thanks to Alistair Millar for lining up speakers and to Bob Tiller for obtaining NGO co-sponsors, adding a speaker, and getting announcements ready.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3  
Date: Thu, 17 Dec 1998 14:13:30 -0500  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) New Agenda UN vote: op-ed  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id MAA18629

Dear Friends,

Below is an article I wrote on the UN vote in which all of our NATO allies, with the exception of Turkey, UK and France resisted US pressure and voted for speedier steps to disarmament. While this unprecedented breach in the NATO wall (thanks in large part to grassroots lobbying by our global Network) has received extensive coverage internationally, there has been no word of it in the US. Please consider writing your own, or using this one, as well as letters to the editor, etc. about US lawless behavior. In light of the awful events in Iraq, it's becomes ever more urgent that the American public know how out of step our own country is, even with our allies.

#### TIME FOR A NEW NUCLEAR POLICY AGENDA by Alice Slater

Calling on the nuclear weapons states "to demonstrate an unequivocal commitment to the speedy and total elimination" of their nuclear arsenals, the New Agenda Coalition of eight nations-- Ireland, Sweden, New Zealand, South Africa, Mexico, Brazil, Egypt and Slovenia-- won an extraordinary victory in the UN this December on their resolution for a new nuclear policy agenda. Despite intense lobbying by United States envoys in capitols all over the world, urging governments to vote against the resolution, it passed by a vote of 114 in favor, 18 against and 38 abstentions. Slovenia, a NATO-wannabe, had to withdraw its sponsorship and voted to abstain after some arm-twisting by Uncle Sam.

Overturning long-standing precedent, all of the non-nuclear NATO nations with the exception of Turkey withstood heavy-handed pressure from the US, aided by France and the UK, breaking ranks to abstain on the resolution. Canada, emulating its leadership role in pushing through the landmines treaty and International Criminal Court agreement over US objections, sent representatives to NATO capitols urging those nations to resist US pressure. Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Greece, Spain, Belgium, Luxembourg, Iceland, Portugal, and Denmark, as well as non-NATO allies Japan and Australia all rejected the rusty cold war position of the US.

The New Agenda Coalition has issued a clarion call to the nuclear weapons states and the nuclear capable states which are not members of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (India, Pakistan, Israel), to take more immediate and practical steps towards nuclear disarmament, urging that we not enter the next millenium without a clear and rapid path towards the elimination of nuclear weapons. The US strenuously objected in the UN debate to the New Agenda's call

to review existing nuclear strategic doctrines and to dealert all nuclear weapons, stating that such measures would undermine its policy of nuclear deterrence.

The new German Foreign Minister recently issued a call that NATO adopt a no first use policy, although Germany's Defense Minister, on a subsequent visit to

Washington avoided a clear statement on no first use, responding to US pressure

and expressions of alarm that NATO Cold War doctrine might actually be changed to conform to new realities. Canada's Foreign Affairs Committee recently issued a parliamentary report urging that Canada and NATO allies should work with the New Agenda Coalition and encourage the nuclear weapons states to conclude negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. It also endorsed the de-alerting of all nuclear weapons, and called upon the government to "argue forcefully" for a re-examination of NATO's nuclear policy.

Now is the time for the US to heed its allies and begin taking the practical steps recommended by the New Agenda Coalition. With the Y2K problem threatening uncertain possibilities for tragic nuclear accidents due to faulty computer programming, taking our weapons off hair-trigger alert is particularly

appealing. Reports from Russia that the Duma is likely to pass START II, reducing arsenals to about 3500 deployed strategic warheads in each country, and then to move for cuts much deeper than the 2500 warheads contemplated under

START III, is an added further incentive for the US to support the lead of its partners in NATO and friends in the New Agenda Coalition by moving towards meaningful nuclear disarmament.

The continued reliance on nuclear weapons as instruments of national security is a provocative invitation to other nations to acquire themwitness events in India and Pakistan. It's time to put the cold war behind us and negotiate a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons. By clinging so obdurately to its useless and dangerous nuclear capability, the US is perceived by other nations as having joined the league of so-called "rogue" states which use the terror of weapons of mass destruction as an instrument of policy. The US should join with its allies in working rapidly to eliminate the nuclear scourge. It must not repeat the tragic and shameful conduct that led to its pariah status on the landmines and International Criminal Court treaties.

Alice Slater  
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment (GRACE)  
15 East 26th Street, Room 915

New York, NY 10010  
tel: (212) 726-9161  
fax: (212) 726-9160  
email: [aslater@gracelinks.org](mailto:aslater@gracelinks.org)

GRACE is a member of Abolition 2000, a global network working for a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons.

-

To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "[majordomo@xmission.com](mailto: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.

To: relctbt  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Senator Warner and the CTBT  
Cc: ctbt  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

At recent meetings on the CTBT we have decided that it would be worthwhile to give some attention to Senator John Warner of Virginia. He is a moderate Republican and will be chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee in the next Congress.

Therefore, we ask you to contact your key constituents in Virginia after the first of the year. To assist you I have drafted a letter to Virginians, which you may use, modify, or replace with your own version. I would appreciate learning what you have done and any feedback you have on Senator Warner's response.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

Sample letter on CTBT for use in Virginia

Dear Virginian:

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is now before the U.S. Senate for ratification. By banning all nuclear explosions, the CTBT will curb the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, help guard against the renewal of the arms race, and establish an extensive global monitoring and verification system. It has been signed by over 150 countries, including the five long-standing nuclear weapon states: United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China. In order for the treaty to enter into force and become international law, it must be ratified by the United States and 43 other nuclear-capable countries. Accordingly, action by the U.S. Senate is urgently needed.

President Clinton submitted the CTBT to the Senate for ratification on September 24, 1997. It was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for consideration, but so far Senator Jesse Helms, committee chair, has refused to schedule hearings on the treaty. Moreover, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott has not been willing to schedule a vote by the Senate on the CTBT. We and other supporters of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty believe that it is important for hearings to start as quickly as possible and for the Senate as a whole to debate and vote on the treaty during the 1999 session.

Senator John Warner of Virginia is now taking over as chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee and can therefore play a key leadership role in achieving CTBT ratification. We ask you to get in touch with Senator Warner and urge him to publicly announce his support for the CTBT. Request him to have the Armed Services Committee schedule fair and open hearings on the CTBT in the near future. Also, ask him to talk with Senator Lott about placing the CTBT on the Senate schedule for floor action in 1999.

You can reach Senator John Warner at Russell Senate Office Building, Room 225, Washington, DC 20500; telephone, 202 224-2023; fax, 202 224-6295; or e-mail: senator@warner.senate.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Organizational signer



Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 17 Dec 1998 15:02:24 -0500  
From: Peace through Reason <prop1@prop1.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Head of State EMAIL Addresses FWD  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org

Thanks to Tom Boland <wgcp@earthlink.net> for sending this.

## HEAD F STATE E-MAIL LIST

Countries are listed alphabetically  
by their common english usage  
(ie.Ivory Coast, North Korea, etc.).

These e-mail addresses are up to date  
as of November 1, 1998.

Albania, Prime Minister Pandeli Majko postmaster@minjash.tirana.al

Antigua and Barbuda, Prime Minister Lester Bird pmo@candw.ag

Argentina, Presidente Dr. Carlos Saul Menem spyd@presidencia.gov.ar

Armenia, President Robert Kocharian president@president.am

Australia, Prime Minister John Howard <http://www.pm.gov.au/comments.htm>

Austria, Federal Chancellor Viktor Klima vklima@spoe.or.at

Azerbaijan, President Geidar Aliyev postmaster@lider.azerbaijan.su

Barbados, Prime Minister Owen Arthur foreign@caribsurf.com

Belgium, Prime Minister M. Jean-Luc Dehaene info@belgium.be

Brazil, President Fernando Henrique Cardoso pr@planalto.gov.br

Bulgaria, President Petar Stoyanov president@president.bg

Cameroon, President Paul Biya celcom@camnet.cm

Canada, Prime Minister Jean Chretien pm@pm.gc.ca

Chad, President Idriss Deby presidency@tchad.td

Chile, President Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle webmaster@presidencia.cl

Colombia, Presidente Andres Pastrana Arango pastrana@presidencia.gov.co

Costa Rica, President Miguel Angel Rodriguez Echeverria

rherrera@ns.casapres.go.cr

Croatia, President Dr. Franjo Tudjman www-admin@president.hr

Czech Republic, President Vaclav Havel president@hrad.cz

Denmark, Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen stm@stm.dk

Dominica, President Crispin Anselm Sorhaindo sorhaindoch@cwdom.dm

Dominica, Prime Minister Edison James pmoffice@cwdom.dm

Dominican Republic, President Leonel Fernandez Reyna  
correspondencias@presidencia.gov.do

Ecuador, President Jamil Mahuad Witt webmast@mmrree.gov.ec

Egypt, President Mohammed Hosni Mubarak webmaster@presidency.gov.eg

El Salvador, President Armando Calderon Sol presidente@casapres.gob.sv

Estonia, President Lennart Meri sekretar@vpk.ee

Estonia, Prime Minister Mart Siimann valitsus@rk.ee

Fiji, President Kamisese Mara info@fiji.gov.fj

Finland, President Martii Ahtisaari presidentti@tpk.vn.fi

France, Prime Minister Lionel Jospin  
<http://www.premier-ministre.gouv.fr/PM/MAIL.HTM>

France, President Jacques Chirac [http://www.elysee.fr/mel/mel\\_.htm](http://www.elysee.fr/mel/mel_.htm)

Gabon, President El Hajd Omar Bongo eleusis@mail.eunet.fr

Georgia, Chairman, State Council Eduard Shevardnadze  
office@presidpress.gov.ge

Germany, President Prof. Dr. Roman Herzog  
<http://www.bundespraesident.de/post.htm>

Germany, Chancellor Gerhard Schoeder  
<http://www.bundesregierung.de/inland/.bin/pbamaild?10>

Ghana, President Jerry Rawlings hagan@cais.com (Ministry of Foreign  
Affairs)

Greece, Prime Minister Kostas Simitis mail@primeminister.gr

Greece, President Constantinos Stephanopoulos mfa@mfa.gr

Greenland, Prime Minister homerule@gh.gl

Guatemala, President Alvaru Arzu alvaroarzu@guate.net

Hungary, Prime Minister Viktor Orban vikt.orban@meh.hu

Iceland, Prime Minister David Oddsson david@althingi.is

Iran, President Seyed Mohammad Khatami iranemb@salamiran.org

Iraq, President Saddam Hussein irqun@undp.org (e-mail for Iraq's Mission to the U.N. in New York City)

Ireland, President Mary McAleese webmaster@aras.irlgov.ie

Ireland, Prime Minister Bertie Ahern webmaster@taoiseach.irlgov.ie

Israel, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu feedback@pmo.gov.il

Jamaica, Prime Minister Percival John Patterson jis@jis.gov.jm

Japan, Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi jpm@kantei.go.jp

Jordan, King Hussain Bin Talal info@nic.gov.jo

Latvia, President Guntis Ulmanis chancery@president.lv

Lebanon, Prime Minister Selim Ahmed Hoss info@lp.gov.lb

Lithuania, President Valdas Adamkus gidirg@president.lt

Luxembourg, Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker  
<http://www.restena.lu:80/gover/mailbox.html>

Malaysia, Prime Minister Dr. Dato` Seri Mahathir Mohamad  
[http://www.smpke.jpm.my/fr\\_fback.htm](http://www.smpke.jpm.my/fr_fback.htm)

Maldives, President Maumoon Abdul Gayoom admin@foreign.gov.mv

Mauritius, President Cassam Uteem statepas@intnet.mu

Micronesia, President Jacob Nena foreignaffairs@mail.fm

Mongolia, President Natsagiyn Bagabandi webmaster@presi.pmis.gov.mn

Namibia, President Sam Nujoma <http://www.republicofnamibia.com/write.htm>

New Zealand, Prime Minister Jenny Shipley mailbox@mx.parliament.govt.nz

Norway, Prime Minister Kjell Magne Bondevik  
postmottak@smk.dep.telemax.no

Pakistan, Prime Minister Mian Muhammad Nawaz Sharif  
primeminister@pak.gov.pk

Panama, President Ernesto Perez Balladares ofasin@pan.gbm.net

Poland, President Aleksander Kwasniewski listy@prezydent.pl

Romania, President Emile Constantinescu guv@kappa.ro

Russia, President Boris Yeltsin president@gov.ru

Saint Lucia, Prime Minister Kenny Anthony pmoffice@candw.lc

Seychelles, President France-Albert Rene ppo@seychelles.net

Slovenia, Prime Minister Janez Drnovsek  
tomaz.lovrencic@vlada.sigov.mail.si

Slovenia, President Milan Kucan darinka.ilovar@up.sigov.mail.si

South Korea, President Kim Dae Jong  
<http://www.bluehouse.go.kr/cwd98/owa/engcwmail.first>

South Africa, President Nelson Mandela communications@po.gov.za

Sri Lanka, President Chandrika Bandaranaike Kumaratunga  
for\_min@sri.lanka.net

Suriname, President Jules Wijdenbosch burpres@sr.net

Swaziland, Prime Minister Dr. Barnabas Sibusiso Dlamini  
ppcu@realnet.co.sz

Sweden, Prime Minister Goran Persson regeringen@regeringen.se

Thailand, Prime Minister Chuan Leekpai govspkmn@mozart.inet.co.th

Togo, President Etienne Gnassingbe Eyadema  
<http://www.republicoftogo.com/english/ecrir-pdt.html>

Trinidad and Tobago, President Arthur Robinson presoftt@carib-link.net

Trinidad and Tobago, Prime Minister Basdeo Panday bpanday@trinidad.net

Turkey, President Suleyman Demirel cankaya@tccb.gov.tr

Turkey, Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz ddlbsl@tccb.gov.tr

Uganda, President Yoweri Kaguta Museveni mofa@starcom.co.ug

Ukraine, President Leonid Kuchma postmaster@ribbon.kiev.ua

United States of America, President William Clinton  
president@whitehouse.gov

Uruguay, President Julio Maria Sanguinetti presidente@presidencia.gub.uy

Yugoslavia, Federal President Slobodan Milosevic  
slobodan.milosevic@gov.yu

Yugoslavia, Federal Prime Minister Momir Bulatovic  
momir.bulatovic@gov.yu

Zambia, President Frederick Chiluba state@zamnet.zm

Comments? Outdated links? I can be reached at:

Donald Vermithrax, Ottawa, Canada

### Head of State E-Mail Page

© Copyright 1997, 98 by Donald Vermithrax

Head of State E-Mail List.....About this E-Mail List

Lobbyist Tools/Linx Page..... Activist Forum New!

### About this E-Mail List

Countries are listed alphabetically by their common english usage  
(ie.Ivory Coast, North Korea,  
etc.). These e-mail addresses are up to date as of November 1, 1998.

### Head of State E-Mail List

Albania, Prime Minister Fatos Nano postmaster@minjash.tirana.al

Antigua and Barbuda, Prime Minister Lester Bird pmo@candw.ag

Argentina, Presidente Dr. Carlos Saul Menem spyd@presidencia.gov.ar

Armenia, President Robert Kocharian president@president.am

Australia, Prime Minister John Howard <http://www.pm.gov.au/comments.htm>

Austria, Federal Chancellor Viktor Klima vklima@spoe.or.at

Azerbaijan, President Geidar Aliyev postmaster@lider.azerbaijan.su

Barbados, Prime Minister Owen Arthur foreign@caribsurf.com

Belgium, Prime Minister M. Jean-Luc Dehaene info@belgium.be

Brazil, President Fernando Henrique Cardoso pr@planalto.gov.br

Bulgaria, President Petar Stoyanov president@president.bg

Canada, Prime Minister Jean Chretien pm@pm.gc.ca

Chad, President Idriss Deby presidency@tchad.td

Chile, President Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle webmaster@presidencia.cl

Colombia, Presidente Andres Pastrana Arango pastrana@presidencia.gov.co

Costa Rica, President Jose Maria Figueres Olsen  
rherrera@ns.casapres.go.cr

Croatia, President Dr. Franjo Tudjman www-admin@president.hr

Czech Republic, President Vaclav Havel president@hrad.cz

Denmark, Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen stm@stm.dk

Dominica, President Crispin Anselm Sorhaindo sorhaindoch@cwdom.dm

Dominica, Prime Minister Edison James pmoffice@cwdom.dm

Dominican Republic, President Leonel Fernandez  
correspondencias@presidencia.gov.do

Ecuador, President Fabian Alarcon webmast@mmrree.gov.ec

Egypt, President Mohammed Hosni Mubarak webmaster@presidency.gov.eg

El Salvador, President Armando Calderon Sol presidente@casapres.gob.sv

Estonia, President Lennart Meri sekretar@nw.vpk.ee

Estonia, Prime Minister Mart Siimann valitsus@rk.ee

Fiji, President Kamisese Mara info@fiji.gov.fj

Finland, President Martii Ahtisaari presidentti@tpk.vn.fi

France, Prime Minister Lionel Jospin  
<http://www.premier-ministre.gouv.fr/PM/MAIL.HTM>

France, President Jacques Chirac [http://www.elysee.fr/mel/mel\\_.htm](http://www.elysee.fr/mel/mel_.htm)

Gabon, President El Hajd Omar Bongo eleusis@mail.eunet.fr

Ghana, President Jerry Rawlings hagan@cais.com (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)

Georgia, Chairman, State Council Eduard Shevardnadze  
office@presidpress.gov.ge

Germany, President Prof. Dr. Roman Herzog  
<http://www.bundespraesident.de/post.htm>

Germany, Chancellor Gerhard Schoeder  
<http://www.bundesregierung.de/inland/.bin/pbamaild?10>

Greece, Prime Minister Kostas Simitis mail@primeminister.gr

Greece, President Constantinos Stephanopoulos mfa@mfa.gr

Greenland, Prime Minister lavi@info.gh.gl

Guatemala, President Alvaru Arzu alvaroarzu@guate.net

Hungary, Prime Minister Viktor Orban orban@mehp.meh.hu

Iceland, Prime Minister David Oddsson postur@for.stjr.is

Iran, President Seyed Mohammad Khatami iranemb@salamiran.org

Ireland, President Mary McAleese webmaster@aras.irlgov.ie

Ireland, Prime Minister Bertie Ahern webmaster@taoiseach.irlgov.ie

Israel, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu pm@pmo.gov.il

Japan, Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi jpm@kantei.go.jp

Jordan, King Hussain Bin Talal info@nic.gov.jo

Latvia, President Guntis Ulmanis chancery@president.lv

Luxembourg, Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker  
<http://www.restena.lu:80/gover/mailbox.html>

Malaysia, Prime Minister Dr. Dato` Seri Mahathir Mohamad  
[http://www.smpke.jpm.my/fr\\_fback.htm](http://www.smpke.jpm.my/fr_fback.htm)

Maldives, President Maumoon Abdul Gayoom admin@foreign.gov.mv

Mauritius, President Cassam Uteem statepas@intnet.mu

Micronesia, President Jacob Nena foreignaffairs@mail.fm

Namibia, President Sam Nujoma <http://www.republicofnamibia.com/write.htm>

New Zealand, Prime Minister Jenny Shipley mailbox@mx.parliament.govt.nz

Norway, Prime Minister Kjell Magne Bondevik  
postmottak@smk.dep.telemax.no

Pakistan, Prime Minister Mian Muhammad Nawaz Sharif  
primeminister@pak.gov.pk

Panama, President Ernesto Perez Balladares ofasin@pan.gbm.net

Poland, President Aleksander Kwasniewski listy@prezydent.pl

Romania, President Emile Constantinescu guv@kappa.ro

Russia, President Boris Yeltsin president@gov.ru

Saint Lucia, Prime Minister Kenny Anthony pmoffice@candw.lc

Seychelles, President France-Albert Rene ppo@seychelles.net

Slovenia, Prime Minister Janez Drnovsek  
tomaz.lovrencic@vlada.sigov.mail.si

Slovenia, President Milan Kucan darinka.ilovar@up.sigov.mail.si

South Korea, President Kim Dae Jong webmaster@cwd.go.kr

South Africa, President Nelson Mandela communications@po.gov.za

Sri Lanka, President Chandrika Bandaranaike Kumaratunga  
for\_min@sri.lanka.net

Suriname, President Jules Wijdenbosch burpres@sr.net

Swaziland, Prime Minister Dr. Barnabas Sibusiso Dlamini  
ppcu@realnet.co.sz

Sweden, Prime Minister Goran Persson regeringen@regeringen.se

Thailand, Prime Minister Chuan Leekpai govspkmn@mozart.inet.co.th

Togo, President Etienne Gnassingbe Eyadema  
<http://www.republicoftogo.com/english/ecrir-pdt.html>

Trinidad and Tobago, President A.N.R. Robinson presoftt@carib-link.net

Trinidad and Tobago, Prime Minister Basdeo Panday bpanday@trinidad.net

Turkey, President Suleyman Demirel cankaya@tccb.gov.tr

Turkey, Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz ddlbsl@tccb.gov.tr

Uganda, President Yoweri Kaguta Museveni mofa@starcom.co.ug

Ukraine, President Leonid Kuchma postmaster@ribbon.kiev.ua

United States of America, President William Clinton  
president@whitehouse.gov

Uruguay, President Julio Maria Sanguinetti presidente@presidencia.gub.uy

Yugoslavia, Federal President Slobodan Milosevic  
slobodan.milosevic@gov.yu

Yugoslavia, Federal Prime Minister Momir Bulatovic  
momir.bulatovic@gov.yu

Zambia, President Frederick Chiluba state@zamnet.zm

END FORWARD

-

\*\* NOTICE: In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, this material is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. \*\*

Return-Path: <sallyl@pacbell.net>  
Date: Thu, 17 Dec 1998 13:38:41 -0800  
From: Sally Lilienthal <sallyl@pacbell.net>  
Reply-To: sallyl@pacbell.net  
Organization: Ploughshares Fund  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: proposal  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id NAA01391

Dear Howard, Will you please answer by e-mail or fax these questions as soon as you are able. I have to serve in jury duty for the first time in my life starting Monday, so will have to work on your proposal over the weekend to be safe.

You mention different organizations, networks, or coalitions. I'm confused.

What is the Interfaith Working Group as different from Grassroots Working Group as different from the Religious Coalition. And are some members of the above former members of the CTBT Coalition ? Or maybe it is still extant. Does it still meet once a month? To what end? What are you organizing these members of religious coalitions to do besides sign letters?.

Just what is your network around the country to which you refer? Have you created a web page for the "interfaith coalition"? Is that the network to which you refer?

Have you any success in bringing in to any of the above groups representatives from Black Churches and Christian Evangelicals? Are all the disparate religious groups active in an alliance for nuclear disarmament? Please list the churches that are actually working within the working groups.

And who is "we" to whom you frequently make reference particularly under the section called Working Modes in the proposal? How are you ("we") going to go about broadening a religious coalition both in this country and internationally?

Who do you mean by the Episcopal Church as different from the Episcopal Peace Fellowship as one example? In other words, are you enlisting Bishops or other church leaders as well as social justice or peace groups? Do they attend meetings – do more than sign letters? Have you enlisted the National Council of Churches as you mentioned, and is it taking an active role?

You mention building a bridge between religious and secular peace organizations. Why is a bridge needed since through your work and the work of others, for the last few years at least religious groups have been represented at anti-war or arms control meetings and have worked on joint projects.

Are there other interfaith coalitions which address nuclear proliferation – in the U.S., in Washington?.

Thanks for your immediate help on this. With best regards, Sally

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 17 Dec 1998 14:25:41 -0800 (PST)  
From: Sue Broidy <a2000@silcom.com>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Richard Salvador's email address  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: a2000@mail.silcom.com

A message from Richard informs us of his latest address till he returns to Hawaii in January.

"Richard Salvador" <salvador@mailcity.com>

Sincerely,

Sue Broidy  
Coordinator, Abolition 2000  
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation  
1187 Coast Village Road  
Santa Barbara CA 93108

Phone (805) 965 3443 FAX(805) 568 0466  
Email: A2000@silcom.com  
Website <http://www.abolition2000.org>

To subscribe to the abolition-usa listserve, send a message (no subject) to  
[abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com](mailto:abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com)  
To post to the list, mail to: [abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com](mailto:abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com)

To subscribe to the international abolition-caucus, send a message (no  
subject) to [majordomo@igc.org](mailto:majordomo@igc.org)  
To post to the list, mail to: [abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org](mailto:abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org)

To: laughlines@readersdigest.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Submission to Laughter, the Best Medicine  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

To: Laughter, the Best Medicine

After I dislocated the little finger on my left hand while playing senior volleyball, I asked my orthopedist, "How long until I can play viola and type?"

He responded, "Could you play the viola and type before you injured your finger?"

Submitted by Howard W. Hallman  
6508 Wilmet Road  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
Phone: 301 897-3669  
Fax: 301 896-0013  
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Mon, 21 Dec 1998 16:24:53 +0100  
From: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-1: Ecumenical Decade to Overcome Violence  
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Reply-To: Sara SPEICHER <ses@wcc-coe.org>

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

Dear friends,

The Eighth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Harare, Zimbabwe, has recently ended. As expected, it was a time of celebration and challenge for the Programme to Overcome Violence and the Peace to the City Campaign.

The Peace to the City Campaign culminated at the Assembly, and through exhibits, workshops, videos, and a "Virtual Peace to the City" page on the Web, our partners in the Campaign were able to share their stories and their challenges to the ecumenical movement. Peace banners from around the world were also shared during the Assembly's Recommitment Celebration to symbolize the end of the Campaign and the hope that efforts to build peace with justice continue to grow.

The Assembly delegates, hearing such messages and bringing stories of violence and peace building from their own contexts, have emphasized the need for churches to continue to overcome violence and build a culture of peace. The delegates overwhelmingly approved an "Ecumenical Decade to Overcome Violence" (2001-2010), which will coincide with the UN International Decade to Build a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the World's Children. We are excited about developing this Decade emphasis further to address so many of the critical issues facing our world today. As Doug Baker, our local campaign coordinator in Belfast, remarked, calling for a Decade to Overcome Violence seems very appropriate "as peacemaking is a decades-long process."

We very much look forward to continuing to build on the networks and efforts already begun, and expanding local and global initiatives to build peace throughout the world. You will certainly be hearing more about this in the months to come.

As we enter into this holiday season and celebrate a new year, we wish you peace and strength, love and courage, hope and faith,

Salpy Eskidjian  
Beatrice Merahi  
Sara Speicher  
Sarah Woodside

Programme to Overcome Violence  
World Council of Churches

P.O. Box 2100  
1211 Geneva 2  
Switzerland  
Tel.: +41-22-791-6219  
Fax: +41-22-791-6409  
E-mail: [ses@wcc-coe.org](mailto:ses@wcc-coe.org)  
Web: <http://www.wcc-coe.org/pov>

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

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>

Date: Mon, 21 Dec 1998 15:20:24 -0500

From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility

To: ggilhool@ix.netcom.com, bmorse@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, cdavis@clw.org, cpaine@nrdc.org, 73744.3675@compuserve.com, dkimball@clw.org, dculp@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, paexec@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, jsmith@clw.org, disarmament@igc.org, kathy@fcnl.org, wandwill@clark.net, ledwidge@psr.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, armsintern@ucsusa.org, stevenraikin@delphi.com, syoung@basicint.org, tperry@ucsusa.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, anitas@ieer.org, nbaliga@psr.org, kroberts@psr.org

Subject: NWWG

Reminders for Nuclear Weapons Working Group members:

1. We decided to meet on the second and fourth Thursday of each month in the coming year, from 9:30 to 11:00, at the Mott House. HOWEVER, for January only we will meet on the first and third Thursday. Therefore, the next meeting of NWWG will be on January 7th at 9:30. The co-chairs (who will serve Jan-Feb-March) will post the agenda in advance.

2. I volunteered to make a new e-mail list for NWWG, so I am now making a request: please let me know if you plan to be a participating member of NWWG in 1999, and thus want your e-mail address included on the e-mail listing. If someone else in your organization should receive these e-mails instead of you, please let me know that also.

Thanks for your help. See you on the 7th.

Happy holidays. Shalom,

Bob Tiller

To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, ggilhool@ix.netcom.com, bmorse@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, cdavis@clw.org, cpaine@nrdc.org, 73744.3675@compuserve.com, dkimball@clw.org, dculp@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, paexec@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, jsmith@clw.org, disarmament@igc.org, kathy@fcnl.org, wandwill@clark.net, ledwidge@psr.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, armsintern@ucsusa.org, stevenraikin@delphi.com, syoung@basicint.org, tperry@ucsusa.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, anitas@ieer.org, nbaliga@psr.org, kroberts@psr.org

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

Subject: Re: NWWG

Cc:

Bcc:

X-Attachments:

At 03:20 PM 12/21/98 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Reminders for Nuclear Weapons Working Group members:

>

2. I volunteered to make a new e-mail list for NWWG, so I am now  
>making a request: please let me know if you plan to be a participating  
>member of NWWG in 1999, and thus want your e-mail address included on  
>the e-mail listing.

Bob,

Yes. Thanks for doing this.

Howard

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 22 Dec 1998 08:56:32 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
CC: ggilhool@ix.netcom.com, bmorse@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, cdavis@clw.org,  
cpaine@nrdc.org, 73744.3675@compuserve.com, dkimball@clw.org,  
dculp@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, paexec@igc.org, mupj@igc.org,  
jsmith@clw.org, kathy@fcn.org, wandwill@clark.net, ledwidge@psr.org,  
ctbt@2020vision.org, armsintern@ucsusa.org, stevenraikin@delphi.com,  
syoun@basicint.org, tperry@ucsusa.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org,  
anitas@ieer.org, nbaliga@psr.org, kroberts@psr.org  
Subject: Re: NWWG  
References: <367EAD88.3DD8@psr.org>

It would be useful to have a more formalized list of contact info. for NWWG members & friends (including phone, address, fax, web-site etc.) This would be useful for all of us, Monday Lobby and Coolfont participants, and select Hill and Administration staff.

Happy Holidays - Pray for progress for a CTBT and nuclear disarmament in 1999.

Bob Tiller wrote:

> Reminders for Nuclear Weapons Working Group members:  
>  
> 1. We decided to meet on the second and fourth Thursday of each month  
> in the coming year, from 9:30 to 11:00, at the Mott House. HOWEVER, for  
> January only we will meet on the first and third Thursday. Therefore,  
> the next meeting of NWWG will be on January 7th at 9:30. The co-chairs  
> (who will serve Jan-Feb-March) will post the agenda in advance.  
>  
> 2. I volunteered to make a new e-mail list for NWWG, so I am now  
> making a request: please let me know if you plan to be a participating  
> member of NWWG in 1999, and thus want your e-mail address included on  
> the e-mail listing. If someone else in your organization should receive  
> these e-mails instead of you, please let me know that also.  
>  
> Thanks for your help. See you on the 7th.  
> Happy holidays. Shalom,  
> Bob Tiller

--  
DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE  
Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools  
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator  
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
E-MAIL: disarmament@igc.org  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Swing Lists  
Date: Tue, 22 Dec 1998 23:52:08 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igce.igc.org id UAA10707

Howard --

I am sending you in the next two e-mails, the two CTBT swing lists in Word ver. 6.0. I don't have the time to reformat them into text files.

I hope this works.

Hope you are enjoying the holiday season,

David

To: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Swing Lists  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 11:52 PM 12/22/98 -0500, David Culp wrote:

>Howard --

>

>I am sending you in the next two e-mails, the two CTBT swing lists in Word ver. 6.0. I don't have the time to reformat them into text files.

>

>I hope this works.

>

>

David,

Thanks for the lists. I was able to download and print them in the format you used. I'm sending the lists to members of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT with a hope that they, too, will be able to download them.

Have a great holiday,

Shalom,  
Howard

>

To: relctbt  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Senate CTBT Swing List  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\INTERACT\DATA\DOWNLOAD\CTBTRATI.DOC;

Dear Colleagues:

David Culp has provided a new Senate swing list on the CTBT. It is attached in a Word 6.0 version. If you have trouble downloading it, please let me know and I'll fax you a copy.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: relctbt  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Key Senators on CTBT  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\INTERACT\DATA\DOWNLOAD\KEYSENAT.DOC;

Dear Colleagues:

David Culp has provided a new listing of key senators on the CTBT. It is attached in a Word 6.0 version. If you have trouble downloading it, please let me know and I'll fax you a copy.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <orders@amazon.com>  
From: orders@amazon.com  
Date: Wed, 23 Dec 1998 08:14:22 -0800 (PST)  
X-Authentication-Warning: online-3-tu0.amazon.com: nobody set sender to orders@amazon.com using -f  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Your Order with Amazon.com (#002-7545782-2241867)

Thank you for ordering from Amazon.com!

Your order information appears below. If you need to get in touch with us about your order, send an e-mail message to orders@amazon.com (or just reply to this message).

-- Amazon.com Customer Service

-----  
Your order reads as follows:

E-mail address: mupj@igc.org

Ship to: Howard W. Hallman  
6508 Wilmett Road  
Bethesda  
MD  
20817

Tel: 301 897-3668

-----  
1 copy of "Grasses (Would You Believe It)"  
Catherine Chambers, Caroline Chambers; Library Binding; @ \$21.40 each  
(Available in 2-3 days)

Will ship via: Standard Shipping (Averages 3-7 business days)

Item(s) Subtotal: \$ 21.40  
Shipping & Handling: \$ 3.95  
Tax: \$ 0.00

-----  
TOTAL DUE: \$ 25.35

As an Amazon.com customer, you'll occasionally receive e-mail updates about important functionality changes to the Web site, new Amazon.com services, and special offers we believe would be beneficial to you. We hope you'll find these updates interesting and informative. But if you'd rather not receive them, please visit your Amazon.com Subscriptions page:

<http://www.amazon.com/subscriptions>

Please note that you can view the status of your account, examine your orders, cancel unshipped orders, change your e-mail address or password, or update your subscriptions to our Personal Notification Services at any time through the "Your Account" link on the navigation bar.

<http://www.amazon.com/your-account>

Thank you for shopping at Amazon.com!

---

Amazon.com  
Books, Music & More  
<http://www.amazon.com>  
[orders@amazon.com](mailto:orders@amazon.com)

---



Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Wed, 23 Dec 1998 16:58:04 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: mupj@igc.org, bblair@brook.edu, syoung@basicint.org,  
amillar@fourthfreedom.org, jdean@ucsusa.org  
Subject: Query

Friends,

The Alliance for Nuclear Accountability is preparing a grassroots packet on de-alerting. They want to list some of us in national organizations as "resources," in case someone who gets the packet wants to ask questions or dig further into the issue.

Would you be willing to have your name listed as a resource in this packet? Those who have already agreed to be listed are: Arjun Makhijani, Kathy Crandall and me. If you are listed by name, your organization's web site will also be listed.

I do not expect a great outpouring of inquiries from such a listing. I was listed in a previous packet, and I think it generated fewer than five calls.

Please let me know if you are willing to do be listed.

Happy holidays,  
Bob Tiller

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

At 04:58 PM 12/23/98 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Friends,  
>  
>The Alliance for Nuclear Accountability is preparing a grassroots packet  
>on de-alerting. They want to list some of us in national organizations  
>as "resources," in case someone who gets the packet wants to ask  
>questions or dig further into the issue.  
>  
>Would you be willing to have your name listed as a resource in this  
>packet?

Bob,

Since my strength is mobilization not technical knowledge of issues, I decline your invitation.

Howard

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>

Date: Wed, 23 Dec 1998 17:18:40 -0500

From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility

To: disarmament@igc.org, kathy@fcl.org, bridget@fcl.org, mupj@igc.org,  
billnrns@aol.com, paprog@igc.org, btiller@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org,  
dculp@nrdc.org, vision@igc.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, meldredge@igc.org,  
dkimball@clw.org, cdavis@clw.org, wandwill@clark.net, vfp@igc.org,  
hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, mupj@igc.org,  
bmorse@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org,  
disarmament@igc.org, btiller@psr.org, dealerting-ana@igc.org,  
dallas41@hotmail.com, allister@snakeriveralliance.org,  
sallight@earthlink.net, cprcrogers@mindspring.com, ncourtney@bhsi.com

Subject: De-alerting op-ed

Here is a draft of an op-ed on de-alerting by Dr. Ira Helfand of PSR. You may want to adapt it for your use. It is perhaps too long for many newspapers.

If you do any cutting, please note that the bracketed phrase [this time] in paragraph 10 refers back to the 1995 near accident discussed in paragraphs 4-7. The sources of a number of quotes are in parentheses; you may want to remove them.

The language in this draft assumes that it is to be published before January 1, 1999; if it runs after the first of the year, the language in several places will have to be adjusted.

Happy holidays,

Bob Tiller

\*\*\*\*\*

On January 1, 2000, there will be computers malfunctioning all around the world because of the Y2K bug. Thousands of nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert are hooked up to computers with the same Y2K problem, and we don't know what's going to happen.

Seven years after the end of the Cold War, there remain in the world some 30,000 nuclear weapons. 5000 of these weapons, in the US and Russian arsenals, sit on missiles on high alert status. They can be fired in about 15 minutes and reach their target cities, destroying the world as we know it, in another 30 minutes.

The effects of even a limited accidental launch of these weapons were described in a study in the New England Journal of Medicine this past April: 6,838,000 prompt fatalities, and millions more dead from radiation sickness in the ensuing weeks. As the study notes, an accidental attack of this sort would almost certainly lead to an all out nuclear war.

This is not just a theoretical danger. As recently as January 25, 1995 we experienced a near miss with nuclear war. On that morning a US weather rocket launched from Norway was identified by the

Russian military as a potential attack on the Russian Federation. The Norwegian government had notified the Russian government in advance of the launch, but word was not passed on to the appropriate radar stations.

The nuclear "suitcase" carried by President Yeltsin was activated and he was given some 10 minutes to decide whether to launch a counter attack against the US. At that time, such a retaliatory strike would have involved up to 4000 warheads hitting every major population center in the US.

We don't know exactly what happened that morning in the Kremlin, but by great good fortune, a man with serious health and alcohol abuse problems happened to make the right decision. He delayed ordering a nuclear attack and within a few minutes Russian radar was able to confirm that the missile was not aimed at Moscow.

January 25, 1995 was an ordinary day, just like today. There was no great political or military crisis in the world-and we almost had a nuclear war. The next time we may not be so lucky.

Since 1995 things have gotten much more dangerous. Both the political situation in Russia and President Yeltsin's health have worsened. In addition Russian computer systems, whose baseline unreliability was eloquently illustrated by the saga of the Mir space station, have deteriorated further.

And now the Y2K bug.

While defense experts feel it is highly unlikely that a computer failure a year from January would lead directly to the accidental launch of a nuclear missile, there is great concern that command and control systems, including early warning systems, could fail. At the least this could leave both sides blind, unable to know what the other is doing. This is profoundly dangerous when we have thousands of nuclear warheads pointed at each other.

Even worse, the failure of some parts of the command network could be misinterpreted by other computers in the system as evidence of an enemy attack and lead to a false warning. And [this time], with computers not working properly, we might not figure out that it was a false alarm.

The US is spending billions of dollars to fix the Y2K bug in our military computers, but we do not know if we can do the job. As Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre said in Senate testimony this past June, "The year 2000 problem is the electronic equivalent of El Nino. This is going to have implications in the world ...that we can't even comprehend." (Quoted by Fred Kaplan in the Boston Globe 6/21/98)

At the time Hamre reported that Pentagon efforts were at least 4 months behind schedule. And Robert Martin at the Miter Corporation, one of the leading contractors working on the Y2K problem for the Pentagon, has confirmed that some of the repairs are taking much longer than anyone

estimated. (same Globe article)

Part of the problem seems to be that many of the computers are so old that there is no one still around who is familiar with their software code. In addition, a recent report from the British American Security Information Council (BASIC) cited allegations of "catastrophic mismanagement" of the Pentagon's Y2K effort.

Even if these problems get ironed out, Deputy Secretary Hamre concedes that "There is no guarantee all...systems will be free of risk." As the BASIC study reports, "The Pentagon has already announced the existence of 'high risk' systems that may not be repaired or tested in time, and for which repairs may ultimately be impossible. Problems may not be eliminated by 2000 no matter what resources and money are devoted to them."

The problem, as anyone with a PC knows, is that new or repaired software always has bugs in it that turn up only when it is used. And in this case the bugs may not turn up until the clock turns over a year from this January when it may be too late.

On the Russian side the situation is even more desperate. Russian officials didn't begin to address the problem until this year and they do not have the resources or, at this point, the time to do the job.

The Pentagon is clearly worried about the possibility of an accidental nuclear war on January 1, 2000. Marvin Langston, who directs the Pentagon Y2K effort, has reported that the US and other nuclear powers plan to "physically share people," next New Year's Day. "Their people will sit in our control rooms and our people in their control center to keep communications open." (USA Today 11/13/98)

This effort is worthwhile, but it does not begin to address the problem.

Given the tremendous uncertainty about how computers will actually function, many informed people are planning not to fly on January 1, 2000. If it is too dangerous to take an airplane ride than it is downright insane to have 5,000 nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert linked to these same kinds of computers.

These warheads represent an accident waiting to happen. For two years, prominent military leaders like General George Lee Butler, former commander of all US strategic nuclear forces, have been urging the US and Russia to take them off alert.

The Y2K problem just brings the whole situation into focus: We need to de-alert these missiles now before we have a catastrophic, and totally preventable accident.

Weapons experts have proposed a number of specific steps that can be taken to de-alert the missiles: the nose cones which cover the

warheads can be removed, or the guidance systems can be taken out of the missiles, or they can be disabled in other ways. Whatever steps are chosen, it will take several months to get all the missiles de-alerted and to set up the necessary verification procedures. If we are to finish this job before next January, there is no time to lose.

President's Clinton and Yeltsin can decide on their own authority to take the nuclear missiles off alert.

Call the White House at (202) 456 1111 and let the President know you want him to act now.

Return-Path: <owner-disarm-news@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 23 Dec 1998 20:17:55 -0500  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-disarm-news@igc.org  
Subject: X-Mas Present for Disarmament Activists  
To: disarm-news@igc.org

The Disarmament Clearinghouse wants to make sure you are well-prepared for 1999 nuclear disarmament advocacy.

With thanks to Bruce Hall at Peace Action, we have for you a 4 panel postcard mailer alert with two post cards to send - one to President Clinton, and another to Russian Prime Minister Primakov.

The text of the mailer is below. If you need to see it in full graphic detail, it will be posted on our web site on Jan. 5, 1999.

But if you're ready to commit to nuclear disarmament activity in 1999, right now. . .

Order as many cards as you think you can distribute. You'll only need to pay for postage. The cost of mailing each complete mailer-alert is .32 (going up to .33 on Jan. 10 - which should give you an incentive to order right now!) .

**\*\*To order cards:\*\***

send an e-mail message to: <disarmament@igc.org>

Tell me: How many cards

Tell me: Would you like cards printed with the Disarmament Clearinghouse return-address, or would you like the return address blank so that you can stamp/ label your own return address?

Tell me: Your full address with zip code, and your phone number

We'd like to have as many postcards out before the State of the Union Address - now scheduled for Jan. 19, but the postcards will have a valid and compelling message through the Spring of 1999.

I'm going to be out of the office until Jan. 5, but retired elves are coming to help me fill your orders promptly - and I'll do my best to get them to you by Jan. 8th.

HERE'S THE MAILER  
OUTSIDE PANEL 1 -

It's our move...

Time to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

-----  
OUTSIDE PANEL 2  
(in the return address... or this can be blank)  
Disarmament Clearinghouse

A project of Peace Action \* Physicians for Social  
Responsibility and Women's Action for New Directions  
1101 14th Street NW Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005

---

OUTSIDE PANEL 3

The Honorable Yevgeni Primakov  
Prime Minister of the Russian Federation  
2650 Wisconsin Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20007

---

OUTSIDE PANEL 4

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

---

INSIDE PANELS 1 & 2 (reverse side of cover)

Despite the end of the Cold War there remain an estimated 36,000 nuclear weapons in the world. Thousands of these are on hair-trigger alert, ready to launch on a moment's notice.

**THEY CAN'T AFFORD IT - NEITHER CAN WE**

Russia's plunge into economic chaos raises serious concerns about that country's ability to control its vast nuclear arsenal. Kremlin officials now admit that Russia can no longer afford to maintain thousands of nuclear weapons as envisioned under existing arms control treaties. Immediate U.S. action is crucial to ensure that Russia's nuclear decline takes place in a controlled, verified manner instead of a chaotic and dangerous freefall.

Even the United States Pentagon, faced with the prospect of spending billions of dollars on maintaining and nuclear weapons that we clearly no longer need, is quietly urging President Clinton to unilaterally scrap thousands of U.S. nuclear weapons.

**A NEW ARMS RACE OR A NEW AGENDA FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT?**

An ever-growing number of countries are lining up to join the nuclear club - increasing the risk of a nuclear catastrophe somewhere on the planet. But against this chilling backdrop, a new worldwide movement is taking shape among governments and citizen groups to abolish nuclear weapons once and for all.

Only strong U.S. leadership can avert another nuclear arms race and put the world on the path to nuclear disarmament.

What you can do:

The United States and Russia hold the keys to a nuclear weapons-free 21st Century. Contact President Clinton and Russian Prime Minister Yevgeni Primakov today.

Tear off and sign the post cards below and mail them to White House and the Russian Embassy in Washington, DC. (Remember, handwritten letters are always the most effective way to reach politicians, so if you have time, write a letter)

Contact your Senators at U.S. Senate \* Washington, DC 20510. Urge them to cut our massive Cold War nuclear arsenal.

Contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse for more information.  
202.898.0150 ext. 232 [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

-----

### INSIDE PANEL 3

The Honorable Yevgeni Primakov  
Prime Minister of the Russian Federation  
2650 Wisconsin Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20007

Dear Prime Minister:

I am increasingly concerned about the continued existence and spread of nuclear weapons. Despite the dramatic reduction in tensions between our two countries, thousands of nuclear weapons remain on hair trigger alert. Surely, together, these two great countries can agree to relax this Cold War nuclear posture and greatly reduce the danger of an accidental or unauthorized nuclear strike.

Only your leadership, along with the leadership of President Clinton, can move the world away from the dangers of nuclear weapons and toward a nuclear weapons-free 21st Century. I urge you to work with President Clinton to reduce rapidly the number of nuclear weapons in the world. In addition, I urge you to take bold measures to lower immediately the alert status of the nuclear weapons in your country's arsenal. I have sent a similar message to President Clinton.

These measures will set the stage for a much safer future.

Sincerely,

---

(name)

---

(address)

---

(city, state, zip)

-----  
INSIDE PANEL 4

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear President Clinton:

I am increasingly concerned about the continued existence and spread of nuclear weapons. Despite the end of the Cold War and the dramatic reduction in tensions between the United States and Russia, thousands of nuclear weapons remain on hair-trigger alert.

It is time to relax this dangerous and costly Cold War nuclear posture. Even the Pentagon has come to the conclusion that our massive nuclear arsenal is too costly to maintain.

Only your leadership, along with the leadership of the Russian government, can move the world away from the dangers of nuclear weapons and toward a nuclear weapons-free 21st Century. I urge you to take bold measures to reduce immediately the alert status of the nuclear weapons in the U.S. nuclear arsenal and to make a new round of nuclear reduction talks with the Russian government a top priority in 1999.

These measures could become the most lasting and important part of your legacy and will set the stage for a much safer future.

Sincerely,

-----  
(name)

-----  
(address)

-----  
(city, state, zip)

--  
DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE

Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools  
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator  
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>  
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

>From ihelfand Thu Dec 24 08:49:13 1998

Return-Path: <ihelfand>

Date: Thu, 24 Dec 1998 08:49:06 -0800 (PST)

From: Ira Helfand <ihelfand@igc.apc.org>

To: allister@snakeriveralliance.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org,  
billnrns@aol.com, bmorse@igc.org, bridget@fcnl.org, btiller@psr.org,  
cdavis@clw.org, cprcrogers@mindspring.com, dallas41@hotmail.com,  
dculp@nrdc.org, dealerting-ana@igc.org, disarmament@igc.org,  
dkimball@clw.org, hisham@ieer.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, kathy@fcnl.org,  
ledwidge@psr.org, mupj@igc.org, ncourtney@bhsi.com, panukes@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org, sallight@earthlink.net, tcollina@ucsusa.org,  
vfp@igc.org, vision@igc.org, wandwill@clark.net

Subject: Re: De-alerting op-ed

The following shortened version of the op-ed piece on y2k and accidental nuclear war may be more useful than the original longer version.

Ira Helfand

\*\*\*\*\*

## COUNTDOWN TO 2000: NEW MILLENIUM OR NUCLEAR NIGHTMARE?

On January 1, 2000, the Y2K bug will cause computers around the world to malfunction. Thousands of nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert are hooked up to computers with the same Y2K problem, and we don't know what's going to happen.

The problem, as anyone with a PC knows, is that new or repaired software always has bugs in it that turn up only when it is used. In this case, the bugs may not turn up until the clock turns over a year from this January, when it may be too late. Many of the computers are so old that there is no one still around who is familiar with their software code. Unfortunately, the situation in Russia is even more desperate. Russian officials didn't begin to address the Y2K problem until this year and they do not have the resources or the time to do the job.

The problem has potentially catastrophic consequences. Seven years after the end of the Cold War, there remain in the world some 30,000 nuclear weapons. Five thousand of these weapons, in the US and Russian arsenals, sit on missiles on high alert status. These missiles can be fired in about 15 minutes and reach their target cities, destroying the world as we know it, in another 30 minutes.

While defense experts feel it is unlikely that a computer failure on January 1, 2000, would lead directly to the accidental launch of a nuclear missile, there is great concern that command and control systems, including early warning systems, could fail. These failures could leave both sides unable to know what the other is doing, and could be misinterpreted as evidence of an enemy attack. With thousands of nuclear weapons pointed at each other, this poses a profoundly dangerous and unacceptable risk.

The U.S. is spending billions of dollars to fix the Y2K bug in our military

computers, but we do not know if we can do the job. As Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre said in Senate testimony this past June, "The year 2000 problem is the electronic equivalent of El Nino. This is going to have implications in the world ...that we can't even comprehend." At the time, Hamre reported that Pentagon efforts were at least four months behind schedule. And Robert Martin at the Miter Corporation, one of the leading contractors working on the Y2K problem for the Pentagon, has confirmed that some of the repairs are taking much longer than anyone estimated.

In addition, a recent report from the British American Security Information Council (BASIC) cited allegations of "catastrophic mismanagement" of the Pentagon's Y2K effort. Even if these problems get ironed out, Deputy Secretary Hamre concedes that "There is no guarantee all...systems will be free of risk." As the BASIC study reports, "The Pentagon has already announced the existence of 'high risk' systems that may not be repaired or tested in time, and for which repairs may ultimately be impossible. Problems may not be eliminated by 2000 no matter what resources and money are devoted to them."

The Pentagon is clearly worried about possible problems on January 1, 2000. Marvin Langston, who directs the Pentagon Y2K effort, has reported that the U.S. and other nuclear powers plan to "physically share people," on New Year's Eve. "Their people will sit in our control rooms and our people in their control center to keep communications open."

This effort is worthwhile, but totally inadequate.

Given the tremendous uncertainty about how computers will actually function, many informed people are planning not to fly on January 1, 2000. If it is too dangerous to take an airplane ride, then why is it OK to have 5,000 nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert linked to these same kinds of computers?

For two years, prominent military leaders such as General George Lee Butler, former commander of all U.S. strategic nuclear forces, have been urging the U.S. and Russia to take nuclear warheads off alert. Weapons experts have proposed a number of specific steps that can be taken to de-alert the missiles, such as removing the nose cones or dismantling the guidance systems. Whatever steps are chosen, it will take several months to get all the missiles de-alerted and to set up the necessary verification procedures. If we are to finish the job before next January, there is no time to lose.

President's Clinton and Yeltsin can decide on their own authority to take the nuclear missiles off alert. It is possible the Y2K bug will not trigger an accidental nuclear war. But are we really willing to risk the future of all mankind to find out? Concerned citizens are urged to call the White House at (202-456-1111) and let the President know that it is imperative for him to act now.

Ira Helfand, MD  
Past-President, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Washington, DC



Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Tue, 22 Dec 1998 11:57:15 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: mupj@igc.org, harrisa@open.org, bobschaeffer@igc.org, jdi@clw.org,  
stevenraikin@delphi.com, mfonte@clw.org, kathy@fcnl.org, joe@fcnl.org,  
ihelfand@igc.org, bmusil@psr.org  
Subject: [Fwd: Fwd(4): Boomer Quiz]  
Content-Disposition: inline

Return-Path: <Nancy\_Thayer@fc.mcps.k12.md.us>  
Received: from mcps.k12.md.us (ns1.mcps.k12.md.us [205.222.5.40])  
by igc7.igc.org (8.8.8/8.8.8) with SMTP id HAA26093  
for <btiller@psr.org>; Tue, 22 Dec 1998 07:04:58 -0800 (PST)  
Received: from fcgateway (fcgateway.mcps.k12.md.us [205.222.5.94]) by mcps.k12.md.us (8.6.12/8.6.12) with SMTP  
id KAA12439; Tue, 22 Dec 1998 10:03:53 -0500  
From: jwitt@fc.fcps.k12.va.us, Nancy\_V.\_King@fc.mcps.k12.md.us,  
Renee\_J.\_Moore@fc.mcps.k12.md.us,  
Nancy\_Thayer@fc.mcps.k12.md.us (Nancy Thayer)  
Sender: Nancy\_Thayer@fc.mcps.k12.md.us (Nancy Thayer)  
To: albajejan@micron.net, walmsley@thesanjuans.com, jthayer@erols.com,  
btiller@psr.org, rossd@erols.com, kjlansing@aol.com  
Date: Tue, 22 Dec 1998 09:41:19 -0500  
Subject: Fwd(4): Boomer Quiz  
Message-ID: <msg1135063.thr-5f923a7d.12d687@fc.mcps.k12.md.us>  
Organization: Montgomery County Public Schools  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  
Content-ID: <msg1135063.thr-5f923a7d.12d687.part0@fc.mcps.k12.md.us>  
X-Gateway: NASTA Gate 2.0 for FirstClass(R)

HAPPY HOLIDAYS! Have fun.

## OFFICIAL BABY BOOMER QUALIFYING EXAM

### QUESTION #1:

Name the Beatles - both the first and last name of each, of course.

Consider this a warm-up.

[If you can't answer this one without thinking, close up the test, and move on to something else. We have nothing further to discuss.]

---

---

### QUESTION #2:

Finish the line: "Lions and tigers and bears, \_\_\_\_\_!"

Admittedly, this came along before we boomers were born. But we remember it from both the movies and the boob tube.

QUESTION #3:

"Hey kids, what time is it?" \_\_\_\_\_.

QUESTION #4:

What do M&M's do? \_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_.

QUESTION #5:

What helps build strong bodies 12 ways? \_\_\_\_\_.

QUESTION #6:

Long before he was Mohammed Ali, before he was The Greatest, we  
knew  
him as \_\_\_\_\_.

QUESTION #7:

"You'll wonder where the yellow went, \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #8:

Those post-baby boomers, or baby boomer wannabes, know Bob Denver  
as  
the Skipper's "little buddy." But we true boomers know that Bob  
Denver  
is actually Dobie's closest friend, \_\_\_\_\_ G.  
\_\_\_\_\_.

QUESTION #9:

M-I-C: See ya' real soon; K-E-Y: \_\_\_\_\_?  
\_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #10:

Definition: A "streaker" is someone who might go running through  
the  
lobby of the girls' dormitory \_\_\_\_\_.

QUESTION #11:

"Brylcream: \_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #12:

Bob Dylan advised us never to trust anyone \_\_\_\_\_.

QUESTION #13:

>>>From the early days of our music, real rock 'n roll, finish this  
line:  
"I wonder, wonder, wonder...wonder who; \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #14:

And while we're remembering rock n' roll, try this one:  
"War...uh-huh,  
huh...yea; what is it good for? \_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #15:

This is from a kinder and gentler protest song, but the question is just as profound: Where have all the flowers gone? Perhaps you could use a little help here: "Where have all the flowers gone, long time passing? Where have all the flowers gone? \_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #16:

Meanwhile, back home in Metropolis, Superman fights a never-ending battle for truth, justice, and \_\_\_\_\_.

QUESTION #17:

He came out of the University of Alabama, and became one of the best quarterbacks in the history of the NFL and later went on to appear in a television commercial wearing women's stockings. He is Broadway \_\_\_\_\_.

QUESTION #18:

"I'm Popeye the sailor man; I'm Popeye the sailor man. I'm strong to the finish, \_\_\_\_\_. I'm Popeye the sailor man."

QUESTION #19:

Your children probably recall that Peter Pan was recently played by Robin Williams, but we will always remember when Peter was played by \_\_\_\_\_.

QUESTION #20:

In the movie, The Graduate, young Benjamin, played by Dustin Hoffman was counseled about his future, and told to consider one thing: \_\_\_\_\_.

QUESTION #21:

In another movie from the late sixties, Paul Newman played Luke, a ne'er do well who was sent to a prison camp for cutting off the heads of parking meters with a pipe cutter. When he was captured after an unsuccessful attempt to escape, the camp commander (played by Strother Martin) used this experience as a lesson for the other prisoners, and explained, "What we have here, \_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #22:

In 1962, a dejected politician chastised the press after losing a race for governor while announcing his retirement from politics. "Just think, you won't have \_\_\_\_\_ to kick around any more."

QUESTION #23:

"Every morning, at the mine, you could see him arrive; He stood six foot, six, weighted 245. Kinda' broad at the shoulder, and narrow at the hip. And everybody knew you didn't give no lip, \_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #24:

"I found my thrill, \_\_\_\_\_." You may remember Riche Cunningham singing this. But if you are a true boomer, you know it was Fats Domino who made this line famous.

QUESTION #25:

"Good night, Mrs. Calabash, \_\_\_\_\_." This originated long before even the first of us boomers was born. But in order to be a true baby boomer, you have to have some breadth.

QUESTION #26:

"Good night, David." " \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #27.

"Liar, liar, \_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #28.

"When it's least expected, you're elected; You're the star today. Smile! \_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #29.

>>>From our parents' day, as I recall, it was Pogo, the comic strip character, who said, "We have met the enemy, and \_\_\_\_\_."

QUESTION #30.

Who put the bop in the bop she-bop she-bop?

Elaine

Return-Path: <orders@amazon.com>  
From: orders@amazon.com  
Date: Sat, 26 Dec 1998 03:43:05 -0800 (PST)  
X-Authentication-Warning: delaware-2.amazon.com: owl set sender to orders@amazon.com using -f  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Your Amazon.com order (#002-7545782-2241867)

We thought you'd like to know that the following item has been shipped to:

Howard W. Hallman  
6508 Wilmett Road  
Bethesda MD 20817

using US Priority (comp. upgrade).

Your order #002-7545782-2241867 (received December 23 1998 08:14 PST)

| Ordered | Title                          | Price                | Shipped | Subtotal |
|---------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------|----------|
| 1       | Grasses (Would You Believe It) | 21.40                | 1       | 21.40    |
|         |                                | Subtotal:            | 21.40   |          |
|         |                                | Shipping & Handling: | 3.95    |          |
|         |                                | Total:               | 25.35   |          |

This completes your order.

If you have any questions, please contact us  
via e-mail (orders@amazon.com), FAX (1-206-694-2950)  
or phone (1-800-201-7575 for US customers or 1-206-694-2992  
for international customers).

Thank you for shopping at Amazon.com.

-----  
Amazon.com  
Books, Music & More  
info@amazon.com      <http://www.amazon.com/>  
-----

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Mon, 28 Dec 1998 12:32:37 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, mupj@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, disarmament@igc.org,  
btiller@psr.org  
Subject: De-alerting event

Friends,

I am addressing this to everyone who was present at the planning meeting on de-alerting on 11-24-98, plus Kathy Crandall. As you know, the de-alerting briefing for Senate staff, which was scheduled for December 17th, was canceled/postponed.

So, I propose that we have an e-mail dialogue about our next steps. We can exchange thoughts and views for a few days, then perhaps have a face-to-face meeting.

Here are some questions that occur to me:

- Shall we try to hold a Senate staff briefing in January, with the same lineup of speakers, if they are available? Or shall we shift our venue to the House, since the Senate will be head-over-heels into the Clinton trial in January? Or shall we wait and do nothing on the Hill until the Senate trial is over, which means February or March?

- Shall we try for a different sort of event, maybe off the Hill, with a stronger media component and more outreach to NGOs?

Also:

- Shall we try to meet briefly around the edges of another January meeting, e.g. the CTBT Working Group of the CRND on the 8th, or the Carnegie conference on the 11th, or the Coolfont retreat?

- Or shall we have a separate time to meet and resolve this? One possibility might be 12:00 noon on January 8th, and another might be 11:00 on January 15th.

- Or would you like to delegate the decision-making to a subgroup, which might consist of Howard, Alistair, me, and anyone else who wants to join us?

Please reply to everyone. I look forward to reading your ideas.

Happy holidays,  
Bob Tiller

To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, mupj@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, disarmament@igc.org, btiller@psr.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: De-alerting event  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 12:32 PM 12/28/98 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Friends,  
>  
>I am addressing this to everyone who was present at the planning meeting  
>on de-alerting on 11-24-98, plus Kathy Crandall. As you know, the  
>de-alerting briefing for Senate staff, which was scheduled for December  
>17th, was canceled/postponed.  
>  
>So, I propose that we have an e-mail dialogue about our next steps. We  
>can exchange thoughts and views for a few days, then perhaps have a  
>face-to-face meeting.  
>  
>Here are some questions that occur to me:

REPLY FROM HOWARD HALLMAN IN BOLD

> -Shall we try to hold a Senate staff briefing in January, with the  
>same lineup of speakers, if they are available? Or shall we shift our  
>venue to the House, since the Senate will be head-over-heels into the  
>Clinton trial in January? Or shall we wait and do nothing on the Hill  
>until the Senate trial is over, which means February or March?

I BELIEVE WE SHOULD WAIT TO GET A BETTER IDEA OF THE SENATE SCHEDULE. THERE MAY BE AN INITIAL PRESENTATION OF IMPEACHMENT CHARGES BY HOUSE MANAGER AND THEN A MONTH FOR PRESIDENT CLINTON TO REPLY. OR MAYBE SOME OTHER SCHEDULE.

DEPENDING ON SCHEDULE, I WOULD BE INCLINED TO AIM FOR THE SAME AUDIENCE: SENATE STAFF, SELECTED HOUSE STAFF, NGOS PLUS MEDIA.

THE SAME SPEAKERS WOULD BE OKAY, BUT I WOULD LIKE TO ADD ADMIRAL CHILES IF WE HAVE ENOUGH TIME AND CAN GET HIM. IF ALISTAIR FEELS WE CAN'T GO TO ADMIRAL TURNER AGAIN BECAUSE OF THE CANCELLATION, I WOULD ACCEPT THAT.

> -Shall we try for a different sort of event, maybe off the Hill, with  
>a stronger media component and more outreach to NGOs?

> NO, I BELIEVE THAT OUR APPROACH IS STILL VALID.

>Also:

> -Shall we try to meet briefly around the edges of another January  
>meeting, e.g. the CTBT Working Group of the CRND on the 8th, or the  
>Carnegie conference on the 11th, or the Coolfont retreat?

HOW ABOUT AS PART OF THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS WORKING GROUP ON JANUARY 7TH? IF NOT, AFTER THE CTBT WORKING GROUP ON THE 8TH WOULD BE OKAY.

> -Or shall we have a separate time to meet and resolve this? One  
>possibility might be 12:00 noon on January 8th, and another might be  
>11:00 on January 15th.

> -Or would you like to delegate the decision-making to a subgroup,  
>which might consist of Howard, Alistair, me, and anyone else who wants  
>to join us?

> IF E-MAIL YIELDS A CONSENSUS, WE MIGHT DELEGATE TO A SUB-GROUP. OTHERWISE WE

SHOULD HAVE ONE MEETING OF ALL.

>Please reply to everyone. I look forward to reading your ideas.  
THANKS FOR KEEPING THIS GOING, BOB.

Shalom,  
Howard

>

Return-Path: <epf@peacenet.org>  
Date: Tue, 29 Dec 1998 07:14:33 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: epf@pop.igc.org  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
From: "Mary H. Miller" <epf@peacenet.org>  
Subject: Re: Senate CTBT Swing List

At 06:59 AM 12/23/98 -0800, you wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>David Culp has provided a new Senate swing list on the CTBT. It is attached  
>in a Word 6.0 version. If you have trouble downloading it, please let me  
>know and I'll fax you a copy.

>

>Shalom,

>Howard

>

>Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\CTBTRATI.doc

>

Howard,

Merry Christmas!

and I'd appreciate it if you'd please fax David's list to me: 202-393-3695

Peace,

Mary

Return-Path: <panukes>  
Date: Sun, 3 Jan 1999 16:25:27 -0800 (PST)  
From: Peace Action - National Office <panukes@igc.apc.org>  
To: amillar@fourthfreedom.org, bmorse@igc.org, btiller@psr.org,  
disarmament@igc.org, hisham@ieer.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, mupj@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org  
Subject: Re: De-alerting event

I would suggest waiting until the middle of the week of January 10 before making a decision for two reasons. One - let's see where this impeachment thing is heading. Two - as you know many of us are working on strategy for an abolition campaign that would obviously include pressure on US elected officials not tarred and feathered to undertake unilateral initiatives possibly including de-alerting. This strategies will be discussed further when we all are back and Congressional briefings should fit nicely.

Bruce

---

> From btiller@psr.org Mon Dec 28 09:33:35 1998  
> Date: Mon, 28 Dec 1998 12:32:37 -0500  
> From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
> Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
> To: hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, mupj@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org,  
> paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org, disarmament@igc.org,  
> btiller@psr.org  
> Subject: De-alerting event

> Friends,

> I am addressing this to everyone who was present at the planning meeting  
> on de-alerting on 11-24-98, plus Kathy Crandall. As you know, the  
> de-alerting briefing for Senate staff, which was scheduled for December  
> 17th, was canceled/postponed.

> So, I propose that we have an e-mail dialogue about our next steps. We  
> can exchange thoughts and views for a few days, then perhaps have a  
> face-to-face meeting.

> Here are some questions that occur to me:

> -Shall we try to hold a Senate staff briefing in January, with the  
> same lineup of speakers, if they are available? Or shall we shift our  
> venue to the House, since the Senate will be head-over-heels into the  
> Clinton trial in January? Or shall we wait and do nothing on the Hill  
> until the Senate trial is over, which means February or March?  
> -Shall we try for a different sort of event, maybe off the Hill, with  
> a stronger media component and more outreach to NGOs?

> Also:

> -Shall we try to meet briefly around the edges of another January  
> meeting, e.g. the CTBT Working Group of the CRND on the 8th, or the  
> Carnegie conference on the 11th, or the Coolfont retreat?  
> -Or shall we have a separate time to meet and resolve this? One  
> possibility might be 12:00 noon on January 8th, and another might be

> 11:00 on January 15th.  
> -Or would you like to delegate the decision-making to a subgroup,  
> which might consist of Howard, Alistair, me, and anyone else who wants  
> to join us?  
>  
> Please reply to everyone. I look forward to reading your ideas.  
>  
> Happy holidays,  
> Bob Tiller

---

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 31 Dec 1998 13:15:58 -0500  
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@pgs.ca>  
Importance: Normal  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: FWB: Norwegian poll  
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id KAB03103

Non-member submission from [Kirsten Osen <kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no>]  
Date: Thu, 31 Dec 1998 17:40:45 +0100 (MET)  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, ippnwbos@igc.apc.org  
From: Kirsten Osen <kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no>  
Subject: Norwegian poll

Dear friends. We apologize for the delay in distributing in English the results of our poll in July 1998. We wish you all a happy new year with progress in the Abolition 2000 campaign. Warm greetings Kirsten and Bjorn.  
**THE NORWEGIAN PEOPLE WANT AN INTERNATIONAL BAN ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

Norwegian Physicians Against Nuclear War (NLA) which is an affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), has, in collaboration with a professional agency (4-fakta), conducted a brief poll on the stand of the Norwegian people about abolition of nuclear weapons. The results show that a large majority of the Norwegian people, independent of their political view in other questions, want the Norwegian government to work actively for an international ban on nuclear weapons. The poll was conducted in the beginning of July 1998 on a representative sample of the population comprising 1,009 adult Norwegians.

Upon the question "Norway has signed international treaties on the prohibition of chemical and biological weapons. There are today activities in many countries in order to achieve an international treaty to ban nuclear weapons. Do you mean that Norwegian authorities should work actively for a ban on nuclear weapons, or do you consider this question as of minor importance?" 92% answered that they wanted a ban on nuclear weapons, while only 5% considered the question as of little importance.

Upon the question "Do you think that the safety of Norway against war and destruction would increase or decrease in case of an international ban on nuclear weapons, or do you think that this would have only little influence on our security?" there were 49% who thought that a ban would increase our security, while 32% answered that it would be of little significance. Only 8% ment that a ban would decrease our security.

As our brief poll was conducted shortly after the nuclear weapons tests of India and Pakistan earlier this year, the results may have been biased to some extent. On the other hand our results do show that the Norwegian people take the same stand in the important question of nuclear disarmament as the people of the United States of America, Great Britain, Canada and Germany where similar investigations have been conducted in 1997 and 1998 before the new nuclear weapons tests.

Our poll shows that the Norwegian people consider the threat of nuclear weapons as an important matter, and that they want nuclear abolition.

This short report was issued in December 1998.  
If you want more information please contact us.

Professor Kirsten Osen  
Deputy chairman of NLA  
Luftfartsveien 10, N-0385 Oslo  
e-mail: [kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no](mailto:kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no)

Professor Bjørn Hilt  
Board member of NLA  
Nygata 10, N-7014 Trondheim  
e-mail: [bjorn.hilt@medisin.ntnu.no](mailto:bjorn.hilt@medisin.ntnu.no)  
Kirsten Osen  
Luftfartsveien 10,  
0385 Oslo, Norway  
Tlf 47-22142007 (home), 47-22851264 (office)  
Fax 47-22920683 (home)  
e-mail [kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no](mailto:kirsten.osen@basalmed.uio.no)

To: sfosler@napawash.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Survey of Fellows  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Scott:

Here are my responses to the Survey of Academy Fellows.

## I. KEY ISSUES

1. Global governance: how to develop a system (with subsystems) for dealing with international conflict and internal ethnic conflict) to supercede the present system of U.S. the superpower intervening when and where it chooses. (I doubt that NAPA could take on this issue, but I would place it as a top issue for somebody to deal with.)
2. Federalism in the new millenium. This goes beyond intergovernmental relations, which has been NAPA's main interest, and looks at federalism as James Madison did in The Federalist No. 46. He noted that the people have "different agents and trustees..., constituted different powers, and designed for different purposes." Luther Gulick called them "extensions". He indicated that the American system of government "is made up of partially autonomous governmental structures which differ primarily with respect to the extent of the constituencies and boundaries on which they rest." Thus, federalism should be examined from the people's perspective (no just the administrators', chief executive's, or legislators' perspective). What do the people want each of its extension to do? How do the people want their respective governments to interact?
3. Broadening citizen participation in ongoing processes of government between elections.
4. Growing inequality of income and wealth and the impact on governance.

## II. PRIORITY ISSUES FOR NAPA

1. Federalism in the new millenium from the above perspective. The Panel on the Federal System has lots of good people who are underutilized by the Academy because of its concern primarily for federal management. As a beginning step, we should have a chat room or list-serve arrangement for interchange on issues of federalism in its broadest sense.
2. Public participation in federal budget making. Such participation should begin quite early in the budget cycle, that is, when federal departments are working up their proposals to OMB (12 to 15 months before the start of the fiscal year). There is some solid local experience on how to do this and also some experiments on citizen involvement in the federal budgetary process. I've done a little writing on this subject if someone wants to see it.
3. The role of government in dealing with disparities of income and wealth. A fresh examination of government responses, particularly in taxation and intergovernmental transfers.

I hope that these thoughts will be useful to the trustees and you.

Cordially yours,

Howard W. Hallman

Return-Path: <SFosler@NAPAWASH.ORG>  
From: "Fosler, Scott" <SFosler@NAPAWASH.ORG>  
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Cc: "Tate, Nancy" <NTate@NAPAWASH.ORG>,  
"Stroup, Benne"  
<BStroup@NAPAWASH.ORG>  
Subject: RE: Survey of Fellows  
Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1999 12:49:26 -0500

Howard:

Many thanks for your thoughts! We will be sure to include these with the survey.

Scott

>-----

>From: Howard W. Hallman[SMTP:mupj@igc.apc.org]  
>Sent: Monday, January 04, 1999 12:04 PM  
>To: Fosler, Scott  
>Subject: Survey of Fellows

>

>Dear Scott:

>

>Here are my responses to the Survey of Academy Fellows.

>

#### >I. KEY ISSUES

>

>1. Global governance: how to develop a system (with subsystems) for dealing  
>with international conflict and internal ethnic conflict) to supercede the  
>present system of U.S. the superpower intervening when and where it chooses.  
>(I doubt that NAPA could take on this issue, but I would place it as a top  
>issue for somebody to deal with.)

>

>2. Federalism in the new millenium. This goes beyond intergovernmental  
>relations, which has been NAPA's main interest, and looks at federalism as  
>James Madison did in The Federalist No. 46. He noted that the people have  
>"different agents and trustees..., constituted different powers, and  
>designed for different purposes." Luther Gulick called them "extensions".  
>He indicated that the American system of government "is made up of partially  
>autonomous governmental structures which differ primarily with respect to  
>the extent of the constituencies and boundaries on which they rest." Thus,  
>federalism should be examined from the people's perspective (no just the  
>administrators', chief executive's, or legislators' perspective). What do  
>the people want each of its extension to do? How do the people want their  
>respective governments to interact?

>

>3. Broadening citizen participation in ongoing processes of government  
>between elections.

>

>4. Growing inequality of income and wealth and the impact on governance.

>

#### >II. PRIORITY ISSUES FOR NAPA

>  
>1. Federalism in the new millenium from the above perspective. The Panel on  
>the Federal System has lots of good people who are underutilized by the  
>Academy because of its concern primarily for federal management. As a  
>beginning step, we should have a chat room or list-serve arrangement for  
>interchange on issues of federalism in its broadest sense.

>  
>2. Public participation in federal budget making. Such participation should  
>begin quite early in the budget cycle, that is, when federal departments are  
>working up their proposals to OMB (12 to 15 months before the start of the  
>fiscal year). There is some solid local experience on how to do this and  
>also some experiments on citizen involvement in the federal budgetary  
>process. I've done a little writing on this subject if someone wants to see  
>it.

>  
>3. The role of government in dealing with disparities of income and wealth.  
>A fresh examination of government responses, particularly in taxation and  
>intergovernmental transfers.

>  
>I hope that these thoughts will be useful to the trustees and you.

>  
>Cordially yours,

>  
>Howard W. Hallman

>  
>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: <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
Date: Mon, 04 Jan 99 15:18:04 -0500  
From: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: CTBT petition

Howard.

Do you still need the petition? My email was down for awhile, and I'm only now getting to some back messages

and HELP.

What is your phone number? I've looked all over for it, but don't have it on rolladex and can't find it.

I wanted to call to get updated list of swing Senators. We are now doing contact work in key states. It didn't get through on computer. Can you fax it?

---

Reply Separator

---

Subject: CTBT petition  
Author: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org> at internet-mail  
Date: 12/8/98 10:47 AM

Dear Jay,

I've misplaced my copy of the CTBT petition and background information. Will you please send me a copy, via e-mail at mupj@igc.org, or fax at 301 896-0013, or by regular mail to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Thanks,  
Howard

To: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: CTBT petition  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 03:18 PM 1/4/99 -0500, JAY LINTNER wrote:

>  
>  
REPLY IN CAPS

> Howard, Do you still need the petition? My email was down for awhile, and I'm  
> only now getting to some back messages

>  
YES, PLEASE. I GOT A COPY FROM MARIE, BUT I NEED A CLEAN ONE. PLEASE SEND IT BY MAIL OR  
BAX.

>  
> What is your phone number? I've looked all over for it, but don't  
> have it on rolladex and can't find it.

>  
PHONE: 301 896-0013 FAX: SAME

> I wanted to call to get updated list of swing Senators. We are now  
> doing contact work in key states. It didn't get through on computer.  
> Can you fax it?

>  
I'M FAXING IT SEPARATELY.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Strategy Outline  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Daryl,

Please send me an e-mail copy of "A Draft Strategy Outline" for the CTBT if you have it that format. I want to share it with members of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

Thanks,  
Howard

To: ctbt@2020vision.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Advocacy Strategies  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Marie,

New Year's Greetings!

Do you have your "Advocacy Strategies for CTBT Ratification in 1999" in an e-mail format. If so, please send me a copy so that I can send it to members of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

Thanks,  
Howard

To: 70761.2655@compuserve.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Next Peace Leaf  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Jim:

New Year's greeting to you and Char.

Regarding Peace Leaf, I talked with you earlier about an article on what to expect in the upcoming session of Congress. I still intend to provide you some material.

The Monday Lobby has a 2½ day retreat next week. This will give me a better picture, so I'll wait until then to write the article. I believe that CTBT ratification, defense spending, and UN funding will be particularly important from our perspective. You might want to gather some other material on defense spending and the UN.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1999 18:03:59 -0500  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: Re: Strategy Outline

Howard:

Sorry for not replying earlier.

If you could stop by and pick up some hard copies of the strategy (or if I might mail them to you) I would prefer that. Let me know what works best.

DK

At 01:16 PM 1/4/99 -0800, you wrote:

>Daryl,  
>  
>Please send me an e-mail copy of "A Draft Strategy Outline" for the CTBT if  
>you have it that format. I want to share it with members of the Interfaith  
>Group for the CTBT.  
>  
>Thanks,  
>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>  
CC: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1999 22:59:33 -0500  
From: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.org>  
Organization: Fourth Freedom Forum  
References: <bb7de48d.36913175@aol.com>  
Reply-To: kwood@igc.org  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: A2000 AND PEACE PRIZE  
To: LANLaction@aol.com

Dear Peggy,

Thanks for your stimulating email. Abolition 2000 is not on everyone's lips primarily because, unlike the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, we are not a campaign and we have not been campaigning. We are a network of people and groups who communicate on this email list, and share information, trade ideas and the occasional arguments, but we do not plan and carry out a united campaign together. As you say, we are all busy working hard on nuclear abolition in our own ways, locally and nationally, but we do not have a united international campaign strategy to achieve our stated goals -- at every meeting of Abolition 2000 I have attended, I have urged campaign plans, but the majority of people have been very opposed to this. I don't think Abolition 2000 will ever be a force to reckon with until we become an International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons.

See you in Los Alamos in the summer,

Karina Wood

LANLaction@aol.com wrote:

>  
> Nobel Peace Prize Laureates Conference - I caught parts of this conference a  
> few weeks ago, but C-SPAN rebroadcast it today, Jan. 4th. and I heard the  
> Dalai Lama asked Jody Williams about the possibility of abolishing nuclear  
> weapons with the same tactics that won the landmine ban. Jody Williams,  
> Bobby Muller, and Oscar Arias all commented on the possibility. Muller  
> mentioned General Lee Butler, but no one mentioned the Abolition 2000  
> movement. This, even though A2000 is organized in much the same way as the  
> Intl. Campaign to Ban Landmines. What is it that we're doing or not doing  
> that is preventing even our own sisters and brothers from knowing who we are ,  
> and don't even seem to know we exist? I certainly would have thought the  
> Dalai Lama would have known us. What's wrong with this picture?  
>  
> I haven't heard much about A2000 networking or organizing lately. Are we only  
> going to have yearly conferences to which most of us cannot afford to go and  
> therefore limit participation? What actions are planned for this year by  
> A2000 as a whole? We have a unique opportunity in this last year before the  
> millennium. I know you know this. I'm not chiding you, my friends, only  
> wondering what has happened to the fire under our butts.  
>

> As a small, but possibly important illustration of how folks are feeling about  
> nuclear weapons: I table at stores almost every weekend with literature on  
> various disarmament issues. One of the main things that bring people to the  
> table is the petition for the abolition of nuclear weapons. Whereas, two  
> years ago, 50% of people wouldn't sign the petition, today people stand  
> sometimes three-deep to write their name down, and most interesting, no one  
> says "No I can't sign that." any more. What does this tell you?  
>  
> We, at Peace Action New Mexico, as you probably know, are preparing to host  
> the national Peace Action Congress and action here in August of this year. It  
> will concentrate on nuclear issues of weapons and abolition. Please contact  
> either me (LANLaction@aol.com) or Bruce Hall (panukes@igc.apc.org) if you  
> want more information.  
>  
> We are all working very hard in our own communities for our collective goals,  
> and I really think we have to make a major world-wide move this year. The  
> time is right.  
>  
> Peace with Justice;  
> Peggy Prince

--

Karina H. Wood  
U.S. Outreach Coordinator  
Hague Appeal for Peace  
43 Nisbet St., 3rd Floor  
Providence, RI 02906  
Ph: 401-751-8172  
Fax: 401-751-1476  
Email: kwood@igc.org  
Web: www.haguepeace.org

Please join us in The Hague, May 11-15, 1999!

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 16:27:13 +0800 (WST)  
From: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@sage.wt.com.au>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: A2000 AND PEACE PRIZE  
To: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.org>  
cc: LANLaction@aol.com, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Why then, are we NOT a campaign? Does anyone have a good answer?

Regards,  
Graham Daniell

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 05 Jan 1999 03:22:20 -0500  
From: Peace through Reason <prop1@prop1.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: A2000 AND PEACE PRIZE  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org

Re Peggy Prince's question: how can we coordinate actions in the future to better get out the word about Abolition 2000? Her anecdote about tabling on weekends is encouraging. I too notice that people are less resistant to the idea of nuclear abolition, at our perch outside the White House. We certainly might all be thinking about how to raise awareness when the NATO leaders gather in Washington D.C. this April. (Has anyone written the Dalai Lama yet to correct the lack of awareness?)

Below is a Christian Science Monitor editorial about the NATO gathering.

et in dc

<http://www.csmonitor.com/durable/1998/12/18/fp11s1-csm.shtml>

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1998

COLUMN: Remolding NATO

Partners are no longer marching to the American drummer

Foreign ministers of the 16 North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries are planning an anniversary summit in Washington next April to redefine the mission of the alliance. And what a whale of a difference a half century makes!

I can remember what it felt like in 1949 when the NATO treaty was signed in the State Department auditorium under the beaming gaze of Secretary Dean Acheson. Mao Zedong's forces were completing the conquest of China. Soviet tanks had rolled into Czechoslovakia. Blockaded Berlin was being kept alive by an American airlift. The Soviets had tested an atomic bomb. And Western Europe, especially West Germany, huddled under the American nuclear umbrella, happy to accept US leadership.

Now a newly confident Germany has proposed that the alliance pledge no first-use of nuclear weapons and has joined with France and Britain in plans for an autonomous European military force. And Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, outlining a new "strategic concept" for NATO at a foreign ministers' conference in Brussels, has found herself at the start of a rancorous debate with partners no longer marching to the American drummer.

The new concept would take the alliance "out of area," in NATO

lingo, to mobilize against the threat of missiles, gas, or chemical attack from any rogue state or nonstate terrorist organization. A new NATO Center for Weapons of Mass Destruction would be created as a clearinghouse for intelligence on potential threats. A central organization would distribute detection equipment, protective clothing, and vaccines.

The initial European reaction has been cool, to put it mildly. French Foreign Minister Hubert Vedrine said that an America with hegemonic aspirations as the only superpower is aiming at "some new kind of global NATO." It would be a NATO no longer willing to subject itself to a veto by China or Russia by seeking the endorsement of the United Nations Security Council.

The Clinton administration has done remarkably little to prepare the Europeans, or the American public for that matter, for its far-reaching proposals. They would require a redrafting of the NATO treaty, whose collective defense provision had in mind a massed Soviet tank attack, not a germ-laden missile or poisoned water supply from a mysterious source.

Remolding NATO, a difficult task in itself, becomes more difficult with Europeans less willing to accept American leadership.

Under a portrait of Dean Acheson in the State Department, our allies may be less acquiescent next April than they were in the perilous days of 1949.

Daniel Schorr is senior news analyst for National Public Radio.

Before bookmarking this page in your browser, click here.

The URL for this page is:  
<http://www.csmonitor.com/durable/1998/12/18/fp11s1-csm.shtml>

---

\* NucNews - to subscribe: [prop1@prop1.org](mailto:prop1@prop1.org) - <http://prop1.org> \*

Please forward -- help educate!

---

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 13:55:13 +0100 (MET)  
From: fredpax@online.no (Fredrik S. Heffermehl)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: A2000 AND PEACE PRIZE  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, kwood@igc.org

Oslo, Jan. 5, 1999

HAPPY NEW YEAR TO YOU ALL!

I send this to express my full support for Karina. She concludes what I have tried to propagate several occasions in her email to

>Dear Peggy,  
>  
>..... I don't think Abolition 2000 will ever be a  
>force to reckon with until we become an International Campaign to  
>Abolish Nuclear Weapons.  
>  
>Karina Wood  
>

Fredrik

Fredrik S. Heffermehl

```
*****  
* Fredrik S. HEFFERMEHL *  
* President, Norwegian Peace Alliance *  
* Vice President, International Peace Bureau *  
* Vice Pres., I Assn. Lawyers Ag. Nuclar Arms *  
* International Free Vanunu Committee *  
* *  
* N. Juels g. 28 A, N-0272 Oslo, Norway *  
* Phone +47-2244 8003 (fax: +47-2244 7616) *  
* E-mail: fredpax@online.no *  
*****
```

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 05 Jan 1999 15:06:14 +0100  
From: Lysiane Alezard <mvtpaix@globenet.org>  
Organization: Mouvement de la Paix  
Reply-To: mvtpaix@globenet.org  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: re A2000 and peace prize  
To: abolition caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id GAA12095  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id GAB12366

Thank you for raising this fundamental challenge as the year 2000 is coming closer !

We agree with Peggy that “we have a unique opportunity in this last year before the millenium” (and century). Whether we are a network or a campaign, what unites us (the 1,200 organizations that have joined A2000), is that we have all signed up a founding statement whose aim is to get a Convention abolishing all nuclear weapons, by 2000.

Therefore, the closer we move to 2000, the louder we should speak out, the more visible our actions should become, the closer we should shift into a campaign. have we “not had a united international campaign strategy” ? Maybe not, and yet, as Peggy underlines, we have an **INTERNATIONAL PETITION FOR THE ABOLITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS**, which is quite an incentive for the man (and the woman) on the street. It is also a perfect backbone for a campaign to get started !

Let us give you a few examples on how we have used the petition in France. As far as the Mouvement de la Paix is concerned, we have now collected over 26,000 signatures. Other French groups have also collected many.

In La Rochelle, a harbour in the South west, a peace caravan was organized with cars from the entire county converging to that city : 2,500 signatures were collected in the preparation and on the very day, on market places, in high schools, at the University.

In the Paris suburbs, various events were organized, including one on the tram, with various attractions, banners, leaflets... 150 petitions were signed in one hour.

In Alsace, a tight schedule has been worked out to present the petition on market places, every Sunday. 1,000 signatures were collected. The petition is circulated in two convents !

In Paris, the giant model of the petition has circulated on wheels on the capital streets, with hundreds of people signing in.

A local activist gave out the petition to one of his cousins in Brazil. A few weeks later, he got a big mail from Rio, with 280 signatures ! The petition was sent to hundreds of local, regional and national elected representatives. Many have sent back their names, including some with actual votes of their council, adopting the petition.

What is at stake now is to broaden all this further, to build a real tight web of people circulating the petition, of organizations (peace ones, unions, women's, youth...) taking it up.

As we are 360 days from 2000, we should try to work out as big plans as possible. Here's a few "rough" ideas :

- how could we best use The Hague Appeal for Peace event to give a new impetus to our campaign ? (in addition to all the many large events already underway)

- the Model Convention has already been sent out to States. How can we envisage to move one step further and actually meet with heads of State and present them with the petition ?

- in Sept. this year, the last UNGA of the century will start. What could we do at the very beginning of this session to make ourselves heard and present the signatures collected throughout the world ?

We feel the 2000 challenge is worth it.

Lysiane Alezard

Daniel Durand

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
CC: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@sage.wt.com.au>, Karina Wood <kwood@igc.org>, LANLaction@aol.com  
Date: Tue, 05 Jan 1999 09:15:46 -0500  
From: Norm Cohen <norco@bellatlantic.net>  
Organization: Coalition for Peace and Justice  
References: <Pine.SGI.3.91.990105162632.6261B-100000@sage.wt.com.au>  
Reply-To: norco@bellatlantic.net  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: A2000 AND PEACE PRIZE  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

I thought we WERE a campaign. Why did we meet in Chicago awhile back? I thought it was for campaign plans.

Peace  
Norm Cohen

Graham Daniell wrote:

> Why then, are we NOT a campaign? Does anyone have a good answer?  
>  
> Regards,  
> Graham Daniell

Return-Path: <ajaxmarie@yahoo.com>  
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 10:26:36 -0800 (PST)  
From: Marie Rietmann <ajaxmarie@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Advocacy Strategies  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>

Hi Howard,

Thanks for being in touch. Hope your holidays were good.

I don't have this document in electronic format--just camera-ready that you have. It's something I could get to after Coolfont. Or possibly before.

See you at NWWG Thursday.

Marie

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

>  
> Dear Marie,  
>  
> New Year's Greetings!  
>  
> Do you have your "Advocacy Strategies for CTBT Ratification in 1999"  
in an  
> e-mail format. If so, please send me a copy so that I can send it to  
> members of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.  
>  
> Thanks,  
> 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.  
>  
>  
>

---

DO YOU YAHOO!?

Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Tue, 05 Jan 1999 13:13:03 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: REMINDER: CTBT Wkg. Grp. Mtg., Jan. 8 at 9:30am

January 5, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball, Director; Tom Collina, CTBT Working Group Chair  
RE: Meeting Reminder

Your are invited to attend this Friday's CTBT Working Group meeting of the Coalition to help implement the initial elements of our strategy for ratification in 1999.

A short meeting on CTBT lobbying will follow immediately after in the same room.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Comprehensive Test Ban Working Group Meeting

WHEN: Friday, January 8, 1999, 9:30 - 11:00 AM  
WHERE: Resources for the Future conference room A, 1400 16th Street, NW

\*\*\*\*\*

The CTBT Working Group meeting will address our work related to:

- \* upcoming State of the Union address
- \* upcoming Coalition meetings with Administration officials, including Sandy Berger
- \* draft Coalition letter to the President on the CTBT
- \* joint media and public education projects

If you have questions or suggestions, please contact us: Tom Collina(332-0900) or Daryl Kimball (546-0795 x136).

---

Daryl Kimball, Exectutive Director  
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers  
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201  
Washington DC 20002  
p: (202)546-0795 ext. 136; fax: (202)546-5142  
website: <<http://www.crnd.org>>

---



To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>,  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: REMINDER: CTBT Wkg. Grp. Mtg., Jan. 8 at 9:30am  
Cc: tcollina@uscusa.org  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 01:13 PM 1/5/99 -0500, Daryl Kimball wrote:

>January 5, 1999

>

>TO: Coalition members and friends

>FR: Daryl Kimball, Director; Tom Collina, CTBT Working Group Chair

>

>RE: Meeting Reminder

>

>Your are invited to attend this Friday's CTBT Working Group meeting of the

>Coalition to help implement the initial elements of our strategy for

>ratification in 1999.....

Daryl, Tom:

At this and future meetings of the CTBT Working Group I would like to give a brief report of the activities of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT. This will help strengthen relationships in our joint effort to achieve CTBT ratification.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: relctbt  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Request for information  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

To: Interfaith Group for the CTBT

The CTBT Working Group, administered by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, has scheduled its next four monthly meetings for January 8, February 5, March 5, and April 9. All organizations seeking CTBT ratification are invited to be represented. Meetings will run from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. The January 8 meeting will be held at Resources for the Future Conference Room A, 1400 16th Street, NW. The other sessions will meet at the Union of Concerned Scientists 7th Floor Conference Room, 1616 P Street, NW.

Because many of you don't have time to attend this monthly meeting, I will report on the activities of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT and will in turn report back to you major decisions of the CTBT Working Group. For my report as well as a check on our progress, will you please provide me the following information by return e-mail by close of business Thursday, January 7.

Do you intend to make use of the CTBT petition developed for circulation at churches, synagogues, and other religious gatherings? If so, briefly describe your plans, such as method of distribution, states to be covered, time frame.

Do you intend to reach out to Virginians in the next month or two to encourage contacts with Senator Warner on the CTBT, as suggested in a previous memo? If so, how and when?

As a reminder, the next meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT will be held on Tuesday, January 19 from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. at the FCNL Conference Room. Among other matters we will discuss how we can encourage interfaith delegations to present petitions to senators' home-state offices. Please mark this date on your calendar as well as the third Tuesday of each month for regular meetings of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <Dringler@umc-gbcs.org>  
Date: Tue, 05 Jan 1999 15:08:34 -0500  
From: Robin Ringler <Dringler@umc-gbcs.org>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: Request for information  
Content-Disposition: inline

Hi Howard! Happy New Year! In answer to your questions:

- The CTBT petition is in the most recent PwJ Newsletter (mailed yesterday) which goes to around 3,800 people around the US. You should receive one. I haven't done a thorough check, but I think we have someone receiving it in every state. In addition, it is on our web site, which last week had over 7,500 hits.

- I intend to reach out to Virginians via our VA conf. PwJ Coordinator re: Sen. Warner. Additionally, I lead a workshop this Sat. for Alexandria District local church C&S Chairs and one of the main issues I'm focusing on is the CTBT. Also, Jan. 28 is UM day in Richmond where UMs converge on the state capitol and lobby their local reps. on various issues. Jim (Winkler) will be going and he'll take with him copies of the petition and info on reaching Sen. Warner.

Hope this sounds okay!

Robin

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org> 01/05/99 02:37PM >>>  
To: Interfaith Group for the CTBT

The CTBT Working Group, administered by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, has scheduled its next four monthly meetings for January 8, February 5, March 5, and April 9. All organizations seeking CTBT ratification are invited to be represented. Meetings will run from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. The January 8 meeting will be held at Resources for the Future Conference Room A, 1400 16th Street, NW. The other sessions will meet at the Union of Concerned Scientists 7th Floor Conference Room, 1616 P Street, NW.

Because many of you don't have time to attend this monthly meeting, I will report on the activities of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT and will in turn report back to you major decisions of the CTBT Working Group. For my report as well as a check on our progress, will you please provide me the following information by return e-mail by close of business Thursday, January 7.

Do you intend to make use of the CTBT petition developed for circulation at churches, synagogues, and other religious gatherings? If so, briefly describe your plans, such as method of distribution, states to be covered, time frame.

Do you intend to reach out to Virginians in the next month or two to encourage contacts with Senator Warner on the CTBT, as suggested in a previous memo? If so, how and when?

As a reminder, the next meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT will be held on Tuesday, January 19 from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. at the FCNL Conference Room. Among other matters we will discuss how we can encourage interfaith delegations to present petitions to senators' home-state offices. Please mark this date on your calendar as well as the third Tuesday of each month for regular meetings of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

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.

\$\*\$\*\$\*\$ 4 LINES REFORMATTED BY POPPER AT igc.apc.org \$\*\$\*\$\*\$

Return-Path: <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>  
X-Sender: disarmtimes@pop.igc.org (Unverified)  
Date: Tue, 05 Jan 1999 15:51:00 -0500  
To: disarmtimes@igc.org  
From: "NGO Comm. on Disarmament" <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: internatl/NPT PrepCom 99

Dear friends,  
Following is a letter inviting coordination of preparations for the 1999  
NPT PrepCom in New York. Many of you will also be receiving this letter by post.  
Thank you and happy new year.  
Peacefully,  
Roger Smith  
Network Coordinator, NGO Committee on Disarmament, New York

\* \* \* \* \*

21 December 1998

Dear NGO colleagues and friends:

We know some of you have already begun preparations for action at the third meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty Review Conference (NPT PrepCom), to be held at the United Nations in New York, 12-23 April 1999. The NGO Committee on Disarmament (New York) invites you and your group to join in our efforts to make sure the collective presence and impact of civil society on this diplomatic conference are as strong and effective as possible. You can participate in these activities by coming to the United Nations for the PrepCom or, if your group cannot make it to New York, by sending literature for distribution, participating in the collaborative drafting of NGO statements, or by early advocacy with your own governments as they are formulating their positions in advance of the PrepCom.

In addition to its diplomatic significance, the NPT review process gives citizens' organizations an avenue for addressing and influencing an important intergovernmental forum. Although NGOs are permitted to observe only some of the deliberations, the presence and expertise of NGOs do have their impact on the proceedings. The two weeks of PrepCom meetings also provide plentiful opportunities for lobbying and informal interactions between citizens and members of the diplomatic community, as well as a focal gathering of people from many countries concerned with nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

The NGO Committee on Disarmament acts as an unofficial NGO secretariat at U.N. disarmament conferences. We welcome your participation with us as we undertake this effort. Our goal is to help all NGOs do their work effectively within the U.N. by facilitating their access and helping to coordinate their efforts. We work in cooperation with the U.N. Department for Disarmament Affairs on matters such as accreditation of incoming NGOs, sponsoring information briefings, and securing facilities at U.N. headquarters. We expect that at least one meeting room within the U.N. will be available for NGO use throughout the PrepCom. We are requesting that the room be stocked with a photocopier, computers and a printer. Other rooms in and out of the U.N. can be made available at specified times for workshops,

panels or other activities. Please let us know if your group plans to organize an event during the PrepCom so we can help with the venue and scheduling.

Due to the quality of informative materials NGOs have presented in the recent past, several key delegations have requested that NGOs distribute their position papers, research and ideas considerably before the meetings convene. Meeting this request will maximize the influence of NGO views on the positions NPT member states take into the PrepCom. We urge your group to begin outlining your position and deciding on how you will articulate your views in the most useful way. If you would like, the NGO Committee on Disarmament will distribute your group's materials to all NPT delegations; please deliver 185 copies to us, or enough money to cover the costs of copying and mailing your report/statement. If you want your material to be included in the packets we will distribute to delegations at the beginning of March, please send it to us by March 1. (Of course, it will also be possible to distribute literature outside the conference room while the PrepCom meetings are on.) The NGO Committee can also provide you with a mailing list of delegations in New York City if you would prefer to send your materials directly. We invite and will distribute materials in languages other than English, although we are not able to provide translation.

We have requested and expect that the 1999 PrepCom will include on its agenda one three- hour session for the formal presentation of NGO views, as has taken place the previous two years. In 1997 and 1998, NGOs worked collaboratively to prepare statements on 9-13 issue areas, allowing for detailed articulation of diverse viewpoints on each theme.\* At an initial meeting held two months in advance of the 1998 PrepCom, a list of themes was collectively agreed, and individual convenors selected to collect input from all interested organizations, coalitions and individuals on each theme, and incorporate this input into a draft statement. Most participants found that this process led to a highly successful result.

To advance these PrepCom preparations, the NGO Committee on Disarmament will sponsor an open planning meeting on Saturday, February 6, 1999, from 10am to 4pm at 777 U.N. Plaza (44th Street and 1st Avenue) in New York. The focus of the meeting will be how to build on the NPT experiences of the past two years to make our joint efforts the most forceful and effective yet. We hope at this meeting to hear proposals and make plans regarding the coordination of NGO activity at the PrepCom, including the matter of NGO statements to the PrepCom delegates. We will also make necessary decisions regarding logistical aspects of the upcoming PrepCom, such as scheduling of NGO events and collection of official documents. A tentative draft agenda is attached to this letter.

We invite your group to send a representative to this meeting. If you cannot attend, we urge you to communicate to us your ideas on any points within the draft agenda, including suggested revisions in the agenda, by post, fax or e-mail; we will make sure your input is circulated and considered. We hope to hear from you and see you at the U.N.!

Sincerely,  
Vernon C. Nichols, President  
NGO Committee on Disarmament, New York

\*For those with Internet access, the NGO statements presented at the 1998 PrepCom can be found on the International Peace Bureau website at <http://www3.itu.ch/ipb/>; we are redistributing these statements to this

year's delegates because they contain factual information and political positions that remain relevant.

\*\*\*\*\*

NGO PLANNING MEETING  
for the 1999 NPT PrepCom

Saturday, February 6, 1999, 10am-4pm,  
777 U.N. Plaza (44th Street and 1st Avenue), New York

TENTATIVE DRAFT AGENDA

1. Introductions & Approval of Agenda (10:00-10:30)
2. Report on contacts with Secretariat, PrepCom Chair, delegations (10:30-11:00)
  - a. Accreditation
  - b. Facilities in and out of U.N. headquarters
  - c. PrepCom documents
3. Meeting delegation requests for information in advance (11:00-11:30)
4. Strategies for advocacy, lobbying and media: discussion and questions (11:30-12:00)
5. Proposals for NGO cooperation (12:00-12:30)

--Break-- (12:30-1:30)

6. Oral presentations (1:30-3:00)
  - a. Collaborative process
  - b. Coordination and scheduling
  - c. Proposals for themes, convenors and forms of input into statements
7. Scheduling of NGO events, briefings etc. (3:00-3:30)
8. Follow-up mechanisms (3:30-4:00)

Please feel free to offer feedback to this draft agenda in advance of the meeting.

\* \* \* \* \*

Roger Smith  
Network Coordinator  
NGO Committee on Disarmament  
777 U.N. Plaza #3B, New York, NY 10017, USA  
tel 1.212.687.5340 fax 1.212.687.1643  
disarmtimes@igc.apc.org <http://www.peacenet.org/disarm/>

Return-Path: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "Nuclear Calendar Recipients" <dculp@igc.org>  
Subject: Nuclear Calendar  
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 15:50:38 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igce.igc.org id MAA14028

NUCLEAR CALENDAR  
January 4, 1999

Revised the first Monday of each month by David Culp, Plutonium Challenge, <dculp@igc.org>. Changes from last month are marked with an asterisk (\*).

- January 6 Congress convenes for the swearing in of new members and election of leadership, noon
- \*January 8-18 House of Representatives recess
- \*January 11 Senate begins impeachment trial of President Clinton (tentative)
- January 11-12 Carnegie Endowment, International Nonproliferation Conference, Washington Marriott Hotel, Washington
- \*January 12 Russian Duma convenes
- \*January 14 DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site high-level waste tank closure EIS, scoping workshop, North Augusta, S.C.
- January 15-20 Defense Secretary Bill Cohen visits Japan, Korea and Singapore
- January 18 Martin Luther King, Jr. Day
- January 18 Conference on Disarmament, first session of 1999 begins, Geneva
- \*January 18-22 Four-party talks on Korea, Geneva (U.S., China, South Korea and North Korea)
- January 19 House of Representatives reconvenes and begins regular sessions, noon
- January 19 President Clinton delivers the State of the Union address, 9 p.m. (tentative)
- \*January 19 DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site high-level waste tank closure EIS, scoping workshop, Columbia, S.C.
- \*January 25-27 Secretary of State Albright visits Moscow
- January 26 Third anniversary of START II ratification by the U.S. Senate
- \*January 28 DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site spent nuclear fuel draft EIS, public meeting, Columbia, S.C.
- January President Clinton nominates John Holum as

Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, T.J. Glauthier as Deputy Energy Secretary, Rose Gottemoeller as DOE Assistant Secretary for Nonproliferation and National Security, and Carolyn Huntoon as DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (estimate)

- \*January DOE Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (N.M.), opening of facility (DOE target date)
- \*January DOE Chicago Operations Office and Fissile Materials Disposition Office, contract award for design of the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility at the Savannah River Site (S.C.) (estimate)
- \*January 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>>
- 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.)
- \*January DOE Oak Ridge Operations Office, Oak Ridge (Tenn.) Transuranic Waste Treatment Facility (Melton Valley), notice of intent to prepare an EIS
- January DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Sandia National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide draft EIS
- \*January DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) remedial action and comprehensive land use plan, revised draft EIS
- \*January DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Calif.), National Ignition Facility draft supplemental EIS
- January DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide final EIS
- January DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium final EIS
- \*January DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL advanced mixed waste treatment project final EIS
- January DOE Savannah River Operations Office, accelerator for the production of tritium final EIS
- January DOE Environmental Management Office, record of decision in the waste management PEIS on treatment sites and disposal sites for low-level radioactive waste and low-level mixed radioactive waste at numerous sites
- January DOE Environmental Management Office, record of decision in 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.)

- January DOE Idaho Operations Office, record of decision in the INEEL , advanced mixed waste treatment project EIS
- January National Academy of Sciences, Committee on Immobilization/MOX Assessment, interim report
- January U.S. and Russia begin negotiations on a plutonium disposition agreement
- January Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and Indian External Affairs Minister Jaswant Singh meet on nuclear issues, New Delhi, India
- January Russian Supreme Court, decision in the appeal of Russian environmental activist Alexander Nikitin (estimate)
- \*Late January Russian President Boris Yeltsin visits Paris
- February 1 President Clinton submits the annual federal budget to Congress
- \*February 2 DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site spent nuclear fuel draft EIS, public meeting, North Augusta, S.C.
- \*February 2-? Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott visits Islamabad, Pakistan for talks on nuclear issues
- \*February 13-21 House and Senate President's Day recess
- \*February 19 French President Jacques Chirac visits Washington
- February 22 New Mexico Environment Department, public hearing on the opening of WIPP, Santa Fe, N.M.
- Early February Indian-Pakistani talks on confidence-building measures and Kashmir, New Delhi, India
- \*February Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, hearing on DOE's stockpile stewardship program (tentative)
- February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition final EIS
- February DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, record of decision in the Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide EIS
- February DOE Defense Programs Office, record of decision in the commercial reactor for tritium EIS
- February DOE Savannah River Operations Office, record of decision in the accelerator for the production of tritium EIS
- Winter DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Accordion" (estimate)
- March 8 New Mexico Environment Department, public hearing on the opening of WIPP, Carlsbad, N.M.
- March 15 Congressional committees submit budget views

and estimates to the House and Senate Budget Committees

- March 15 Commission on Maintaining U.S. Nuclear Weapons Expertise, report to Congress (42 U.S.C. 2121 note, amended by Public Law 105-85, sec. 3163(b))
- \*March 15 Defense Department reports to Congress on Russian tactical nuclear weapons (Public Law 105-261, Sec. 1504)
- March 15 New Mexico Environment Department, public hearing on the opening of WIPP, Santa Fe, N.M.
- March 26 Conference on Disarmament, first session of 1999 ends, Geneva
- \*Mar. 27-Apr. 5 House of Representatives spring recess
- \*Mar. 27-Apr. 11 Senate spring recess
- \*March 28 U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is merged into the State Department
- March 28 20th anniversary of the Three Mile Island nuclear accident, near Harrisburg, Pa.
- March Gore-Primakov Commission meeting, Washington
- March DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) remedial action and comprehensive land use plan final EIS
- March DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) spent nuclear fuel management final EIS
- March DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, record of decision in the surplus plutonium disposition EIS
- April 1 Senate Budget Committee reports budget resolution (target date)
- \*April 9-10 Third Tokyo Forum on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, sponsored by the Japan Institute of International Affairs and Hiroshima Peace Institute; New York
- April 12-23 Third PrepCom for the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, United Nations, New York
- April 15 Congress completes action on the budget resolution (target date)
- April 22 Earth Day
- \*April 20-23 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, Preparatory Commission meeting, Vienna, Austria
- April 24-25 NATO 50th anniversary summit, Washington
- April 25-27 Alliance for Nuclear Accountability, D.C. Days, Washington
- April 26 Chernobyl Commemoration Day
- \*April 26-May 14 U.N. Disarmament Commission annual meeting, New York (Agenda items will be nuclear-weapons-free zones, fourth U.N. Special Session on Disarmament, and conventional arms control and disarmament.)

April DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL high-level waste and facilities disposition draft EIS

April DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste program draft EIS

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

April DOE Richland Operations Office, record of decision in the Hanford Site (Wash.) remedial action and comprehensive land use plan EIS

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

Spring Tennessee Valley Authority, experimental tritium-producing rods at the Watts Bar Nuclear Plant (Tenn.) removed and shipped to a DOE laboratory for tests

\*Spring Russian Duma, possible vote on ratification of START II

Spring or President Clinton visits India, Pakistan and Bangladesh (tentative)

Summer

May 1 Defense Department reports to Congress on counterproliferation programs (22 U.S.C. 2751 note)

\*May 1-9 Senate recess (tentative)

May 7-10 Healing Global Wounds, spring gathering, Nevada Test Site, Nev.  
<<http://www.shundahai.org/HGW/spring99gath.html>>

\*May 10 Conference on Disarmament, second session of 1999 begins, Geneva

May 11 First anniversary of the recent Indian nuclear tests at Pokhran ("Pokhran II")

May 11-16 Hague Appeal for Peace 1999 Conference, The Hague, Netherlands  
<<http://www.haguepeace.org>>

May 15 House Appropriations Committee, markup of annual appropriation bills may begin (Markups may occur earlier if the budget resolution has been adopted.)

\*May 17 Israeli national elections

May 18 25th anniversary of the first Indian nuclear test (1974) at Pokhran

\*May 28-June 1 House and Senate Memorial Day recess

May DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Calif.), record of decision in the National Ignition Facility supplemental EIS

June 6 10th anniversary of the FBI raid at DOE's Rocky Flats Plant (Colo.) for environmental violations

June 10 House Appropriations Committee reports last annual appropriation bill (target date)

June 15 Congress completes action on reconciliation legislation (target date)

June 18-20 G-8 summit, Cologne, Germany

\*June 25 Conference on Disarmament, second session of 1999 ends, Geneva

June 30 House of Representatives completes floor action on annual appropriation bills (target date)

\*June 30 Defense Department's Defense Science Board reports to Congress on tritium production technology options (Public Law 105-261, Sec. 3163)

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

June NATO foreign ministers meeting (estimate)

June NATO defense ministers meeting, Brussels, Belgium

July 1 Energy Department reports to Congress on external oversight of national nuclear weapons laboratories (Public Law 105-85, sec. 3154)

\*July 3-11 House and Senate Independence Day recess

July 16 54th anniversary of the first nuclear test, "Trinity," at Alamogordo, N.M.

\*July 23-25 Fourth Tokyo Forum on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, sponsored by the Japan Institute of International Affairs and Hiroshima Peace Institute; Tokyo

\*July 26 Conference on Disarmament, third session of 1999 begins, Geneva

July DOE Civilian Radioactive Waste Management Office, Yucca Mountain Project (Nev.) draft EIS

July DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, record of decision in the Sandia National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide EIS

August 6 Hiroshima Day

\*August 7-9 Peace Action annual congress, Albuquerque, New Mexico

\*Aug. 7-Sept. 7 House and Senate summer recess

August 9 Nagasaki Day

August 18 NASA spacecraft Cassini swings by the Earth on its way to Saturn

\*Aug. 23-27 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, Preparatory Commission meeting, Vienna, Austria

August 29 50th anniversary of the first Soviet nuclear test, Semipalatinsk Test Site, Kazakhstan

\*August DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) high-level waste tank closure draft EIS

\*September 8 Conference on Disarmament, third session of 1999 ends, Geneva

- \*September 18-21 House and Senate Yom Kippur recess
- September 21 United National General Assembly, 54th session convenes, New York
- September 24 Third anniversary of the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)
- Sept. 25-28 Women's Action for New Directions annual conference, Washington
- September 27 President Clinton addresses the U.N. General Assembly, New York (estimate)
- September DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL high-level waste and facilities disposition final EIS
- September DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.), solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste program final EIS
- Sept. or Oct. Gore-Primakov Commission meeting, Moscow (estimate)
- October 1 Federal budget year begins
- \*October 1 Defense Department reports to Congress on the reliability, safety and security of the nuclear stockpile (Public Law 105-261, Sec. 3159)
- \*October 4-6 First Conference of CTBT Ratification States, United Nations, New York or Vienna (tentative)
- \*October 9-11 House and Senate Columbus Day recess
- October 11 25th anniversary of the Energy Reorganization Act, which abolished the Atomic Energy Commission and created the Energy Research and Development Administration (later absorbed into the Energy Department) and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- October 15 Nobel Peace Prize announced, Oslo, Norway (estimate)
- October 16 35th anniversary of the first Chinese nuclear test, Lop Nur, China
- October 21 U.S. temporary waiver of sanctions against India and Pakistan related to their nuclear testing expires
- Week of Oct. 25 NGO Committee on Disarmament, Disarmament Week symposium, United Nations, New York
- \*October 29 Congressional adjournment (target date)

Copyright © 1999 by Plutonium Challenge. Permission (and encouragement) is given to citizens groups to reproduce this calendar. Proper credit is appreciated.

Return-Path: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "CTBT Calendar Recipients" <dculp@igc.org>  
Subject: CTBT Calendar  
Date: Tue, 5 Jan 1999 16:54:40 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igce.igc.org id NAA15317

CTBT CALENDAR  
January 4, 1999

Revised by David Culp, Plutonium Challenge, <dculp@igc.org>.

January 6 Congress convenes for the swearing in of new members and election of leadership, noon  
January 11 Senate begins impeachment trial of President Clinton (tentative)  
January 19 President Clinton delivers the State of the Union address, 9 p.m. (tentative)  
January Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott and Indian External Affairs Minister Jaswant Singh meet on nuclear issues, New Delhi, India  
February 2-? Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott visits Islamabad, Pakistan for talks on nuclear issues  
February 13-21 Senate President's Day recess  
Early February Indian-Pakistani talks on confidence-building measures and Kashmir, New Delhi, India  
February Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, hearing on DOE's stockpile stewardship program (tentative)  
Winter DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Accordion" (estimate)  
March 15 Commission on Maintaining U.S. Nuclear Weapons Expertise, report to Congress (42 U.S.C. 2121 note, amended by Public Law 105-85, sec. 3163(b))  
Mar. 27-Apr. 11 Senate spring recess  
Spring or Summer President Clinton visits India, Pakistan and Bangladesh (tentative)  
May 1-9 Senate recess (tentative)  
May 11 First anniversary of the recent Indian nuclear tests at Pokhran ("Pokhran II")  
May 18 25th anniversary of the first Indian nuclear test (1974) at Pokhran  
May 28-June 1 Senate Memorial Day recess  
July 3-11 Senate Independence Day recess

July 16 54th anniversary of the first nuclear test,  
"Trinity," at Alamogordo, N.M.

August 6 Hiroshima Day

Aug. 7-Sept. 7 House and Senate summer recess

August 9 Nagasaki Day

August 29 50th anniversary of the first Soviet nuclear  
test, Semipalatinsk Test Site, Kazakhstan

September 24 Third anniversary of the signing of the  
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)

October 1 Defense Department reports to Congress on the  
reliability, safety and security of the  
nuclear stockpile (Public Law 105-261,  
Sec. 3159)

October 4-6 First Conference of CTBT Ratification States,  
United Nations, New York or Vienna  
(tentative)

October 16 35th anniversary of the first Chinese nuclear  
test, Lop Nur, China

October 21 U.S. temporary waiver of sanctions against  
India and Pakistan related to their nuclear  
testing expires

October 29 Congressional adjournment (target date)

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 05 Jan 1999 22:05:03 -0800  
From: Nevada Desert Experience <nde@igc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: re A2000 and peace prize  
To: mvtpaix@globenet.org, abolition caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>  
X-Sender: nde@pop.igc.apc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id WAA18627

Dear Abolition 2000,                      January 5, 1999  
I am enjoying the dialogue about Abolition 2000 becoming a campaign. May I suggest a serious consideration of Abolition 2000 members coming to Las Vegas and the Nevada Test Site at the turn of the millennium. The Nevada Desert Experience is hosting Millennium 2000: Walking the Ways of Peace from December 29, 1999 to January 2, 2000. The highlight will be a candlelight procession onto the Nevada Test Site at midnight on December 31, 1999. Participants already coming include Daniel Berrigan, Dr. Rosalie Bertell, David McReynolds, Jonathan Schell, Joanna Macy and many others. It will be a great place to join with others to plan the campaign to abolition nuclear weapons in the beginning weeks of the 21st century.

Sincerely,

David Buer, ofm  
Nevada Desert Experience

At 03:06 PM 1/5/99 +0100, Lysiane Alezard wrote:

>Thank you for raising this fundamental challenge as the year 2000 is  
>coming closer !

>

>We agree with Peggy that “we have a unique opportunity in this last year  
>before the millenium” (and century). Whether we are a network or a  
>campaign, what unites us (the 1,200 organizations that have joined  
>A2000), is that we have all signed up a founding statement whose aim is  
>to get a Convention abolishing all nuclear weapons, by 2000.

>

>Therefore, the closer we move to 2000, the louder we should speak out,  
>the more visible our actions should become, the closer we should shift  
>into a campaign. have we “not had a united international campaign  
>strategy” ? Maybe not, and yet, as Peggy underlines, we have an  
>INTERNATIONAL PETITION FOR THE ABOLITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, which is  
>quite an incentive for the man (and the woman) on the street. It is also  
>a perfect backbone for a campaign to get started !

>

>Let us give you a few examples on how we have used the petition in  
>France. As far as the Mouvement de la Paix is concerned, we have now  
>collected over 26,000 signatures. Other French groups have also  
>collected many.

>In La Rochelle, a harbour in the South west, a peace caravan was  
>organized with cars from the entire county converging to that city :  
>2,500 signatures were collected in the preparation and on the very day,  
>on market places, in high schools, at the University.  
>In the Paris suburbs, various events were organized, including one on  
>the tram, with various attractions, banners, leaflets... 150 petitions  
>were signed in one hour.

>In Alsace, a tight schedule has been worked out to present the petition  
>on market places, every Sunday. 1,000 signatures were collected. The  
>petition is circulated in two convents !  
>In Paris, the giant model of the petition has circulated on wheels on  
>the capital streets, with hundreds of people signing in.  
>A local activist gave out the petition to one of his cousins in Brazil.  
>A few weeks later, he got a big mail from Rio, with 280 signatures !  
>The petition was sent to hundreds of local, regional and national  
>elected representatives. Many have sent back their names, including some  
>with actual votes of their council, adopting the petition.  
>What is at stake now is to broaden all this further, to build a real  
>tight web of people circulating the petition, of organizations (peace  
>ones, unions, women's, youth...) taking it up.  
>  
>As we are 360 days from 2000, we should try to work out as big plans as  
>possible. Here's a few "rough" ideas :  
>- how could we best use The Hague Appeal for Peace event to give a new  
>impetus to our campaign ? (in addition to all the many large events  
>already underway)  
>- the Model Convention has already been sent out to States. How can we  
>envisage to move one step further and actually meet with heads of State  
>and present them with the petition ?  
>- in Sept. this year, the last UNGA of the century will start. What  
>could we do at the very beginning of this session to make ourselves  
>heard and present the signatures collected throughout the world ?  
>We feel the 2000 challenge is worth it.  
>  
>Lysiane Alezard  
>Daniel Durand  
>  
>

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 06 Jan 1999 10:36:22 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
CC: hisham@ieer.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, mupj@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, jdean@ucsusa.org  
Subject: Re: De-alerting event  
References: <3687C0B5.2E74@psr.org>

Bob Tiller wrote:

> Friends,  
>  
> I am addressing this to everyone who was present at the planning meeting  
> on de-alerting on 11-24-98, plus Kathy Crandall. As you know, the  
> de-alerting briefing for Senate staff, which was scheduled for December  
> 17th, was canceled/postponed.  
>  
> So, I propose that we have an e-mail dialogue about our next steps. We  
> can exchange thoughts and views for a few days, then perhaps have a  
> face-to-face meeting.  
>  
> Here are some questions that occur to me:  
> -Shall we try to hold a Senate staff briefing in January, with the  
> same lineup of speakers, if they are available? Or shall we shift our  
> venue to the House, since the Senate will be head-over-heels into the  
> Clinton trial in January? Or shall we wait and do nothing on the Hill  
> until the Senate trial is over, which means February or March?  
> -Shall we try for a different sort of event, maybe off the Hill, with  
> a stronger media component and more outreach to NGOs?

I'M NOT SURE THAT WAITING UNTIL THE SENATE TRIAL IS OVER MEANS FEB./MARCH.  
COULD BE EARLIER/LATER.

I WOULD PROPOSE TRYING A DIFFERENT KIND OF EVENT WITH LESS HILL FOCUS, AND  
MORE MEDIA FOCUS & NGO PARTICIPATION.

I DO THINK MORE INTERACTION WITH CONGRESS (SENATE & HOUSE) IS NEEDED ON  
THIS ISSUE - BUT I THINK PERHAPS MORE STANDARD LOBBYING, DEAR COLLEAGUES,  
SIGN-ON LETTERS ETC. FOCUSED ON BUILDING RELATIONS WITH "DE-ALERTING  
ENTHUSIASTS," AND TRYING TO BRING MORE ON BOARD - ESPECIALLY REPUBLICANS-  
WOULD BE MORE EFFECTIVE THAN WASTING ENERGY TRYING TO PLAN AN EVENT AROUND  
THIS ISSUE ON THE HILL AT A VERY TUMULTUOUS TIME.

AS FAR AS HOUSE PARTICIPATION, I WOULD NOTE THAT MARK DOOLEY, IN WOOLSEY'S  
OFFICE IS VERY KEEN ON DISARMAMENT/ ABOLITION ISSUES. HE IS ALREADY PLANNING  
A DE-ALERTING RELATED EVENT ON MARCH 8 WITH HELEN CALDICOTT - WHICH WILL  
FOCUS (TO THE EXTENT THAT I'VE BEEN ABLE TO DETERMINE) ON Y2K & NUCLEAR  
WEAPONS & Y2K & COMMERCIAL NUCLEAR REACTORS.

IT'S IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER TIMING OF ANY EVENT IN THE CONTEXT OF OTHER ACTIVITIES INCLUDING THE ABOLITION USA MEETING AND DEVELOPING STRATEGIES, THE CLEARINGHOUSE MAILER CAMPAIGN, ANA'S MARCH THEME MONTH, THE APRIL NATO SUMMIT, WHEN/IF NSNS DOES AN EDITORIAL PITCH , ADDITIONAL PLANS OF THE CRND, ETC.

- >
- >
- > Also:
- > -Shall we try to meet briefly around the edges of another January meeting, e.g. the CTBT Working Group of the CRND on the 8th, or the Carnegie conference on the 11th, or the Coolfont retreat?
- > -Or shall we have a separate time to meet and resolve this? One possibility might be 12:00 noon on January 8th, and another might be 11:00 on January 15th.
- > -Or would you like to delegate the decision-making to a subgroup, which might consist of Howard, Alistair, me, and anyone else who wants to join us?

THIS IS AN ISSUE WHICH COULD/SHOULD BE DISCUSSED AT NWWG, ESPECIALLY SINCE DE-ALERTING/DEEP CUTS IS ONE OF TWO PRIORITY ISSUES FOR THAT GROUP. IT COULD ALSO POSSIBLY BE ON THE DEEP CUTS MEETING AGENDA . IN THE NEW YEAR LET'S FIGHT HARD AGAINST THE PROLIFERATION OF MEETINGS.

- >
- >
- > Please reply to everyone. I look forward to reading your ideas.
- >
- > Happy holidays,
- > Bob Tiller

--  
DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE  
Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools  
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator  
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>  
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions