

## *Project Abolition*

### **Expanded State Strategy Memo**

**To: Member Organizations and Supporters of Project Abolition**  
**From: Karina Wood & Kevin Martin**  
**January 21, 2000**

Before the holidays, we consulted Michael Trister, a prominent and experienced Washington, DC, attorney who advises many non-profits on tax-status issues. In light of his advice, we have decided to modify our proposed "short list" of priority states for Project Abolition's organizing in 2000 - 2001 in order that the IRS does not think we wish to influence the outcome of Senate elections, which we cannot do as a 501 © 3 educational project. Pending your agreement on the modified list, we will present it to him for his legal seal of approval when he returns from his current business trip at the end of this month.

The previously proposed short list of 5 states was **Indiana, Michigan, New Mexico, Pennsylvania** and **Washington** – 4 of which are states where anti-test ban Senators are up for re-election (New Mexico being the exception, where Sen. Bingaman, who supported the test ban, is running for re-election). Trister noted that even if we scrupulously conduct only (c) 3, non-partisan, educational activities, our selection of these states as priorities for our organizing could nevertheless seem designed to affect the outcome of the elections.

Therefore, we propose expanding the short list to include the following states: **Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa, North Carolina** and **Oregon**. These are all states where we have grassroots networks, some strong and some in need of development, where it makes good sense for us to work. None of these states have Senate races this year. The U.S. nuclear abolition movement urgently needs to expand its membership base and build a public profile in the Mid-West and the South. Arkansas and North Carolina are two important Southern states where we have good growth potential. WAND, Peace Action and PeaceLinks have grassroots bases for us to build upon in these two states. Iowa is important for obvious long-term reasons, and its peace activist base is curiously under-developed for such a historically progressive state. (To be clear, Iowa is not listed in an attempt to influence the presidential caucuses, which are only a week away.) Illinois has a strong grassroots base, and Project Abolition might be able to do some high-profile work there without too much effort. The inclusion of Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa and Oregon also allows us to further develop the connections we made in those states through last fall's Project Abolition speakers tour events around the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall.

Ten states may sound like a lot, but the 10 states comprising this new list need not be equally prioritized, and there may be work in some states we would wish to emphasize above work in others. Also, this list may change as we contact activists in those states and gather intelligence.

Two final points on the state strategy: the prioritizing of states represents an agreement on which states should receive priority attention for our common work together in Project Abolition. In no way does such a list impinge on each organization's right to prioritize whatever states it wishes to in its own work. Finally, the listing of priority states does not mean we will not promote Project Abolition activities in other states, rather that the priority states will receive intensive organizing focus.

We wish to get moving on the state strategy as soon as possible, so please give us your feedback on the changes to the list before January 31, so we can consult Michael Trister again as soon as he returns from his trip. Once we get his approval on the revised list, we can start contacting our state activists and putting the state strategy into action. (We will ask for a written legal opinion, which we will share with all the groups participating in Project Abolition.)

In the meantime, we would like to convene a meeting next week, via conference call, of the state strategy working group, so we can discuss how to best conduct our outreach to the groups in the priority states. So far, the state strategy working group consists of Esther Pank, Joan Wade, Karina Wood and Kevin Martin. We welcome any others of you to join the working group, if you so choose – please contact Kevin or Karina.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Return-Path: <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
Date: Wed, 6 Jan 1999 14:55:56 -0500  
From: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Address  
Sender: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Camille S. Anders  
Director of Adult and Family Ministries  
Annandale U.M.C.  
6935 Columbia Pike  
Annandale, VA 22003

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
CC: abolition caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Wed, 06 Jan 1999 15:00:02 -0500  
From: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.org>  
Organization: Fourth Freedom Forum  
References: <36921C56.7EF1@globenet.org>  
Reply-To: kwood@igc.org  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: re A2000 and peace prize  
To: mvtpaix@globenet.org  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id MAA14927

Dear Lysiane and Daniel,

Your work with the petition is very inspiring! As I see it, Abolition 2000 has all the right arguments (the Abolition 2000 statement) and all the right tools (the petition is a tool, as is the model convention, passing city resolutions, conducting and publicizing opinion polls, conducting citizen inspections, etc.), but we just haven't focused enough on developing a PLAN (campaign strategy) on how to UTILIZE and COORDINATE the tools to get to the treaty negotiations started.

The Int'l Campaign to Ban Landmines had a PLAN -- they determined which governments to work with, they formed working partnerships, they strategised with those governments and made lobbying pushes at specifically chosen events and meetings. And they had a campaign coordinator (Jody Williams) who directed the plans. Every group participating was free to do their own thing in the campaign -- no huge bureaucracy was created -- , but there was also an amount of leadership to steer everyone's actions and maximise effectiveness.

In response to your suggestions, I would urge that Abolition 2000 invite the governments who support abolition (the New Agenda Coalition) to join us in a strategy discussion at The Hague Appeal for Peace Conference in May, to determine a PLAN to take us forward. All governments have been invited to attend The Hague Conference, and many have indicated they are sending representatives. Amb. Dhanapala is coming, and UN Sec-Gen Kofi Annan. So, let's take full advantage of the thousands of citizen activists and the many government reps who will be in The Hague for this historic gathering, and take concrete steps to move forward.

Karina Wood.

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

--

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](mailto:kwood@igc.org)  
Web: [www.haguepeace.org](http://www.haguepeace.org)

Please join us in The Hague, May 11-15, 1999!

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Wed, 06 Jan 1999 17:26:53 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: REPLY REQ: Draft CTBT sign-on ltr.to prez

January 6, 1998

TO: Coalition members; select friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: draft sign-on letter to Bill Clinton; PLZ REPLY BY TUESDAY, JAN. 12 at NOON

As discussed at the Dec. 2 Coalition strategy meeting on the CTBT, a small drafting committee has prepared letter to Bill Clinton calling for renewed action on the CTBT. The text is below. The letter's recommendations are consistent with the points we agreed upon at the strategy meeting.

Because of the possibility of a small group meeting next week with Sandy Berger and the possibility of an important Presidential statement on the CTBT as part of the State of the Union the following week, we would ask that you reply PROMPTLY by Tuesday, Jan. 12 at noon so that the letter can be delivered that day.

The letter would go out on Coalition letterhead with names of signers and their organizational affiliation listed below.

Please contact me by phone or e-mail if you wish to sign-on or have an important suggested modification to the letter.

Thank you.

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

DRAFT COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS SIGN-ON LETTER -- REPLY BY NOON, 1/12/99

January 12, 1999

President William Jefferson Clinton  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President,

Despite your longstanding support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, United States Senate approval and global treaty implementation are in

serious jeopardy. Without a new and sustained Presidential campaign for CTBT ratification, we may lose the historic opportunity to end all nuclear test explosions and to arrest a new wave of weapons development and proliferation in South Asia and elsewhere.

Many countries are waiting for the United States to ratify the treaty before acting themselves. If the U.S. fails to ratify, the NPT Review Conference in 2000 will hold the United States largely responsible for the failure to honor their commitments in obtaining consensus for the indefinite extension of the NPT. This could seriously weaken the U.S. leadership role in maintaining the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

Consequently, we respectfully urge you to redouble your efforts to secure Senate approval of the CTBT before the Special Conference on treaty entry into force later this year so that the United States can participate as a voting member of this critical conference.

The endorsements of the former chairmen of the JCS, the national laboratory directors, and NATO, as well as the overwhelming, bipartisan public support for the treaty put the campaign for the test ban on very solid footing. Although the fight for the treaty in the Senate will be difficult, we firmly believe that if it can be brought to the Senate floor for a vote in 1999, the CTBT will win final approval. As was the case with the Chemical Weapons Convention, however, this ratification effort requires significant and consistent effort from all quarters.

In order to overcome the Senate leadership's opposition to CTBT consideration, it is essential that you make it clear through your words and actions that CTBT ratification is the Administration's top 1999 foreign policy legislative priority. We urge you to:

- \* make the case for CTBT ratification and invite bipartisan support for its consideration and approval in your upcoming State of the Union address;
- \* secure early agreement from the Senate Republican leadership to schedule a vote in 1999;
- \* appoint a high-level, full-time CTBT coordinator to strengthen and focus administration-wide efforts and to signal the seriousness with which you plan to pursue ratification;
- \* direct key cabinet members to pursue a sustained campaign to increase support and win Senate approval for the treaty.

These and other steps are needed to mobilize greater support from CTBT allies and signal to CTBT opponents that they will pay a high political price if they continue to block a vote on this popular treaty, which is so vital for U.S. and world security.

Much is at stake and the time is short. As President Kennedy once said: "We have a great obligation to use whatever time remains to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, to persuade other countries not to test, transfer, acquire, possess, or produce such weapons." The time is now for the CTBT.

Sincerely,

Tom Z. Collina  
Spurgeon Keeny, Jr.  
Michael Krepon  
John Isaacs

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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>>

---

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 06 Jan 1999 19:41:50 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
To: Brad Morse <bmorse@igc.apc.org>  
CC: btiller@psr.org, bmorse@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, cdavis@clw.org,  
73744.3675@compuserve.com, dkimball@clw.org, dculp@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org, paexec@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, jsmith@clw.org,  
kathy@fcl.org, wandwill@clark.net, ledwidge@psr.org,  
ctbt@2020vision.org, armsintern@ucsusa.org, stevenraikin@delphi.com,  
anitas@ieer.org, syoung@basicint.org, tperry@ucsusa.org,  
tcollina@ucsusa.org, vfp@igc.org  
Subject: Re: draft NWWG agenda & CTBT STATE CONTACT LIST  
References: <2.2.16.19990106110914.0e8763b4@pop.igc.org>

Just to see who stays late/ comes in early . . . here is the list of current state contacts, with asterisks next to states where we definitiely need a change. As you can see, the list needs some remedial attention in order to be an effective tool. See you all at 9:30 am Thurs. (tomorrow!)

Kathy

#### STATE CONTACTS CURRENTLY LISTED

AK\*

Lisa Ledwidge  
Cathy Schumaker (PSR)

AZ

Kathy Guthrie  
?

CO\*

Bruce Hall (PA)  
Dallas Gudgell, Beryl Schwartz (Peace Action)

DE

David Culp &  
Sheila Dormody (PA)  
Sally Milbury-Steen (Pacem In Terris)

IA\*

Michael Pancook  
Deb Fische (Iowa Peace Net)

IL (New Republican)

??

:

IN\*

Lisa Ledwidge  
Mark Mebane (Indiana Test Ban Network)

KS

Kathy Guthrie

Bill Beachy (Topeka Center for Peace & Justice)

KY\*

PA , Kathy Crandall

Sr. Pat Kenoyer (Sisters of Loretto)

ME\*

Lisa Ledwidge

Wells Staley-Mays (PA/PSR)

MI

Laura Kriv

Shana Milkie (20/20 Vision)

MO\*

Antonia Balasz (VFP)

Lincoln Grahlfs (Nat'l. Assoc. of Radiation Survivors)

MS

Marie Rietmann

??

NE

Marie Reitmann

Jo Peterson (Nebraskans for Peace)

NH\*

PA

Scott Donahue (New Hampshire Peace Action)

NM\*

Lisa Ledwidge

Greg Mello (LASG)

NY\*

Kimberly Robson

Judy Metzger (WAND)

&

PA

Diane Swords (Central NY Peace Action)

OH\*

Sheila Dormody (PA)

Linda Kimball (Oxford Citizens for Peace & Justice)

&

Francis Chiappa

&

Ellen Robinson

OR\*

Bruce Hall & Marie Rietmann

Michael Carrigan (Oregon PeaceWorks)

PA  
Kathy Guthrie  
Rusty Seitzer (Coalition for Abolition)

RI  
Bruce Hall  
Karina Wood (Hague Appeal for Peace)

TN\*  
Bruce Hall  
& Michael Pancook  
Bill Akin (Mid-South Peace & Justice Center)

UT  
Kimberly Robson  
Deb Sawyer (Writing to Reduce Nuclear Dangers)

VA  
Marie Rietmann  
??

WA\*  
Marie Rietmann & Kathy Crandall  
Mary Hanson (20/20)  
&  
Peace Action of Washington

WY  
Kathy Crandall  
Don Stoen (Wyoming Peace Initiative)

Brad Morse wrote:

> Folks,  
> This is the list of co-chair assignments and the draft agenda for tomorrow's  
> meeting. If you have grave concerns with the agenda, let me know and I'll  
> adjust it. It's on short notice this time because I didn't return from the  
> holidays until yesterday, but it will be more timely in the future. Also, I  
> know we may or may not have an updated e-mail list now, so if I'm missing  
> someone please let me know or forward this to them.

>  
> Thanks,

>  
> Brad

>  
> UPDATE ON CO-CHAIRS  
> Januray-February-March       Kathy Crandall and Brad Morse  
> April-May-June                Marie Rietman and ???  
> July-August-September        Fran Teplitz and Kathy Guthrie  
> October-November-December    Bob Tiller and Kimberly Robson

>  
> NWWG DRAFT AGENDA

>

- > 9:30
- > INTRODUCTIONS
- >
- > 9:35
- > UPDATES:
- > START II--what now?
- > Impeachment--what will it mean in terms of schedule, etc.
- >
- > 9:50
- > CTBT
- > a) Please come with suggestions for state contacts-Kathy Crandall will bring
- > a current list of our state contacts so that we can see where to make
- > adjustments
- > b) Please come with any know meetings/events in Washington or regionally
- > where we should have CTBT materials
- >
- > 10:20
- > WEAPONS COMPLEX ISSUES
- > a) Tritium decision
- > b) Plutonium Disposition decision
- > c) Health legislation update
- > d) Rough outline of upcoming events on Capitol Hill
- >
- > 10:35
- > DE-ALERTING/DEEP CUTS
- > a) ANA theme month
- > b) DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE & Peace Action post cards
- > c) update on de-alerting Hill briefing
- >
- >
- > 10:50
- > Announcements (including Coolfont agenda)
- > \*\*\*\*\*
- > 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

--  
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: <MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org>  
Sender: MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org  
Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1999 7:22:28 -0500 (EST)  
Subject: CTBT  
To: mupj@igc.org (Howard Hallman)  
From: MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org (MARY MILLER)

To: mupj@igc.org (Howard Hallman)

Howard,

re your message concerning CTBT plans:

I'm home, on jury duty, and cannot give you a detailed answer, only that it's my intention to give the petition a good try this month and following. I will concentrate on the states where EPF has proven activists (esp. where there is an EPF chapter) and aim for them to meet with their senators during the earliest recess possible after collecting signatures - the Easter recess if not the Presidential Birthday one. My recollection is that we're aiming for the Easter one anyway - is that right?

And I'll get something going in Virginia with Senator Warner as well and will hope to include a bishop or two.

See on the 19th but probably not sooner.

mary h miller, epf  
Thu, Jan 7, 1999 7:16 am

Return-Path: <jsammon@networklobby.org>  
X-Sender: jsammon@mail.networklobby.org  
Date: Thu, 07 Jan 1999 15:03:14 -0500  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org> (by way of NETWORK <network@networklobby.org>)  
From: Jean Sammon <jsammon@networklobby.org>  
Subject: Re: Request for information

Hi Howard,

We will be distributing the CTBT petition to approximately 65 groups who subscribe to our 'legislative fax' service. They are in 22 states: CA CO FL IA IL IN KS KY MA MD MI MN MO MS NJ NY OH PA RI SC VA WI (with heaviest concentrations in NY, OH, & IL). We plan to do this in mid to late January. I'll also pass along the info about Sen. Warner to one (or maybe more) of our activists in Virginia, who can distribute to others.

Also, I wanted to let you know that we were NOT able to set up a meeting with Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson, altho I did try -- he was not available to meet with us before the state of union on Jan. 19.

I have a conflict for Jan. 19, so I probably won't be at the Interfaith meeting. Hope to see you in Feb.

~~~~~  
NETWORK, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby  
801 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Suite 460  
Washington, DC 20003-2167  
Phone 202-547-5556, Ext. 13  
FAX 202-547-5510  
jsammon@networklobby.org  
  
<http://www.networklobby.org>  
~~~~~

Return-Path: <owner-disarm-news@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 07 Jan 1999 15:54:22 -0500  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-disarm-news@igc.org  
Subject: JOIN THE NAVY - NEWS & ACTION ALERT  
To: disarm-news@igc.org  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id NAB27147

ENCLOSED IN THIS E-MAIL PLEASE FIND:

This is a long e-mail, so I've tried to give you navigating assistance.  
Most everything is also available on the web.

The ACTION TOOLS - A MAILER & DE-ALERTING KITS can be previewed at the  
Disarmament Clearinghouse site <http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

\*\*\*\*\* NEWS  
DEVELOPMENTS

\*\*\*\*\*

(Text Below, or check these web sites)

1) Summary the Problem - (START II stalled, lack of disarmament  
progress)

2) Bob Bell on START II:

[http://library.whitehouse.gov/ThisWeek-plain.cgi?type=b&date=2&br  
iefing=5](http://library.whitehouse.gov/ThisWeek-plain.cgi?type=b&date=2&br<br/>iefing=5) (This is a briefing on Readiness & military spending, with the  
excerpts on START II which are included below)

3) Legislation preventing nuclear weapons' cuts below START I levels:

<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/xcutfy99.htm> (WARNING: this is very  
long, legislative language. I recommend reading it on the web site if  
you can)

4) The Navy Backs Cuts in Trident Subs (Wash. Post Jan. 7, 1999)

[http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1999-01/03/1761-01  
0399-idx.html](http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1999-01/03/1761-01<br/>0399-idx.html)

5) More on Tridents (Wash. Post Jan 3,1999)

[http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1999-01/03/1761-01  
0399-idx.html](http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1999-01/03/1761-01<br/>0399-idx.html)

6) ORDER YOUR DISARMAMENT MAILER NOW & The text of the Mailer (If you  
can't read it on <http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm> )

\*\*\*\*\*

ACTION ALERT -WHAT YOU CAN DO

\*\*\*\*\*

(See additional details below)

1)A GREAT NEW TOOL FROM THE DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE - see

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

(The text is also at the very end of this e-mail - but I urge you to  
check the web site where you can see the formatted version)

IT'S OUR MOVE . . . TIME TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS:

A Mailer featuring two tear-off post cards - one to President Clinton,

the other to Russian Prime Minister Primakov. Recognizing that the United States and Russia hold the keys to moving nuclear disarmament progress forward, both cards urge de-alerting and disarmament progress toward a nuclear weapons-free 21st Century.

**ORDER YOUR MAILERS NOW (UP TO 500 FREE), CONTACT THE DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE (SEE BELOW)**

2)DE-ALERTING, along with reductions in nuclear arsenals, can take us a step away from nuclear disaster, and a step toward a nuclear weapons-free world **ORDER YOUR DE-ALERTING NUCLEAR WEAPONS RESOURCE & ACTION KIT NOW (UP TO 5 FOR FREE), CONTACT THE DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE (SEE BELOW)**The contents of the De- Alerting Kits can be found at:  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse-dealert.htm>

3) **CONTACT THE DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE** for these resources, as well as additional resources & assistance in your nuclear disarmament advocacy.

Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Kathy Crandall Coordinator  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232  
FAX: 202 898 0172  
E-Mail: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)  
Web: <http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>  
& for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW: <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

## NEWS DEVELOPMENTS

### 1) THE PROBLEM

We were very hopeful that Russia would ratify START II in the Duma's last legislative session -until the U.S. bombed Iraq.

Russian Duma ratification of START II has now been delayed - again. Although it is still possible that Russia will ratify START II in its Spring session, it may again be delayed . . .

Can we afford to keep waiting?

The Pentagon doesn't think so:

In November, 1998 the New York Times reported that the Pentagon facing paying hundreds of millions of dollars to maintain and eventually rebuild nuclear weapons that it expected to scrap was urging unilateral reductions in the strategic nuclear arsenal  
(New York Times Nov. 23)

AND NOW the Navy says we should move forward too:

As reported by the Washington Post today,"the chief of naval operations has told Congress for the first time that he would like to reduce the number of operational Trident ballistic missile submarines . . ."

One significant problem is legislation requiring that the U.S. nuclear weapon arsenal be maintained at START I

levels until Russian ratification of START II.

IT'S OUR MOVE . . .WHAT WE CAN DO: Let's join with the Pentagon and the Navy calling for cuts now,(actually they're joining with us of course).  
ORDER "It's Our Move. . . Time To Abolish Nuclear Weapons Mailers" and De-alerting Resource & Action Kits now. Contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse for additional resources & assistance to help you call for disarmament progress now leading to a nuclear weapons-free 21st Century.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

## 2) BOB BELL ON START II

<http://library.whitehouse.gov/ThisWeek-plain.cgi?type=b&date=2&briefing=5> (This is a press briefing on readiness & military spending that includes the excerpts below)

[From a White House briefing for reporters by Bob Bell, Special Assistant for National Security Affairs, Tuesday, January 5, 1999.] \*  
Thanks To David Culp, Plutonium Challenge for posting this.

BELL: ... over the course of the last year, serious readiness concerns became apparent. ... Now, why has this occurred? ... In part, it's because it's taken longer than we had hoped for the Duma to act on START II, and we haven't gotten as far down that slope as we wanted towards the reductions called for at the Helsinki Agreement of 1997 in strategic nuclear forces. ...

Q: You mentioned that being unable to implement the cuts under the START treaty has, in effect, added costs to the military. Can you give an estimate of that? And also, what is your assessment of the prospects of finally getting START II signed in Moscow?

A: Well, I think it's principally an opportunity cost to date. If things had gone much faster -- after all, the Senate approved START II in January of '96 and the treaty was signed in '92, so -- if this had been realized years earlier, you could speculate that we could have gotten on to START III and much-reduced levels a lot sooner. But in terms of staying at START I, which has been a Congressional mandate for the last several years, that cost is just beginning to sink in. It's now measured in hundreds of millions but will quickly grow to billions unless the Duma acts.

We, of course, hope that the government in Moscow can deliver -- as they are now telling us it is their intention to do -- this treaty early in the year. They've made clear, in the recent week or two, that they don't consider the treaty dead and they intend to resume that effort early in the year. The question is simply going to be, within the Duma, particularly within the Communist faction, where the sentiments rest.

Q: Is there any sign that -- what's the change? I mean, every six months or so, President Yeltsin and other Russian officials have said, we're sure we're going to get this ratified in the next few weeks.

It's gone on for several years. What's changing there?

A: Well, I think you're just seeing -- again, in this theme of victim of our own success -- in part because of the triumph of this democratization process in Russia, you have a truly independent Duma, no longer a rubber stamp of the Kremlin, as during the Soviet Union. And it's very vulnerable to the vicissitudes of developments on the world stage. It just seems there's been one linkage or one complication after another the last couple of years that have been the immediate, proximate cause of the delay, and you have to work through each one of those events. But you can't allow your foreign policy, or your national security strategy, to be dictated simply by a calculation of START II ratification prospects.

\*\*\*\*\*

3)LEGISLATION that says U.S. arsenal must be maintained at START I levels until Russia Ratifies START II. (You can trust me, or read the whole thing - I know there are some lawyers out there . . . ) additionally, the complete text in easier-to-read format is available on the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers Web Site:  
<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/xcutfy99.htm>

H.R.1119 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999  
(Enrolled Bill as Sent to President)

SEC. 1501. LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT OR DISMANTLEMENT OF STRATEGIC NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS.

(a) FUNDING LIMITATION- Funds available to the Department of Defense may not be obligated or expended during the strategic delivery systems retirement limitation period for retiring or dismantling, or for preparing to retire or dismantle, any of the following strategic nuclear delivery systems below the specified levels:

- (1) 71 B-52H bomber aircraft.
- (2) 18 Trident ballistic missile submarines.
- (3) 500 Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles.
- (4) 50 Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missiles.

(b) WAIVER AUTHORITY- If the START II Treaty enters into force during the strategic delivery systems retirement limitation period, the Secretary of Defense may waive the application of the limitation under subsection (a) to the extent that the Secretary determines necessary in order to implement the treaty.

(c) FUNDING LIMITATION ON EARLY DEACTIVATION-

(1) If the limitation under subsection (a) ceases to apply by reason of a waiver under subsection (b), funds available to the Department of Defense may nevertheless not be obligated or expended to implement any agreement or understanding to undertake substantial early

deactivation of a strategic nuclear delivery system specified in subsection (a) until 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress a report concerning such actions.

(2) For purposes of this subsection and subsection (d), a substantial early deactivation is an action during fiscal year during the strategic delivery systems retirement limitation period to deactivate a substantial number of strategic nuclear delivery systems specified in subsection (a) by--

(A) removing nuclear warheads from those systems; or

(B) taking other steps to remove those systems from combat status.

(3) A report under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) The text of any understanding or agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation concerning substantial early deactivation of strategic nuclear delivery systems under the START II Treaty.

(B) The plan of the Department of Defense for implementing the agreement.

(C) An assessment of the Secretary of Defense of the adequacy of the provisions contained in the agreement for monitoring and verifying compliance of Russia with the terms of the agreement and, based upon that assessment, the determination of the President specifically as to whether the procedures for monitoring and verification of compliance by Russia with the terms of the agreement are adequate or inadequate.

(D) A determination by the President as to whether the deactivations to occur under the agreement will be carried out in a symmetrical, reciprocal, or equivalent manner and whether the agreement will require early deactivations of strategic forces by the United States to be carried out substantially more rapidly than deactivations of strategic forces by Russia.

(E) An assessment by the President of the effect of the proposed early deactivation on the stability of the strategic balance and relative strategic nuclear capabilities of the United States and the Russian Federation at various stages during deactivation and upon completion, including a determination by the President specifically as to whether the proposed early deactivations will adversely affect strategic stability.

(d) FURTHER LIMITATION ON STRATEGIC FORCE REDUCTIONS-

(1) Amounts available to the Department of Defense to implement an agreement that results in a substantial early deactivation of strategic forces may not be obligated for that purpose if in the report under subsection (c)(3) the President determines any of the following:

(A) That procedures for monitoring and verification of compliance by Russia with the terms of the agreement are inadequate.

(B) That the agreement will require early deactivations of strategic forces by the United States to be carried out substantially more rapidly than deactivations of strategic forces by Russia.

(C) That the proposed early deactivations will adversely affect strategic stability.

(2) The limitation in paragraph (1), if effective by reason of a determination by the President described in paragraph (1)(B), shall cease to apply 30 days after the date on which the President notifies Congress that the early deactivations under the agreement are in the national interest of the United States.

(e) CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR SUSTAINMENT OF SYSTEMS-

(1) Not later than February 15, 1998, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a plan for the sustainment beyond October 1, 1999, of United States strategic nuclear delivery systems and alternative Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty force structures in the event that a strategic arms reduction agreement subsequent to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty does not enter into force before 2004.

(2) The plan shall include a discussion of the following matters:

(A) The actions that are necessary to sustain the United States strategic nuclear delivery systems, distinguishing between the actions that are planned for and funded in the future-years defense program and the actions that are not planned for and funded in the future-years defense program.

(B) The funding necessary to implement the plan, indicating the extent to which the necessary funding is provided for in the future-years defense program and the extent to which the necessary funding is not provided for in the future-years defense program.

(f) START TREATIES DEFINED- In this section:

(1) The term `Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty' means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the United Soviet Socialist Republics on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START), signed at Moscow on July 31, 1991, including related annexes on agreed statements and definitions, protocols, and memorandum of understanding.

(2) The term `START II Treaty' means the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed at Moscow on January 3, 1993, including the following protocols and memorandum of understanding, all such documents being integral parts of and collectively referred to as the `START II Treaty' (contained in Treaty Document 103-1):

(A) The Protocol on Procedures Governing Elimination of Heavy ICBMs and on Procedures Governing Conversion of Silo Launchers of Heavy ICBMs Relating to the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (also known as the `Elimination and Conversion Protocol').

(B) The Protocol on Exhibitions and Inspections of Heavy Bombers Relating to the Treaty Between the United States and the Russian Federation on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (also known as the `Exhibitions and Inspections Protocol').

(C) The Memorandum of Understanding on Warhead Attribution and Heavy Bomber Data Relating to the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (also known as the `Memorandum on Attribution').

(g) STRATEGIC DELIVERY SYSTEMS RETIREMENT LIMITATION PERIOD- For purposes of this section, the term 'strategic delivery systems retirement limitation period' means the period of fiscal years 1998 and 1999.

\*\*\*\*\*

4) WASHINGTON POST, Jan. 7  
<http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1999-01/03/1761-010399-idx.html>

Naval Chief Backs Cut In Force of Trident Subs:  
14 Would Suffice, Admiral Tells Senate

By Walter Pincus  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Thursday, January 7, 1999; Page A23

The chief of naval operations has told Congress for the first time that he would like to reduce the number of operational Trident ballistic missile submarines from 18 to 14, opening the way for Congress to repeal its ban against cutting U.S. strategic nuclear force levels until the Russian parliament ratifies the START II treaty.

"My personal belief is that a 14-boat force is the minimum acceptable force right now," Adm. J.L. Johnson said.

Under present law, if the Russian Duma continues to delay approval of the 1993 strategic arms control treaty as it has done for the past year, the Navy must plan to spend up to \$500 million in fiscal 2000 to stay operational at the START I level of 18. That number includes four of the older, giant Tridents that were scheduled to be decommissioned beginning in 2002. [For the text of the law, see: The Coalition To Reduce Nuclear Dangers' Site at <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/xcutfy99.htm> ]

But at Tuesday's Senate Armed Services Committee session, when Chief of Naval Operations Johnson was asked by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.)

whether the Navy would rather have 14 of the subs and use the money for other priorities, he replied, "Personally I would, yes, sir."

The amendment that froze strategic forces at START I levels was added two years ago to the defense authorization bill by Sen. Robert C. Smith (R-N.H.), chairman of the Armed Services strategic forces subcommittee.

Opponents of the provision want to debate the issue "based on what forces are needed," a senior congressional aide said yesterday, "and not on the politics associated with the arms control treaties."

Sen. John W. Warner (R-Va.), chairman of the committee, said before the hearing that "we have to reevaluate priorities" on strategic weapons. "We may be able to redirect money from strategic weapons to strategic defense," he said. A spokesman said Smith was tied up with meetings yesterday and unavailable for comment.

Eugene E. Habiger, a retired Air Force general and former head of the U.S. Strategic Command, which included the Tridents, said "it would make sense" for the Navy to go down to 14, because "there is no need to stay at the START I level from a military prospective; although if you stay at that level it may give you some political leverage" with the Russians. But Habiger also noted that Moscow's "sub fleet is belly-up."

A military source familiar with intelligence said Moscow had a serious problem with one of the ballistic subs in the Northern Fleet last year when seawater got into the missile compartment when some seals leaked. The sub immediately surfaced and was brought back into port. The other alert Russian ballistic missile sub was brought back from its patrol in the Pacific for repairs. So for two to three weeks, the Russians for the first time in recent memory had no ballistic missile subs patrolling on alert.

The Russians do keep at least two other ballistic missile subs on pier-side alert, one in the Atlantic and the other in the Pacific.

The United States maintains five Trident subs on patrol alert, with five others either coming or going on patrol and ready to fire their missiles if needed. The Tridents each have 24 missiles that can carry up to eight warheads. The warheads have seven times the force of the Hiroshima bomb and are designed to destroy Russian missiles in hardened silos.

Sen. Bob Kerrey (D-Neb.), who is pushing for the United States to begin making unilateral reductions in its strategic forces, said yesterday that "waiting for the Russians to act on START II is a mistake." With their economy collapsing, their nuclear systems deteriorating and their experiment with democracy on the line, Kerrey said, members of the Russian parliament "don't have time to talk about nuclear arms control." As of today, there are 10 modern Tridents based at Kings Bay, Ga., all armed with highly accurate D-5 missiles that can travel more than 4,000 miles. Eight older Tridents, fitted with 24 of the earlier C-4 missiles, are based at Bangor, Wash.

If current law continues, all eight of the older Tridents would have to

have their nuclear engines refurbished and their launching systems would need to be retrofitted to carry modern D-5 missiles.

\*\*\*\*\*

5. WASH. POST Jan 3

<http://search.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/WPlate/1999-01/03/1761-010399-idx.html>

## Questions Raised on Trident Subs Cost and Size of Strategic Nuclear Deterrent Are Issues

By Walter Pincus  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Sunday, January 3, 1999; Page A22

On any given day, at least five giant Trident strategic ballistic missile submarines, each nearly the length of two football fields, are submerged on patrol in the Pacific or Atlantic.

Each submarine is capable of firing 24 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), each of which has up to eight warheads with many times the explosive power of the atomic bomb that destroyed Hiroshima. Backing up these submarines are 13 more Tridents, four or five of them either sailing toward patrol stations or on their way home, but also prepared to launch missiles.

Although the 18-sub Trident force has never faced the kind of public criticism that the more visible land-based ICBMs such as the MX or Peacekeeper missiles did, that quiet acceptance of ballistic missile submarines may soon be ending.

Questions are being raised, even from within the military, about the cost of the strategic submarine force and why the United States needs to maintain such a massive nuclear deterrent when the world's other major nuclear power, Russia, is having trouble keeping just one or two of its strategic nuclear submarines operational.

"Who are we preparing to assault or retaliate against at this level of destructive power?" asked retired Adm. Eugene J. Carroll Jr., deputy director of the Center for Defense Information, a think tank that favors reducing arms. Noting that the five boats on permanent patrol could "eradicate the world," Carroll criticized as "totally irrational" a congressional amendment that has prohibited cutting the Trident force until Russia ratifies the START II strategic arms reduction agreement.

Earlier this decade, the Navy acknowledged that it no longer needed 18 Tridents, and prepared to reduce the number to 10 at the end of the Bush administration. The Clinton administration strategic nuclear review raised the number to 14.

Then Congress put into law a ban on any reductions below the START I level of 18 submarines until the Russian parliament ratifies START II, the 1993 treaty that would lower allowable strategic nuclear warheads on land- and sea-based missiles to 3,500. Last month,

after Moscow protested the U.S. bombing of Iraq, the Russians again delayed ratification of START II, at least until spring.

As a result, at least \$500 million in additional funding is likely to be needed in the Pentagon's fiscal 2000 budget to keep the Trident force at START I levels. If Moscow's failure to ratify goes beyond next year, the Navy's added costs could grow to \$1 billion more a year to keep 18 Tridents operational.

According to a 1997 Congressional Budget Office study, at START I levels "the Navy would probably need funding for additional D-5 missiles, modifications to four submarines that carry C-4 missiles, and overhauls, including refueling the nuclear cores," of the four oldest Tridents that otherwise would have been decommissioned. Additional amounts would be needed to keep extra crews on duty.

Frank J. Gaffney Jr., a Pentagon official during the Reagan administration and now director of the Center for Security Policy, defended maintaining the current Trident force. Gaffney, whose organization favors a firmer military posture, called the submarines "the last vestige of a robust nuclear deterrent posture. . . . We should modernize and keep them on station as long as possible. The last thing I would cut is these boats that represent a credible, survivable force against people who may not be deterred."

Prior to the end of the Cold War in 1991, the United States had 34 ballistic missile submarines in operation carrying some 5,400 warheads or roughly 45 percent of America's strategic nuclear warheads. Today, the 18 Trident submarines carry almost 3,400 strategic warheads, or almost half the strategic warheads in operation.

The missiles on each Trident have no preset targets, but during their 60-day patrols the submarines are in position to launch missiles at any spot on the globe. The Tridents are "extremely flexible, capable of rapidly retargeting their missiles should the need arise," according to a Navy press release.

Ten Tridents are based at Kings Bay, Ga., and roam primarily in the Atlantic. The remaining eight are based at Bangor, Wash., and patrol the Pacific. The subs spend about 70 percent of the year underway, using two crews, called Blue or Gold, that average 15 officers and 140 enlisted men. The eight original Tridents, beginning with the USS Ohio in 1982, were equipped with 24 Trident I C-4 ballistic missiles. Beginning with the ninth Trident submarine, the USS Tennessee, the subs were armed with the Trident II D-5 missile system. Added funds in fiscal 2000 would permit the Ohio and other older subs to be retrofitted to carry the D-5. The D-5 has warheads with a range of 4,000 miles and the ability to maneuver to avoid any antiballistic missile defense, although only Russia has even a rudimentary ABM system.

The D-5 is fired underwater by the pressure of expanding gas within the launch tube. When the missile attains sufficient distance from the submarine, the first stage motor ignites, an aerospike engine extends and the boost stage begins. Within about two

minutes, after the third stage motor kicks in, the missile is traveling faster than three miles per second, according to Navy data.

Tridents can operate with extreme stealth and have devices to thwart enemy antisubmarine warfare systems. They also have four torpedo tubes and Mark 48 torpedoes.

Five years ago, the Congressional Budget Office suggested that a reduction of the Trident fleet to 10 boats would enable it to deter a less capable Russia and "other nuclear nations" whose "stockpiles of long-range nuclear weapons . . . number in the tens of warheads rather than the thousands."

In justifying this option, CBO said preventing a regional nuclear power from using the weapons "may depend much more on the capability of U.S. conventional forces, U.S. political actions, and trends in world events rather than on the size of the U.S. nuclear arsenal."

© Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company

\*\*\*\*\*

6) \*\*To order cards:\*\*

send an e-mail message to: <disarmament@igc.org>

Tell me: How many cards (Order up to 500 for free)

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.

The mailers require standard first class postage (going up to 33 cents on Jan. 10) - Of Course they work great for tabling/canvassing as well.

Each tear-off post card can be sent for .20 (post card rates are not changing)

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

Return-Path: <a2000@silcom.com>

Date: Thu, 7 Jan 1999 17:45:41 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: a2000@mail.silcom.com

To: 106351.1634@compuserve.com, a2000@silcom.com, abeier@igc.org, act@web.net,

afscamb@igc.apc.org, afscvt@plainfield.bypass.com,  
alichterman@igc.apc.org, allison1@leland.Stanford.edu,  
antiatom@twics.com, aslater@gracelinks.org, atota\_a2k@hotmail.com,  
basecln@skyinet.net, BetseyMJ@aol.com, bjack8@3-cities.com,  
bkinsey@peacemission.org, bplumley@igc.apc.org, bstedman@igc.apc.org,  
btiller@psr.org, btree@pop1.osk.3web.ne.jp,  
caab.lindis\_anni@virgin.net, cfpa@cyberenet.net, Chiapski@aol.com,  
clarkg2@rpi.edu, cloudflowers@igc.org, contia@dvol.com, cppnw@web.net,  
cprcrogers@mindspring.com, crazyemail@technologist.com,  
crramey@igc.apc.org, crypt.keeper@arena.leba.net, danfine@igc.apc.org,  
dave@paxchristiusa.org, Dave\_Lesley@compuserve.com, davidmcr@aol.com,  
dbain@igc.org, dcortright@igc.apc.org, DCulp@nrdc.org,  
dellsberg@igc.apc.org, disarmament@igc.org, disarmtimes@igc.apc.org,  
dkimball@igc.apc.org, dpflanz@cedar.alberni.net, driscoll@vni.net,  
drttd@compuserve.com, dwhite11@edgenet.net, ecaaras@igc.apc.org,  
epank@igc.org, epic1934@aol.com, erippy@jps.net, fboyle@law.uiuc.edu,  
fbp@igc.apc.org, fcpj@afn.org, freedom@peg.apc.org,  
friedman@uconnvm.uconn.edu, fuifulupe@mailexcite.com,  
GELN38A@prodigy.com, gensuikin@igc.apc.org, greensfelder@igc.apc.org,  
hcaldic@ibm.net, hgw@scruznet.com, iakim@glas.apc.org, ike@swva.net,  
info@nuclearfreeworld.org, ipis@igc.apc.org, irss@igc.apc.org,  
iswenson.uncson@mhs.unc.edu, jburroughs@igc.apc.org,  
JCKtemple@rscj.org, JGG786@aol.com, jim@merical.mhs.compuserve.com,  
jklotz@walrus.com, jlonn@undp.org, johnpike@fas.org,  
jrussow@coastnet.com, jsp-sls@pacbell.net, jtlowe@aol.com,  
Kathy4paz@aol.com, kathy-s@k2nesoft.com, kgrossman@hamptons.com,  
kliu@chaminade.edu, kwood@igc.apc.org, lanlaction@aol.com,  
Larry\_Ebersole@mist.seattleantioch.edu, lasg@igc.apc.org, LCNP@aol.com,  
lforrow@igc.apc.org, lgseek@aol.com, lialliancepeace@hotlink.com,  
lorjacy@ix.netcom.com, lorjacy@ix.netcom.com, lwirbel@igc.apc.org,  
maryl@mt.arias.net, marylia@igc.apc.org,  
mcasper@watt.physics.carleton.edu, mecta@aol.com,  
meldredge@igc.apc.org, melinda@stimson.org, micropho@shaysnet.com,  
mlist@eworks.com, mtpdu@ime.net, mupj@igc.org, nbutler@basicint.org,  
nde@igc.apc.org, nhpeaceact@igc.org, nirsnet@igc.apc.org,  
norco@bellatlantic.net, nukeresister@igc.org, paintl@igc.apc.org,  
panukes@igc.apc.org, paxwpb@gate.net, pcoombes@web.net,  
PeaceFirst@aol.com, pff@igc.apc.org, pgs@web.net, philr@sonic.net,  
ploughshares@igc.apc.org, pmeidell@igc.apc.org,  
prcsandiego@igc.apc.org, proose@oberlin.edu, prop1@prop1.org,  
psrsm@igc.apc.org, psysrusa@interserv.com, pwalker@globalgreen.org,  
quercus@concentric.net, ramana@JUNO.COM, Robert\_L.\_Civiak@omb.eop.gov,  
rush@hnrc.tufts.edu, sallight@EARTHLINK.NET, salvador@hawaii.edu,  
sbeville@EARTHLINK.NET, sbrackman@igc.apc.org, sfcny@igc.apc.org,  
shundahai@saltmine.radix.net, sinhas@cognos.com,  
smirnowb@ix.netcom.com, spearce@igc.apc.org, srfnyusa@igc.apc.org,  
stopnuketest@igc.org, stuwhis@enter.net, swv1@ctaz.com,  
syoun@basicint.org, tatty@compuserve.com, tbtaylor@Princeton.edu,  
tinabell@walrus.com, tornukes@aol.com, tsbrueni@wheel.dcn.davis.ca.us,

veiluvawslf@igc.apc.org, vsidel@igc.apc.org, wagingpeace@napf.org,  
Weissdor@aol.com, wilpf@people-link.com, wr1@igc.apc.org,  
wsantelmann@peacenet.org, wslf@igc.apc.org, shundahai@shundahai.org,  
petweiss@igc.org, damjanov@math.uni-hamburg.de, jbloomfield@gn.apc.org,  
msherrard@bigfoot.com, ilpeace@igc.apc.org, mmebane@fourthfreedom.org,  
clgallagher@igc.org, Squintyrb@aol.com, jahn@cruzio.com,  
lmkai@northcoast.com, nbaliga@psr.org, rwilcock@pgs.ca,  
dshank@igc.apc.org, duane@benjerry.com, dculp@igc.org, hisham@ieer.org

From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <a2000@silcom.com>

Subject: January 1999 Grassroots Newsletter

Abolition 2000 Grassroots Newsletter January 1999

1999 begins with a clear two years until the end of the year 2000, by which time we hoped that a treaty would be in place with a firm and binding commitment to the abolition of nuclear weapons in the future. Two years is a long time. With your help we can continue to make a difference and hope for success.

PLEASE copy this newsletter and pass it on to other organizations in your area. We want more organizations to join us and more activists to spread the word that Abolition is possible, timely and imperative!

PLEASE JOIN the Abolition-usa list-serve. It makes it easier for us to keep in touch with you regularly.

## PETITIONS

Petitions are being collected until the end of the year 2000! So please keep collecting signatures.

The Sonoma County Center for Peace and Justice has collected 1,100 Abolition 2000 signatures to date. This is in ADDITION to the approximately 3000 already reported. Santa Cruz has sent us 756 more names. East Bay Peace Action 40. Also from Regina Hagen, Darmstadt, Germany 379 names; and Joanna Miller of Saskatchewan gathered 328 signatures.

Don't forget to copy the petition forms and include completed petitions with your letters to Congressional Representatives. Then send the forms on to us.

**WE NOW HAVE OVER 1200 ORGANIZATIONS!**

Welcome to these organizations who have joined in December:

Anti-Atom International of Austria  
Ballona Wetlands Land Trust, Playa del Rey CA  
Bloomfield Citizens for Global Security, CT  
Commission for Earth and Public Safety, Santa Monica CA  
Pax Christi Traverse City MI

Youth for Peace, Belfast, Northern Ireland  
Associazione Mediterranean Media, Italy  
Ati'Ati'A Tahiti, French Polynesia  
Peace and Social Concerns Committee, Mount Toby Monthly Meeting, Religious  
Society of Friends  
Columbus Campaign for Arms Control, Columbus, Ohio  
Student Civil Liberties Organization ,Lorain, Ohio.  
Fellowship of Reconciliation/Japan (NIHON YUWA Kai) Japan  
Mohawk Valley Friends Meeting, Clinton.NY  
Saratoga Monthly Meeting, Society of Friends, Saratoga NY  
Labor Party of Pakistan  
Anuvrat Global Organization, Jaipur, India  
Brandywine Peace Community, Swarthmore PA  
Asangha International Peace Research Institute, Japan

Message from the US Pacifist Party.

Gary Swing of the US Pacifist Party writes:

"We have established the U.S. Pacifist Party as a qualified political organization in Colorado. This means that people can now affiliate with the party on their voter registration. If we get at least 1,000 registered members in the state, we will qualify as an official minor party with automatic ballot status. This, in turn, would make it easier to run more candidates, because we wouldn't have to do an individual petition drive for each one. We would like to build the U.S. Pacifist Party as a way of promoting a pro-active peace agenda within the context of electoral politics. For the elections in 2000, we hope to recruit a full slate of candidates for Congress from this state, as well as presidential and vice-presidential nominees. For us, the abolition of nuclear weapons is a starting point for a much broader peace platform. "

## Municipalities

Sadly, the West Hartford City Council failed to endorse the A2000 resolution at its meeting in December. But there is good news from the City of Santa Cruz where in October, the Mayor, Celia Scott issued a Mayor's Proclamation declaring the city a nuclear free zone. She also proclaimed November 8th as "Abolition 2000 Day" and expressed "heartfelt appreciation for Abolition 2000's continuing good work."

## Action in Vermont

People in more than 70 communities in the state of Vermont are now working to have the question of nuclear weapons abolition included on their town meeting warnings. On March 30, in one of the oldest democratic rituals and practices in the U.S., people those communities where they have been successful will have an opportunity to cast their votes for or against nuclear weapons abolition. This was how we launched the nuclear weapons freeze movement here in the U.S. in 1981 and 1982 (after voters in Western Massachusetts gave us something of a model.) For more information contact Joseph Gainza at: [afscvt@together.net](mailto:afscvt@together.net)

Suggested wording :

## Nuclear Weapons Abolition Town Meeting Article

The citizens of (name of town, state), call upon the US government and governments of all nuclear weapons states to secure on an urgent basis a nuclear weapons abolition treaty. The treaty must include an early timetable for the elimination of nuclear weapons in a manner that is mutual and verifiable among all nations.

We further urge our state senators and representatives to introduce a resolution to this effect and send it on to the (State) Congressional delegation for immediate action.

### News from Oak Ridge

The Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance, a member of Abolition 2000, is working in coalition with other grassroots groups in the region to sponsor the STOP the BOMBS campaign, aimed at stopping nuclear weapons production at the Y-12 nuclear weapons plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

Y-12 is the only remaining full-scale operating nuclear weapons production facility in the US. It continues to make parts for bombs, upgrading old weapons and working with weapons labs on replacement parts for bombs that are taken apart for testing, and designs for potential new bombs.

The STOP the BOMBS campaign is a series of actions at Y-12, most of which include nonviolent direct action and civil disobedience. In August, 12 protesters were arrested at the Hiroshima demonstration for attempting to enter the Y-12 Plant to post a Citizen's STOP WORK order on the facilities. On October 25, four women were arrested as part of the Mothers Action for Peace. On December 10, in celebration of the 50th Anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights, local artists will gather for an Artist's action.

On March 5, 1999, a major action will be held in commemoration of the signing of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. "People of Faith Call for Abolition" will involve people of all faiths (and likely some of no faith at all) gathering at the gates of the bomb plant to offer prayers and issues a call to the conscience of workers. It is expected the action will include mass arrests.

On May 24, 1999 International Women's Disarmament Day will be celebrated with an action at the Y-12 Plant, and on June 20, the Father's Action for Peace is scheduled.

More information is available from the Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance, 100 Tulsa Rd, Suite 4A, Oak Ridge, TN 37830; phone: 423 483 8202; e-mail: [orep@igc.org](mailto:orep@igc.org) . Ralph Hutchison, coordinator  
Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance

### News from Finland

Dear Friends,

We have collected signatures for the International Abolition 2000 petition. At the moment there are 1896 signatures of individuals in the office of Committee of 100 in Finland, to be exact. We have translated the petition into Finnish to get people to sign it. It is not so easy to get people to sign petitions which are in English. There are even a couple of versions, looking bit different but the petition text is identical. I hope this is OK.  
Yours in peace,

Malla Kantola  
secretary general

Committee of 100  
Peace Station, Veturitori 3  
Fin-00520 Helsinki  
Finland  
Tel: +358-9-141336  
Fax: +358-9-147297  
Email: mkantola@kaapeli.fi

### A Student Speaks Out

Hi, I signed the Abolition 2000 Petition and I just checked my email just today and I saw your email. So I thought I should tell you why I signed it. 2 years ago I didn't even know what nuclear weapons were or what they could do. I'm in Grade 11 right now and last year in Grade 10 in my English class we watched some movies on them and I got so scared of what they could do! Now I'm still scared of them but it's not on my mind as much as it was. I just hope if Iraq and US go to war they don't use nukes or chemical warfare. Because that would really suck. I live just outside of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, and I 100% support Abolition 2000, so keep up the good work!!!!!!

Thanks  
Greg McAllister  
E-Mail: NikyGM@hotmail.com

Please write a letter  
Mordechai Vanunu's adopted parents, Nick & Mary Eoloff, request folks send Mordechai a letter or card. His address is

Mordechai Vanunu  
PO BOX 17  
Shikma Prison  
Ashkelon, Israel

Speaker on Y2K  
"The Millennium Bug: How To Survive the Coming Chaos" by Michael S. Hyatt [Regnery Publishers] Anyone interested in having Michael Hyatt speak to their group can contact:  
Tim Grable  
Ambassadors Speaker Bureau

PO Box 50358  
Nashville, Tn. 37205  
Phone:615-377-9100  
Fax:615-661-4344

#### Video Available

A video is available for children produced by Peace Anime No Kai in Tokyo, Japan. The film was produced with young children in mind and shows how the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki affected the lives of ordinary Japanese people.

This can be obtained by writing or sending a FAX to

Peace Anime No Kai  
c/o Dokuritsu Eiga Center  
7th floor Taiyo Building  
3-16-2 Shimbashi, Minato-ku, Tokyo  
FAX: 81-3-3432-8633

#### Millennium NGO Forum "The UN for the 21st Century"

The Conference "Space Use and Ethics. Criteria for the Assessment of Future Space Projects" will be held in Darmstadt/Germany from March 3-5, 1999, at the Darmstadt University of Technology (TUD).

The conference is being organized mainly by IANUS, the Research Group Science, Technology and Security at the Darmstadt University of Technology, in cooperation with the Darmstaedter Friedensforum. The Friedens- und Begegnungsstaette Mutlangen is also involved in the preparation.

Speakers will include Ulf Merbold, the first German astronaut, Karl Grossman, journalism professor from New York and an important campaigner for the Cassini protests, and Lieutenant Colonel Brad Duty from the 3rd Space Communications Squadron with the U.S. Air Force in Europe.

Official information about the scientific conference may be obtained from:

IANUS  
Hochschulstrasse 10  
D-64289 Darmstadt  
Tel. [49] 6151/16-43 68  
Fax [49] 6151/16-60 39  
e-mail: IANUS@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de

Information about the scientific conference and the Global Network meeting:

Darmstaedter Friedensforum  
c/o Regina Hagen  
Teichhausstrasse 46  
D-64297 Darmstadt  
Tel. [49] 6151/47 114  
Fax. [49] 6151/47105  
e-mail: regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de

#### Cranes for Peace

Cranes for Peace is a purely volunteer organization working towards spreading awareness about war, especially nuclear war, in Pakistan, and

providing peace as an alternative. What we have achieved so far:  
The first effort to mobilize children took place at the Rafi Peer Puppet Festival 1998 in Lahore. Donations were collected from various sources with which three thousand school children from economically depressed backgrounds were sponsored to come to the festival and participate in the activity. These children included working children, handicapped children, and those from abused backgrounds.

What we plan:

Currently in the pipeline are plans for a Peace Festival next year, as well as a series of seminars and debates based on the subject of conflict and peace. The Cranes for Peace Volunteers propose to undertake a variety of activities in the coming six months, details of which are given below.

What we want from you:

To take our message further, we require assistance and cooperation. Cranes for Peace will welcome any person wanting to volunteer his or her time and energies. We need your ideas and opinions on what we are planning to do, and we need your help in terms of advice, financial support or infra-structural support.

Cranes for Peace is not restricted to Lahore or Pakistan. We aim to start a world movement for peace. This is what we have started with; you may have other and better ideas. Share them with us and / or initiate efforts directed towards peace in your own area of the world.

Please forward this to as many people as possible and spread the message of peace. To contact us, please write to Zain or Hajrah at:  
dastan@brain.net.pk

Call for Action from the Brandywine Peace Community

Join the Citizens Disarmament Inspection Campaign walking tour at Lockheed Martin, Valley Forge, PA which is being held on Martin Luther King Day January 18 at noon.

For more information: call (610) 544 1818 or email: brandywine@juno.com

News from Costa Rica

We were delighted to hear from Mitzi Stark of LIMPAL Costa Rica, a new organization in the A2000 network. Mitzi writes:

"I am sending you a copy of the petition in Spanish which we are sending out with our November-December newsletter. We already have collected about 200 signatures and with summer coming, and with it a lot of events, we should get a lot more. Here it is easy to get signatures because Costa Rica is in favor of nuclear disarmament and introduced the Canberra Resolution to the UN. ..I am also sending a copy of an article to the Tico Times and to the Spanish language papers..."

League of Women Voters

The National League Board has been deliberating our request that they endorse the Abolition 2000 Statement. They have replied that they do not support Abolition 2000's central goal. "The League's Arms Control position

anticipates a progression of treaties to reduce the quantity and risk of weapons "as a long term goal." Abolition 2000 calls for a treaty abolishing nuclear weapons to be completed by 2000, an unrealistic timeframe. As a practical, political matter, it is highly unlikely that the two major nuclear powers, United States and Russia, would participate in negotiating any such treaty within the next two years."

This point of view is a common one - a reminder that we must work to counter it!

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

Sue Broidy has left her position as coordinator of Abolition 2000. Future questions and correspondence should be sent to the same address, c/o Lori Beckwith.

Sincerely,

Lori Beckwith  
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)

Return-Path: <adelorey@erols.com>  
Date: Sat, 09 Jan 1999 01:10:23 -0500  
From: ann delorey <adelorey@erols.com>  
Organization: cwu  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Request for information  
References: <2.2.16.19990105143751.52673b4a@pop.igc.org>

Howard,

Church Women United will be distributing the CTBT petition to our State Action Chairs (one in each state), as well as at all meetings and conferences we attend.

Best regards,

Ann Delorey

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>  
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org (Unverified)  
To: mupj@igc.org, kathy@fcl.org, lintnerj@ucc.org  
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)  
Subject: text of CTBT action alert for UCC  
Date: Fri, 8 Jan 1999 13:52:39 -0500

Hi Howard, Kathy, and Jay,

Here's what I prepared at Jay's request in October for the UCC's use with the petition. I made some slight changes today, and may make more in the next week or two, but I think this would serve any group's needs fine. The paragraph about the fall 1999 conference and Indian and Pakistani intentions (or any other part) could be eliminated if space is a problem. Others would want to insert their own faith group's statement, such as the UCC's at the beginning of this piece.

Thanks for your great work on this!

Marie

### Help End Nuclear Testing Your Senators' Active Support is Critical

"We declare our opposition to all weapons of mass destruction. All nations should...cease immediately the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons."

Excerpt from the General Synod 15 Pronouncement Affirming the United Church of Christ as a Just Peace Church.

**BACKGROUND:** The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is an international treaty to ban all nuclear tests. The CTBT is an essential tool for reducing the dangers posed by nuclear weapons. It is especially important in light of last year's Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests. In order to enter into force and become international law, the treaty must first be ratified by the 44 nuclear-capable countries, including the U.S. Our ratification will:

- \* Stem the spread of nuclear weapons. The CTBT's ban on nuclear testing will prevent other nations from obtaining advanced nuclear weapons. It will also severely impede the development of new nuclear weapons by those countries which already have them.
- \* Establish a strict monitoring system. This global network will detect nuclear weapon testing activities and allow for short-notice, on-site inspections, but it will not be fully operational until the treaty enters into force.
- \* Protect the environment. Ending nuclear testing will stop radioactive fallout from spreading underground and escaping into the atmosphere.

\* Lead the way, setting an example for other countries to follow. Currently, at least 21 countries have ratified the CTBT. As the world's leading military power, U.S. ratification will serve as a catalyst for other countries to do likewise.

Public support for a nuclear test ban has been consistently high - it was most recently endorsed by four out of five American voters in bipartisan public opinion surveys. The Administration, including the Departments of Defense and Energy, supports ratification of the treaty, as do prominent U.S. military figures, including four of the last five chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: Admiral William Crowe and Generals David Jones, Colin Powell, and John Shalikashvili. Despite this support, substantial obstacles lie in the path of treaty ratification.

"The only way that the Senate will ratify the CTBT is if you, the grassroots, are successful in communicating the importance of this issue to your Senators." - Senator Jim Jeffords (R-VT)

[In the fall of 1998, President Clinton urged the Senate to ratify the CTBT as early as possible in 1999.\*] A two-thirds Senate majority is needed for ratification. Active support by your Senators will help gain at least the minimum 67 votes required.

The treaty calls for a special conference that can be convened in the fall of 1999 for countries that have already ratified to determine ways to garner additional ratifications. The U.S. will want to participate in that conference, which creates a political deadline for Senate action on the treaty. The Indian and Pakistani Prime Ministers have committed to signing the treaty by September. This would eliminate one of the major objections CTBT opponents raise: that India isn't going to sign anyway so there is no reason for the U.S. to ratify it. In addition, recent history has shown that the Senate does not ratify treaties during presidential election years. All of this makes 1999 our last best chance to gain Senate approval of the CTBT.

The Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Jesse Helms (R-NC), has jurisdiction over the treaty. Senator Helms and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS) continue to defy public opinion by refusing to allow the significant consideration an issue of this magnitude demands. U.S. failure to act on the treaty would be a major blow to global efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

+ ACTION: [Sign petition.]

[Verbage for other kinds of advocacy follows:] Contact your Senators and urge them to do everything possible to assure that the CTBT is ratified in 1999. They need to hear resounding support for the treaty. Encourage them to take leadership roles in its ratification process.

Inform your Senators that four out of five voters support the treaty, as do the current and former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Tell them that U.S. ratification of the CTBT will make America and the world safer for our children and grandchildren.

The Honorable \_\_\_\_\_  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510  
Call: 202-224-3121 (Capitol Switchboard)

This action alert prepared October 1998 and slightly revised early January 1999

\*There will be more current statements from the Administration coming from National Security Adviser Sandy Berger's address to the Carnegie Endowment 1/12 and the President's State of the Union address

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-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
CC: Abolition 2000 Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sat, 09 Jan 1999 10:39:02 -0500  
From: John Loretz <jloretz@tiac.net>  
References: <36966F0A.725E@wenet.net>  
Reply-To: jloretz@tiac.net  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: A Suggestion for an Abolition 2000 Campaign  
To: Sandy Shartzter <jspsls@wenet.net>  
X-Accept-Language: en

Sandy Shartzter wrote:

> I have been reading messages urging that Abolition 2000 be made a  
> "campaign" like the land mind campaign, and I have been reading messages  
> about the "bug in the bomb" that could accidently set off nuclear  
> weapons when Y2K reaches its 1-1-2000 deadline. How about combining the  
> two? The campaign could be to "turn off" all nuclear weapons worldwide  
> before the 1-1-2000 deadline, the only way to be sure that disaster will  
> be avoided. This could be a prelude to the treaties called for by  
> Abolition 2000 and proof that the world can get along without any active  
> nuclear weapons. Just a thought...

This is one of the best and most original ideas for an abolition campaign that I've heard yet! I'm reminded of the "tests" of the emergency broadcasting system that frequently used to interrupt U.S. radio and television programming for a minute with a test pattern and a high pitched whine. This was to ensure that the "civil defense" (i.e., nuclear war) communications system was functioning properly. The analogous campaign ad would be pretty simple and could be really effective: "This is a Y2K compliance test of our nuclear command structure. For the next 60 seconds, all nuclear weapons systems will be taken off line. This is only a test. Were it a \*real\* nuclear disarmament plan, we would shut the system down permanently and begin to disassemble the weapons." [Fade out missile silo; fade up sunflower. In the background I hear the Beach Boys singing "Wouldn't It Be Nice." (Actually, I hear Jim Morrison singing "When the Music's Over," but I don't think that one will fly.)]

Right on, Sandy!

John Loretz  
Executive Editor  
Medicine & Global Survival  
727 Massachusetts Ave.  
Cambridge, MA 02139 USA  
617-868-9230  
617-576-3422 (fax)  
jloretz@tiac.net

M&GS on the Web:  
<http://www.healthnet.org/MGS>



Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: tp2000.lst.grp@gn.apc.org  
Date: Sun, 10 Jan 1999 21:56:08 +0100  
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Nuclear Weapon Free Zone Flanders/ Citizens inspection  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, a-days@motherearth.org  
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

Dear friends,

With some delay the For Mother Earth team wishes you all lots of happiness and love for this new year. As we all had a short break over christmas and new year, some delay in forwarding you following encouraging newsstory which broke news in Belgium at Christmas.

We are looking forward to work with all of you this year,

Peace,

Pol

-----  
Resolution tabled for a nuclear weapon free zone in northern Belgium

Brussels, December 24 1998 - Following several succesful Citizens Inspections of the Belgian AFB of Kleine Brogel earlier this year, three Members of the Flemish Parliament announced today at a news-conference their plan to table a resolution at the Flemish Parliament calling for Flanders (Northern part of Belgium) to be a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone. Though the Flemish Parliament has no power over defence matters, this resolution is another clear signal to the Belgian federal government and the USA which has nuclear weapons deployed in Flanders.

MP Johan Sauwens (Flemish regionalist party), MP Cecile Sillis-Verwimp (Green Party) and MP Jef Sleenckx (Social Democratic Party) their resolution calls for the harbours of Flanders to be closed for vessels carrying nuclear weapons, as well as a prohibition of the storage of nuclear weapons on Flemish territory. Today it is believed that 10 US B-61 tactical nuclear weapons are deployed at the Belgian AFB of Kleine Brogel. The Belgian MoD still doesn't confirm nor denies the presence of nuclear weapons on this base. It is believed that the US has deployed weapons of mass-destruction (WMD) in Kleine Brogel since 1962.

A new Citizen Inspection of the AFB of Kleine Brogel is planned for Sunday February 21 1999. Citizens will continue to gather information on the presence of WMD, referring to their duty as citizens to prevent the preparation of crimes against humanity.

end

-----  
For Mother Earth/Voor Moeder Aarde vzw,  
Lange Steenstraat 16/d, 9000 Gent, Belgium  
Phone/fax +32-9-233 84 39

Mobile +32-9-28 02 59  
E-mail : pol@motherearth.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Sun, 10 Jan 1999 22:10:43 +0100  
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>  
References: <bb7de48d.36913175@aol.com>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: A2000 CAMPAIGN  
To: kwood@igc.org, LANLaction@aol.com  
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

Dear Karina and Peggy, and all Abolitionists,

Yes, I also agree with Karina. I also have missed campaign planning during previous A2000 international meetings, involving reps of the complete network.

I therefore propose that the people who share the need for making Abolition 2000 an 'International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons', to get together at the NPT PrepCom in New York, and come up with a proposal for a campaign plan at the annual Abolition 2000 meeting scheduled for 1999. I am happy to help out with this.

Peace,

Pol D'Huyvetter  
For Mother Earth

P.S. has The Hague been confirmed as a venue for the A2000 annual meeting?

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1999 06:40:23 -0500  
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.org>  
References: <36918E25.D6BB7BF3@igc.org>  
<bb7de48d.36913175@aol.com>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: A2000 CAMPAIGN and PrepCom  
To: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>, kwood@igc.org, LANLaction@aol.com  
X-Sender: lforrow@pop2.igc.org

If there are specific dates for one or more meetings for Abolition 2000 planning during the PrepCom (as opposed to the many meetings that I assume will take place related to specific campaigning at the PrepCom) it would help me (and probably others) to know them as soon as possible.

--LF

At 10:10 PM 1/10/99 +0100, Pol D'Huyvetter wrote:

>Dear Karina and Peggy, and all Abolitionists,  
>  
>Yes, I also agree with Karina. I also have missed campaign planning during  
>previous A2000 international meetings, involving reps of the complete  
>network.  
>  
>I therefore propose that the people who share the need for making Abolition  
>2000 an 'International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons', to get  
>together at the NPT PrepCom in New York, and come up with a proposal for a  
>campaign plan at the annual Abolition 2000 meeting scheduled for 1999. I am  
>happy to help out with this.  
>  
>Peace,  
>  
>Pol D'Huyvetter  
>For Mother Earth  
>  
>P.S. has The Hague been confirmed as a venue for the A2000 annual meeting?  
>

Return-Path: <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
Date: Fri, 8 Jan 1999 17:16:27 -0500  
From: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Peace Leaf  
Sender: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

I have had a note from Pitt Library at Emory and they are missing the following copies of the Peace Leaf. In the hope that you may have one, could you copy and send to us and we will send to them

They need volume 5, no 2 and no 3. We cleaned house too well.

Jim

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 11 Jan 1999 15:58:15 +0100  
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: UPDATE For Mother Earth ADDRESS, PHONE & FAX #  
To: fme@motherearth.org, 2000walk4abolition@motherearth.org,  
a-days@motherearth.org, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org,  
tp2000.lst.grp@gn.apc.org  
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be

Dear friends,

Still many people continue to send mail to the old address of the Belgian office of For Mother Earth.

Please, if you have not, change the address.

Now all mail is send to the international office of FME.

->> Lange Steenstraat 16/d, 9000 Gent, Belgium

And we also have changes with our phones and fax #

-----

Phone +32-9-233 84 39 (do not use as fax anylonger)  
Fax +32-9-233 73 02

Mobile +32-95-28 02 59 ->> NEW +32-495-28 02 59 FEBRUARY 1 1999!!

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 13 Jan 1999 16:02:14 -0500  
From: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.org>  
Organization: Fourth Freedom Forum  
Reply-To: kwood@igc.org  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Action during NATO meeting, April 1999, D.C.  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, start3-europenwfz@igc.org

Here is a message from Alistair Miller of the Fourth Freedom Forum:

--

Thank you for your interest in the activities that the Fourth Freedom Forum are planning for NATO's fiftieth anniversary summit in April. I hope the following will be useful as background. Please let me know if you have any questions.

## ENDING FIFTY YEARS OF NUCLEAR DANGER: REMOVING NUCLEAR WEAPONS FORM NATO

### Background

Two events are going to take place in the spring of 1999 that present an excellent opportunity to publicize and affect long overdue changes in NATO nuclear strategy since the end of the Cold War. First, in mid-April the NPT PrepCom meeting will take place in New York. At the previous PrepCom, the Non-Aligned Movement (113 countries) issued a working paper at the PrepCom that condemned the sharing of nuclear weapons by NATO states - a practice widely believed to be illegal under Articles I and II of the NPT. This year, it will be possible to amplify the objections of the NAM, and hopefully additional nations, and feed them in to the NATO summit described below. Second, at the tail end of the PrepCom, (now there is a possibilty that the Prepcom might be convined on the 28th of April after insted of before the NATO Summit, ) on the 23rd - 25th of April, NATO will be holding its 50th anniversary summit in Washington, DC. The event will be covered by the international press and be used to announce the formal accession of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland as new members to NATO. This development is troubling in this context because, the Alliance has not firmly guaranteed that new members will not eventually be involved with Alliance nuclear-sharing practices. NATO will also be officially unveiling its newly revised Strategic Concept that is supposed to reflect changes in NATO Strategy (which includes sections on nuclear weapons strategy) since the end

of the Cold War.

Over the past two years, the Fourth Freedom Forum has actively supported the Washington, DC based NATO Working Group's efforts to oppose NATO expansion and advocate reform in Alliance policies that aim to reduce risks.

Recently the Fourth Freedom Forum has been building on the strong contacts with NGO's in the US and Western Europe that focus on nuclear disarmament and NATO.

The Forum is now planning to work in coalition with NATO Working Group participants, such as the British American Security Information Council (BASIC), and European NGO's, such as the Berlin Information-center for Transatlantic Security (BITS) to:

Highlight the problems of NATO nuclear-sharing in the context of the NPT process; and

Call for the elimination of nuclear weapons from Europe on the basis that there is no longer a specific need for nukes in Europe.

#### PROPOSED ACTIVITIES

As a sub-set of a broader nuclear abolition campaign, the Fourth Freedom Forum will work with other organizations to promote and organize a high profile two-day event in Washington, DC immediately before the NATO Summit.

The purpose of this effort is to link the alliance's strategy review with the NPT Process, and push for deep cuts toward total elimination of allied nuclear forces, while capitalizing on the presence of the international press who will be covering the Summit.

#### EXPERTS WORKSHOP

On 22 April the Forum proposes to hold a workshop of experts - including officials -- from Western Europe, Russia and the United States.

Participants

will present papers and discuss opportunities for: completing the removal of tactical (sub-strategic) nuclear weapons from Europe; changing NATO's nuclear strategy and sharing policies; developing NATO-Russia relations in support of future nuclear arms reductions; and exploring the possibility of a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone in Europe. Policy-makers and the press will be invited. Experts will also be made available for media interviews and editorial board meetings before hand.

#### ALTERNATIVE SUMMIT

The second day's activities are planned to encourage involvement from a broader selection of interested organizations and individuals from international NGO's to the Grassroots. We encourage the active

participation

of as many organizations and individuals as possible! The media needs to witness our widespread public disapproval of nukes in NATO. Lets rain on NATO's 50th birthday party. NUClear weapons are nothing to celebrate and

the next fifty years have no place for them!

High profile participants from the Expert's meeting will evaluate the dangers of current NATO nuclear policy and advocate proposals presented the

previous day. The Forum intends set-up a webpage that will facilitate global

participation in the meeting and generate an electronic petition calling for

the elimination of NATO's nuclear weapons. If sufficient funding is available Those present at the Alternative summit will then be encouraged to

demonstrate peacefully in front of the official NATO summit. A representative at the grassroots level will then present a communique in front of the official NATO Summit (we are in the process of obtaining a permit to congregate legally in front of the Mellon Auditorium) calling for

the elimination of NATO nuclear weapons.

#### PREPARATION

The Fourth Freedom Forum has convened two preliminary meetings on its proposed activities for the summit in the past three months. The first meeting took place in Washington, DC on 3 September. Representatives from US

based NGO's, and public relations firms discussed and offered support for

the project. The Second meeting was convened in Stockholm as part of a PENN

(Project on European Nuclear Non-proliferation) network gathering on 12 October and included representatives from the United Kingdom, Germany, Finland, Holland, Norway and Sweden.

Several groups present at both meetings have been monitoring current developments in NATO Strategy, will attend the New York PrepCom and will assist with organizing the proposed Washington events. To ensure that both

the PrepCom and the Summit are coupled together sufficiently it will also be

necessary to advertise the Washington events in New York and sponsor a press

event for diplomats, officials and media at the PrepCom.

Contact Alistair Millar:

Program Director

Fourth Freedom Forum, 733 15th St, NW, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20005

tel: 202-393-5201 fax: 202-39305202 e-mail:

amillar@fourthfreedom.org

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](mailto:kwood@igc.org)  
Web: [www.haguepeace.org](http://www.haguepeace.org)

Please join us in The Hague, May 11-15, 1999!

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Tue, 12 Jan 1999 14:42:25 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: news: Coalition on Berger's call for CTBT in 99  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id LAA28998

January 12, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Berger calls CTBT top Administration non-prolif. priority for 99

National Security Advisor Sandy Berger identified Senate ratification of the CTBT by September 1999 the top Administration non-proliferation legislative priority for 1999 in a speech made this morning at the Carnegie Endowment for Intl. Peace annual non-proliferation conference.

Attached is the Coalition's news release on the remarks.

Berger's speech will soon be available on the Coalition's CTBT Site <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>, on the Carnegie Site <<http://www.ceip.org>>, and on the White House web site.

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

## COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

"Test Ban Must Be Senate's #1 Proliferation Priority:  
Berger Urges Approval by September '99"

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: Jan. 12, 1999  
CONTACT: Daryl Kimball (202) 546-0795 x136  
WEB SITE: <<http://www.crnd.org>>

(WASHINGTON, DC) Today, a broad coalition of nuclear security and arms control organizations praised National Security Advisor Samuel Berger's renewed call for Senate approval of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 1999. Berger made the comments in a speech delivered at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace annual non-proliferation conference.

Berger said: "... attaining Senate advice and consent on the CTBT in 1999 [is] one of the President's top priorities." He argued that failure to act on the Test Ban Treaty this year would severely undermine U.S. leadership to help persuade nations like India and Pakistan from conducting nuclear tests and building up advanced nuclear arsenals. "If the Senate rejects or fails to act on the CTBT, we will throw open the door to regional arms races. It would be a tragedy if our Senate did not ratify this year."

"Mr. Berger's call for Senate action on the CTBT marks the beginning of a dialogue with the Senate leadership that must lead to the Senate's approval of this longest-sought, hardest-fought nuclear threat reduction treaty," said John Isaacs, President of Council for a Livable World. "The CTBT must be the Senate's and the President's number one non-proliferation priority in order to secure ratification before the special international conference on treaty entry into force later this year," he said.

"It is essential that the Senate leadership work with, not against, the White House and the majority of Senators to ratify the test ban treaty in order to help curb proliferation in dangerous regions, such as South Asia," said Tom Z. Collina, Director of Arms Control and International Security Programs at the Union of Concerned Scientists. "They must overcome any partisan divisions over other issues and take concrete action on the test ban treaty, which will help protect America from nuclear dangers."

"For decades, the American public has consistently supported a nuclear test ban treaty. It would be very difficult for the Senate to ignore that support," said Daryl Kimball, Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. Recent national public opinion surveys indicate that 73% of the American public supports approval of the nuclear test ban (Wirthlin Worldwide and The Mellman Group, May 1998).

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was sent to the Senate in September 1997 for its advice and consent for ratification. Throughout 1998, the President and a growing number of Senators called on the Senate to consider and approve the CTBT, which gained new significance following Indian and Pakistani nuclear blasts in May 1998. However, Senator Jesse Helms, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, so far has refused to hold hearings on the Treaty. He suggests that the U.S. should resume nuclear testing and that the U.S. should not press India and Pakistan to sign the CTBT.

The Treaty, which bans all "nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions," has been signed by 151 countries, including the five declared nuclear weapon states. A group of 44 nuclear-capable states must ratify in order for the Treaty to enter into force. The CTBT would make it much harder for countries with advanced nuclear weapons, including Russia and China, to produce new and more threatening types of nuclear weapons. The test ban would also help prevent nations seeking nuclear arms from making smaller nuclear warheads, which are more easily deliverable by ballistic missiles.

- 30 -

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is a joint effort of 17 of the nation's leading nuclear arms control and disarmament organizations. The Coalition, formed in 1995, is committed to the pursuit of a comprehensive, step-by-step program leading to the elimination of the nuclear threat by the reduction of nuclear arsenals and by preventing new threats from emerging.

For more information about nuclear testing and the test ban, see the Coalition's Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Site

<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

---

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>>

---

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Wed, 13 Jan 1999 18:02:11 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: more news: White House push for CTBT

January 13, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: LA Times; Reuters coverage of Berger's call for Senate action on CTBT  
in '99

Attached below are two of the several news stories on Natl. Sec. Adv. Sandy Berger's speech yesterday at the Carnegie Endowment for Intl. Peace conference.

Pete Domenici, Republican Senator from New Mexico, spoke later in the day at yesterday's Carnegie conference and said that "prospects for the treaty are not good" at this time because Senate ratification "requires a focused push from the Administration and the Senate," which he said did not seem likely at this time. However, he did also say "I would like to give my support to this treaty [the CTBT]."

For the complete text of Berger's Jan. 12 speech, see:  
<<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/berg0112.htm>>

For the Coalition's press release, see:  
<<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/rel0112.htm>>

Other Carnegie conference speeches and remarks are available at:  
<<http://www.ceip.org>>

D. Kimball

\*\*\*\*\*

<[http://www.latimes.com/HOME/NEWS/NATION/UPDATES/lat\\_treaty990113.htm](http://www.latimes.com/HOME/NEWS/NATION/UPDATES/lat_treaty990113.htm)>

Los Angeles Times

Wednesday, January 13, 1999

"Clinton to Push Passage of Nuclear Test-Ban Pact:  
President will make ratification a priority this year, aides say.  
But key Senate Republicans are opposed."

By TYLER MARSHALL, Times Staff Writer

WASHINGTON--The Clinton administration announced Tuesday that it will make ratification of a global treaty banning nuclear testing a priority for

1999, a move that launches President Clinton on a collision course with key Republicans already sworn in as jurors in his Senate impeachment trial.

Speaking at an international conference on nonproliferation here, National Security Advisor Samuel R. "Sandy" Berger said Clinton will press the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

"This treaty is in America's national interest," Berger said. "If the Senate rejected, or failed to act on, the test-ban treaty, we would throw the door open to regional nuclear arms races and a much more dangerous world."

The United States signed the pact in 1996, and Clinton submitted it to the Senate for ratification the following year. It has languished there since, largely because of opposition from powerful Republicans, including Majority Leader Trent Lott of Mississippi and Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms of North Carolina. Conservative Republicans oppose the treaty, much as they have resisted other arms-control conventions, in part because they are convinced that other nations will circumvent its restrictions, leaving the United States at a disadvantage.

In another move aimed at reducing proliferation, Berger announced Tuesday that the United States has imposed economic sanctions against three Russian institutions accused of assisting Iran in its quest for weapons of mass destruction.

The trio--the Moscow State Aviation Institute, the Scientific Research and Design Institute of Power Technology and the D. I. Mendeleev University of Chemical Technology--reportedly have supplied Iran with technology and training that could be used for weapons development.

White House spokesman David Leavy said Clinton will make "a forceful presentation" for ratification of the test-ban treaty during his State of the Union speech later this month. Senior members of Clinton's foreign policy team will then try to increase pressure on the Senate by pushing for ratification in speeches and in testimony on Capitol Hill.

"The message will be that not to ratify would damage national security," Leavy said.

But in a speech Tuesday to the conservative Heritage Foundation in Washington, former Vice President Dan Quayle, a possible presidential contender in 2000, underscored the opposition to the pact, calling on the Senate to reject it.

With polls showing public support for a test ban running as high as 75%, however, there are signs that congressional Republicans risk ending up yet again on the wrong side of a fight with Clinton in the court of public opinion.

The urgency for ratification increased last year after nuclear tests by longtime foes India and Pakistan raised the prospect of a regional arms race in one of the poorest, most densely populated parts of the world.

Berger said the Clinton administration is pressing for ratification by September, the date of a planned inaugural conference among the nations that have signed the treaty. Because only those nations that have ratified the pact can make decisions at the conference, failure by the Senate to act would leave the United States on the sidelines.

So far, 26 nations, including nuclear powers Britain and France, have ratified the convention. Arms control specialists argue that many others, including Russia and China, are waiting for the United States to decide. The accord will not become binding until it has been ratified by all 44 nations that conduct nuclear research or have

nuclear reactors.

Arms control specialists, most of whom favor the treaty, say the stakes are extremely high.

"Without U.S. leadership by example to ratify, we've got no chance whatsoever of bringing India and Pakistan into the [treaty] and halting a dangerous trend," said Darryl Kimball, director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, an alliance of 17 Washington-based arms control organizations.

Two years ago, Senate Republicans stalled an international convention banning chemical weapons for months before an administration-led political offensive managed to win approval. But analysts question whether a wounded president has the ability to turn the tide again.

"It's naive to ignore that as a factor," said Alton Frye, who studies congressional politics at the Council on Foreign Relations. Berger admitted that ratification will not be easy. "We have some formidable opponents in the Senate," he said. "But I think the important thing here is to make it clear . . . that the American people want this treaty ratified."

For Clinton, the tactic appears to echo administration strategy on impeachment: Appeal beyond Congress to the public.

The sanctions Berger announced against the three Russian institutions accused of assisting Iran in its weapons development programs were largely symbolic. Only one of the facilities, the power technology institute, conducts any business with the United States. It is believed to have a small contract with the Energy Department to aid in the decommissioning of Russian nuclear submarines.

Arms control specialists tended to dismiss the move as insignificant.

"These are window-dressing sanctions that do nothing to address the real issues," said Henry D. Sokolski, director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center in Washington.

In Moscow, reaction to the sanctions was muted. None of Russia's three national news networks mentioned it on the nightly broadcasts. But an official at one of the targeted institutions expressed dismay.

"These charges sound totally ridiculous," said Pavel S. Lukyanov, an official on duty at the aviation institute. "We are a higher educational establishment and are in no position to officially or secretly trade with Iran, let alone sell it any weapon technology."

---

Times staff writers Ronald Brownstein in Washington and Maura Reynolds in Moscow contributed to this report.

\*\*\*\*\*

"CTBT Top Clinton Priority"

RTw 01/12 1335

"Nuclear test ban called top Clinton priority"

WASHINGTON, Jan 12 (Reuters) - President Bill Clinton plans to push U.S. Senate ratification of an international treaty banning nuclear tests as one of his "top priorities" of 1999, National Security Adviser Sandy Berger

said on Tuesday.

He said Clinton is determined to strengthen international controls on weapons of mass destruction and likely would lay out the case for Senate action on the treaty in his State of the Union address, set for Jan. 19.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), which has been signed by 151 countries, cannot enter into force until the United States and a number of other specific nations, including India and Pakistan, ratify it.

"If we fail to ratify, we will undercut our own efforts to curb further nuclear arms development, particularly in South Asia where India and Pakistan each have announced an intention to adhere to the CTBT by September of this year," Berger told a conference on arms non-proliferation, sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

"That is the right choice for those countries, one we have been urging for some time. Senate action on the CTBT before September will greatly strengthen our hand in persuading India and Pakistan to fulfil their pledges," he said.

The treaty bans all nuclear explosive tests. In this way, it "will constrain the development of more advanced nuclear weapons by the nuclear powers and limit the possibilities for other states to acquire such weapons (and) will enhance our ability to detect and deter suspicious activities by other nations," Berger said.

He acknowledged that winning approval in the Senate, where Sen. Jesse Helms -- Republican of North Carolina and the powerful chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee -- is a strong opponent, would be difficult.

But he said failure would be a "terrible tragedy ... If the Senate rejected or failed to act on the test ban treaty, we would throw open the door to regional nuclear arms races and a much more dangerous world."

Berger said the deadline created by the announcement by India and Pakistan that they would drop their long-standing opposition and sign the treaty by September may enhance prospects for Senate approval this year.

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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>>

---

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Thu, 14 Jan 1999 08:35:12 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Deposits  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

Today I'm depositing checks totalling \$330 in our General Fund Account.  
They are comprised of the following donors and amounts:

Holston Conference, Johnson City, TN (Peace Leaf) \$40  
Nebraska Conference, Lincoln, NE \$200  
Mark S. Womack, 3229 Westonia Dr., Chattanooga, TN 37412-1361 \$15  
Mildred G. Seydel, 909 39th Street CT. Moline, IL 61265 \$15  
Pitts Theology Libary, Atlanta, GA \$10  
Wesley Foundation at the U. of C. Berkeley, 2398 Bancroft Way, Berkeley, CA  
94704-1604 (Schuyler Rhodes) \$50

This deposit restores our General Fund to \$607.84.

Return-Path: <owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Thu, 14 Jan 1999 15:15:14 +0100  
From: Beatrice MERAHI <bem@wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-l: December bulletin from Rio de Janeiro, Brazil  
Sender: owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Reply-To: Beatrice MERAHI <bem@wcc-coe.org>

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

Rio de Janeiro Peace to the City Campaign  
December 1998 Bulletin

In this issue:

1) Peace Banners, Samba and Capoeira: Youth from the Civilian Volunteer Service travel to the World Council of Churches 8th General Assembly in Harare, Zimbabwe to deliver a message of peace and solidarity

2) Viva Rio celebrates its 5th anniversary and prepares a new agenda for action in 1999 focusing on public safety and human rights

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

1) Peace Banners, Samba and Capoeira: Youth from the Civilian Volunteer Service travel to the World Council of Churches 8th General Assembly in Harare, Zimbabwe to deliver a message of peace and solidarity

"What really makes me nervous is getting on an aeroplane for the first time in my life, but I'm excited about the chance to meet so many new people. This is one of the best things that has ever happened to me! ", said Michelle Pereira dos Santos, just hours before embarking for Harare, Zimbabwe to take part in the World Council of Churches 8th General Assembly and participate in a samba and Afro-Brazilian capoeira dance performance. Like the three other participants from the Brazilian Civilian Volunteer Service, Walson Luis Pereira Silva, Alberto Figueredo Covado, and Flavio Alex de Mesquita Soares, Michelle had never even dreamed of getting on a aeroplane and travelling abroad, let alone being able to represent her country in an international event and share her experience with people from around the world.

The trip to Harare came as a result of the success of the Civilian Volunteer Service, a government program coordinated in the field by civil society organizations which is providing underprivileged 18 year olds with the opportunity to complete their basic education while performing community work in poor neighborhoods. Viva Rio is implementing the program in Rio de Janeiro State in collaboration with 104 community organizations enrolling 3,000 youth, known as "Agents of the Future". For the four "Agents of the Future", this first trip ever abroad is a crowning moment of achievement following nine months of hard work in

the pilot program. Participating in the Civilian Volunteer Service was also the first time for them to actively partake in community work, helping to improve the needy neighborhoods where the "Agents of the Future" reside.

"In my program station we collected donations of food and clothing to distribute to the poor. I saw that there were many people worse off than myself and that made me realize how lucky I am to have the opportunity to learn", said Alberto. "I want to tell the people I meet in Zimbabwe, which is also a country with poor communities, that youth should take advantage of all the opportunities life offers", said Alberto. "We are taking along banners with messages of peace from the people here in Brazil and I want to say that peace is above all communion and solidarity." Walson, who is originally from the northeastern Brazilian state of Bahia, steeped in African traditions brought over by the slaves to Brazil, is especially eager to visit an African country for the first time. "I want to meet my brothers, the continent which gave Brazil many of its traditions and beliefs, such as our music and capoeira. We are the same people and I want to give them a message of peace, love and above all fraternity." Summing up the opinions and sentiments of the group, Flavio wants to share their experience in the Civilian Volunteer Service with other youth: "I used to only think of myself before, but taking part in the program inspired me to help others. I know that feeling applies to everyone here. We want to continue studying and show the people in Zimbabwe that Brazil is a country of joy, optimism and vitality".

Sharing their traditions, experience, dances and music with the participants of the World Council of Churches Assembly gathering, the youth from the Civilian Volunteer Service are presenting a lot more than just a folkloric exhibit: they will be above all sharing their hopes and their renewed faith in the future.

2) Viva Rio celebrates its 5th anniversary and prepares a new agenda for action in 1999 focusing on public safety and human rights

When citizens of the "Marvellous City" of Rio de Janeiro gathered on December 17th, 1993 to pray for peace and an end to violence in their divided city, few expected that they were contributing to the creation of a far-reaching and profound social movement which would go beyond the symbolic gesture of a public demonstration against violence to effective peace-building.

The demonstration was initially in reaction to two traumatizing events: the assassination of eight streetchildren on the steps of the Candelaria Church, one of the city's landmarks, in July, and the assassination of 22 inhabitants of the Vigario Geral shanty-town in August. Both killings were carried out at dawn by policemen. The public outcry and determination to overcome violence in the city which resulted from these two incidents led to the founding of a social movement which came to be known as Viva Rio. Its creation took place during three successive events; a seminar bringing together a "Citizen's Committee" to discuss issues of public safety and propose immediate and practical solutions, a public rally, and an ecumenical event concluded by a musical show.

Today, Viva Rio develops and coordinates projects aimed at promoting citizenship and reconciling the divided city of Rio de Janeiro with itself in three main areas: Human Rights and Public Safety, Education, and Community Development. Viva Rio's various projects in these fields directly benefit over 23,000 inhabitants within the State of Rio de Janeiro, working in partnership with civil society organizations in 700 community centers and creating 1,074 jobs in fields linked to education and social development, with a network of over 800 volunteers. In addition to this vast network, the Civilian Volunteer Service, Viva Rio's largest program, directly benefits 3,000 underprivileged youth throughout the State in collaboration with 300 local civil society organizations. On this large scale, the impact of Viva Rio's actions within the social context of the city has given the citizen's "movement" a de facto mandate for proposing reform within the city at the political level.

To commemorate the hard work and victories of these past five years, while focusing on the challenges of the future, Viva Rio is hosting 2 seminars in December on Public Safety, Citizenship and Democracy.

The first seminar Police and a Democratic Society, sponsored by the Ford Foundation, will be held on December 15, 1998 and will bring together Latin American specialists in the fields of public safety and policing from Chile, Argentina and Peru who along with their Brazilian counterparts, will study proposals to monitor police services in the Americas. The participants will comprise a restricted panel of specialists, police officials, judges and public authorities working in the area of institutional reform to propose a working agenda for reform to be published and distributed internationally.

The second seminar will in fact function as a citizen's forum during a one-day workshop. The seminar/workshop on the Participation of Civil Society in Public Safety Policies for Slum -dwellers in Rio de Janeiro will bring together researchers from Viva Rio and community leaders from several slums in Rio de Janeiro to discuss proposals presented by the Public Safety Commission created by recently elected State Governor, Anthony Garotinho. The aim of the workshop is to establish local Citizen's Committees to consolidate democratic values in communities and neighborhoods throughout Rio de Janeiro by bringing together the human and material resources of local institutions in order to promote solidarity and citizenship. The role of the Citizen's Committees is to improve communication amongst local institutions and to stimulate the participation of these institutions in community initiatives of common interest such as educational campaigns, disease prevention and other public events. The Citizen's Committees will also strengthen local controls over the quality of public services within their communities such as police patrolling, electricity, water and sanitation services, waste collection, road safety etc... Meeting on a monthly basis with a rotating coordination representing each community respectively, the Citizen's Committees will create a viable forum for proposing reform and monitoring public services which can be discussed with public authorities. By empowering local institutions to take community issues to heart and by creating a forum for dialogue with public authorities, the Citizen's Committees will be effectively consolidating civil society on a daily basis at the local and municipal level.

Five years following its creation in 1993, Viva Rio has come a long way towards achieving its initial goals and towards strengthening the concept of citizenship in Rio de Janeiro. There is indeed cause for celebration-- and the renewed commitment to continue working towards restoring peace and justice in the city.

The following are some reflections on Viva Rio's 5th anniversary and on what the organization means to them from staff who have accompanied the work being carried out in Rio de Janeiro since 1993:

"Viva Rio today is a source of professional fulfilment for me. The possibility of being able to work within my profession towards the goal of community development."

----Pedro Strozenberg

Lawyer working with the Citizen's Counters project, providing free legal assistance and conflict mediation in Rio's shanty towns.

"Viva Rio's 5th anniversary commemorates the realization of some of our dreams and the birth of new hopes. The dream of being committed towards improving the city of Rio de Janeiro."

-----Layra Santos

Secretary for Viva Rio's Executive Secretary, Rubem Cesar Fernandes

"Viva Rio represents a great opportunity to be able to work for the betterment of my city."

-----Mauricio Lisovsky

Educational Projects Coordinator

"Viva Rio and the 5th anniversary commemorations represent the renewed commitment to stimulate solidarity amongst all the inhabitants of the city."

-----Beth Costa

Press attache

"Viva Rio is a large social movement which succeeded in transforming the society in order to give communities new opportunities for growth and improvement."

-----Fernando Camara

Administrative Support Dept.

"Viva Rio's work over these past five years represents a profound change which contributed towards making the city more aware of its rights and responsibilities. Viva Rio changed the image of Rio de

Janeiro from a violence-ridden city where all values had been lost,  
towards a city where people now feel renewed confidence and pride."

-----Ernan Andrada  
Viva Rio Executive Lawyer

"Viva Rio is a form of social commitment which provides citizens with  
the opportunity to fight for peace and social justice. Viva Rio provides  
the link for dialogue between poor communities and the mainstream of  
society."-----Baltazar Morgado Neto

Architect and urbanist working for the Rio das Pedras habitational  
project

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-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Thu, 14 Jan 1999 15:45:25 +0100  
From: Beatrice MERAHI <bem@wcc-coe.org>  
To: pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org  
Subject: pov-1: December 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  
December 1998 Bulletin

In this issue:

1. Signs of Peace
2. S-Corner in Zimbabwe

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

1. Signs of Peace

Since our last correspondence, many exciting developments have taken place in Bennett Lands and at S-Corner in particular.

There are very obvious signs that violence has abated with the coming of the holiday season, which, compared with similar periods in other years, would be a time fraught with criminal activity. The primary reason has been the intervention of the Community Development Council (CDC) peace committee and their campaign to maintain the peacemaking initiatives. For the past three months, CDC meetings have been characterized by growing attendance of local \*crew\* members, and sincere attempts by all factions to establish a lasting peace. Most parties have taken responsibility for previous misgivings and a time of forgiveness and healing has ensued.

Having come to grips with the culpability of said gang members, the CDC has headed in a new direction by expanding its role to include dialogue with police officials. In late November, four CDC members along with S-Corner's Deputy Board Chair met with Police Commissioner Forbes, along with several deputies and superintendents, to discuss persistent and widespread police harassment in the community. This came in response to multifarious instances in which police imposed curfews in Bennett Lands, thereby restricting the movement and activities of residents therein. In addition, over the past year, there have been numerous cases of police brutality and aggravation.

The outcome of this meeting yielded a pledge by the Jamaica Constabulary Force to sensitize officers on issues of social justice, and a call for continued dialogue among the two groups. In addition, the Police offered positions to four at-risk males from within the community to be employed at the Police Information Centre (PIC), which will no doubt help to alleviate some of the unemployment woes of this marginalized

population. Since there was no criteria given for job specification, the delegation nominated the most promising youths from four sections of the community.

## 2. S-Corner in Zimbabwe

It was an awesome experience, as the creative energies who were responsible for establishing peace in their respective communities and countries came together under one roof (or should I say tent?)\*, says Angela of her participation in the WCC 8th Assembly held in Harare, Zimbabwe.

It wasn't just the six representatives from the POV (we were missing one, because the rep from Jerusalem was denied a visa and could not attend) gathered on the campus of the University of Zimbabwe. There were an estimated 3,000 persons, from over 180 countries, attended this historical event. The diversity in culture, language, race, and dress code was evident, and it significantly enhanced the forum, with their voices and assertions addressing the four broad issues. The issues were Gender and Religion; Human Rights and Democracy; Reconciliation, Truth and Justice; and the Struggle against Discrimination (gender, race, sexual orientation, and religion). Indeed, there is cause for hope when the world comes together for peace.

My personal objectives for attending the conference were to utilize the forum and space to:

- Highlight the work that S-Corner was doing.
- Learn from other country's experiences, their obstacles and triumphs.
- Broaden our networking capability with regional and international organizations.
- Make tangible recommendations that will help to reduce economic injustice and social degradation.
- See Mother Africa, thereby tasting the culture.

Realising these objectives was easier said than done, and proved to be quite a challenging task due to a number of reasons. For one, there were simply too many padares taking place at the same time. There were as many as 32 meetings to choose from and all of them relevant to some area of our work. This limited participation and the potential to learn from other people's experience and knowledge, as one could only be physically at one place at a time. This situation also created the opportunity for some wayward disciples to go into town, shop and see Africa.

We are very pleased that the decision was made to have decade 2001-2010 as the Ecumenical Decade to overcome violence and, I am pleased to report, is testimony that our work toward world peace must continue in earnest. The culmination of the Peace to the City Campaign cannot die. All of us have been ordained with the responsibility to continue our work for peace in all cities: Kingston, Belfast, Durban, Boston, Suva, Colombo, and Rio. It is of paramount importance that we extend ourselves to work with all the players involved. This means the at-risk youths that view crime as a way out, the policy-makers and the private sector all share the responsibility of exploring recommendations

and making decisions.

Because, regardless of which city you live in, the relationship between violence and urban poverty cannot be denied, and manifests itself within the cycle of poverty. We cannot close our eyes to the underlying factors of injustices that create and help to maintain this global concern. Currently, various research findings have indicated that the disparity between poor and rich countries is widening and, in some cases, so too is the gap between rich and the poor in their own countries.

The S-Corner Clinic and Community Development Council will continue to address the issue of social justice through our 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, and our involvement has encouraged us to work harder in our country and has significantly enhanced our work. We have learned from the experience of others and will adopt some of the approaches when necessary.

Being in Harare as part of the POV emphasis at the WCC Assembly created the space and forum to meet and join with other persons from across the globe who are doing similar work. We learned from each other's struggles and triumphs, and by doing so, were encouraged and re-energized to carry this fight for social equity. It was a stimulating experience. We wish to formally thank Salpy and Sara and all the workers who made it possible.

At the behest of the CDC, a \*Peace Sign\* is being constructed for the corner of Waltham Park Road and St. Joseph Road. The initiative is being sponsored by Grace, Kennedy and Company, Ltd., and will culminate in a ribbon-cutting ceremony in the near future. In addition, a map of the community will be painted and displayed with it, so as to define the geographic location of the S-Corner/Bennett Lands community. It is our sincere hope that this will be a source of pride and education for residents and passers-by alike.

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-l ---->

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Sun, 17 Jan 1999 08:14:39 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Spring Meeting  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

If you sent me a message with dates for a spring board meeting, I must have inadvertently deleted it. If you sent a letter with the info, I've misplaced it on my desk. Please refresh my mind as to what you wanted me to look into at Foundry.

I can say that the church generally closes at 2:00 p.m. on Saturday. Were we to want to keep it open longer we would have to pay the receptionist.

Sorry about my carelessness.

Phil

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

At 08:14 AM 1/17/99 -0500, Phillip H. Miller wrote:

>Howard,  
>  
>If you sent me a message with dates for a spring board meeting, I must have  
>inadvertently deleted it. If you sent a letter with the info, I've  
>misplaced it on my desk. Please refresh my mind as to what you wanted me  
>to look into at Foundry.  
>  
>I can say that the church generally closes at 2:00 p.m. on Saturday. Were  
>we to want to keep it open longer we would have to pay the receptionist.  
>

Phil,

It was a phone message. The dates I am suggesting is Friday or Saturday, April 9 or 10. Of those who might attend, Bruce Edwards prefers a Friday meeting. Jim and Char can make either day. If Foundry closes Saturday afternoon, why don't we try for Friday, April 9 in the parlor if possible. We can finish by 5:00 p.m. is that is the time Foundry closes.

Thanks for helping out on this,

Howard

To: relctbt  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Interfaith Group for the CTBT meets today  
Cc: ctbt  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT meets today, Tuesday, January 19, from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. at the FCNL Conference Room, 245 Second Street, NE, Washington, D.C.

Among other matters, we will consider ways to coordinate in-state circulation of the petition on the CTBT and presentations to home-state offices of senators.

Shalom,  
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 420  
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 99 17:17:39 EST

"NEWSCOPE" by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on July 21, 1993 at 21:36 Eastern, about  
SUBSCRIPTION-ONLY WEEKLY NEWS SOURCE (420 notes).

Note 420 by NEWSCOPE OFFICE on Jan. 19, 1999 at 16:36 Eastern (756  
characters).

To all members of the Newscape family.

You are now paid up until Jan. 1, 2000 (some of you until 2001).

You will continue to receive Newscape in your inbox, but you may also receive  
Newscape at the UMPH home page by following these instructions:

- 1) Go to <http://www.UMPub.com>
- 2) Click on the news icon
- 3) Click on "Newscape on Line."
- 4) You can now read any back issues you want.
- 5) To receive the current issue, click on "Member Access to Newscape Live"
- 5) Enter user name as "ns99" (without the quotation marks)
- 6) Enter password as "99pass" (without the quotation marks)

Please note -- This is a new user name and a new password for 1999.

Thanks to all of you for reading Newscape.

-- Rich Peck (615/749-6007) (RPeck@UMPublishing.Org)

~~~~~  
This note sent to subscribers of the newscape list.  
To unsubscribe DO NOT REPLY TO THIS NOTE! Instead,  
create a new note to newscape-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-newscape@ecunet.org](mailto:owner-newscape@ecunet.org) and a real person will assist. Here are links if your mailer supports that sort of thing.

unsubscribe notices: <mailto:newscape-request@ecunet.org>

human intervention: <mailto:owner-newscape@ecunet.org>

Return-Path: <owner-disarm-news@igc.org>

Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 21:29:45 -0500

From: disarmament@igc.org

To: "undisclosed-recipients:;"

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id SAB01622

Subject Clinton on CTBT/START

Excerpted from the President's 1998 State of Union Address , Jan. 19, 1999

Message-Id: <3.0.32.19990119212944.006bb780@[209.8.25.194]>

Mime-Version: 1.0

Precedence: bulk

Sender: owner-disarm-news@igc.org

Subject: Clinton on CTBT/START

To: disarm-news

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id SAA01601

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)

X-Sender: jsmith@[209.8.25.194]

With Russia, we must continue to reduce our nuclear arsenals. The START II treaty and the framework we have already agreed to for START III could cut them by 80 percent from their Cold War height.

It has been two years since I signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. If we don't do the right thing, other nations won't either. I ask the Senate to take this vital step: Approve the treaty now, so we can make it harder for other nations to develop nuclear arms — and we can end nuclear testing forever.

From: Disarmament Clearinghouse - Kathy Crandall Coordinator  
<disarmament@igc.org>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 22:12:46 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: State of the Union n-weapons highlights

January 19, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: State of the Union nuclear dangers highlights

In his State of the Union address, President Clinton asked the Senate to approve the test ban treaty "now" and, to address the risk of loose nukes in Russia, an increase in spending on Cooperative Threat Reduction programs by 70% over the next 5 years.

Excerpts of key sections from the text of the speech are attached below. Also attached is an excerpt on the CTBT from last year's State of the Union address.

Additional background information is available on the White House Web Site in PDF format at <<http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/SOTU99/SOTU118B.pdf>>

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

Excerpts on Nuclear Weapons Issues/CTBT from the Jan. 19, 1999  
State of the Union Address

"... We must increase our efforts to restrain the spread of nuclear weapons and missiles, from North Korea to India and Pakistan.

We must expand our work with Russia, Ukraine and the former Soviet nations to safeguard nuclear material and technology so they never fall into the wrong hands. My balanced budget will increase funding for these critical efforts by almost two-thirds over the next 5 years.

With Russia, we must continue to reduce our nuclear arsenals. The START II treaty and the framework we have already agreed to for START III could cut them by 80 percent from their Cold War height.

It has been two years since I signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. If we don't do the right thing, other nations won't either. I ask the Senate to take this vital step: Approve the treaty now, so we can make it harder for other nations to develop nuclear arms — and we can end nuclear testing forever."

Excerpt on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty from the 1998

## State of the Union Address

"I ask Congress to join me in pursuing an ambitious agenda to reduce the serious threat of weapons of mass destruction. This year, four decades after it was first proposed by President Eisenhower, a comprehensive nuclear test ban is within reach.

By ending nuclear testing, we can help to prevent the development of new and more dangerous weapons and make it more difficult for non-nuclear states to build them.

I'm pleased to announce that four former chairmen of the joint chiefs of staff -- Generals John Shalikashvili, Colin Powell, and David Jones and Admiral William Crowe -- have endorsed this treaty. And I ask the Senate to approve it this year."

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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>>

---

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

Date: Wed, 20 Jan 1999 13:09:48 +0000

From: Nicola Butler <nbutler@gn.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: CD OPENS, NOTHING DECIDED

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host usero967.uk.uudial.com [193.149.90.221] claimed to be nicola-butler

X-Sender: nbutler@pop.gn.apc.org

January 19, 1999

CD Update from Rebecca Johnson

## CD OPENS, NOTHING DECIDED

The Conference on Disarmament formally opened its 1999 session on January 19, with Amb Robert Grey of the United States in the Presidency (for a month). South Africa and Myanmar (Burma) spoke, both making strong statements on nuclear disarmament. The CD discussed adopting its agenda but could not agree even this small symbolic step towards starting work. Nor were they able to take the decision on expansion held over from the end of 1998, so Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Tunisia and Ecuador are still left knocking on the door of CD membership.

What is likely in the next few weeks?

1) Adopting the agenda: expect the CD to prevaricate a week or more and then adopt the same agenda as they had last year, e.g:

1. Cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament.
2. Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters.
3. Prevention of an arms race in outer space.
4. Effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon states against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.
5. New types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons; radiological weapons.
6. Comprehensive programme of disarmament.
7. Transparency in armaments.
8. Consideration and adoption of the annual report and any other report, as appropriate, to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

2) Expansion of CD membership

The CD, which has 61 official members, was set to add 5 more (Ireland, Ecuador Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia) at the end of 1998, but the decision was blocked by Iran, annoyed by criticism of its human rights. The Foreign Minister of Iran is due to speak to the CD on February 2, so no decision on expansion is expected until then.

3) Fissban/FM(C)T

Could take another few weeks to establish the committee and agree on a Chair.

Although there is no overt opposition now to reconvening the ad hoc

committee finally established in August 1998, it is unlikely that agreement on this will be achieved separately from consensus on the whole programme of work (see below -- this is not the same as the agenda, which is largely symbolic).

#### 4) Programme of work

On 19 January in his opening statement, Amb Robert Grey recommended that the CD should adopt the same programme of work as in 1998, which would be:

Ad hoc committee on Fissban (agenda item 1);  
Ad hoc committee on Negative Security Assurances (under agenda item 4);  
Special Coordinator on Landmines (under agenda item 6);  
Special Coordinator on Prevention of an arms race in outer space (PAROS) (under agenda item 3);  
Special coordinator on transparency in armaments (TIA) (under agenda item 7);  
Special Coordinator on Improved and effective functioning of the Conference;  
Special Coordinator on Review of the Agenda;  
Special Coordinator on Expansion of the Membership of the CD;  
together with  
Consultations under the auspices of the 'troika' of past, present and next CD Presidents (the position rotates monthly according to the alphabet).

There are, however, some countries (mainly NAM, supported by China, with some interest from France and not much opposition from other Europeans) pushing to establish an ad hoc committee on PAROS rather than reappointing a special coordinator. They argue that last year's special coordinator, Amb Paliakkara of Sri Lanka almost got agreement on a deliberative (non-negotiating) mandate in 1998 and that it is not enough to repeat last year's discussions. The US strongly opposes. Britain, Germany and others do not oppose in principle but want to avoid overloading the CD's workload, which they want to prioritise the fissban negotiations.

#### 5) Agreeing on countries and ambassadors to chair or coordinate the various issues

Further problems arise over who should chair the Fissban (and other committees). The issue is not just about the person but about which of the three groups should hold the Chair. Ambassador Mark Moher of Canada chaired only for a few weeks in 1998 and the Western Group would like him to be reconfirmed for 1999. The NAM are divided, with some but not all wanting a non-aligned chair for 1999, or possibly one from the group of Eastern European states, which would likely mean Poland or Hungary. However, some G-21 states are arguing for Canada to start the ball rolling for 1999. The ad hoc committee could not start work without a chair, so this discussion could take a few weeks, delaying the start of fissban negotiations.

#### 6) Nuclear Disarmament

South Africa opened the 1999 session by formally putting down its 1998 proposal for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament to "deliberate upon practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons as well as to identify if and when one or more such steps should be the subject of negotiations in the Conference". Peter Goosen, deputy head

of delegation announced that South Africa would push for a decision on Thursday, January 28.

It is also likely over the coming weeks that Belgium and possibly others will also put down their 1998 proposals for disarmament discussions to be established in some form in the CD. The nuclear weapon states and a few allies remain firmly against addressing nuclear disarmament other than in the presidential 'troika' consultations set up last year.

NOTE RE NPT DATES:

Because of a clash with the Human Rights Cttee in Geneva, some NAM delegations have asked for the third PrepCom dates to be swapped with the UNDC, which usually involves only the New York delegations. If so, it would mean that the NPT would start on May 3 for two weeks. I have pointed out the difficulty for NGOs who may have already booked on the basis of the April 12-23 dates and also the clash with the Hague Peace Conference, which they didn't know about. They may try to shorten the UNDC to 2 weeks, which would allow them to begin the NPT PrepCom on April 26 and finish 7 May. This is not yet decided, and there is also quite a lot of opposition to changing the dates, since they were agreed in 1997 and confirmed in 1998. If you are concerned about the date changes I suggest you contact the Geneva delegations, particularly perhaps the NAM. If it matters to you, this is urgent, as they are under pressure to make the decision within the next couple of weeks.

ends

Rebecca Johnson  
The Acronym Institute  
24, Colvestone Crescent, London E8 2LH, England.  
telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857  
fax (0) 171 503 9153  
website <http://www.gn.apc.org/acronym>

To: mmebane <mmebane@fourthfreedom.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: February 12-14 meeting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Today I received your invitation to the February 12-14 meeting in Santa Barbara. I would like to attend, but at the moment we don't have travel funds in our budget. I'll try to find some, but it's pretty tight on time, especially to get an economical flight.

Before I decide to go I need more information. Please send the agenda and schedule of events. When does it start? When does it end? You didn't provide that information. It effects travel planning.

On one page you say the conference cost is \$150, but the registration form says \$166. Which is correct?

Thanks for providing this information.

Howard W. Hallman

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 18:05:55 -0500  
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@pgs.ca>  
Importance: Normal  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: FW: re The International Interim Coordinating Committee  
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3155.0

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

Non-member submission from [flick@igc.org (Felicity Hill)]  
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 1999 14:34:48 -0800 (PST)  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
From: flick@igc.org (Felicity Hill)  
Subject: Re ICC

Dear All,

The International Interim Coordinating Committee of Abolition 2000 needs help.

The current group, chosen out of the pool of those present at the last Abolition 2000 Annual General Meeting held after the NPT in Geneva is not functioning due to the busyness of those involved. Are there any volunteers out there would like to help undertake any or one of the following tasks that were set for the ICC:

- \* Help the network to expand in terms of numbers of groups, paying close attention to those regions in which we are underrepresented, as well as establish a regional structure to facilitate ongoing dissemination of info & growth of the A 2000 movement globally
- \* Make sure the working groups are working
- \* General strategic planning and proliferation of A2000 materials at the upcoming meetings - CD, NPT, NATO, HAP

Looking forward to hearing ideas from creative, determined volunteers!

love felicity

Felicity Hill

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

Director, UN Office

777 UN Plaza

New York, NY 10017

Ph. + 1 212 682 1265

Fax + 1 212 286 8211

email: wilpfun@igc.apc.org or flick@igc.apc.org

To: EDBruegge@aol.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Prospective visit  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Ed:

We would very much like you and Luann to stay with us the night of Saturday, March 27. I'll mail you directions, including a map.

I'm impressed by the thoroughness of your itinerary. If you don't mind unsolicited advice, I can offer you an alternative in going from Charlottesville to Alexandria, unless you want to visit Richmond. From Charlottesville we use VA 29, which is four lanes, to I-66. I-66 connects to the George Washington Parkway. In Alexandria you would go over a couple of blocks to U.S. 1 southbound to your motel. I-95 from Richmond to the Washington area has very heavy traffic and construction work every time we've been on it. If you are interested, I can send you a detailed map of Alexandria for that phase of the alternative route.

Incidentally, Carlee has a double "ee" in her name. You're not the first one who has misspelled it.

We look forward to seeing you in March.

Shalom,

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 20 Jan 1999 18:44:11 -0800 (PST)  
From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: suggestions for Abolition 2000 annual meeting  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: wslf@pop.igc.org

Dear friends, I am delinquent in posting this message, but it seems timely now. In late November, while in Stockholm for the "Treaties Under Threat" conference, a few Abolition 2000 folks had a mini-abolition caucus (we named it a "pocket") over dinner. The gathering included a couple of members of the international Interim Coordinating Committee -- me and Lysiane Alezard from Le Mouvement de la Paix -- and other long-time colleagues including Dave Knight from CND, Xanthe Hall from German IPPNW, Merav Datan, now with IPPNW, and Colin Archer from the International Peace Bureau. Sitting at the other end of our long table, and occasionally joining in were Reicho from Gensuikyo, several Swedish colleagues and a Finn. (My apologies if I've left anyone out!) We talked mainly about ideas for the next annual meeting. Nobody took notes, but I agreed to post a message to the list-serve. What this informal group came up with is very consistent with many of the suggestions that have been recently posted (not surprising really, since one of Abolition 2000's great strengths is its synergy): 1) We propose to hold the 1999 annual meeting of Abolition 2000 during the Hague Appeal for Peace; 2) We propose to conduct the meeting in 3 sessions, over several days, with 2 of the sessions devoted to strategy discussions and the 3rd devoted to structure; 4) We propose to hold Abolition 2000 "PrepCom" meetings in New York in April during the NPT PrepCom to brainstorm and develop proposals for the Hague; 5) We suggest that these Abolition 2000 "PrepCom" meetings be scheduled in lieu of panel presentations. (In other words, we suggest having a few less panel presentations and a few more Abolition 2000 planning meetings. These meetings would not be the same as the 8 am daily caucus meetings.) Please post your comments and responses to the abolition-caucus list serve. -- Jackie Cabasso

\*\*\*\*\*

WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

1440 Broadway, Suite 500  
Oakland, CA USA 94612  
Tel: (510)839-5877  
Fax: (510)839-5397  
wslf@igc.apc.org

\*\*\*\*\* Part of ABOLITION 2000 \*\*\*\*\*

Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Thu, 21 Jan 1999 08:48:21 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Receipts  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

I'm depositing today a \$50 contribution from Neil Inman, 7401 Red Fox Terrace, Shreveport, LA 71129, Tel. 318-687-5033. Neil's Congressman is Jim McCrary, 4th Dist. LA.

Our balances are Gen Fund \$657.84; Ed Fund \$723.51.

I put in a space request for Helen Harris Parlor all day on Friday, April 9. As an alternative I asked for Room 203 which would also provide a good work space.

Phil

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 21 Jan 1999 09:06:37 -0500  
From: Peace through Reason <prop1@prop1.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: U.N. e-mail addresses, Permanent Missions  
To: NucNews@onelist.com, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, nukenet@envirolink.org  
X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org

Permanent Missions (and Observer Missions: Switzerland, Palestine, Vatican) to  
the United Nations - <http://www.undp.org/missions/em.html>

Afghanistan - afgun@undp.org  
Albania - albun@undp.org  
Algeria - dzaun@undp.org  
Andorra - andun@undp.org  
Angola - agoun@undp.org  
Antigua and Barbuda - atgun@undp.org  
Argentina - argun@undp.org  
Armenia - armun@undp.org  
Australia - ausun@undp.org  
Austria - autun@undp.org  
Azerbaijan - azeun@undp.org  
Bahamas - bhsun@undp.org  
Bahrain - bhrun@undp.org  
Bangladesh - bgdun@undp.org  
Barbados - brbun@undp.org  
Belarus - brun@undp.org  
Belgium - belun@undp.org  
Belize - blzun@undp.org  
Benin - benun@undp.org  
Bhutan - btnun@undp.org  
Bolivia - bolun@undp.org  
Bosnia and Herzegovina - bihun@undp.org  
Botswana - bwaun@undp.org  
Brazil - braun@undp.org  
Brunei Darussalam - brnun@undp.org  
Bulgaria - bgrun@undp.org  
Burkina Faso - bfaun@undp.org  
Burundi - bdiun@undp.org  
Cambodia - khmun@undp.org  
Cameroon - cmrun@undp.org  
Canada - canun@undp.org  
Cape Verde - cpvun@undp.org  
Central African Republic - cafun@undp.org  
Chad - tcdun@undp.org  
Chile - chiun@undp.org  
China - chnun@undp.org  
Colombia - colun@undp.org  
Comoros - comun@undp.org  
Congo - cogun@undp.org  
Costa Rica - cosun@undp.org  
Cote d'Ivoire - civun@undp.org

Croatia - hrvun@undp.org  
Cuba - cubun@undp.org  
Cyprus - cypun@undp.org  
Czech Republic - czeun@undp.org  
Denmark - dnkun@undp.org  
Djibouti - djiun@undp.org  
Dominica - dmaun@undp.org  
Dominican Republic - domun@undp.org  
Ecuador - ecuun@undp.org  
Egypt - egyun@undp.org  
El Salvador - salun@undp.org  
Equatorial Guinea - gnqun@undp.org  
Eritrea - eriun@undp.org  
Estonia - estun@undp.org  
Ethiopia - ethun@undp.org  
Fiji - fjiun@undp.org  
Finland - finun@undp.org  
France - fraun@undp.org  
Gabon - gabun@undp.org  
Gambia - gmbun@undp.org  
Georgia - geoun@undp.org  
Germany - germany@un.int  
Ghana - ghaun@undp.org  
Great - Britain - gbrun@undp.org  
Greece - grcun@undp.org  
Grenada - grdun@undp.org  
Guatemala - gtmun@undp.org  
Guinea - ginun@undp.org  
Guinea-Bissau - gnbun@undp.org  
Guyana - gyun@undp.org  
Haiti - htiun@undp.org  
Honduras - hndun@undp.org  
Hungary - hunun@undp.org  
Iceland - islun@undp.org  
India - indun@undp.org  
Indonesia - idnun@undp.org  
Iran - irnun@undp.org  
Iraq - irqun@undp.org  
Ireland - irlun@undp.org  
Israel - isrun@undp.org  
Italy - itaun@undp.org  
Jamaica - jamun@undp.org  
Japan - jpnun@undp.org  
Jordan - jorun@undp.org  
Kazakstan - kazun@undp.org  
Kenya - kenun@undp.org  
Korea (Dem. People's Republic of) - prkun@undp.org  
Korea (Republic of) - korun@undp.org  
Kuwait - kwtun@undp.org  
Kyrgyzstan - kgzun@undp.org  
Lao P. Dem. Republic - laoun@undp.org  
Latvia - lvaun@undp.org  
Lebanon - lbnun@undp.org  
Lesotho - lsoun@undp.org

Liberia - lbrun@undp.org  
Libya - lbyun@undp.org  
Liechtenstein - lieun@undp.org  
Lithuania - ltuun@undp.org  
Luxembourg - luxun@undp.org  
Macedonia - mkdun@undp.org  
Madagascar - mdgun@undp.org  
Malawi - mwiun@undp.org  
Malaysia - mysun@undp.org  
Maldives - mdvun@undp.org  
Mali - mliun@undp.org  
Malta - mltun@undp.org  
Marshall Islands - mhlun@undp.org  
Mauritania - mrtun@undp.org  
Mauritius - musun@undp.org  
Mexico - mexun@undp.org  
Micronesia - fsmun@undp.org  
Moldova - mdaun@undp.org  
Monaco - mcoun@undp.org  
Mongolia - mngun@undp.org  
Morocco - marun@undp.org  
Mozambique - mozun@undp.org  
Myanmar - mrun@undp.org  
Namibia - namun@undp.org  
Nepal - nplun@undp.org  
Netherlands - nldun@undp.org  
New Zealand - nzlun@undp.org  
Nicaragua - nicun@undp.org  
Niger - nerun@undp.org  
Nigeria - ngaun@undp.org  
Norway - norun@undp.org  
Oman - omnun@undp.org  
Pakistan - pakun@undp.org  
Palau - plwun@undp.org  
Palestinian National Authority - palun@undp.org  
Panama - panun@undp.org  
Papua New Guinea - pngun@undp.org  
Paraguay - pryun@undp.org  
Peru - perun@undp.org  
Philippines - phlun@undp.org  
Poland - polun@undp.org  
Portugal - prtun@undp.org  
Qatar - qatun@undp.org  
Romania - romun@undp.org  
Rwanda - rwaun@undp.org  
Russian Federation - rusun@undp.org  
Samoa - wsmun@undp.org  
San Marino - smrun@undp.org  
Sao Tome and Principe - stpun@undp.org  
Saudi Arabia - sauun@undp.org  
Senegal - senun@undp.org  
Seychelles - sycun@undp.org  
Sierra Leone - sleun@undp.org  
Singapore - sgpun@undp.org

Slovakia - svkun@undp.org  
Slovenia - svnun@undp.org  
Solomon Islands - slbun@undp.org  
Somalia - somun@undp.org  
South Africa - zafun@undp.org  
Spain - espun@undp.org  
Sri Lanka - lkaun@undp.org  
St. Kitts and Nevis - knaun@undp.org  
St. Lucia - lcaun@undp.org  
St. Vincent & the Grenadines - vctun@undp.org  
Sudan - sdnun@undp.org  
Suriname - surun@undp.org  
Swaziland - swzun@undp.org  
Sweden - sweun@undp.org  
Switzerland - cheun@undp.org  
Syrian Arab Republic - syrunk@undp.org  
Tajikistan - tjkun@undp.org  
Tanzania (United Republic of) - tzaun@undp.org  
Thailand - thaun@undp.org  
Togo - tgoun@undp.org  
Trinidad and Tobago - ttoun@undp.org  
Tunisia - tunun@undp.org  
Turkey - turun@undp.org  
Turkmenistan - tkmun@undp.org  
Uganda - ugaun@undp.org  
Ukraine - ukrun@undp.org  
United Arab Emirates - areun@undp.org  
United States of America - usaun@undp.org  
Uruguay - uruun@undp.org  
Uzbekistan - uzbun@undp.org  
Vanuatu - vutun@undp.org  
Vatican (Holy See) - vatun@undp.org  
Venezuela - venun@undp.org  
Viet - Nam - vnmun@undp.org  
Yemen - yemun@undp.org  
Yugoslavia - yugun@undp.org  
Zaire - zarun@undp.org  
Zambia - zmbun@undp.org  
Zimbabwe - zweun@undp.org

---

\* NucNews - to subscribe: prop1@prop1.org - <http://prop1.org> \*

Say "Please Subscribe NucNews"

NucNews Archive: [HTTP://WWW.ONELIST.COM/arcindex.cgi?listname=NucNews](http://WWW.ONELIST.COM/arcindex.cgi?listname=NucNews)

(since January 13, 1999 -- earlier editions may be obtained via  
e-mail)

---

<html><div>Permanent Missions (and  
Observer Missions: Switzerland,  
Palestine, Vatican) to the United Nations -  
<a href="http://www.undp.org/missions/em.html" EUDORA=AUTOURL><http://www.undp.org/missions/em.html></a>  
</div>  
<br>

<div>Afghanistan - afgun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Albania - albun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Algeria - dzaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Andorra - andun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Angola - agoun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Antigua and Barbuda - atgun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Argentina - argun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Armenia - armun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Australia - ausun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Austria - autun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Azerbaijan - azeun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Bahamas - bhsun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Bahrain - bhrun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Bangladesh - bgdun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Barbados - brbun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Belarus - blrun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Belgium - belun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Belize - blzun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Benin - benun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Bhutan - btnun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Bolivia - bolun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Bosnia and Herzegovina - bihun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Botswana - bwaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Brazil - braun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Brunei Darussalam - brnun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Bulgaria - bgrun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Burkina Faso - bfaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Burundi - bdiun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Cambodia - khmun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Cameroon - cmrun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Canada - canun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Cape Verde - cpvun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Central African Republic - cafun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Chad - tcdun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Chile - chiun@undp.org</div>  
<div>China - chnun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Colombia - colun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Comoros - comun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Congo - cogun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Costa Rica - cosun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Cote d'Ivoire - civun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Croatia - hrvun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Cuba - cubun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Cyprus - cypun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Czech Republic - czeun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Denmark - dnkun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Djibouti - djiun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Dominica - dmaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Dominican Republic - domun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Ecuador - ecuun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Egypt - egyun@undp.org</div>  
<div>El Salvador - salun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Equatorial Guinea - gnqun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Eritrea - eriun@undp.org</div>

<div>Estonia - estun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Ethiopia - ethun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Fiji - fjiun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Finland - finun@undp.org</div>  
<div>France - fraun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Gabon - gabun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Gambia - gmbun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Georgia - geoun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Germany - germany@un.int</div>  
<div>Ghana - ghaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Great - Britain - gbrun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Greece - grcun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Grenada - grdun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Guatemala - gtmun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Guinea - ginun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Guinea-Bissau - gnbun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Guyana - guyun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Haiti - htiun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Honduras - hndun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Hungary - hunun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Iceland - islun@undp.org</div>  
<div>India - indun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Indonesia - idnun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Iran - irnun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Iraq - irqun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Ireland - irlun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Israel - isrun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Italy - itaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Jamaica - jamun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Japan - jpnun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Jordan - jorun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Kazakstan - kazun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Kenya - kenun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Korea (Dem. People's Republic of) - prkun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Korea (Republic of) - korun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Kuwait - kwtun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Kyrgyzstan - kgzun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Lao P. Dem. Republic - laoun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Latvia - lvaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Lebanon - lbnun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Lesotho - lsoun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Liberia - lbrun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Libya - lbyun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Liechtenstein - lieun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Lithuania - ltuun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Luxembourg - luxun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Macedonia - mkdun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Madagascar - mdgun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Malawi - mwiun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Malaysia - mysun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Maldives - mdvun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Mali - mliun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Malta - mltun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Marshall Islands - mhlun@undp.org</div>

<div>Mauritania - mrtun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Mauritius - musun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Mexico - mexun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Micronesia - fsmun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Moldova - mdaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Monaco - mcoun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Mongolia - mngun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Morocco - marun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Mozambique - mozun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Myanmar - mmrun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Namibia - namun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Nepal - nplun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Netherlands - nldun@undp.org</div>  
<div>New Zealand - nzlun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Nicaragua - nicun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Niger - nerun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Nigeria - ngaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Norway - norun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Oman - omnun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Pakistan - pakun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Palau - plwun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Palestinian National Authority - palun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Panama - panun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Papua New Guinea - pngun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Paraguay - pryun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Peru - perun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Philippines - phlun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Poland - polun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Portugal - prtun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Qatar - qatun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Romania - romun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Rwanda - rwaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Russian Federation - rusun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Samoa - wsmun@undp.org</div>  
<div>San Marino - smrun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Sao Tome and Principe - stpun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Saudi Arabia - sauun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Senegal - senun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Seychelles - sycun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Sierra Leone - sleun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Singapore - sgpun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Slovakia - svkun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Slovenia - svnun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Solomon Islands - slbun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Somalia - somun@undp.org</div>  
<div>South Africa - zafun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Spain - espun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Sri Lanka - lkaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>St. Kitts and Nevis - knaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>St. Lucia - lcaun@undp.org</div>  
<div>St. Vincent & the Grenadines - vctun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Sudan - sdnun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Suriname - surun@undp.org</div>  
<div>Swaziland - swzun@undp.org</div>



Return-Path: <hnolen@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 21 Jan 1999 11:01:27 -0800  
From: Heather Nolen <hnolen@igc.org>  
Reply-To: hnolen@igc.org  
Organization: church world service  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: email addition for CTBT list

Hi Howard,

Please add me to your CTBTWG mailing list: [hnolen@igc.org](mailto:hnolen@igc.org).

Thanks!  
Heather Nolen

To: hnolen@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: email addition for CTBT list  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 11:01 AM 1/21/99 -0800, Heather Nolen wrote:

>Hi Howard,  
>  
>Please add me to your CTBTWG mailing list: hnolen@igc.org.  
>  
>Thanks!  
>Heather Nolen  
>  
>  
Heather,

Done. Glad you'll be working with us? I have Lisa Wright on our list, but she hasn't been active recently. Do you replace her?

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>  
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org (Unverified)  
To: jpmdc@ucc.org  
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)  
Subject: Delivering petitions to Senators info  
Cc: dculp@igc.org, mupj@igc.org  
Date: Thu, 21 Jan 1999 16:51:52 -0500

Hi Marijke,

Here's the document I promised at the Tuesday interfaith meeting. As per our conversation, I'll provide the remainder of the Senators' field office locations and the info re the Senators' positions by a week from today (or sooner if possible).

Note to David: That means I need the 2 sentences per Senator we discussed by then, too!

Note to Howard: We want you to be in the loop about this.

Thanks for your great work.

Marie

Delivering Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty petitions to your Senators:

The goal is for all of these petitions to be hand-delivered to Senators' field offices throughout the country during the Senate's Easter recess (March 26-April 10) for maximum attention-getting potential, but it will also be useful to deliver them before then or even after if necessary.

It is most effective if you can deliver a set of your petitions to each of your Senators. It is best if you or someone affiliated with this petition drive effort in your area can get an appointment with each Senator for this purpose. If you can, gather together a delegation comprised of representatives of the faith groups that circulated the petitions for the meeting. This presentation would make a great photo opportunity, so invite your local press! As an alternative, you can hand-deliver the petitions to your Senator at public meetings s/he might be holding--call her/his office to find out when these are scheduled. Or you can make an appointment to meet with the staff member in your Senator's nearest field office who handles nuclear weapons issues or simply walk in and deliver the petitions and discuss the issue briefly with a staff member. The key is, this effort will be much more effective if your Senators, or their staff, receive these petitions in person rather than in the mail.

If you need further information about how to get appointments with your Senators or to make the meetings media events, contact your denomination's regional or national offices or your state ecumenical council.

For your information, here is a list of all Senators and their field office locations, along with a brief description of their positions relative to the CTBT. [When this document is on a web page: To learn more about each

Senator, you can use the link to each of their web pages.]

#### ALABAMA

John Breaux: New Orleans (504/589-2531), Baton Rouge (504/382-2050),  
Lafayette (318/262-6871), Monroe (318/325-3320)

Senator Breaux \_\_\_\_\_

Jeff Sessions: Birmingham (205/731-1500), Huntsville (205/533-0979),  
Montgomery (334/265-9507), Mobile (334/690-3167)

Senator Sessions \_\_\_\_\_

#### ALASKA

Ted Stevens: Anchorage (271-5915), Fairbanks (456-0261, Juneau (586-7400),  
Kenai (283-5808), Ketchikan (225-6880), Wasilla (376-7665)--all area code  
907

Frank Murkowski: Anchorage (271-3735), Fairbanks (456-0233, Juneau  
(586-7400), Kenai (283-5808), Ketchikan (225-6880), Wasilla (376-7665)--all  
area code 907

+ 48 more states

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: <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1999 05:48:41 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: mupj@pop.igc.org  
To: mupj@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Campaign strategies for U.S. abolition campaign

Dear Colleagues:

As we design a U.S. campaign to abolish nuclear weapons, we need to think strategically about who we want to influence and how we go about this task. As we do this, we will realize that there are many tasks to perform and that we need a division of labor, somehow orchestrated into a harmonious whole.

I would like to offer some ideas, mostly in outline form.

## I. PREMISE

Presently all known nuclear weapons on Earth are possessed and controlled by governments of nation states. For nuclear abolition to occur these possessor governments must adopt and carry out policies oriented toward this goal. Therefore, a citizens campaign to abolish nuclear weapons should seek to bring about governmental policies that can achieve nuclear abolition. This requires us to focus our attention, directly and indirectly, on the governing officials in order to influence the policies they adopt and carry out.

## II. WHO TO INFLUENCE

- A. Executive branch officials
  - 1. President and supporting staff
  - 2. Civilian department heads and supporting staff
  - 3. Military leaders and supporting staff
  - 4. Treaty negotiators
- B. Legislative bodies
- C. International bodies and negotiating forums

## III. STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

- A. Influence who is elected and appointed to public office
  - 1. Electoral activities
    - a. Run for office
    - b. Support specific candidates
      - i. Campaign workers
      - ii. Financial contributions
    - c. Contact with all candidates
      - i. Submit issue papers and policy proposals
      - ii. Send delegations to discuss issues
      - iii. Birddog campaign appearances
    - d. Nonpartisan activities, such as
      - i. Candidate forums
      - ii. Questionnaires
      - iii. Voting records of incumbents running for reelection
    - e. Recommendations for political party platforms
    - f. Form a new party (an alternative some may choose)
  - 2. Appointments to public office
    - Propose nominees

## Support or oppose particular nominees

### B. Influence decision-making processes

1. Executive (president, department heads, top advisors)
  - a. Direct contact by
    - i. Representatives of national organizations
    - ii. Experts
    - iii. Delegations of grassroots representatives
  - b. Indirect contact
    - i. Through legislators
    - ii. Through influential persons who have access
  - c. Communications
    - i. Sign-on letters
    - ii. Petitions
    - iii. Grassroots letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
    - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
2. Legislative bodies
  - a. Direct contact in Washington
    - i. By lobbyists
    - ii. Delegations from home districts
    - iii. Public hearings
  - b. Direct contact in home districts
    - i. Individuals, delegations
    - ii. Community meetings
  - c. Communications
    - i. Letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
    - ii. Petitions
    - iii. Sign-on letters
    - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
3. Treaty negotiators
  - a. Citizen drafts of treaty proposals
  - b. Track treaty negotiations and keep network organizations informed
  - c. Rally support for or opposition to specific treaty provisions
4. International bodies
  - a. Track proceedings
  - b. Influence delegations on specific issues

### C. Influence public opinion

1. Media
  - a. Think pieces, proposals, and other documents
  - b. Editorials, op-ed pieces, magazine articles
  - c. News actualities
  - d. Television shows, radio talk shows, radio and television ads
2. Direct action
  - a. Rallies, demonstrations, celebrations, commemorations
  - b. Leafleteering and picketing
3. Sending messages
  - a. Petitions
  - b. Pledges signed by individuals
  - c. Policy resolutions of organizations
  - d. Policy resolutions of local and state legislative bodies
  - e. Local and state referendums
4. Education
  - a. Speeches at organization meetings and conventions
  - b. Community forums

- c. Speaker tours, teach-ins
- d. Educational activities within networks, such as religious, civic, professional, racial/ethnic, and others

#### V. Division of Labor

A campaign to abolish nuclear weapons won't necessarily undertake all of these activities, but to be successful it must embark upon many of them. For this to be effective there needs to be a division of labor among lobbyists, grassroots organizers, speakers, media outreach persons, treaty drafters, researchers, strategists, and others.

Given the pluralistic nature of organizations committed to nuclear abolition, it seems highly unlikely that all of these activities and actors can be contained in a single, unified organization. Rather many different organizations must work together, each doing what it does best, each respecting what others are doing. The campaign structure should reflect this diversity and use it to the advantage of a broadly encompassing campaign. In designing this structure it may be useful to chart who is doing what and to design linkages between various components.

I would be interested in your response to these ideas.

Shalom,

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

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

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1999 11:03:22 -0500  
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Fwd: Re: Fw: re The International Interim Coordinating  
Committee  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3

>Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1999 00:00:00 -0500  
>Subject: Re: Fw: re The International Interim Coordinating Committee  
>From: IPPNW@VLBERLIN.comlink.de (IPPNW@VLBERLIN.comlink.de)

>  
> International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)  
>  
> Koertestrasse 10, Tel: +49 (0)30 693 0244  
> D-10967 Berlin 61, Fax: +49 (0)30 693 8166  
>  
> IPPNW@VLBerlin.comlink.de IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org  
> <http://www.ippnw.de>

---

>  
>  
> 22.01.99  
>Dear All,

>  
>Thank you Flick for openly admitting that the ICC is not functioning.  
>Many had suspected this and those of you who are on it should not feel  
>bad about the fact that you are overworked (and probably underpaid, if  
>paid at all). The Working Group on Communication is also not  
>communicating, of which I am a member, and we should review the  
>current set-up if it is not working.

>  
>Since abolition-europe was set up to deal with the e-mail overload, I  
>for one feel less hassled by the Network as a whole. But not being on  
>abolition-caucus I am not in a forum where I can speak to the Network  
>as a whole and hear their views. In my travels I am beginning to hear  
>views from all sides that are either rather critical or downright  
>negative about Abolition 2000.

>  
>These are the criticisms:  
>1) It is exclusive or "cliquey".  
>People who have not been in the Network for as long as others have the  
>impression that there is a "core" or insider group. The attempt to  
>break this down by establishing a Coordinating Committee that was  
>different from the original coordinating group/transition team/interim  
>management group and was more regionally representative has obviously  
>not solved this problem. I think it is psychological.

>  
>2) People make statements on behalf of the Network  
>There are still some who insist on not abiding by the fundamental rule  
>that NOBODY can speak for the network, UNLESS they use the wording of  
>the statement. People can "borrow" the name by saying that their  
>organisation or working group belongs to the Network, but the

>distinction should be made clear. This was established at the meeting  
>where the Network was founded and reiterated at the last meeting in  
>Geneva. We all believe in abolition, but we are not all of the same  
>opinion on all subjects related to abolition. People issuing  
>statements on behalf of the Network encourage the criticism that  
>Abolition 2000 is exclusive, and that somewhere up there is "in  
>charge".

>  
>3) There is no strategy  
>Well, we agreed also that we could not agree on a common strategy for  
>the whole Network. But this does not exclude the idea of strategies  
>being recommended and being taken on by groups if they think they are  
>good.

>  
>4) The structure doesn't function  
>This seems to me because we are still thinking that someone should be  
>in charge of the Network and MAKE IT WORK. Felicity is right when she  
>asks for volunteers as an answer to this. Everyone of us should be  
>taking responsibility for this Network and not delegating it to a small  
>overworked group that actually has no time for it.

>  
>There are many who still think that a centrally run organisation would  
>be more effective than a Network. I for one would not be in Abolition  
>2000 if it was anything else but a Network. If people want an  
>organisation that runs a fully-fledged, centrally organised campaign  
>for the abolition of nuclear weapons, then they should do that - but  
>the Abolition 2000 Network is not that.

>  
>Every time I meet people at conferences, especially from regions where  
>Abolition 2000 is weak, I take their business card and then I send  
>them the statement and ask them to join Abolition 2000. Any of us can  
>do this, it is very simple.

>  
>  
>  
>So what do I think the strategy for Abolition 2000 in 1999 might be?  
>My recommendation would be the following:

>  
>1) Aim for 2000 endorsers for The Hague Appeal for Peace and make this  
>statement there: "2000 organisations want a nuclear convention by the  
>year 2000: Start negotiations now!" This also feeds into the 2000 Walk  
>for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons

>  
>2) Send copies of the Model Convention to relevant Parliamentarians  
>and Ministers in all of our countries, together with a request that  
>they put a resolution to the national parliament to call for  
>negotiations to begin on a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

>  
>3) Build on the work on the NAC and other nuclear disarmament UN  
>resolutions from last year. Work on shifting positions of countries  
>for the UNGA 1999.

>  
>There are many more things to do, but if we concentrate on getting the  
>above done this work will complement the work we are doing anyway on

>the NATO strategic concept, NPT, testing, fissile materials, etc.  
>These three strategy recommendations apply to the number one goal of  
>Abolition 2000 - to get a Convention. They involve grassroots work,  
>direct action and lobbying - the three main elements of Abolition  
>2000.

>

>

>Abolition 2000 is bigger than we are. It has its own dynamics that  
>noone has control over. Offshoots of Abolition 2000 are springing up  
>everywhere. It influences the thinking of many decision-makers, arms  
>controllers and NGOs working in disarmament all over the world. But it  
>is also frustrating and unwieldy. There is noone to complain to when  
>things go wrong. As soon as money comes in people start to argue. The  
>understanding of the functioning of a Network is painfully small, and  
>the ability to work without hierarchy and yet with job-sharing and  
>responsibility is still in its teething stages.

>

>I encourage you to take part.

>

>Love,

>

>Xanthe Hall

>(self-appointed until overthrown)

>European Facilitator for Abolition 2000

>## CrossPoint v3.11 R ##

>

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: a-usa  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Tasks for a nuclear abolition campaign  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

As we design a U.S. campaign to abolish nuclear weapons, we need to think strategically about who we want to influence and how we go about this task. As we do this, we will realize that there are many tasks to perform and that different persons and organizations have different contributions to make. We need to achieve a division of labor, somehow orchestrated into a harmonious whole.

I would like to offer some ideas, mostly in outline form.

## I. PREMISE

Presently all known nuclear weapons on Earth are possessed and controlled by governments of nation states. For nuclear abolition to occur these possessor governments must adopt and carry out policies oriented toward this goal. Therefore, a citizen campaign to abolish nuclear weapons should seek to bring about governmental policies that can achieve nuclear abolition. This requires us to focus our attention, directly and indirectly, on the governing officials in order to influence the policies they adopt and carry out.

## II. WHO TO INFLUENCE

### A. Executive branch officials

1. President and supporting staff
2. Civilian department heads and supporting staff
3. Military leaders and supporting staff
4. Treaty negotiators

### B. Legislative bodies

### C. International bodies and negotiating forums

## III. HOW TO ACHIEVE INFLUENCE

### A. Influence who is elected and appointed to public office

1. Electoral activities
  - a. Run for office
  - b. Support specific candidates
    - i. Campaign workers
    - ii. Financial contributions
  - c. Contact with all candidates
    - i. Submit issue papers and policy proposals
    - ii. Send delegations to discuss issues
    - iii. Birddog campaign appearances
  - d. Nonpartisan activities, such as
    - i. Candidate forums
    - ii. Questionnaires
    - iii. Voting records of incumbents running for reelection
  - e. Recommendations for political party platforms
  - f. Form a new party (an alternative some may choose)
2. Appointments to public office

- Propose nominees
- Support or oppose particular nominees
- B. Influence decision-making processes
  - 1. Executive (president, department heads, top advisors)
    - a. Direct contact by
      - i. Representatives of national organizations
      - ii. Experts
      - iii. Delegations of grassroots representatives
    - b. Indirect contact
      - i. Through legislators
      - ii. Through influential persons who have access
    - c. Communications
      - i. Sign-on letters
      - ii. Petitions
      - iii. Grassroots letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
      - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
  - 2. Legislative bodies
    - a. Direct contact in Washington
      - i. By lobbyists
      - ii. Delegations from home districts
      - iii. Public hearings
    - b. Direct contact in home districts
      - i. Individuals, delegations
      - ii. Community meetings
    - c. Communications
      - i. Letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
      - ii. Petitions
      - iii. Sign-on letters
      - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
  - 3. Treaty negotiators
    - a. Citizen drafts of treaty proposals
    - b. Track treaty negotiations and keep network organizations informed
    - c. Rally support for or opposition to specific treaty provisions
  - 4. International bodies
    - a. Track proceedings
    - b. Influence delegations on specific issues
- C. Influence public opinion
  - 1. Media
    - a. Think pieces, proposals, and other documents
    - b. Editorials, op-ed pieces, magazine articles
    - c. News actualities
    - d. Television shows, radio talk shows, radio and television ads
  - 2. Direct action
    - a. Rallies, demonstrations, celebrations, commemorations
    - b. Leafleteering and picketing
  - 3. Sending messages
    - a. Petitions
    - b. Pledges signed by individuals
    - c. Policy resolutions of organizations
    - d. Policy resolutions of local and state legislative bodies
    - e. Local and state referendums
  - 4. Education
    - a. Speeches at organization meetings and conventions
    - b. Community forums

- c. Speaker tours, teach-ins
- d. Educational activities within networks, such as religious, civic, professional, racial/ethnic, and others

#### IV. Division of Labor

A campaign to abolish nuclear weapons won't necessarily undertake all of these activities, but to be successful it must embark upon many of them. For this to be effective there needs to be a division of labor among lobbyists, grassroots organizers, speakers, media outreach persons, treaty drafters, researchers, strategists, and others.

Given the pluralistic nature of organizations committed to nuclear abolition, it seems highly unlikely that all of these activities and actors can be contained in a single, unified organization. Rather many different organizations must work together, each doing what it does best, each respecting what others are doing (special emphasis on this point). The campaign structure should reflect our diversity and use it to the advantage of a broadly encompassing campaign. In designing this structure it may be useful to chart who is doing what and to design linkages between various components. In this way what various participants are doing may complement the work of others.

I would be interested in your response to these ideas.

Shalom,

X-Mozilla-Status: 0001

Message-ID: <36A91685.4567@igc.apc.org>

Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1999 16:23:33 -0800

From: mupj <mupj@igc.apc.org>

Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

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

MIME-Version: 1.0

To: mark.brown@ecunet.org

Subject: Your web page

X-URL: <http://www.loga.org/CTBTalt.htm>

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

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Mark,

The web page on the CTBT petition looks great. Thanks for doing this.

Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1999 14:40:52 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: wslf@pop.igc.org (Unverified)  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) Re: US Conditions for the CTB  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

At 05:19 PM 1/19/99 -0500, War Resisters League wrote:

>Jackie,  
>  
>I'd like to see a copy of your article. It sounds interesting and useful.

>Chris

At 12:02 PM 1/19/99 +0530, Vijai K Nair wrote:

>Vijai Nair wrote:

>Dear Jackie,

>Please send me the updated article. Also let me know if I have your permission  
>to run it in a News Paper or Journal in India?

>Fond regards

>Magoo

>Jackie Cabasso wrote:

>> Dear Abolitionists. Regarding US conditions for the CTBT: If you're looking  
>> for a medium length (5 pages), up-to-date, fact-filled summary of current US  
>> nuclear weapons programs and policies, I've recently updated my November  
>> INESAP Bulletin article, NUCLEAR HYPOCRISY: NEW WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT AND  
>> ANTI-DISARMAMENT POLICIES IN THE US. If you'd like a copy I can e-mail it  
>> in an enclosed file (WordPerfect or MSWord) or plain text, or I can fax  
>> it or send it by snail mail. As the convenor of the "virtual" Beyond the  
>> CTBT working group, I'm pleased to provide this service. Please let me  
>> know if and how you would like a copy sent. Peace, -- Jackie Cabasso

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>> WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

>> 1440 Broadway, Suite 500

>> Oakland, CA USA 94612

>> Tel: (510)839-5877

>> Fax: (510)839-5397

>> wslf@igc.apc.org

>> \*\*\*\*\* Part of ABOLITION 2000 \*\*\*\*\*

>> Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

>Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii; name="vcard.vcf"

>Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>Content-Description: Card for Vijai K Nair  
>Content-Disposition: attachment; filename="vcard.vcf"

>  
>Attachment Converted: C:\INTER2\data\download\vcard7.vcf

>At 12:34 AM 1/19/99 -0800, Timothy Bruening wrote:

>At 09:11 PM 1/18/99 -0800, you wrote:

>>Dear Abolitionists. Regarding US conditions for the CTBT: If you're looking  
>>for a medium length (5 pages), up-to-date, fact-filled summary of current US  
>>nuclear weapons programs and policies, I've recently updated my November  
>>INESAP Bulletin article, NUCLEAR HYPOCRISY: NEW WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT AND  
>>ANTI-DISARMAMENT POLICIES IN THE US. If you'd like a copy I can e-mail it  
>>in an enclosed file (WordPerfect or MSWord) or plain text, or I can fax  
>>it or send it by snail mail. As the convenor of the "virtual" Beyond the  
>>CTBT working group, I'm pleased to provide this service. Please let me  
>>know if and how you would like a copy sent. Peace, -- Jackie Cabasso

>  
>Please e-mail it to me as plain text.

>  
>At 07:25 PM 1/19/99 -0800, SCN User wrote:  
>hey Jackie--Scott McClay here (you may remember me from LAG et seq days).  
>Been in Seattle since 91, working w/ NACC, affliate of WRL. Would you  
>send me your CTBT update, plain text, please? (or if easier, you can fax  
>to 206.547.2631). I look forward to using it.

>  
>I occassionally see bay area stuff w/ your name, glad to see you still  
>plugging away relentlessly! Keep it up. Take care.

>  
>  
>--  
>Scott McClay  
>Seattle WA  
>(206)-323-5695

>  
>At 10:48 PM 1/19/99 -0500, Peter Weiss wrote:

>Hi Jackie,  
>  
> Please forward update. I've been having trouble opening attachments  
>lately. I have both Word Perfect and MSWord; would plain text be best?  
> Thanks and regards, Peter

>  
>Jackie Cabasso wrote:  
>>  
>> Dear Abolitionists. Regarding US conditions for the CTBT: If you're looking  
>> for a medium length (5 pages), up-to-date, fact-filled summary of current US  
>> nuclear weapons programs and policies, I've recently updated my November  
>> INESAP Bulletin article, NUCLEAR HYPOCRISY: NEW WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT AND  
>> ANTI-DISARMAMENT POLICIES IN THE US. If you'd like a copy I can e-mail it  
>> in an enclosed file (WordPerfect or MSWord) or plain text, or I can fax  
>> it or send it by snail mail. As the convenor of the "virtual" Beyond the  
>> CTBT working group, I'm pleased to provide this service. Please let me  
>> know if and how you would like a copy sent. Peace, -- Jackie Cabasso  
>> \*\*\*\*\*  
>> WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION  
>> 1440 Broadway, Suite 500

>> Oakland, CA USA 94612  
>> Tel: (510)839-5877  
>> Fax: (510)839-5397  
>> wslf@igc.apc.org  
>> \*\*\*\*\* Part of ABOLITION 2000 \*\*\*\*\*  
>> Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons  
>>  
>> -  
>> 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.

>  
>  
>At 09:42 AM 1/19/99 -0800, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation wrote:  
>Hi Jackie:  
>I would appreciate it if you would email me (WordPerfect version) your paper.

>  
>Thanks,  
>  
>Lori

>  
>At 09:11 PM 1/18/99 -0800, you wrote:  
>>Dear Abolitionists. Regarding US conditions for the CTBT: If you're looking  
>>for a medium length (5 pages), up-to-date, fact-filled summary of current US  
>>nuclear weapons programs and policies, I've recently updated my November  
>>INESAP Bulletin article, NUCLEAR HYPOCRISY: NEW WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT AND  
>>ANTI-DISARMAMENT POLICIES IN THE US. If you'd like a copy I can e-mail it  
>>in an enclosed file (WordPerfect or MSWord) or plain text, or I can fax  
>>it or send it by snail mail. As the convenor of the "virtual" Beyond the  
>>CTBT working group, I'm pleased to provide this service. Please let me  
>>know if and how you would like a copy sent. Peace, -- Jackie Cabasso

>> \*\*\*\*\*  
>> WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION  
>> 1440 Broadway, Suite 500  
>> Oakland, CA USA 94612  
>> Tel: (510)839-5877  
>> Fax: (510)839-5397  
>> wslf@igc.apc.org  
>> \*\*\*\*\* Part of ABOLITION 2000 \*\*\*\*\*  
>> Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

>>  
>>  
>\*\*\*\*\*  
>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/>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>At 12:13 PM 1/19/99 -0500, lizzy wrote:

>Jackie, great job and great offer. Please send me Nuclear Hypocrisy

>5-page in plain text if it's not too much trouble.

>

>Lizzy Poole

>lizzy@fkol.com

>

>NUCLEAR HYPOCRISY: NEW WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT  
>AND ANTI-DISARMAMENT POLICIES IN THE US

Jacqueline Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation

In 1991, as the Soviet Union was disintegrating, US General Colin Powell stated: "You've got to step aside from the context we've been using for the past 40 years, that you base military planning against a specific threat. We no longer have the luxury of having a threat to plan for. What we plan for is that we're a super power. We are the major player on the world stage with responsibilities and interests around the world." More than seven years later, despite massive geopolitical transformations, the US continues its quest for nuclear superiority and global military dominance. Since the end of World War II, the US has fostered the myth of nuclear "deterrence," while relying on the threatened first use of nuclear weapons to back up a foreign policy based on intimidation and intervention.

The nuclear tests by India and Pakistan briefly put the fear of nuclear war back on the front page, and demonstrated the fragility of the nonproliferation regime. But a deeper look reveals the global weakness of a hypocritical "do as we say, not as we do" US nuclear posture, and calls into question the basic premises of official US nonproliferation policy.

In his May 16, 1998 weekly radio address, President Clinton told the American people: "India has pursued this course at a time when most nations are working hard to leave the terror of the nuclear age behind." This statement is completely at odds with current US policy. Contrary to its public pronouncements, the US is modernizing and upgrading its nuclear forces and renewing its commitment to reliance on nuclear weapons, a reality which threatens the long-term viability of both the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTB).

Presidential Decision Directive 60 (PDD), signed in December 1997, reaffirms the fundamental elements of US nuclear doctrine since World War II. According to newspaper accounts, the PDD re-commits the US to policies of threatened first use and threatened massive retaliation, and affirms that the US will continue to rely on nuclear arms as a cornerstone of its national security for the "indefinite future." In addition, the PDD reportedly contemplates nuclear retaliation against the use of chemical and biological arms -- a policy called "counterproliferation."

The PDD is backed by a major new program to upgrade the US nuclear weapons infrastructure. The so-called "Stockpile Stewardship" program is intended to retain "all historical capabilities of the weapons laboratories, industrial plants and the Nevada Test Site," without underground testing. Stockpile

Stewardship will provide design capabilities potentially greater than those available during the Cold War. It encompasses a test site ready to rapidly resume full scale underground testing and a substantial nuclear warhead production capacity, computer-integrated with new, high-tech, experimental laboratory facilities. In addition to ensuring the "safety and reliability" of the "enduring" arsenal, Stockpile Stewardship is officially and explicitly intended to maintain the capability to design and develop new weapons, and to train a new generation of nuclear weapons designers. Over the next decade, the US plans to invest \$45 billion in this program -- an amount, in inflation-adjusted dollars, well above the Cold War annual spending average for nuclear weapons research, development, testing, and production.

Stockpile Stewardship will allow nuclear weapons development to continue without full-scale underground tests. Instead, scientists will simulate nuclear tests using the world's fastest supercomputers and data collected from more than 1000 past tests, coupled with new diagnostic information. This information will be obtained from inertial confinement fusion facilities, pulsed power fusion experiments, above-ground hydrodynamic explosions, and subcritical "zero yield" tests conducted deep underground at the Nevada Test Site. These tests involve hundreds of pounds of high explosive material and up to several pounds of weapon-grade plutonium. They are called "subcritical" because they do not generate self-sustaining nuclear chain reactions with measurable nuclear yields. The US claims that subcritical tests don't violate the CTB, which does not define a nuclear test. But the CTB obligates the US "not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion." In view of US condemnation of India's and Pakistan's nuclear tests, the subcritical tests, which clearly violate the spirit of the CTB, should be called "hypocritical" tests. Since signing the CTB in September 1996, the US has conducted five subcritical tests. The next one, code-named "Clarinet," is expected in February 1999.

Some of the key Stockpile Stewardship technologies have been developed as "dual-use" scientific facilities that can be used for both high energy physics research and bomb science. The prime example is the multi-billion dollar, stadium-sized National Ignition Facility (NIF), presently under construction at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California. The NIF is designed to focus 192 powerful laser beams onto a pea-sized capsule containing deuterium and tritium, forcing the two heavy isotopes of hydrogen to combine through compression, and causing a brief thermonuclear explosion that will create extremely high temperatures approaching those found in full scale underground nuclear tests. If it works, "ignition" will be achieved, producing a self-sustaining fusion reaction. NIF will generate sizeable explosions, central to Stockpile Stewardship. This raises serious questions about whether NIF -- and the virtually identical "Projet Megajoule," under construction in France, -- violates the letter of the CTB.

The dangerous development and spread of these technologies is not limited to the declared nuclear weapon states, each of which has its own version of Stockpile Stewardship. Any country with an advanced inertial confinement fusion program has the capability to rapidly develop a sophisticated hydrogen bomb. Since the 1970's, India's weapons labs have constructed their own "stockpile stewardship" program, complete with inertial confinement fusion, thus allowing their designers to develop sophisticated weapons prior

to "proof" testing. Much like the final French tests in the Pacific, the Indian government announced that its tests served the purpose of generating sufficient data to allow scientists to design and deploy weapons in confidence, using lab experiments and supercomputers, without the need for underground explosions. Not surprisingly, this capability was obtained with US assistance. Between 1994 and 1996, over 800 Indian scientists visited the US nuclear weapons laboratories. And, it was reported shortly after the May tests that IBM had sold an advanced supercomputer capable of running simulations necessary to develop nuclear weapons "codes" to a suspected Indian nuclear weapons research facility.

The South Asian tests warn of a frightening trend, in which developing nuclear powers can utilize sophisticated laboratory research and "dual-use" technologies to design and deploy nuclear weapons with a minimum number of explosions.

The US Stockpile Stewardship program is the result of a "devil's bargain." It is the price exacted by the nuclear weapons laboratories in exchange for their acceptance of a ban on full scale underground tests. It is being widely promoted as an essential condition for Senate ratification of the CTB, a stated objective of official US nonproliferation policy. However, this "deal" may actually weaken prospects for stemming the spread of nuclear weapons.

When the NPT was originally negotiated, a two-part bargain was struck to induce the non-nuclear weapon states to forswear nuclear weapons. First, the nuclear weapon states promised in Article IV to assist the non-nuclear weapon states with the development of nuclear power, an unfortunate commitment that promoted the very proliferation the NPT was intended to prevent. Second, the nuclear weapon states promised in Article VI to negotiate the cessation of the nuclear arms race and the elimination of their nuclear arsenals. This bargain was reaffirmed in the 1995 decision to indefinitely extend the Treaty. Pursuant to Article VI, the nuclear weapon states agreed to conclude a CTB by 1996 and to pursue "systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons."

These commitments were reinforced and expanded by the historic 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. In what is now the authoritative interpretation of Article VI, the Court held unanimously 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."

During the Cold War, the NPT was largely ignored by the nuclear weapon states. Now, in the logic of "counterproliferation," the US military establishment has turned the Treaty's original logic upside down. Possible proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction has become a principal rationale for the US to maintain and upgrade its own nuclear forces. This represents an expansion, rather than a reduction, of the role of nuclear weapons and directly contradicts the Article VI disarmament obligation.

When President Clinton submitted the CTB to the Senate for ratification

over a year ago, his transmittal letter made clear that his endorsement of the Treaty was conditioned on Senate support for the Stockpile Stewardship program as a central requirement of "national security strategy" premised on maintenance of a robust nuclear "deterrent."

The CTB has been long-sought in the belief that it would constitute an effective disarmament measure. However, conditioning adoption of the Treaty on the establishment of the Stockpile Stewardship program in order to compensate for the loss of underground testing demonstrates a profound US disregard for global and historical expectations of the CTB. This may serve in the long term to stimulate the spread of nuclear weapons, directly, through the development and spread of technology and information, and indirectly, by legitimizing continued possession and threatened use of nuclear weapons.

Today, US Trident submarines patrol the world's oceans at Cold War levels. Armed with hundreds of unimaginably powerful nuclear weapons, they remain ready to strike targets around the globe in a matter of minutes. The US weapons laboratories are currently working on upgrades to the Trident warheads and missiles. These upgrades may allow improvement in accuracy for large portions of the submarine-launched ballistic missile force. During the Cold War, this kind of "upgrading" raised fears of a disabling "first strike" and was a driving force in the arms race. Russia, France, the UK and China are upgrading their strategic and tactical nuclear forces as well.

The US plans to maintain indefinitely a nuclear arsenal of more than 10,000 intact warheads in various states of readiness, with thousands of additional plutonium "pits" in reserve. The size of this arsenal is not affected by the START process, which deals only with deployed "strategic," or long-range weapons. Even if START II is ratified by the Russian Duma -- in doubt due to NATO expansion, US development of a Ballistic Missile Defense system, and political instabilities in Russia -- in 2007 each side will retain some 3,500 deployed strategic weapons. The START III framework agreement would allow each side to maintain 2,000 or more deployed strategic nuclear weapons. At present, there are no formal arms reduction negotiations underway.

While US officials publicly proclaim that the CTB will severely constrain the further development of nuclear weapons, it appears that the Pentagon has sufficient confidence in near-term Stockpile Stewardship capabilities to seriously consider developing and deploying modified weapons designs without underground testing. In fact, it has already done so. Existing facilities have been used to produce and deploy the first US nuclear weapon with improved military capabilities since 1989. The B61-11 is an earth penetrating gravity bomb with a variable yield ranging from 300 tons to over 300 kilotons TNT. The US claims that the B61-11 is not a "new" weapon because the physics package has not been changed. But in fact, it is a weapon with new military capabilities. And its use has already been threatened against Libya and Iraq in connection with alleged chemical and biological weapons-capabilities.

The world reeled when India and Pakistan conducted their nuclear tests. But just two months earlier, the US flight-tested the B61-11 in Alaska, using a depleted uranium warhead. Attempts by local tribes and environmental groups to focus national attention on this US nuclear test

fell on deaf ears. Other nuclear weapons projects reportedly underway include upgrades to MX warheads and strategic bombs, nuclear glide bombs, and -- possibly -- a nuclear warhead for theater defense missiles designed to intercept and incinerate biological and chemical warheads.

In addition, contingency plans are underway to allow US nuclear weapons production to quickly increase to "cold war levels of building." Modernized plutonium pit manufacturing capability will add to the 12,000 unused pits currently in storage and the 12,000 in the current weapon arsenal. In addition, the US is preparing to resume production of tritium, halted in 1988 for safety reasons. (Tritium is radioactive hydrogen -- the "H" in H-bomb. It is used to boost the explosive power of nuclear weapons.) Yet the current store of tritium could supply a stockpile of 1,000 nuclear warheads for the next 50 years.

Such programs represent the antithesis of the NPT Article VI obligation to "pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race and an early date and to nuclear disarmament," which was unambiguously reaffirmed by the US in conjunction with the 1995 NPT extension decision. The reality is that Stockpile Stewardship is intended to ensure that nuclear disarmament does not occur as a consequence of the CTB. Moreover, new nuclear weapons designs and improvements directly contravene the "cessation of the nuclear arms race" Article VI requirement.

The US National Academy of Sciences, in its 1997 report, The Future of Nuclear Weapons, warned: "The absence of change in US nuclear posture and practice to reflect the dramatically altered post-Cold War conditions weakens the credibility of US leadership in nonproliferation efforts."

The most appropriate and effective response to the nuclear crisis in South Asia is for the US, the world's first and leading nuclear power, to commence, without further delay, negotiations on the global elimination of nuclear weapons -- its legal obligation under the NPT. This should be coupled with immediate measures to reduce the very real danger of an intentional or accidental nuclear launch. Nuclear forces should be taken off "hair trigger" alert and withdrawn from deployment. Warheads should be separated from delivery vehicles. And Senate ratification of the CTB should be linked to nuclear disarmament instead of being conditioned on the Stockpile Stewardship program. Maybe then the US would be in a position to convince India and Pakistan not to alert and deploy their own nuclear forces, and to join the CTB and NPT.

-----  
-----  
Jacqueline Cabasso is the Executive Director of the Western States Legal Foundation in Oakland, California, a founding member of the Abolition 2000 Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons. An earlier version of this article appeared in the INESAP Bulletin, November 1998. Revised 1/99>

\*\*\*\*\*

WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION  
1440 Broadway, Suite 500  
Oakland, CA USA 94612  
Tel: (510)839-5877

Fax: (510)839-5397

wslf@igc.apc.org

\*\*\*\*\* Part of ABOLITION 2000 \*\*\*\*\*

Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

-

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.

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Tasks for U.S. nuclear abolition campaign  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

I have trouble getting the U.S. abolition list-serve to transmit my messages. This is my second attempt 2ith this message because my first try apparently failed (for it never came to me).

As we design a U.S. campaign to abolish nuclear weapons, we need to think strategically about who we want to influence and how we go about this task. As we do this, we will realize that there are many tasks to perform and that different persons and organizations have different contributions to make. We need to achieve a division of labor, somehow orchestrated into a harmonious whole.

I would like to offer some ideas, mostly in outline form.

## I. PREMISE

Presently all known nuclear weapons on Earth are possessed and controlled by governments of nation states. For nuclear abolition to occur these possessor governments must adopt and carry out policies oriented toward this goal. Therefore, a citizen campaign to abolish nuclear weapons should seek to bring about governmental policies that can achieve nuclear abolition. This requires us to focus our attention, directly and indirectly, on the governing officials in order to influence the policies they adopt and carry out.

## II. WHO TO INFLUENCE

- A. Executive branch officials
  - 1. President and supporting staff
  - 2. Civilian department heads and supporting staff
  - 3. Military leaders and supporting staff
  - 4. Treaty negotiators
- B. Legislative bodies
- C. International bodies and negotiating forums

## III. HOW TO ACHIEVE INFLUENCE

- A. Influence who is elected and appointed to public office
  - 1. Electoral activities
    - a. Run for office
    - b. Support specific candidates
      - i. Campaign workers
      - ii. Financial contributions
    - c. Contact with all candidates
      - i. Submit issue papers and policy proposals
      - ii. Send delegations to discuss issues
      - iii. Birddog campaign appearances
    - d. Nonpartisan activities, such as
      - i. Candidate forums
      - ii. Questionnaires

- iii. Voting records of incumbents running for reelection
    - e. Recommendations for political party platforms
    - f. Form a new party (an alternative some may choose)
  - 2. Appointments to public office
    - Propose nominees
    - Support or oppose particular nominees
- B. Influence decision-making processes
  - 1. Executive (president, department heads, top advisors)
    - a. Direct contact by
      - i. Representatives of national organizations
      - ii. Experts
      - iii. Delegations of grassroots representatives
    - b. Indirect contact
      - i. Through legislators
      - ii. Through influential persons who have access
    - c. Communications
      - i. Sign-on letters
      - ii. Petitions
      - iii. Grassroots letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
      - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
  - 2. Legislative bodies
    - a. Direct contact in Washington
      - i. By lobbyists
      - ii. Delegations from home districts
      - iii. Public hearings
    - b. Direct contact in home districts
      - i. Individuals, delegations
      - ii. Community meetings
    - c. Communications
      - i. Letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
      - ii. Petitions
      - iii. Sign-on letters
      - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
  - 3. Treaty negotiators
    - a. Citizen drafts of treaty proposals
    - b. Track treaty negotiations and keep network organizations informed
    - c. Rally support for or opposition to specific treaty provisions
  - 4. International bodies
    - a. Track proceedings
    - b. Influence delegations on specific issues
- C. Influence public opinion
  - 1. Media
    - a. Think pieces, proposals, and other documents
    - b. Editorials, op-ed pieces, magazine articles
    - c. News actualities
    - d. Television shows, radio talk shows, radio and television ads
  - 2. Direct action
    - a. Rallies, demonstrations, celebrations, commemorations
    - b. Leafleteering and picketing
  - 3. Sending messages
    - a. Petitions
    - b. Pledges signed by individuals
    - c. Policy resolutions of organizations
    - d. Policy resolutions of local and state legislative bodies

- e. Local and state referendums
- 4. Education
  - a. Speeches at organization meetings and conventions
  - b. Community forums
  - c. Speaker tours, teach-ins
  - d. Educational activities within networks, such as religious, civic, professional, racial/ethnic, and others

#### IV. Division of Labor

A campaign to abolish nuclear weapons won't necessarily undertake all of these activities, but to be successful it must embark upon many of them. For this to be effective there needs to be a division of labor among lobbyists, grassroots organizers, speakers, media outreach persons, treaty drafters, researchers, strategists, and others.

Given the pluralistic nature of organizations committed to nuclear abolition, it seems highly unlikely that all of these activities and actors can be contained in a single, unified organization. Rather many different organizations must work together, each doing what it does best, each respecting what others are doing (special emphasis on this point). The campaign structure should reflect our diversity and use it to the advantage of a broadly encompassing campaign. In designing this structure it may be useful to chart who is doing what and to design linkages between various components. In this way what various participants are doing may complement the work of others.

I would be interested in your response to these ideas.

Shalom,

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
Date: Sun, 24 Jan 1999 13:24:03 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) Freeing the CTBT from Jessie Helms  
References: <199901230636.WAA26671@wheel.dcn.davis.ca.us>  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Senators can do anything they want on the floor. If they want to bring up the CTBT, they can do it. A discharge petition is not required. However, unanimous consent is the usual and preferred approach for proceeding to consideration of any topic in the Senate, and unanimous consent for CTBT consideration would be impossible right now.

As a matter of practical politics, the Senate is a clubby place where it is considered inappropriate to challenge the authority of senior members. They operate within a comity arrangement which does not encourage bucking a chairman. Very few would consider challenging Sen. Helms on this or any other matter. But it can be done if the circumstances are right and a bipartisan group plans its strategies well.

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller

Timothy Bruening wrote:

>  
> Jesse Helms has bottled up the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty since Clinton  
> sent it to the Senate in 1997. Could Senators discharge it from the Foreign  
> Relations Committee and onto the floor for a vote by collecting signatures  
> on a discharge petition?  
>  
> -  
> 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.

-  
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: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Sun, 24 Jan 1999 14:57:24 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: news: START stopped; NMD moving ahead; ABM ??

January 24, 1999

TO: Coalition friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball, Director

RE: START and NMD developments

Several developments last week have profoundly changed the course of our efforts to achieve deep reductions in U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals and to steer U.S. policy on ballistic missile defenses in an intelligent direction. The developments are not promising.

For your information, the Coalition has collected key statements on our Web Site and I am sending several key articles, which are attached below.

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

KEY STATEMENTS AND ANALYSIS ON NMD developments are collected on the Coalition's Web Site at: <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/libbmd.htm#whatsnew>>

ADDITIONAL STORIES stories are attached below:

Pentagon Debates Arms Treaty Changes: Plan Aims to Allow Missile Defense System  
By Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writer  
Friday, January 22, 1999; Page A16

START-II BLASTED BY LEBED, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Newsline  
Friday, January 22, 1999

Amend the ABM Treaty? No, Scrap It  
By Jesse Helms  
The Wall Street Journal  
January 22, 1999

The New York Times, Editorial, "Defense Against a Missile Attack," January 22, 1999

The Washington Post Editorial  
Moving to Missile Defense  
Friday, January 22, 1999; Page A34

The New York Times  
Week in Review

## "Missile Defense: Rethinking a Treaty for a New Kind of Enemy"

January 24, 1999

\*\*\*\*\*

### Pentagon Debates Arms Treaty Changes Plan Aims to Allow Missile Defense System

By Walter Pincus

Washington Post Staff Writer

Friday, January 22, 1999; Page A16

Pentagon officials are studying a proposal that would allow Russia to deploy a new strategic missile with up to three warheads if, in return, Moscow does not object to U.S. plans to build a limited national missile defense system at two sites with up to 200 launchers, according to administration sources.

The proposal, which is being discussed in the Pentagon but has not been accepted by the administration, would require amending not only the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty to permit an expanded missile defense system but also the START II treaty, which claimed as a major goal the elimination of multi-warhead intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs).

Discussion of the plan is one indication that inside and outside the government, arms control experts are considering how Cold War treaties between Moscow and Washington can be retooled to address long-range missile threats from countries such as North Korea, Iran and possibly Iraq that may not be deterred under the approaches worked out more than a decade ago between the world's two major nuclear powers.

Brent Scowcroft, former national security adviser in the Ford and Bush administrations, said during a recent interview that "we have to find a new way of thinking about arms control" instead of balancing numbers between the superpowers.

Pentagon officials involved in arms control issues with Moscow recognize that the Russians are worried that, because their strategic missile force is aging, any new push by the United States to build even a limited missile defense is threatening. The Pentagon officials' plan, according to sources, would allow the economically stressed Russians to put more warheads on their newest ICBM, which otherwise is permitted one warhead under START II. Such a solution would give Moscow a relatively inexpensive guarantee that its offensive force would be able to overcome any new limited U.S. missile defense.

Robert Bell, the National Security Council's senior director for defense and arms control, told reporters yesterday, "The Russian government is wary of changes in the ABM Treaty that could be construed to constitute a threat to their strategic deterrent, that they would deem to have the actual or potential capability to counter their strategic forces."

The limited missile defense system being contemplated is not the "Star Wars" space-based model contemplated by the Reagan administration, but a

ground-based system comparable to that allowed under the current ABM Treaty. The old, Cold War idea was that if the two nuclear giants each had far more offensive warheads than the opponent could possibly shoot down, both would be deterred from attacking.

Bell said yesterday that the Pentagon has not approved the two-site, 200-launcher missile defense system version that would fall outside the ABM Treaty. However, Bell said any new system would be "primarily aimed at the capability to defeat a rogue state that acquires a very small number of ICBMs equipped with weapons of mass destruction warheads."

Under START II, which the Russian parliament, the Duma, has yet to ratify, both sides would reduce their nuclear arsenals to 3,000 to 3,500 warheads. President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin have endorsed goals for a START III treaty that would take those totals down to 2,000 to 2,500 warheads.

Unofficially, Russian officials and Duma members have talked about revising downward warhead numbers on both sides, even from START III numbers, which Russian military sources said can't be maintained in the current economic climate, according to Bruce Blair, an expert on Russian weapons at the Brookings Institution. Blair has projected that Moscow can build only 40 to 50 TOPAL ICBMs a year and perhaps 500 of these missiles overall. If, as contemplated by the Pentagon officials, the Russians put three warheads on each missile, the 1,500 total would far exceed the maximum of 200 launchers in the proposed U.S. defense system.

Although the Pentagon has not officially adopted the two-site plan, one administration source said yesterday that a decision might come "in two to three months."

"We have to determine whether or not we can defend the entire 50 states from a single site," Defense Secretary William S. Cohen said. "That's a determination that has not yet been made. But in the event that more is needed, multiple sites, we would have to amend it to accommodate that." He added, however, "We have already begun environmental site surveys for potential basing sites in both Alaska and North Dakota, and we have briefed Russian officials on these activities."

Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright told reporters yesterday that on her upcoming trip to Moscow she will discuss ratification of START II and how new threats of missile proliferation "will affect the ABM Treaty."

Michael Krepon, a former arms control official in the Clinton administration who is president of the Henry L. Stimson Center, which studies arms control, said yesterday that he is not an opponent of missile defense but thinks the Pentagon plan is "the wrong trade-off. The trade-off should be deep cuts plus limited defenses. The administration ought to look at this problem whole and not piecemeal."

Inside the Clinton administration, said one senior official, Pentagon planners are arguing that arms control supporters "must choose between cooperative amendments to existing treaties and their old goal of getting rid of land-based multi-warhead missiles."

\*\*\*\*\*

Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Newsline  
Friday, January 22, 1999

### START-II BLASTED BY LEBED

In an article in "Nezavisimaya gazeta" on 21 January, Krasnoyarsk Krai Governor and possible presidential contender Aleksandr Lebed slammed the START-II treaty, urging the Duma not to ratify it. He said that ratification of the treaty "may cause irreparable damage to Russia's national security." Lebed called for a more drastic cut in the number of strategic offensive weapons owned by Russia and the U.S than that provided for by START-II, from 3,000-3,500 nuclear warheads to 1,500-1,700 each. The same day, Defense Minister Igor Sergeev praised the treaty, calling it "necessary and beneficial for Russia."

### START-II LINKED WITH ABM TREATY

Colonel-General Leonid Ivashov, head of the Defense Ministry's Department for International Military Cooperation, told Interfax on 21 January that the U.S.'s plans to review the ABM treaty could harm chances for ratification of the START-II treaty. The Duma is scheduled to debate the treaty in March. Ivashov said that "attempts to bypass the ABM treaty will upset strategic stability." In a letter sent to President Boris Yeltsin last week, U.S. President Bill Clinton proposed lifting the deployment of anti-missile defense systems, ITAR-TASS reported on 22 January. However, according to the agency, Robert Bell, special aide to Clinton on defense policy and arms control, said that deployment of such a system may not require amending the ABM treaty but that if modification is necessary the U.S. will work with Russia to reach an agreement.

\*\*\*\*\*

Amend the ABM Treaty? No, Scrap It  
By Jesse Helms

01/22/99  
The Wall Street Journal

Under pressure from the Pentagon and congressional conservatives, President Clinton reluctantly decided to request \$6.6 billion over six years in his new budget for missile-defense research. And Defense Secretary William Cohen announced yesterday that the administration wants permission from Russia to renegotiate the Antiballistic Missile Treaty.

But administration officials have made it clear that unless the Russians are willing to give that permission, they have no intention of actually deploying a nationwide missile defense system. Why? Because the administration believes

that any such deployment would violate the ABM Treaty. And, as National Security Adviser Samuel Berger affirmed in a speech just last week, "We remain strongly committed to the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty [as] a cornerstone of our security."

What that means is that in Mr. Berger's view, deploying even the most limited missile defense would require getting permission from Russia to revise the ABM Treaty. Consider that for a moment: The Clinton administration wants to negotiate permission from Russia over whether the U.S. can protect itself from ballistic missile attack by North Korea.

The ABM Treaty is the root of our problems. So long as it is a "cornerstone" of U.S. security policy, as Mr. Berger says, we will never be able to deploy a nationwide missile defense that will provide real security for the American people.

We do not need to renegotiate the ABM Treaty to build and deploy national missile defense. We can do it today. The ABM Treaty is dead. It died when our treaty partner, the Soviet Union, ceased to exist. But rather than move swiftly to declare the treaty dead, and to build and deploy a national missile defense, the Clinton administration is attempting to resuscitate the ABM Treaty with new protocols to apply its terms to Russia and all the other nuclear states that were once part of the Soviet Union.

The world has changed a great deal since the ABM Treaty was first ratified 27 years ago. The U.S. faces new and very different threats today -- threats which are growing daily. China has 19 intercontinental ballistic missiles, 13 of which are aimed at the U.S. As recently as 1997 a senior Chinese official issued a veiled nuclear threat, warning that the U.S. would never come to the defense of Taiwan, because we Americans "care more about Los Angeles than we do Taipei."

Saddam Hussein is doggedly pursuing nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the long-range missiles to deliver them, and the will of the international community to confront and disarm him is crumbling. Iran, which is also developing a nuclear capability, just tested a new missile -- built with Russian, Chinese and North Korean technology -- which can strike Israel and Turkey, a NATO ally. And, according to the Rumsfeld Commission, Iran "has acquired and is seeking advanced missile components that can be combined

to produce ballistic missiles with sufficient range to strike the United States." If

Iran succeeds, the commission warns, it will be capable of striking all the way to St. Paul, Minn.

North Korea's unstable communist regime is forging ahead with its nuclear weapons program, and test-fired a missile over Japan last August which is capable of striking both Alaska and Hawaii. And Pyongyang is close to testing a new missile, the TD-2, which could allow it to strike the continental U.S.

America is today vulnerable to ballistic missile attack by unstable outlaw regimes, and that missile threat will increase dramatically in the early years of the 21st century. What are we doing today, in this waning year of the 20th century, to defend ourselves against these emerging threats? Practically nothing.

When the Senate votes on the new protocols expanding the ABM Treaty to Russia and other post-Soviet states, we will in fact be voting on the ABM Treaty itself. For the first time in 27 years, the Senate will have a chance to re-examine the wisdom of that dangerous treaty. If I succeed, we will defeat the ABM Treaty, toss it into the dustbin of history and thereby clear the way to build a national missile defense.

The Clinton administration wants to avoid that at all costs. So the president has delayed sending the new protocols to the Senate for approval. But Mr. Clinton does not have a choice -- he is required by law to submit the ABM protocols to the Senate. On May 14, 1997, Mr. Clinton agreed to explicit, legally binding language that he submit the protocols, a condition that I required during the ratification of another treaty, the Conventional Forces in Europe Flank Document. It has been 618 days since Mr. Clinton made that commitment under law. I am going to hold him to it.

Today I am setting a deadline for the president to submit the ABM protocols to the Senate. I expect them to arrive by June 1. In the meantime, I will begin ratification hearings on the treaty shortly, so that the Foreign Relations Committee will be ready to vote and report the treaty to the full Senate by June 1. I say to the president: Let your administration make its case for the ABM Treaty, we will make our case against it, and let the Senate vote. If I

have my

way, the Senate this year will clear the way for the deployment of national missile defense.

Not until the administration has submitted the ABM protocols and the Kyoto global-warming treaty, and the Senate has completed its consideration of them,

will the Foreign Relations Committee turn its attention to other treaties on the president's agenda.

Mr. Clinton cannot demand quick action on treaties he wants us to consider, and at the same time hold hostage other treaties he is afraid we will reject. The president must submit all of them, or we will consider none of them.

\*\*\*\*\*

The New York Times  
Editorial  
January 22, 1999

### Defense Against a Missile Attack

During the cold war, when the only real missile threat to America came from the Soviet Union, building missile defenses was rightly seen as a bad idea. The other side would simply build more offensive missiles so that some got through any shield. Today's world is different, with reckless lesser powers like North Korea developing long-range missiles that could one day reach American soil.

The Clinton Administration is right to devote money and effort to designing a limited missile defense system to counter this potential threat.

But America's preparations have to be guided by the imminence of the danger, the technical challenges and the possible diplomatic consequences for managing nuclear relations with Russia and China.

The Administration is acting responsibly in moving ahead with a \$4 billion research and testing program over the next six years and setting aside \$6.6 billion for possible future construction. But the White House must not let itself be rushed into a premature decision to proceed with construction. North Korea is closer to being able to launch a missile attack on the United States than was previously thought. The three-stage rocket it tested last year, once perfected, would probably be able to reach parts of Alaska and Hawaii.

What must now be determined is what kind of technologies can be produced to intercept a limited number of missiles.

Despite 40 years of research and testing, America does not yet have a reliable shield against long-range missiles. The challenge is formidable, akin to shooting at speeding bullets. But some day a reliable system will probably be developed. The actual building of a defense system should wait

until it is.

Missile defenses are currently restricted by a 1972 treaty between the United States and Russia. That treaty underpins current nuclear arms reduction agreements between the two countries, since neither would be willing to reduce its arsenal if its missiles were likely to be intercepted in midflight.

Renegotiating the treaty to allow a limited defensive system directed against North Korea and other rogue states may be possible, despite Russia's current reluctance to do so. But the subject must be approached carefully. Defense Secretary William Cohen's threat that America could simply renounce the treaty if Russia resists amendments was a poor way to start this discussion.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Washington Post Editorial  
Moving to Missile Defense  
Friday, January 22, 1999; Page A34

THE CLINTON administration has moved toward the position on a ballistic missile threat held by its Republican critics, but not all the way. Critics have held that the threat of rogue state nuclear attack on the United States is so urgent that deployment of an anti-missile shield should begin forthwith. The administration accepts, in policy statements and in financial readiness, that the threat is pressing and that deployment plans -- but not yet a deployment decision -- should be made. It inserts the sensible condition that the systems finally chosen to provide the protection should work.

For years, President Reagan's call for a space-based defense against an all-out Soviet attack was widely mocked as "Star Wars." But North Korea's open missile testing and secret nuclear program, and Iran's and Iraq's pursuit of weapons of terror, have convinced increasing numbers of Americans that some American forces abroad are already exposed to hostile missile attack and that it will not be long before the United States itself could become similarly vulnerable on its home soil.

Threat is half the rationale for considering a defensive deployment. The other half, which still needs to be filled in, is whether the technology is there to do the job. The administration's answer is to commit to deployment but actually to proceed with it, with a ground-based system, when we have one that can do what it is designed to do.

Besides the technological hurdles, a political hurdle exists in the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty signed by the Soviet Union/Russia and the United States in 1972. In what was meant as a gesture of mutual confidence, it condoned certain limited missile defenses but barred a national defense. Over the years the theory ("Mutual Assured Destruction") underlying the treaty has come to be as mocked as "Star Wars," albeit from a different place on the political spectrum. But the treaty is in effect,

and still represents to an unsteady Russia a crucial American commitment to mutual strategic restraint.

The United States has good reason to keep the treaty from confounding its emerging security requirements for a limited national missile defense; no defense against the still-great Russian nuclear arsenal is contemplated or even conceived of. But it also has good reason to unhitch from relevant treaty obligations in a way that does not undermine Russian confidence. It's a hard task but a doable one.

\*\*\*\*\*

The New York Times  
Week in Review  
January 24, 1999

"Missile Defense: Rethinking a Treaty for a New Kind of Enemy"

By STEVEN LEE MYERS

WASHINGTON -- Ever since Richard Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev signed the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in 1972, it has been a cornerstone of arms control. Its fundamental premise, which held throughout the Cold War, was that limiting missile defenses limited offensive missiles.

Now, the cornerstone has crumbled a bit.

The Pentagon announced last week that the threat of a missile strike from a rogue state like North Korea, Iraq or Iran justified building a limited national missile defense system -- something explicitly prohibited by the treaty.

While insisting the United States was not abandoning the treaty's basic aims, the Clinton administration said it wanted to start negotiations with the Russians to amend the treaty in ways that would reflect the emergence of troubling new threats in a troubling new world.

Defense Secretary William Cohen even suggested the new threats had become so great that the United States would reserve its right to withdraw from the treaty unilaterally if the Russians refused to consider amendments. While the White House later insisted his remarks were interpreted too harshly, it was clear that the rules that have governed arms control for a quarter century had changed.

"Some of the orthodoxy that has driven our policy in the Cold War needs to be rethought in a world that is much more complex, that has many and varied threats and that in many ways is much less stable than the cold war standoff that created the orthodoxy," said James Rubin, the State Department's spokesman, who has an extensive background in arms control.

"Whether it's Iraq or North Korea or the reality of nuclear explosions in India and Pakistan, we need to hone our nonproliferation tools to reflect the world we live in," he said.

The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty strictly limited the number, type and placement of missiles that the United States or the Soviet Union could deploy to shoot down incoming nuclear missiles. In the strange logic of nuclear warfare, officials believed that creating national missile defenses would upset the strategic balance by encouraging the other side to build more offensive weapons to overwhelm the defenses.

Cohen, who announced that the Pentagon now plans to spend \$10.5 billion over the next six years developing a missile defense, said that logic still held today.

"To the extent that there is no ABM treaty, then certainly Russia or other countries would feel free to develop as many offensive weapons as they wanted, which would then set in motion a comparable dynamic to offset that with more missiles here," Cohen said.

But he and others said they believed the treaty had enough flexibility to allow for the sort of limited national missile defense now being contemplated.

A limited defense, they said, need not upset the strategic balance of power with the Russians since the threats it aims to counter lie elsewhere -- a notion very close to heresy for arms controllers of the Cold War era.

Unlike President Ronald Reagan's vision of a "Star Wars" program to build a shield to protect the entire country from thousands of incoming nuclear missiles, the Pentagon's newest plan calls for a more modest endeavor. The new defense would use space-based sensors, early-warning radars and missiles based in North Dakota or Alaska to shoot down no more than a handful of missiles from rogue states or terrorists.

Far from being reassured, the Russians reacted sharply to the administration's announcement.

"We proceed from the assumption that it must not happen," Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov said Friday.

China, too, joined in criticizing the United States, declaring that a missile defense "would only undermine security and stimulate the proliferation of missiles."

There are still enormous fiscal and technological obstacles to a national missile defense. Foremost among them: the Pentagon still has not proved it can construct a system that will work. And Clinton has not yet decided to deploy a system.

But clearly the thinking about arms control has evolved as the world has changed.

Michael Krepon, president of the Henry L. Stimson Center, an independent

research center, said the administration was justified in considering a limited national missile defense, though deeper cuts in U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals were also needed. "Common sense suggests we need limited defenses," he said.

Joseph Cirincione, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, an advocacy group in Washington, said he had profound doubts about the Pentagon's plans, but believed that arms control treaties should not be impervious to change.

"I think we are in a period where we should be willing to rethink our treaties," he said. "I don't think there is anything wrong with the United States saying, if the conditions warrant it, we should consider changing it. It should be a living document."

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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>>

---

Return-Path: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "CTBT Recipients" <dculp@igc.org>  
Subject: Helms Sets ABM and CTBT Treaties "Deadline"  
Date: Mon, 25 Jan 1999 09:05:41 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800  
Importance: Normal  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igce.igc.org id GAA25422

Helms Sets Arms Treaty 'Deadline'

January 23, 1999  
1:24 a.m. EST  
By The Associated Press

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., says he will put a freeze on treaties the administration wants unless the White House submits proposed modifications in the nuclear arms treaty by June.

"We will consider all of (the treaties) or we will consider none of them," Helms, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, told a conference of conservative activists on Friday.

Helms wants amendments to the 27-year-old Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty brought to the floor, predicting that the Republican Senate would then vote to pull the United States out of the entire treaty.

Among treaties that could become stalled if a standoff develops between Helms and the White House is the 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, a top administration priority.

The modifications in the ABM treaty were agreed to by President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin but have not been sent to the Senate. Helms and other conservatives consider the pact dead anyway, because the Soviet Union with whom it was negotiated no longer exists.

Helms told the Conservative Political Action Conference that the entire pact belongs "in the dustbin of history."

The treaty is standing in the way of proceeding on a GOP plan to establish a national missile defense system.

Such a system is prohibited by terms of the existing ABM treaty -- and the administration contends that Moscow would have to agree to any move by the United States to set up such a system.

"I say baloney," Helms said to renegotiating the treaty with the Russians. "Not on my watch, Mr. President."

Helms also demanded the administration submit another treaty likely to be rejected: a 1997 environmental pact signed by the United States and

37 other industrial nations in Kyoto, Japan, to limit gases that contribute to global warming.

Helms, who is known for holding up measures and nominations, opposes that treaty, as well.

In 1997, Helms single-handedly blocked the nomination of former Massachusetts Gov. William Weld, a fellow Republican, to be ambassador to Mexico by refusing to hold hearings.

If that earned him the nickname "Senator No," so be it, Helms told the standing-room-only audience.

"Saying no is part of the job of being chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee," he said, "and I plan to say 'no' to a few more things this year."

But Helms said he would not criticize recent steps taken by the administration to permit more humanitarian aid to reach Cuba, even though he strongly supports a continuation of a trade embargo against Fidel Castro's regime.

"I'll (also) go along with letting the Baltimore Orioles play exhibition games against the Cuban national team -- but on one condition," Helms said. "I want the Cuban national team to come to Baltimore to play the Orioles first and then the Orioles can go to Havana. Because when the O's get to Cuba, there will be no one to play them."

To: "David Krieger" <napf@silcom.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Access to Abolition USA list serve  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear David:

For some reason I am unable to get messages through to the Abolition USA list-serve. I have tried twice in the last three days to send out some campaign ideas that may be useful to the February meeting in Santa Barbara, but they have never come back to me as a subscriber. The same thing happened several times last fall. At that time I talked with Sue Broidy about it, and she referred me to the company that handles the list-serve. That led nowhere, and I never did gain access.

I'm addressing my communication to abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com. Isn't that correct? I receive messages from the list serve, so I know I'm a subscriber. Am I doing something wrong? Am I somehow blacklisted? Because your office is a facilitator for the list-serve, perhaps you can help me.

Thanks,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 10:50:57 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: "abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com" <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) THE STAR WARS REVIVAL, THE DISARMAMENT STALL  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by kds5.kivex.com id LAA12762  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

THE STAR WARS REVIVAL, THE DISARMAMENT STALL  
NEWS SUMMARY & ACTION ALERT

ENCLOSED PLEASE FIND:

- 1) Summary of the Current Situation
- 2) WHAT YOU CAN DO - with sample letter to the editor
- 3) State of the Union - Republican Response
- 4) Cohen Announcement
- 5) Russia Response to Administration Plans
- 6) Jesse Helms on STAR WARS & the ABM Treaty

\*\*\*\*\*

- 1) Summary of the Current Situation

Last week's developments on STAR WARS missile defense system will have a major impact on our work as nuclear disarmament advocates in the coming months.

Starting at the beginning of the week - with Tuesday's State of the Union Address, Republicans placed missile defense in a high- priority and high-profile position in their State of the Union Response. STAR WARS is a key "individual liberty" issue for Republicans. (See excerpts below # 3)

The following day, On January 20, Secretary of Defense William Cohen announced major steps toward deployment of a National Missile Defense, but avoided an outright commitment to a system that is years from testing. Interpretation and response has varied and has required a great

deal of additional explanation from the White House about U.S. commitment to the ABM (Anti- Ballistic Missile) Treaty, and actual deployment plans. (See articles, links to speeches and fact sheets below

#4)

It is clear, however, that the Russian response was especially negative and will make progress on START II even more difficult. Friday's Washington Post featured two stories on the same page: "Pentagon Debates Arms Treaty Changes - Plan Aims to Allow Missile Defense System " and "Russia Says START II is Imperiled - U.S. Missile System Plan could End Hopes for Ratification" (See more on Russian

response below #5)

Meanwhile, like a shark smelling blood, Jesse Helms (R-NC Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) surfaced on Friday, announcing that his demand that ABM Treaty protocols be considered by June 1 of this year, so that "If I succeed, we will defeat the ABM Treaty, toss it into

the dustbin of history and thereby clear the way to build a national missile defense."

Moreover, according to Helms, only after the ABM protocols and the Kyoto

Protocols (on Global Climate Change) are considered, will the Senate Foreign Relations Committee consider the Test Ban Treaty. (See Helms' op-ed below #6)

## 2)WHAT YOU CAN DO

a. ORDER Disarmament Clearinghouse  
STAR WARS REVIVAL RESOURCE & ACTION KITS -  
AVAILABLE FEB 10, More information coming soon

b. Write a Letter to the Editor

There is going to be plenty of news in the coming weeks on STAR WARS Developments. Please take the opportunity to respond with letters to the

editor. For additional assistance, please contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

\*Tips on Successful Letters to The Editor\*  
(From 20/20 Vision)

\*Letters to the editor can be submitted by regular (postal) mail, fax, and often e-mail.

\*Be sure to include your return address and day and evening phone numbers so that the newspaper can verify your letter. The newspaper will not print your contact information.

\*Letters that are educational, personal, and refer to coverage in the paper are much more likely to be printed. It is helpful if you can relate your letter to a relevant event.

\*Your newspaper's editorial page will often include the newspaper's policy on publishing letters such as length requirements as well as the mailing address, fax number and e-mail address where available for letters to the editor. If you cannot find this information, contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse for assistance.

For more information or assistance please contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse and please send us all printed Letters to the Editor:

--

## DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE

Kathy Crandall, Coordinator

1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005

TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232

FAX: 202 898 0172

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

(A project of: Friends Committee on National Legislation, Peace Action,

Physicians for Social Responsibility, and Women's Action for New Directions)

**\*\*SAMPLE LETTER TO THE EDITOR \*\***

(Please modify this to respond to the news coverage in your papers. Also

see additional resources listed below for additional talking points)

Policy makers in Washington are headed the wrong way on nuclear weapons policy.

Republicans harkening back to the Cold War days have been leading the revival of the ineffective, costly STAR WARS missile defense system. Now

it seems that the Clinton Administration is falling in step right behind

them.

The Administration plans to spend another \$6.6 billion to get closer to deploying something that probably won't work any time soon. In fact, the

deployment date has been moved back from 2003 to 2005. After over 40 years of research, and over \$100 billion since STAR WARS was first conceived in the 1950's, there is still no defense system that actually works reliably.

Even a working STAR WARS defense system wouldn't stop terrorists from smuggling nuclear materials or other weapons of mass destruction via plane, truck, train or ship. Moreover, I am much more concerned about the vast uncontrolled Russian nuclear arsenal. Promoting these STAR WARS

plans make it less likely that we can reduce Russian arsenals and maintain a stable working relationship with Russia.

Instead, the President and Congress should pursue measures to really make us safer. The U.S. Senate should ratify the nuclear test ban treaty

finally banning nuclear test explosions and hindering the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries. The President should pursue measure to reduce U.S. and Russian arsenals, and to lower the alert status of the thousands of nuclear weapons currently poised on hair-trigger alert.

**MORE RESOURCES ON THE STAR WARS REVIVAL/ DISARMAMENT STALL**

"Cohen's National Missile Defense Statement: What Did It Mean?"

January 21, 1999 by John Isaacs, Council for a Livable World  
<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/clw12199.htm>

For more background on Ballistic Missile Defense see:

Physicians for Social Responsibility Fact Sheet  
<http://www.psr.org/bmd.htm>

"Star Wars Missile Defense — A Solution in Search of A Problem"  
Women's Action For New Directions Fact Sheet  
[http://www.wand.ORG/getfacts/star\\_wars/star\\_wars.html](http://www.wand.ORG/getfacts/star_wars/star_wars.html)

and don't miss The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers Ballistic Missile

Defense page:  
<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/libbmd.htm>

More below . . .

\*\*\*\*\*

3) State of the Union - Republican Response from Congressman Steve Largent (R-OK) on Reviving STAR WARS - A key "Individual Liberty" Issue

#### INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY

"First, we must preserve the notion that true liberty and freedom come from God and are His blessing on this land and that FREEDOM reigns only as we act responsibly toward God, each other and His creation. . .

And the good news is that after six years of cutting spending for our armed forces, the president has signaled that he is ready to join us in strengthening our national defense.

"We must never be complacent in what is still a dangerous world. Terrorists and rogue nations are rapidly acquiring technology to deliver weapons of mass destruction to our very doorstep. Most Americans are shocked to discover that our country is unshielded from the accidental or ruthless launch of even a single missile

over our skies. Mr. President, we urge you to join Congress in establishing a viable missile defense system to protect the United States.. .

#### 4) Cohen Announcement

On January 20, Secretary of Defense William Cohen announced major steps toward deployment of a National Missile Defense, but avoided an outright commitment to a system that is years from testing.

See COHEN ANNOUNCES PLAN TO AUGMENT MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

[http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan1999/b01201999\\_bt018-99.html](http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan1999/b01201999_bt018-99.html)

[http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/program/news99/t01201999\\_t0120md.htm](http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/program/news99/t01201999_t0120md.htm)

&

Cohen's National Missile Defense Statement: What Did It Mean?

January 21, 1999 by John Isaacs, Council for a Livable World

<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/clw12199.htm>

Aprn 01/23 1131 Missile Threats

By ROBERT BURNS

Associated Press Writer

WASHINGTON (AP) -- In the six years since President Clinton's first defense secretary declared "the end of the Star Wars era," the administration has come nearly full circle in weighing the threat posed to America by long-range nuclear missiles.

After years of insisting the threat lay far in the future, the administration says the future has arrived.

"We are affirming that there is a threat, and the threat is growing," Defense Secretary William Cohen declared last week in announcing that the administration is asking Congress for \$6.6 billion over the next five years to build a national defense against missile attack.

Cohen's statement provoked criticism from Russia and China -- the only countries with nuclear missiles that can reach American territory. The comment also marked a turning point in the administration's view about whether small-scale nuclear wannabes like North Korea, Iran and Iraq can develop ballistic missiles with intercontinental range.

As well, it brought the Democratic administration's approach closer in line with the Republicans, who have argued for years that Clinton was underestimating the missile threat. The Republicans favor a crash program to build missile defenses as soon as possible.

At a flashy news conference in the Pentagon on May 13, 1994, then-Defense Secretary Les Aspin declared that the end of the Cold War and dissolution of the Soviet Union meant the United States had no further need to invest heavily in a futuristic shield against all-out nuclear attack. Aspin officially killed the Strategic Defense Initiative

that President Reagan launched in 1983, which became known as Star Wars for its emphasis on space-based weaponry to shoot down missiles.

"This signals the end of the Star Wars era, and it signals the end of a battle that has raged in Washington for a decade over the best way to avoid nuclear war," Aspin declared.

Aspin relegated the national missile defense work to a "technology" program -- meaning mainly lab work rather than engineering an actual weapons system. His successor, William Perry, began a turnaround in April 1996 by upgrading the program to "deployment readiness," to make the technology ready by 2000 for fielding as early as 2003. Perry saw a widening missile threat on the horizon but none on the doorstep.

As recently as last year the view of U.S. intelligence agencies was that a long-range missile threat from potential Third World

adversaries was unlikely to emerge before 2010.

Cohen now says the threat has arrived, and a missile system must be built. Remaining questions are whether it can be made to work, how much it will cost and whether the United States will have to abrogate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty in order to deploy it.

Cohen said a formal decision on fielding a national missile defense will be made in June 2000.

"We have many new threats with which to deal, and we need to make sure that we are able to fulfill our responsibilities regarding our

own defenses," Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said Friday.

Among questions this new emphasis on missile defense raises is "Why now? What's changed?"

"What's changed over the last six or seven months has been an acceleration in the threat" from efforts by North Korea and Iran to develop and deploy long-range missiles -- "missiles that have the potential to reach our homeland if launched," said Robert Bell, senior director of defense programs and arms control on the White House's National Security Council.

Last August North Korea fired a three-stage missile over Japan, signaling a surprising advance in missile technology, but it has no missile now that could reach U.S. soil.

Air Force Lt. Gen. Lester Lyles, director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization -- created by Aspin to replace the Star Wars program office -- said the perceived missile threat is so great now

that the Pentagon is willing to push its missile defense effort to a "high risk" pace.

No other defense projects are being accelerated at this pace with as little testing done, he said. "We are doing this," he said, "because of the urgency of the need" for a defense.

Some defense analysts are skeptical that the administration really intends to deploy missile defenses.

Baker Spring, senior policy analyst at the conservative Heritage Foundation, said he doubts either Cohen or Clinton is interested in accomplishing a national missile defense. But he saw "really good news" in Cohen's talk of the missile threat being immediate.

"They have given up the idea that they can run away from the threat," Spring said.

\*\*\*\*\*

For more background on Ballistic Missile Defense see Physicians for Social Responsibility Fact Sheet <http://www.psr.org/bmd.htm>

## 5) Russia Response to Administration Plans

Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty Newsline  
Friday, January 22, 1999

### START-II BLASTED BY LEBED

In an article in "Nezavisimaya gazeta" on 21 January, Krasnoyarsk Krai Governor and possible presidential contender Aleksandr Lebed slammed the

START-II treaty, urging the Duma not to ratify it. He said that ratification of the treaty "may cause irreparable damage to Russia's national security." Lebed called for a more drastic cut in the number of

strategic offensive weapons owned by Russia and the U.S than that provided for by START-II, from 3,000-3,500 nuclear warheads to 1,500-1,700 each. The same day, Defense Minister Igor Sergeev praised the treaty, calling it "necessary and beneficial for Russia."

#### START-II LINKED WITH ABM TREATY

Colonel-General Leonid Ivashov, head of the Defense Ministry's Department for International Military Cooperation, told Interfax on 21 January that the U.S.'s plans to review the ABM treaty could harm chances for ratification of the START-II treaty. The Duma is scheduled to debate the treaty in March. Ivashov said that "attempts to bypass the

ABM treaty will upset strategic stability." In a letter sent to President Boris Yeltsin last week, U.S. President Bill Clinton proposed lifting the deployment of anti-missile defense systems, ITAR-TASS reported on 22 January. However, according to the agency, Robert Bell, special aide to Clinton on defense policy and arms control, said that deployment of such a system may not require amending the ABM treaty but that if modification is necessary the U.S. will work with Russia to reach an agreement.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### 6) Jesse Helms on STAR WARS & the ABM Treaty

Amend the ABM Treaty? No, Scrap It  
By Jesse Helms

01/22/99  
The Wall Street Journal

Under pressure from the Pentagon and congressional conservatives, President Clinton reluctantly decided to request \$6.6 billion over six years in his new budget for missile-defense research. And Defense Secretary William Cohen announced yesterday that the administration wants permission from Russia to renegotiate the Antiballistic Missile Treaty.

But administration officials have made it clear that unless the Russians are willing to give that permission, they have no intention of actually deploying a nationwide missile defense system. Why? Because the

administration believes that any such deployment would violate the ABM Treaty. And, as National Security Adviser Samuel Berger affirmed in a speech just last week, "We remain strongly committed to the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty [as] a cornerstone of our security."

What that means is that in Mr. Berger's view, deploying even the most

limited missile defense would require getting permission from Russia to revise the ABM Treaty. Consider that for a moment: The Clinton administration wants to negotiate permission from Russia over whether the U.S. can protect itself from ballistic missile attack by North Korea.

The ABM Treaty is the root of our problems. So long as it is a "cornerstone" of U.S. security policy, as Mr. Berger says, we will never be able to deploy a nationwide missile defense that will provide real security for the American people.

We do not need to renegotiate the ABM Treaty to build and deploy national missile defense. We can do it today. The ABM Treaty is dead. It died when our treaty partner, the Soviet Union, ceased to exist. But rather than move swiftly to declare the treaty dead, and to build and deploy a national missile defense, the Clinton administration is attempting to resuscitate the ABM Treaty with new protocols to apply its terms to Russia and all the other nuclear states that were once part of the Soviet Union.

The world has changed a great deal since the ABM Treaty was first ratified 27 years ago. The U.S. faces new and very different threats today -- threats which are growing daily. China has 19 intercontinental ballistic missiles, 13 of which are aimed at the U.S. As recently as 1997 a senior Chinese official issued a veiled nuclear threat, warning that the U.S. would never come to the defense of Taiwan, because we Americans "care more about Los Angeles than we do Taipei."

Saddam Hussein is doggedly pursuing nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and the long-range missiles to deliver them, and the will of the international community to confront and disarm him is crumbling. Iran, which is also developing a nuclear capability, just tested a new missile -- built with Russian, Chinese and North Korean technology -- which can strike Israel and Turkey, a NATO ally. And, according to the Rumsfeld Commission, Iran "has acquired and is seeking advanced missile components that can be combined to produce ballistic missiles with sufficient range to strike the United States." If Iran succeeds, the commission warns, it will be capable of striking all the way to St. Paul, Minn.

North Korea's unstable communist regime is forging ahead with its nuclear weapons program, and test-fired a missile over Japan last August which is capable of striking both Alaska and Hawaii. And Pyongyang is close to testing a new missile, the TD-2, which could allow it to strike

the continental U.S.

America is today vulnerable to ballistic missile attack by unstable outlaw regimes, and that missile threat will increase dramatically in the early years of the 21st century. What are we doing today, in this

waning year of the 20th century, to defend ourselves against these emerging threats? Practically nothing.

When the Senate votes on the new protocols expanding the ABM Treaty to Russia and other post-Soviet states, we will in fact be voting on the

ABM Treaty itself. For the first time in 27 years, the Senate will have a chance to re-examine the wisdom of that dangerous treaty. If I succeed, we will defeat the ABM Treaty, toss it into the dustbin of history and thereby clear the way to build a national missile defense.

The Clinton administration want to avoid that at all costs. So the president has delayed sending the new protocols to the Senate for approval. But Mr. Clinton does not have a choice -- he is required by law to submit the ABM protocols to the Senate. On May 14, 1997, Mr. Clinton agreed to explicit, legally binding language that he submit the protocols, a condition that I required during the ratification of another treaty, the Conventional Forces in Europe Flank Document. It has

been 618 days since Mr. Clinton made that commitment under law. I am going to hold him to it.

Today I am setting a deadline for the president to submit the ABM protocols to the Senate. I expect them to arrive by June 1. In the meantime, I will begin ratification hearings on the treaty shortly, so that the Foreign Relations Committee will be ready to vote and report the treaty to the full Senate by June 1. I say to the president: Let your administration make its case for the ABM Treaty, we will make our case against it, and let the Senate vote. If I have my way, the Senate this year will clear the way for the deployment of national missile defense.

Not until the administration has submitted the ABM protocols and the Kyoto global-warming treaty, and the Senate has completed its consideration of them, will the Foreign Relations Committee turn its attention to other treaties on the president's agenda.

Mr. Clinton cannot demand quick action on treaties he wants us to consider, and at the same time hold hostage other treaties he is afraid we will reject. The president must submit all of them, or we will consider none of them.

--

#### 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 0172

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

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

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

A project of: Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

-  
To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com"  
with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.  
For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send  
"help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 12:41:25 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: New brochure  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com,  
bananas-ana@igc.org

Physicians for Social Responsibility is pleased to announce that in February we will publish a new four-color brochure on abolition of nuclear weapons, intended for mainstream distribution. The abolition movement needs some easy-to-read pieces that are intended for the general public, and we hope that this one will help to bring more people into our effort and enlarge our base.

The brochure was explicitly written so that other organizations will be able to distribute it. While it mentions in two places that it is produced by PSR, that fact is not featured prominently. Indeed, it urges people to "join a group working to eliminate nuclear weapons," so our hope is that other groups will want to distribute it.

The back panel is left blank, but it is not a self-mailer. Thus you can not only put your own mailing labels and postage, but also put on your own return address. The size is approximately 5x7 inches.

We will provide up to 50 brochures free to any organization that wants them, though we will not pay for overnight mail. If you want more than 50, please contact me and we will discuss a price.

For those who will be in Santa Barbara next month, I expect to have some copies available for you there.

We hope that this brochure will be helpful to you and to the abolition effort.

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
phone 202-898-0150, ext. 220  
fax 202-898-0172  
e-mail <btiller@psr.org>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 15:31:59 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org  
Subject: Interfaith Petition Drive  
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org  
X-Accept-Language: en

Dear CTBT Organizers:

Here is an exciting action you can do right now on the CTBT:

A broad coalition of faith groups is promoting an interreligious petition drive to encourage the U.S. Senate to approve ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1999.

Please participate in this important effort by circulating this petition at your church, synagogue, mosque or other religious gathering.

**WHAT YOU CAN DO**  
Circulate the petition:

Copies of the Petition and instructions can be found on the Lutheran Office of Governmental Affairs Web Site:  
<http://www.LOGA.org/CTBTalt.htm>

The text of the petition says:  
As people of faith, we appeal for U.S. Senate action on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), an international treaty to ban all nuclear test explosions. We believe that ratification of the CTBT is an essential step toward reducing the dangers posed by nuclear weapons. To care for God's creation and to best fulfill our moral responsibilities, we urge the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty as early as possible in 1999.

Please print out and duplicate the petition (if you cannot access it on the web, contact the Disarmament Clearinghouse) and collect signatures at your church, synagogue, mosque or other religious gathering.

For the petition drive to have the greatest effect, the petitions should be hand delivered to your Senators or to their staff around the time of the Senate's Passover/Easter recess, March 26 - April 12.

Where possible, interreligious delegations will present petitions directly to Senators when they are in their home states over the recess.

Where a meeting with the Senator can not be arranged, delegations may choose to present the petitions to staff in one of the Senator's state offices or mail the petitions to the Senator.

Support the petition drive: If you would like to offer to help with some of the leg work or want more information about the petition drive,

please contact the petition drive coordinator Jay Lintner, United Church of Christ Office for Church in Society, tel. 202-543-1517, fax 202-543-5994.

Updates on the Petition Drive effort and its coordination can also be found at: <http://www.LOGA.org/CTBTalt.htm> and on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now Action Web site: <http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

or by contacting the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

Please post your petition circulation plans to this CTBT-Organize list. Send your e-mail to: <[ctbt-organize@igc.org](mailto:ctbt-organize@igc.org)>

## GO FORTH & RATIFY

President on CTBT: It's been two years since I signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. If we don't do the right thing, other nations won't either. I ask the Senate to take this vital step: Approve the treaty now, to make it harder for other nations to develop nuclear arms, and to make sure we can end nuclear testing forever. (1999 State of the Union Address, January 19, 1999)

--

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 0172  
E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>  
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>  
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org (Unverified)  
To: jpmdc@ucc.org, mupj@igc.org  
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)  
Subject: Background info on CTBT for denominations' use  
Date: Wed, 27 Jan 1999 16:20:21 -0500

Hi Marijke, Howard, and Mark,

Here is current background information regarding CTBT in case it may be helpful to denominations doing the petition--you'll note that I've used the UCC's policy statement at the beginning of this as an example. I have already emailed all of you my document containing suggestions about delivery of the petition and I will email two more by COB Thursday: an Excel spreadsheet listing all the field offices of all the Senators and a document David Culp is preparing with a couple sentences about each Senator and the CTBT.

FYI re Senators' field offices, I've done 26 states and among them, they have 216 field offices so far.

I know what's on Mark's web page--a great contribution to the cause! It would help me to help you all with this if I could see other documents relevant to the petition. Any emails or faxes on it that have been produced since our 1/19 interfaith group meeting, Marijke or Howard?

Thanks for your work on this. It should be a very effective product!

Marie

Help End Nuclear Testing  
Participate in National Interfaith Petition Drive

"We declare our opposition to all weapons of mass destruction. All nations should...cease immediately the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons."

Excerpt from the General Synod 15 Pronouncement Affirming the United Church of Christ as a Just Peace Church.

**BACKGROUND:** The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is an international treaty to ban all nuclear weapons tests and it is before the U.S. Senate now. The CTBT is an essential tool for reducing the dangers posed by nuclear weapons, especially important in light of last year's Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests. In order to become international law, the treaty must first be ratified by the 44 nuclear-capable countries, including the U.S. Our ratification will:

\* Stem the spread of nuclear weapons. The CTBT's ban on nuclear testing will prevent other nations from obtaining advanced nuclear weapons. It will also severely impede the development of new nuclear weapons by those countries which already have them.

\* Establish a strict monitoring system. This global network will detect nuclear weapon testing activities and allow for short-notice, on-site inspections, but it will not be fully operational until the treaty enters into force.

\* Protect public health and the environment. Ending nuclear testing will stop radioactive fallout from spreading underground and escaping into the atmosphere.

\* Lead the way, setting an example for other countries to follow. As of January 1999, 23 countries had ratified the CTBT. As the world's leading military power, U.S. ratification will serve as a catalyst for other countries to do likewise.

Public support for a nuclear test ban has been consistently high - it was most recently endorsed by four out of five American voters in bipartisan public opinion surveys. The Administration, including the Departments of Defense and Energy, supports ratification of the treaty, as do prominent U.S. military figures, including four of the last five chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: Admiral William Crowe and Generals David Jones, Colin Powell, and John Shalikashvili. Despite this support, substantial obstacles lie in the path of treaty ratification.

"The only way that the Senate will ratify the CTBT is if you, the grassroots, are successful in communicating the importance of this issue to your Senators." - Senator Jim Jeffords (R-VT)

In his 1999 State of the Union address, President Clinton urged the Senate to ratify the CTBT, "so we can make it harder for other nations to develop nuclear arms, and we can end nuclear testing forever." A two-thirds Senate majority is needed for ratification. Active support by your Senators will help gain the minimum 67 votes required.

The treaty calls for a special conference that can be convened in the fall of 1999 for countries that have already ratified to determine ways to garner additional ratifications. The U.S. will want to participate in that conference, which creates a political deadline for Senate action on the treaty. The Indian and Pakistani Prime Ministers have committed to signing the treaty by September. This would eliminate one of the major objections CTBT opponents raise: that India isn't going to sign anyway so there is no reason for the U.S. to ratify it. In addition, recent history has shown that the Senate does not ratify treaties during presidential election years. All of this makes 1999 our last best chance to gain Senate approval of the CTBT.

The Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Jesse Helms (R-NC), has jurisdiction over the treaty. Senator Helms and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS) continue to defy public opinion by refusing to allow the significant consideration an issue of this magnitude demands. U.S. failure to act on the treaty would be a major blow to global efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

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-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1999 05:33:11 -0500  
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Thoughts on Abolition 2000  
To: IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org  
X-Sender: lforrow@pop2.igc.org

Xanthe: Thanks for your comments. The way the message came through (forwarded by Janet Bloomfield) I didn't know who was writing until I got to the end, but all along the way I found myself thinking "Yes, I really agree with this person."

I do think that Abolition 2000 hasn't (yet) become the world force that it can/should be, but I don't think that tighter leadership is the answer.

The Tao te Ching has become one of my most treasured books (I carry a pocket version with me almost everywhere). Chapter 17, in the Stephen Mitchell English translation, seems to me to have some relevance (Mitchell alternates "he" and "she" in the 81 chapters, because in the Chinese there is no gender-specificity; I've changed "he" to "she" for this one):

When the Master governs, the people  
are hardly aware that she exists.  
Next best is a leader who is loved.  
Next, one who is feared.  
The worst is one who is despised.

If you don't trust the people,  
you make them untrustworthy.

The Master doesn't talk, she acts.  
When her work is done,  
the people say, "Amazing:  
we did it, all by ourselves!"

Abolition 2000 is only in part about nuclear  
weapons, which are ultimately a symptom  
of deeper problems in how we as human beings  
live and work together....

warmly,

Lachlan

Return-Path: <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
X-Authentication-Warning: beach.silcom.com: pm8-11.sba1.avtel.net [207.71.222.161] didn't use HELO protocol  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com  
Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1999 15:49:17 -0800  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Subject: listserv

Dear Howard,

I am at a loss as to why you aren't able to communicate with the listserv. You are using the right command, and are obviously subscribed. I am waiting to hear from IGC as to what the problem may be, but in the meantime, I would suggest taking a message that you've received from the listserv, hitting the reply to button, and then erasing all of the text from the message and replacing it with what you want to say. This is one method I've used for getting messages to the listserves in the past, although it was inadvertent! I had received a message from someone, automatically hit the reply to button without looking at the return path, replied and sent it only to find the message hadn't been sent to me directly, but to the listserv. I was surprised to see my reply posted to the listserv.

Let me know if you have any more questions.

Lori

P.S. Are you planning on attending the meeting in February?

\*\*\*\*\*

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: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: listserv  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 03:49 PM 1/26/99 -0800, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation wrote:

>Dear Howard,  
>I am at a loss as to why you aren't able to communicate with the listserv....  
>  
>P.S. Are you planning on attending the meeting in February?

Dear Lori:

The method you suggested for getting on the list-serve didn't work. Therefore, I have sent my message through the global abolition-caucus list-serve.

We don't have any travel funds in our current budget, so I won't be able to attend the February meeting.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: abolition  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) Tasks for an abolition campaign  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

This communication is addressed primarily to U.S. abolition advocates, who are in the process of designing a U.S. abolition campaign. Unfortunately I am unable to gain access to the abolition-USA list-serve even though I am a subscriber (failed three times). My apologies to those in other countries for using the global list-serve, but maybe you will find some useful ideas.

As we design a U.S. campaign to abolish nuclear weapons, we need to think strategically about who we want to influence and how we go about this task.

As we do this, we will realize that there are many tasks to perform and that different persons and organizations have different contributions to make. We need to achieve a division of labor, somehow orchestrated into a harmonious whole.

I would like to offer some ideas, mostly in outline form.

## I. PREMISE

Presently all known nuclear weapons on Earth are possessed and controlled by governments of nation states. For nuclear abolition to occur these possessor governments must adopt and carry out policies oriented toward this goal. Therefore, a citizen campaign to abolish nuclear weapons should seek to bring about governmental policies that can achieve nuclear abolition. This requires us to focus our attention, directly and indirectly, on the governing officials in order to influence the policies they adopt and carry out.

## II. WHO TO INFLUENCE

### A. Executive branch officials

1. President and supporting staff
2. Civilian department heads and supporting staff
3. Military leaders and supporting staff
4. Treaty negotiators

### B. Legislative bodies

### C. International bodies and negotiating forums

## III. HOW TO ACHIEVE INFLUENCE

### A. Influence who is elected and appointed to public office

1. Electoral activities
  - a. Run for office
  - b. Support specific candidates
    - i. Campaign workers
    - ii. Financial contributions
  - c. Contact with all candidates
    - i. Submit issue papers and policy proposals
    - ii. Send delegations to discuss issues
    - iii. Birddog campaign appearances
  - d. Nonpartisan activities, such as
    - i. Candidate forums

- ii. Questionnaires
      - iii. Voting records of incumbents running for reelection
    - e. Recommendations for political party platforms
    - f. Form a new party (an alternative some may choose)
  - 2. Appointments to public office
    - Propose nominees
    - Support or oppose particular nominees
- B. Influence decision-making processes
1. Executive (president, department heads, top advisors)
    - a. Direct contact by
      - i. Representatives of national organizations
      - ii. Experts
      - iii. Delegations of grassroots representatives
    - b. Indirect contact
      - i. Through legislators
      - ii. Through influential persons who have access
    - c. Communications
      - i. Sign-on letters
      - ii. Petitions
      - iii. Grassroots letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
      - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
  2. Legislative bodies
    - a. Direct contact in Washington
      - i. By lobbyists
      - ii. Delegations from home districts
      - iii. Public hearings
    - b. Direct contact in home districts
      - i. Individuals, delegations
      - ii. Community meetings
    - c. Communications
      - i. Letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
      - ii. Petitions
      - iii. Sign-on letters
      - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
  3. Treaty negotiators
    - a. Citizen drafts of treaty proposals
    - b. Track treaty negotiations and keep network organizations informed
    - c. Rally support for or opposition to specific treaty provisions
  4. International bodies
    - a. Track proceedings
    - b. Influence delegations on specific issues
- C. Influence public opinion
1. Media
    - a. Think pieces, proposals, and other documents
    - b. Editorials, op-ed pieces, magazine articles
    - c. News actualities
    - d. Television shows, radio talk shows, radio and television ads
  2. Direct action
    - a. Rallies, demonstrations, celebrations, commemorations
    - b. Leafleteering and picketing
  3. Sending messages
    - a. Petitions
    - b. Pledges signed by individuals
    - c. Policy resolutions of organizations

- d. Policy resolutions of local and state legislative bodies
  - e. Local and state referendums
4. Education
- a. Speeches at organization meetings and conventions
  - b. Community forums
  - c. Speaker tours, teach-ins
  - d. Educational activities within networks, such as religious, civic, professional, racial/ethnic, and others

#### IV. Division of Labor

A campaign to abolish nuclear weapons won't necessarily undertake all of these activities, but to be successful it must embark upon many of them. For this to be effective there needs to be a division of labor among lobbyists, grassroots organizers, speakers, media outreach persons, treaty drafters, researchers, strategists, and others.

Given the pluralistic nature of organizations committed to nuclear abolition, it seems highly unlikely that all of these activities and actors can be contained in a single, unified organization. Rather many different organizations must work together, each doing what it does best, each respecting what others are doing (special emphasis on this point). The campaign structure should reflect our diversity and use it to the advantage of a broadly encompassing campaign. In designing this structure it may be useful to chart who is doing what and to design linkages between various components. In this way what various participants are doing may complement the work of others.

I would be interested in your response to these ideas.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: mark.brown@ecunet.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Your web page  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Mark:

Your web page on the CTBT petition is excellent. Thanks for doing this.

I borrowed some of your text as instructions for copies of the petition I am sending out.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

Dear Marie:

Responding to your request for material on the interfaith petition, I have written the attached explanatory statement to print on the back of the petition as an insert for our newsletter and other uses. You can see I borrowed from your postcard as well as the LOGA web page. I hope you don't mind that I didn't give the sources.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

### Interfaith Petition for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), an international treaty to ban all nuclear tests, is an essential tool for reducing the dangers posed by nuclear weapons. It is especially important in the wake of the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests in May 1998.

The United States is one of 150 countries that have signed the treaty. In order to enter into force and become international law, it must first be ratified by the 44 nuclear-capable countries, including the United States. Therefore, U.S. ratification is essential. It will set an example for other countries to follow. When the treaty is in effect, there will be a strict monitoring system to help stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

Public support for a nuclear test ban has been consistently high. A recent bipartisan public opinion survey revealed that the CTBT has the support of four out of five American voters. The Clinton Administration, including the Departments of Defense and Energy, supports ratification of the treaty. So do prominent U.S. military figures, including four of the last five chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: Admiral William Crowe and Generals David Jones, Colin Powell, and John Shalikashvili.

The CTBT is now pending before the U.S. Senate. A two-thirds Senate majority is needed for ratification. Unfortunately Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC), chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, refuses to hold public hearings on the treaty. Furthermore, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS) has been unwilling to schedule a floor vote on the CTBT. If the Senate does not ratify the treaty in 1999, it will be a major blow to global efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

To push for Senate ratification, a broad coalition of faith groups is conducting a petition drive to encourage prompt Senate action. A copy of the petition is attached.

We ask your help in gaining signatures to the petition. You can make copies and have them circulated for signature at your church, synagogue, mosque, or other religious gatherings. For the petition drive to have greatest effect, the petitions should be hand-delivered to your senators or to their staff around the time of the Senate's Passover/Easter recess, March 26 to April 12. Where possible, organize an interfaith delegation to present signed petitions directly to the senators when they are in their home state. Where a meeting with a senator cannot be arranged, delegations can present the petition to staff in one of the senator's in-state offices. Or you can mail the petitions to the senator.

Efforts are underway to coordinate the interfaith petition drive in various states. By February 17 information will be posted on the web site of the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs -- [www.loga.org](http://www.loga.org) -- on persons collecting

petitions in each state and persons arranging visits with senators or their staff. If you lack access to the Internet, you may get in touch with Methodists United for Peace with Justice for this information: phone/fax 301 897-3668; e-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org). The overall coordinator of this interfaith initiative is the Washington office of the United Church of Christ (UCC) Office for Church in Society. The United Methodist General Board of Church and Society and Methodists United for Peace with Justice are among the 16 religious groups circulating petitions

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 28 Jan 1999 06:49:56 -0800 (PST)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: (abolition-usa) Tasks for an abolition campaign  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: mupj@pop.igc.org

Dear Colleagues:

This communication is addressed primarily to U.S. abolition advocates, who are in the process of designing a U.S. abolition campaign. Unfortunately I am unable to gain access to the abolition-USA list-serve even though I am a subscriber (failed three times). My apologies to those in other countries for using the global list-serve, but maybe you will find some useful ideas.

As we design a U.S. campaign to abolish nuclear weapons, we need to think strategically about who we want to influence and how we go about this task. As we do this, we will realize that there are many tasks to perform and that different persons and organizations have different contributions to make. We need to achieve a division of labor, somehow orchestrated into a harmonious whole.

I would like to offer some ideas, mostly in outline form.

## I. PREMISE

Presently all known nuclear weapons on Earth are possessed and controlled by governments of nation states. For nuclear abolition to occur these possessor governments must adopt and carry out policies oriented toward this goal. Therefore, a citizen campaign to abolish nuclear weapons should seek to bring about governmental policies that can achieve nuclear abolition. This requires us to focus our attention, directly and indirectly, on the governing officials in order to influence the policies they adopt and carry out.

## II. WHO TO INFLUENCE

### A. Executive branch officials

1. President and supporting staff
2. Civilian department heads and supporting staff
3. Military leaders and supporting staff
4. Treaty negotiators

### B. Legislative bodies

### C. International bodies and negotiating forums

## III. HOW TO ACHIEVE INFLUENCE

### A. Influence who is elected and appointed to public office

1. Electoral activities
  - a. Run for office
  - b. Support specific candidates
    - i. Campaign workers
    - ii. Financial contributions
  - c. Contact with all candidates
    - i. Submit issue papers and policy proposals
    - ii. Send delegations to discuss issues

- iii. Birddog campaign appearances
  - d. Nonpartisan activities, such as
    - i. Candidate forums
    - ii. Questionnaires
    - iii. Voting records of incumbents running for reelection
  - e. Recommendations for political party platforms
  - f. Form a new party (an alternative some may choose)
- 2. Appointments to public office
  - Propose nominees
  - Support or oppose particular nominees
- B. Influence decision-making processes
  - 1. Executive (president, department heads, top advisors)
    - a. Direct contact by
      - i. Representatives of national organizations
      - ii. Experts
      - iii. Delegations of grassroots representatives
    - b. Indirect contact
      - i. Through legislators
      - ii. Through influential persons who have access
    - c. Communications
      - i. Sign-on letters
      - ii. Petitions
      - iii. Grassroots letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
      - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
  - 2. Legislative bodies
    - a. Direct contact in Washington
      - i. By lobbyists
      - ii. Delegations from home districts
      - iii. Public hearings
    - b. Direct contact in home districts
      - i. Individuals, delegations
      - ii. Community meetings
    - c. Communications
      - i. Letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
      - ii. Petitions
      - iii. Sign-on letters
      - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
  - 3. Treaty negotiators
    - a. Citizen drafts of treaty proposals
    - b. Track treaty negotiations and keep network organizations informed
    - c. Rally support for or opposition to specific treaty provisions
  - 4. International bodies
    - a. Track proceedings
    - b. Influence delegations on specific issues
- C. Influence public opinion
  - 1. Media
    - a. Think pieces, proposals, and other documents
    - b. Editorials, op-ed pieces, magazine articles
    - c. News actualities
    - d. Television shows, radio talk shows, radio and television ads
  - 2. Direct action
    - a. Rallies, demonstrations, celebrations, commemorations
    - b. Leafleteering and picketing
  - 3. Sending messages

- a. Petitions
  - b. Pledges signed by individuals
  - c. Policy resolutions of organizations
  - d. Policy resolutions of local and state legislative bodies
  - e. Local and state referendums
4. Education
- a. Speeches at organization meetings and conventions
  - b. Community forums
  - c. Speaker tours, teach-ins
  - d. Educational activities within networks, such as religious, civic, professional, racial/ethnic, and others

#### IV. Division of Labor

A campaign to abolish nuclear weapons won't necessarily undertake all of these activities, but to be successful it must embark upon many of them. For this to be effective there needs to be a division of labor among lobbyists, grassroots organizers, speakers, media outreach persons, treaty drafters, researchers, strategists, and others.

Given the pluralistic nature of organizations committed to nuclear abolition, it seems highly unlikely that all of these activities and actors can be contained in a single, unified organization. Rather many different organizations must work together, each doing what it does best, each respecting what others are doing (special emphasis on this point). The campaign structure should reflect our diversity and use it to the advantage of a broadly encompassing campaign. In designing this structure it may be useful to chart who is doing what and to design linkages between various components. In this way what various participants are doing may complement the work of others.

I would be interested in your response to these ideas.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

Return-Path: <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com  
Date: Fri, 29 Jan 1999 14:37:06 -0800  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Subject: Re: Statements on Abolition From Religious Organizations &  
Leaders

I can't explain the problem you are having. I just clicked on the link in the e-mail I sent you and the web page loaded immediately.

It is <http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition2000/religious.html>

Eric

At 01:48 PM 1/29/99 -0800, you wrote:

>At 05:50 AM 1/29/99 -0800, david wrote:

>>

>>Dear Mr. Hallman:

>>

>>I am compiling a list of statements and resolutions by religious leaders  
>>and organizations are nuclear weapons abolition for the Abolition 2000  
>>website. What I have collected so far may be found at:

>><http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition2000/religious.html>

>>

>

>Dear friends:

>

>I couldn't locate this file on the web. My server said that it wasn't  
>available. I went through the site map for abolition2000 and found no entry  
>for religious. I'd like to see what you have. Please provide more guidance.

>

>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](mailto: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.

>

>

\*\*\*\*\*

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](mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org)

URL <http://www.wagingpeace.org>

URL <http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>

\*\*\*\*\*

To: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Statements on Abolition From Religious Organizations & Leaders  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 02:37 PM 1/29/99 -0800, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation wrote:

>I can't explain the problem you are having. I just clicked on the link in the e-mail I sent you and the web page loaded immediately.

>

>It is <http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition2000/religious.html>

>

>Eric

>

Dear Eric:

This time I found it. There are other statements available, but I don't have time at the moment to put together a list. I'll try to do it when I can.

I will note that you used the weaker of the two United Methodist resolutions on the subject. A better and more complete one is entitled "Nuclear Abolition: Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence", The Book of Resolutions of the United Methodist Church, 1996, pp. 556-561.

Shalom,  
Howard

>

Return-Path: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "Nuclear Calendar Recipients" <dculp@igc.org>  
Subject: Nuclear Calendar  
Date: Mon, 1 Feb 1999 12:19:08 -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 JAA01279

NUCLEAR CALENDAR  
February 1, 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 (\*).

- February 1 President Clinton submits the annual federal budget to Congress
- \*February 1 Energy Secretary Bill Richardson presents the DOE budget, 1 p.m., Main Auditorium, Forrestal Building
- \*February 2 Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing on current and future worldwide threats to the national security of the United States, 9:30 a.m., SH-216 Hart (open and closed)
- \*February 2 Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, confirmation hearing for Carolyn Huntoon to be DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, 9:30 a.m., SD-106 Dirksen
- \*February 2 House Armed Services Committee, hearing on the Defense Department budget, with Defense Secretary Bill Cohen, Joint Chiefs of Staff chair Gen. Henry Shelton, and Defense Department Comptroller Bill Lynn testifying, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn
- February 2 DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site spent nuclear fuel draft EIS, public meeting, North Augusta, S.C.
- February 2-3 Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott visits Islamabad, Pakistan for talks on nuclear issues
- \*February 3 House Armed Services Committee, hearing on threats to U.S. national security, with CIA director George Tenet testifying, 9:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn (closed)
- \*February 3 Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing on the Defense Department budget, with Defense Secretary Bill Cohen, Joint Chiefs of Staff chair Gen. Henry Shelton, and Defense

Department Comptroller Bill Lynn testifying,  
9:30 a.m., SH-216 Hart

- \*February 4 House Armed Services Committee, hearing on threats to U.S. national security, with CIA witnesses testifying, 9:30 a.m., 2118 Rayburn (closed)
- \*February 4 Russian Supreme Court, hearing and decision in the appeal of the espionage case of environmental activist Alexander Nikitin, Moscow  
<<http://www.bellona.no/e/russia/nikitin/>>
- \*February 10 House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, hearing on the future of Russia, witnesses to be determined
- \*February 12 Senate Budget Committee, hearing on defense budget, with former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger; Robert Zoelick, Center for Strategic International Studies; and Lawrence Korb, Council on Foreign Relations testifying, 9:30 a.m., SD-608 Dirksen
- \*February 12 Senate floor vote on articles of impeachment of President Clinton (tentative)
- February 13-21 House and Senate President's Day recess
- \*February 15 National Academy of Sciences, Committee on International Security and Arms Control, MOX Assessment Meeting, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
- February 19 French President Jacques Chirac visits Washington
- \*February 23 Senate Budget Committee, hearing on the Defense Department's budget with Defense Secretary Bill Cohen and Joint Chiefs of Staff chair Gen. Henry Shelton testifying, 10 a.m., SD-608 Dirksen (tentative)
- \*February 22 New Mexico Environment Department, public hearing on the opening of WIPP, Santa Fe, N.M. begins (continues on March 15)
- \*February 25 House Armed Services Subcommittee on Subcommittee on Research and Development, hearing on ballistic missile defense with Defense Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology Gansler and BMDO director Gen. Lyles testifying, a.m.
- Early February Indian-Pakistani talks on confidence-building measures and Kashmir, New Delhi, India
- \*February Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee chair Frank Murkowski (R-Alaska) introduces legislation on interim high-level nuclear waste storage (tentative)
- \*February House Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power, hearing on the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1999, H.R. 45 (tentative)
- \*February Senate Armed Services Committee, confirmation hearing on Carolyn Huntoon to be DOE

Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (tentative)

\*Feb. or March Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, hearing on DOE's stockpile stewardship program (tentative)

\*February Senate floor action on the National Missile Defense Act of 1999, S. 269 (Cochran-Inouye bill) (tentative)

\*February President Clinton nominates John Holum as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, T.J. Glauthier as Deputy Energy Secretary, and Rose Gottemoeller as DOE Assistant Secretary for Nonproliferation and National Security (estimate)

\*February DOE Nevada Test Site, subcritical test "Clarinet"

\*February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office and Chicago Operations Office, contract awarded for MOX disposition of plutonium <<http://www.ch.doe.gov/business/mox/mox.htm>> (Believed to be to Duke Power Co., Virginia Power Co. and Cogema for processing and burning MOX fuel at the Catawba nuclear power plant near Rock Hill, S.C., the McGuire plant south of Charlotte, N.C., and the North Anna plant near Mineral, Va.)

\*February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office and Chicago Operations Office, contract award for design of the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility at the Savannah River Site (S.C.) (estimate)

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

\*February DOE Oak Ridge Operations Office, Oak Ridge (Tenn.) Transuranic Waste Treatment Facility (Melton Valley), notice of intent to prepare an EIS

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

\*February DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) remedial action and comprehensive land use plan, revised draft EIS

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

\*February DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide final EIS

\*February DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial

reactor for tritium final EIS

- \*February DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL advanced mixed waste treatment project final EIS
- \*February DOE Savannah River Operations Office, accelerator for the production of tritium final EIS
- \*February 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
- \*February 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.)
- \*February DOE Idaho Operations Office, record of decision in the INEEL advanced mixed waste treatment project EIS
- \*February U.S. District Judge John Garrett Penn holds a hearing in the case N.M. vs. Richardson on motions regarding the opening of WIPP, Washington (estimate)
- \*February U.S. and Russia begin negotiations on a plutonium disposition agreement
- \*March 2 Vermont town meetings, resolutions supporting nuclear weapons abolition will be voted at some meetings
- \*March 3-4 Energy Communities Alliance annual conference, Washington
- March 8 New Mexico Environment Department, public hearing on the opening of WIPP, Carlsbad, N.M.
- \*March 9 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on the Energy Department budget, with Energy Secretary Bill Richardson testifying, 10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn
- 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. continues (began on February 22)
- \*March 16 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on the DOE Environmental Management and Civilian

Radioactive Waste Management budgets,  
10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn

- \*March 18 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on the DOE Defense Programs, Fissile Materials Disposition Office, and Nonproliferation and National Security Office budgets, 10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn (closed)
- 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 DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition final EIS
- 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 Albuquerque Operations Office, record of decision in the Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide EIS
- \*March DOE Defense Programs Office, record of decision in the commercial reactor for tritium EIS
- \*March DOE Savannah River Operations Office, record of decision in the accelerator for the production of tritium EIS
- March Gore-Primakov Commission meeting, Washington
- \*March Russian Duma, possible vote on ratification of START II
- March Russian President Boris Yeltsin visits Paris (tentative)
- 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 23-25 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 Fissile Materials Disposition Office,  
record of decision in the surplus plutonium  
disposition 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 House Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and  
Investigations, hearing on DOE's tritium  
production program (tentative)

\*Spring Tennessee Valley Authority, experimental  
tritium-producing rods at the Watts Bar  
Nuclear Plant (Tenn.) removed and shipped to  
a DOE laboratory for tests

May 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.ht  
ml](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 general 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 1 Senate Foreign Relations Committee chair Jesse Helms' (R-N.C.) deadline for the Clinton Administration to submit the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty protocols  
 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  
 \*June Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott meets with Indian Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh to discuss nuclear issues (estimate)  
 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  
 \*Summer President Clinton visits India, Pakistan and

Bangladesh (estimate)

- \*July-Sept. New Mexico Environment Department issues mixed nuclear waste permit for WIPP (tentative)
- 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)
- \*Sept. 29-Oct. 1 First Conference of CTBT Ratification States, United Nations, New York or Vienna (tentative dates if held in New York; October 4-6 is also possible; late October if held in Vienna)
- 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 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 (c) 1999 by Plutonium Challenge. Permission (and encouragement) is given to citizens groups to reproduce this calendar. Proper credit is appreciated.

Return-Path: <napf@silcom.com>  
Date: Sun, 31 Jan 1999 17:27:31 -0800 (PST)  
From: david <napf@silcom.com>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Statements on Abolition From Religious Organizations & Leaders

Actually, checking the web page again I see that I did have the 1996 Methodist statement, too. The statements are in reverse chronological order. If you scroll down to 1996 you will see a second Methodist statement.

Eric

Email: <napf@silcom.com>

To: david <napf@silcom.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Statements on Abolition From Religious Organizations & Leaders  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 05:27 PM 1/31/99 -0800, david wrote:

>Actually, checking the web page again I see that I did have the 1996  
>Methodist statement, too. The statements are in reverse chronological  
>order. If you scroll down to 1996 you will see a second Methodist  
>statement.

>  
>Eric

>  
>

Dear Eric:

Your second United Methodist Statement was from the Council of Bishops pastoral letter and foundation document, In Defense of Creation, issued in 1986. I'm referring to the 1996 General Conference Resolution on "Nuclear Abolition." I'll fax you a copy.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
Date: Mon, 01 Feb 1999 07:03:41 +0800  
From: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) Tasks for an abolition campaign  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
X-Sender: gdaniell@mail.wt.com.au

Dar Howard,

Thanks for your ideas. I want to follow up on one of the points you put forward, namely that of forming a new political party.

Back in the heady days of the eighties, at the height of the massive build-up in US nuclear forces by Reagan, that is exactly what happened here in Australia. With a snap election called with only about 6 weeks warning, a group of activists sitting around in a kitchen thought about how they could influence the political process, and came up with the same idea.

Thus was born the Nuclear Disarmament Party, which managed to pull together a party and a campaign in just 6 weeks. We went on to win a seat in the upper house (the Senate) of the Australian Parliament, in fact we nearly won two seats, but the second was wrested from us by a technicality.

The result stunned the government of the day, and I believe, led to many gains, such as chairs in peace studies being opened in some Australian Universities,  
Our senator (Jo Vallentine) was there in the halls of power to challenge the government on every related issue.

I believe that part of the reason for the success was that the party had one platform only - universal nuclear disarmament. Later it expanded to address other issues and eventually became a green party, which, while meaning well, I believe has diluted its focus too much to be as effective as it once was.

Hope this helps,  
Graham Daniell

-----  
At 06:49 28/01/99 -0800, you wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>This communication is addressed primarily to U.S. abolition advocates, who  
>are in the process of designing a U.S. abolition campaign. Unfortunately I  
>am unable to gain access to the abolition-USA list-serve even though I am a  
>subscriber (failed three times). My apologies to those in other countries  
>for using the global list-serve, but maybe you will find some useful ideas.

>

>As we design a U.S. campaign to abolish nuclear weapons, we need to think  
>strategically about who we want to influence and how we go about this task.  
>As we do this, we will realize that there are many tasks to perform and that  
>different persons and organizations have different contributions to make.

>We need to achieve a division of labor, somehow orchestrated into a  
>harmonious whole.

>

>I would like to offer some ideas, mostly in outline form.

>

## >I. PREMISE

>Presently all known nuclear weapons on Earth are possessed and controlled by  
>governments of nation states. For nuclear abolition to occur these  
>possessor governments must adopt and carry out policies oriented toward this  
>goal. Therefore, a citizen campaign to abolish nuclear weapons should seek  
>to bring about governmental policies that can achieve nuclear abolition.  
>This requires us to focus our attention, directly and indirectly, on the  
>governing officials in order to influence the policies they adopt and carry  
out.

>

## >II. WHO TO INFLUENCE

### >A. Executive branch officials

- > 1. President and supporting staff
- > 2. Civilian department heads and supporting staff
- > 3. Military leaders and supporting staff
- > 4. Treaty negotiators

### >B. Legislative bodies

### >C. International bodies and negotiating forums

>

## >III. HOW TO ACHIEVE INFLUENCE

### >A. Influence who is elected and appointed to public office

- > 1. Electoral activities
  - > a. Run for office
  - > b. Support specific candidates
    - > i. Campaign workers
    - > ii. Financial contributions
  - > c. Contact with all candidates
    - > i. Submit issue papers and policy proposals
    - > ii. Send delegations to discuss issues
    - > iii. Birddog campaign appearances
  - > d. Nonpartisan activities, such as
    - > i. Candidate forums
    - > ii. Questionnaires
    - > iii. Voting records of incumbents running for reelection
  - > e. Recommendations for political party platforms
  - > f. Form a new party (an alternative some may choose)
- > 2. Appointments to public office
  - > Propose nominees
  - > Support or oppose particular nominees

### >B. Influence decision-making processes

- > 1. Executive (president, department heads, top advisors)
  - > a. Direct contact by
    - > i. Representatives of national organizations
    - > ii. Experts
    - > iii. Delegations of grassroots representatives
  - > b. Indirect contact
    - > i. Through legislators
    - > ii. Through influential persons who have access
  - > c. Communications

- > i. Sign-on letters
- > ii. Petitions
- > iii. Grassroots letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
- > iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
- > 2. Legislative bodies
  - > a. Direct contact in Washington
    - > i. By lobbyists
    - > ii. Delegations from home districts
    - > iii. Public hearings
  - > b. Direct contact in home districts
    - > i. Individuals, delegations
    - > ii. Community meetings
  - > c. Communications
    - > i. Letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
    - > ii. Petitions
    - > iii. Sign-on letters
    - > iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques
- > 3. Treaty negotiators
  - > a. Citizen drafts of treaty proposals
  - > b. Track treaty negotiations and keep network organizations informed
  - > c. Rally support for or opposition to specific treaty provisions
- > 4. International bodies
  - > a. Track proceedings
  - > b. Influence delegations on specific issues
- > C. Influence public opinion
  - > 1. Media
    - > a. Think pieces, proposals, and other documents
    - > b. Editorials, op-ed pieces, magazine articles
    - > c. News actualities
    - > d. Television shows, radio talk shows, radio and television ads
  - > 2. Direct action
    - > a. Rallies, demonstrations, celebrations, commemorations
    - > b. Leafleteering and picketing
  - > 3. Sending messages
    - > a. Petitions
    - > b. Pledges signed by individuals
    - > c. Policy resolutions of organizations
    - > d. Policy resolutions of local and state legislative bodies
    - > e. Local and state referendums
  - > 4. Education
    - > a. Speeches at organization meetings and conventions
    - > b. Community forums
    - > c. Speaker tours, teach-ins
    - > d. Educational activities within networks, such as religious, civic, professional, racial/ethnic, and others
- > IV. Division of Labor
  - > A campaign to abolish nuclear weapons won't necessarily undertake all of these activities, but to be successful it must embark upon many of them.
  - > For this to be effective there needs to be a division of labor among lobbyists, grassroots organizers, speakers, media outreach persons, treaty drafters, researchers, strategists, and others.
  - > Given the pluralistic nature of organizations committed to nuclear

>abolition, it seems highly unlikely that all of these activities and actors  
>can be contained in a single, unified organization. Rather many different  
>organizations must work together, each doing what it does best, each  
>respecting what others are doing (special emphasis on this point). The  
>campaign structure should reflect our diversity and use it to the advantage  
>of a broadly encompassing campaign. In designing this structure it may be  
>useful to chart who is doing what and to design linkages between various  
>components. In this way what various participants are doing may complement  
>the work of others.

>  
>I would be interested in your response to these ideas.

>  
>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.

>  
>

Graham Daniell  
Western Australia  
gdaniell@wt.com.au

To: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) Tasks for an abolition campaign  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 07:03 AM 2/1/99 +0800, Graham Daniell wrote:

>Dar Howard,

>

>Thanks for your ideas. I want to follow up on one of the points you put

>forward, namely that of forming a new political party....

Dear Graham:

Thanks for your comments on forming a new political party. I myself am not an advocate of this course, for I believe that we are better off to make our impact in the United States through the established political parties and other political processes (especially grassroots and direct lobbying). However, I recognize that historically in the U.S. third parties have had a useful role as cutting edge instruments, advocating policies and programs that latter move into the political mainstream and are taken up by one of the major parties. I also recognize that some persons in the nuclear abolition movement talk about forming a new party. Thus, I wanted to include this on the list of tasks to make it complete.

I was glad to hear about your Australian experience.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: phil  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Grant received, Foundry space  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

The other day I received a call from Sally Lilienthal of the Ploughshares Fund, saying that they have awarded us a \$10,000 grant. The last grant we received from them required confirmation by our financial officer (you) and myself. So if you see the grant letter at Foundry, please open it and sign as appropriate.

Do you have confirmation of space at Foundry on April 9? I want to sent out an announcement to our board? Thanks

Howard

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

Date: Mon, 1 Feb 1999 12:08:05 GMT

From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: CD update

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host userc766.uk.uudial.com [194.69.99.224] claimed to be acronym

X-Sender: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org

To Acro receivers

January 28, 1999

CD Update from Rebecca Johnson

## SOUTH AFRICA PUSHES FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT DECISION

At the Conference on Disarmament plenary of 28 January, just before leaving the CD to return to Pretoria, Peter Goosen of South Africa pushed for a decision on his 19 January proposal for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament to "deliberate upon practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons as well as to identify if and when one or more such steps should be the subject of negotiations in the Conference".

The proposal was supported by the G21 group of non-aligned states and China had no objection, but there was opposition from within the Eastern European and Western groups. When the CD President, Ambassador Robert Grey of the United States, formally announced that there was no consensus, Goosen presented a legal advice and argument based on the rules of procedure as updated in August 1990 (CD/1036). He argued that if there was no consensus on a proposal at the beginning of the annual session, the President was obliged to take reasonable steps to identify someone to be a special coordinator to assist in carrying out consultations with a view to obtaining consensus. Grey agreed to do so over the next two weeks. South Africa did not push for an actual decision on its proposal for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament, because the result of a public sounding in this plenary could have resulted in Grey announcing that the proposal was rejected, which would have made it impossible to use the legal advice to call for a special coordinator.

What does this actually mean?

I gather that some of you have already received an NGO press release claiming that the president is now obliged to appoint a special coordinator on nuclear disarmament. I'm afraid this is not the decision that was taken on Thursday, although if the South African strategy plays out successfully, it is hoped that this will be the outcome.

South Africa argues that the relevant rule adopted in 1990 does not stipulate that the President must now obtain consensus for appointing the special coordinator. Others are already challenging this reading, however. There is likely to be two weeks before the issue comes up again in plenary. Probably each of the groups will be asked to nominate one (or more?) potential special coordinators, with attempts then made to obtain (and

impede) consensus. In a way it does not matter who the coordinator is: if a special coordinator on nuclear disarmament is appointed, it will break an important psychological/political barrier.

Some delegates have sought to portray South Africa's strategy as a personal attack on the US presidency of the CD. In my view this is nonsense. This is not about 'getting at the US'. South Africa's legal argument relied on a provision that applied only in the first four weeks after the new CD year started and would have been employed whoever held the presidency at that time (although some Geneva players do acknowledge that there would be something undeniably sweet in a US presidency appointing a nuclear disarmament coordinator!!).

This is an interesting strategy and has certainly caught the United States -- as the most intransigent opponent of any CD role in nuclear disarmament -- between a rock and a hard place. The eventual outcome, however, will depend on a number of factors, including what opposition is voiced when various names are put forward. Watch this space.

Fissban/FM(C)T

Meanwhile, Grey has been doing his utmost to secure agreement on the programme of work, and especially the committee to negotiate a ban on the production of fissile materials or on its Chair, but so far consensus has been elusive. Some useful meetings have been held in Geneva by ISIS (hosted by Canada), providing delegates with nitty gritty technical information about fissile materials and by UNIDIR, to stimulate thinking into the implications of different positions on scope and stocks.

Statements

UN Secretary General Kofi Annan addressed the CD on 26 January, giving plenty of generalised encouragement to the CD, without any significant substance. Munir Zahran of Egypt made a long statement reiterating his position on the fissban, stressing the importance of including stocks. Finland announced that it had ratified the CTBT on 15 January and called for the CD to make a speedy start on the fissban negotiations and not to overload its programme of work.

CTBT:

no dates or venue have yet been set for the special conference on CTBT entry into force (under Article XIV), as there is still substantial disagreement between those who advocate New York, as more conducive to political and media attention, and those (mainly the Europeans) who prefer Vienna, the seat of the CTBTO. Two months ago the decision had seemed all-but-made by a small group of Vienna-based diplomats, who (unsurprisingly) preferred Vienna. The tide is now slowly turning towards New York, as more people realise the need to make this conference more high profile and politically targetted. The conference would probably take about 3 days, so could be fitted into New York comfortably between the General Assembly and First Committee. It would be useful if advocates of the CTBT would contact your governments and stress the importance of a high profile conference in New York, around September/October 1999.

NPT:

Still no decision on the dates of the third PrepCom for the NPT, originally set for 12 to 23 April. Because of clashes with the Committee on Human Rights in Geneva, some NAM Ambassadors wanted the NPT to be moved back, but despite considering a range of options, including having it in Geneva or having it much later in the year, nothing has yet emerged as a front running favourite, and so they may end up where they started, with the original dates. Since I know that some of you were planning to attend, I will let you know as soon as the dates have been finalised.

#### Note on info from Geneva

When significant things happen at the CD, I will try to put the information out as soon as I can. This won't always be the same day, because a lot of my work in Geneva involves one-to-one meetings with delegates to get a range of perspectives, which is very time consuming but necessary. I no longer plan to put out updates each week or on each plenary as I did during the CTBT, partly as many acro receivers have told me you'd prefer less detail and are happy to wait for the monthly report which will be put in Disarmament Diplomacy and on our website, in which I will aim to continue synthesising the main events and developments.

#### 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: <stuwhis@enter.net>  
Date: Tue, 2 Feb 1999 12:39:38 -0500 (EST)  
X-Sender: stuwhis@mailman.enter.net  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
From: stuwhis@enter.net (bill stuart-whistler)  
Subject: Re:(abolition-usa) Tasks for an abolition campaign  
Cc: gdaniell@chronus.comswest.net.au, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org,  
dos403@aol.com, mary-miller@ecunet.org, brian.grieves@ecunet.org

Dear Howard,

I appreciated you "Tasks" structure for the AB2000 Conference Feb.12-14. I expect to be there representing EPF.

In your "How to achieve Influence" section, I would like to add particular emphasis on reaching the Senators of the Senate Armed Services Committee with a delegation of significant religious leaders. If we can reach these Senators by emphasizing the moral aspects of the abolition argument as well as the social and economic aspects, it may be possible to raise the priority of our nuclear abolition cause in that committee's deliberations.

While there are many other pressure points to consider in our Conference, I believe this Senate committee to be a key player to consider influencing.

I'll see you at the Conference---Peace, Bill Stuart-Whistler

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
From: DavidMcR@aol.com  
Date: Tue, 2 Feb 1999 13:34:52 EST  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Subject: (abolition-usa) Re: Penny Poll Results on Clinton Budget Proposal  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

In a message dated 2/2/99 10:25:47 AM Eastern Standard Time, wrl@igc.apc.org writes:

<< Subj: Penny Poll Results on Clinton Budget Proposal  
Date: 2/2/99 10:25:47 AM Eastern Standard Time  
From: wrl@igc.apc.org (War Resisters League)

February 2, 1999 Contact: Chris Ney or Ruth Benn  
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE (212) 228-0450

THE BUDGET:  
BROOKLYNITES SAY PUT IT IN EDUCATION AND HEALTH CARE;  
Poll Shows Overwhelming Preference For Social Programs Over Military

NEW YORK, February 2, 1999—More than 100 voters in a 90-minute "penny poll" conducted today in Brooklyn's Cadman Plaza opted to have the lion's share of the federal budget go to education (24%) and health care (24%). They allocated the smallest amounts to foreign aid (4%) and the military (4%).

The poll was held to measure New Yorkers' support for the priorities outlined in President Clinton's budget for fiscal year 2000, released today. Clinton has proposed an increase in military spending of more than \$110 billion over the next six years—the largest such increase since Ronald Reagan's first term at the height of the Cold War. If the Brooklyn penny poll participants are typical, Clinton's proposed allocation of federal dollars is exactly the reverse of what most Americans want.

Penny poll participants indicated how they would like the government to spend their tax dollars by putting pennies into containers marked "Housing," "Education," "Public Transportation," "Military," etc. Ten pennies were provided to each respondent by the War Resisters League, the 75-year-old antiwar group that held the poll. When the pennies were counted, participants had voted 1,131 pennies for the following budget priorities:

|                    |     |     |
|--------------------|-----|-----|
| Education          | 256 | 23% |
| Health Care        | 256 | 23% |
| Housing            | 153 | 12% |
| Environment/Energy | 106 | 9%  |
| Income Assistance  | 79  | 7%  |
| Nutrition          | 79  | 7%  |
| National Debt      | 69  | 6%  |
| Mass Transit       | 69  | 6%  |
| Foreign Aid        | 48  | 4%  |
| Military           | 40  | 3%  |

The poll took place during a protest against the presidential budget bonanza for the Pentagon. Opponents of Clinton's budget proposal and U.S. military spending, which totals more than 50 percent of Federal expenditures, argue that those priorities damage communities at home and abroad. Notes Chris Ney, Disarmament Coordinator for the War Resisters League, "In addition to domestic needs that will go unmet so the Pentagon can buy more cruise missiles, a major boost in U.S. military spending will in the long run increase international instability, spark regional arms races and lead ultimately to more wars and violence."

\*\*\*\*\*

War Resisters League  
339 Lafayette St.  
New York, NY 10012  
212-228-0450  
212-228-6193 (fax)  
1-800-975-9688 (YouthPeace and A Day Without the Pentagon)  
wrl@igc.apc.org  
web address: <http://www.nonviolence.org/wrl>  
>>

-  
To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com" with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.  
For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send "help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

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

Date: Tue, 2 Feb 1999 19:32:01 GMT

From: acronym@gn.apc.org (Rebecca Johnson)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: latest on disarmament at CD

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host userk659.uk.uudial.com [193.149.70.235] claimed to be acronym

X-Sender: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org

To Acro receivers

February 2, 1999

CD Update from Rebecca Johnson

FIVE NATO COUNTRIES CALL FOR CD WORKING GROUP ON NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT: Iran agrees to expansion

#### SUMMARY

At today's Conference on Disarmament plenary, the Belgian Ambassador Andre Mernier, speaking on behalf of Belgium, Germany, Italy, Netherlands and Norway, introduced a proposal for the CD to establish "an ad hoc working group to study ways and means of establishing an exchange of information and views within the Conference on endeavours towards nuclear disarmament".

The Deputy Foreign Minister of Iran, Dr M Javad Zarif, addressed the CD on a number of issues, particularly nuclear disarmament. Most importantly for Ireland, Ecuador, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia, Iran signalled a lifting of its veto on their admission to the CD. The expansion decision could not yet be taken, however, as Pakistan is now holding out. Pakistan's motivation is reportedly to 'punish' Ecuador and Kazakhstan for their 'betrayal' in actively supporting the UN (First Committee) resolution condemning the South Asian nuclear tests last year, and is unlikely to be taken very far now that Iran has moved. Although Pakistan has not yet signalled its intention to let the expansion go forwards, the Geneva view is that the decision to admit the five could come as early as Thursday (Feb 4).

#### The NATO-5 Proposal

Stressing that as far as these five countries were concerned the priority for negotiations was the treaty to ban the production of fissile materials for weapons (fissban/FM(C)T), Mernier said that nuclear arms reduction and disarmament was nevertheless a major issue for the whole international community.

The proposal called for an 'ad hoc working group', which would presumably be convened under agenda item 1, as is the committee to negotiate the fissban. It is carefully not a call for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament and Mernier made clear that the five were not advocating multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Nevertheless, the fact that four other NATO countries have now joined Belgium in wanting the CD to address nuclear disarmament is regarded as interesting and significant.

As many of you will recall, Belgium had put a similar proposal in 1998 (CD/1496, 12 February) calling for the CD to establish an ad hoc group "for

reflection and study on ways and means of opening an exchange of information" on matters relating to Article VI. Opinion was divided at the time between the nuclear powers, some of whom still regarded it as too much, and the non-aligned, some of whom thought Belgium had been set up to relieve the pinch on the nuclear powers by offering something even more moderate than South Africa's proposal.

The fact that this proposal was co-sponsored by five NATO/European countries shows how much CD opinion has shifted towards the recognition that nuclear disarmament cannot be kept out of the CD forever and the acknowledgement by many pro-fissban governments that some sort of CD forum on nuclear disarmament may be needed in order to enable the fissban negotiations to go forwards.

### Assessment

There are now three distinct proposals (and one variation) on the table:

- 1) South Africa has proposed an ad hoc committee to "deliberate upon practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons as well as to identify if and when one or more such steps should be the subject of negotiations in the Conference" (19.1.99) supported by Mexico and Brazil
- 2) Egypt has proposed an ad hoc committee under agenda item 1 on nuclear disarmament to "commence negotiations on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament with the objective of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons". (26.1.99) supported by Venezuela, Iran, Myanmar
- 3) Belgium on behalf of five NATO countries has proposed "an ad hoc working group to study ways and means of establishing an exchange of information and views within the Conference on endeavours towards nuclear disarmament." (2.2.99)

The 'variation' is the playing out of South Africa's argument based on the rules of procedure in which, in the absence of consensus on a proposal put forward at the beginning of the annual session, the CD President must 'try to identify' a special coordinator to consult on the issue.

A working group may be weaker than an ad hoc committee, and a special coordinator is weaker than a working group. No-one is willing to wager a bet on which of these is eventually agreed, but there is a growing assumption that the CD will this year break the psychological barrier and decide on some kind of mechanism or forum on nuclear disarmament, even if only to discuss the issue at present.

I will publish a fuller report on the first weeks of the CD in Disarmament Diplomacy 33, which is likely to go up onto the web some time early next week.

ends

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: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Tue, 2 Feb 1999 22:50:17 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Grant received, Foundry space  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Congratulations on the grant. I'll be on the lookout although I don't expect to be at Foundry until Sunday.

I put in the form for the 9th, have heard no objection and I'm chair of the Trustees so go ahead with the board meeting!

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
X-Sender: nukeresister@pop2.igc.org  
Date: Tue, 2 Feb 1999 23:08:12 -0700  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: nukeresister@igc.org (Jack & Felice Cohen-Joppa)  
Subject: (abolition-usa) Proposal regarding Mission Statement & strategies  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear fellow Abolitionists,

I regret I cannot attend the meeting in Santa Barbara. Instead I offer my very best wishes and these personal views, informed by - but not representing - the Nuclear Resister newsletter I co-edit with Felice Cohen-Joppa.

Together with other political tactics, I believe that the new U.S. campaign for nuclear weapons abolition should explicitly endorse "nonviolent direct action for nuclear disarmament" without reference to "civil disobedience." I hope the group would be unafraid to make the argument that nuclear weapons are what is illegal and unjust, in contrast to the legitimacy of nonviolent direct actions that educate the public and inhibit the political and material capability of the nation to use or threaten to use these weapons.

This argument is being asserted creatively in the breach of the local courts of Scotland and England by the Trident Ploughshares 2000 Campaign [see <<http://www.gn.apc.org/tp2000/>> and related comments of David McKnight, CND chair, in email excerpt below]. The argument is also evident in the phenomena of Citizen Weapons Inspections (see the Nuclear Resister #113 <<http://www.nonviolence.org/nukeresister>>, page 2, and Vincent Romano's report of the Fellowship of Reconciliation's experience with this action scenario, among others).

For this group NOT to address NVDA would be to ignominiously ignore acts of individual and collective conscience which have resulted in over 60,000 arrests in North America alone over the past half century, in the process playing a vital role in public education and agitation for a nuclear-free future at various points in our history.

A separate question is whether this group would actively be involved in planning, endorsing, or coordinating particular NVDA campaigns. This question need not necessarily be considered now.

Traditionally, major national groups advocating nuclear arms reduction or abolition have shunned any activity hinting of "civil disobedience." Arguments for this stance include statements that such acts are "ineffective"; that they alienate a more liberal, less radical constituency; and that they put at risk an organization's nonprofit status.

If asked, I would be happy to address these and other arguments in the interests of healthy debate (but not in this email).

For now, I will only ask that as you consider this question, recall that while the movement for nuclear abolition stumbled in the wake of the Atmospheric Test Ban Treaty, groups such as the Community for Nonviolent Action stood up and carried the goal forward in their hearts and lives. Theirs and other nonviolent direct activism prepared the ground for the anti-nuclear resurgence of the 70s and 80s that made nuclear power, euromissiles, and warheads by the tens of thousands politically unsupportable. And after Reagan trumped the Freeze with warhead cuts, and the Freeze folded not long after failing to support the nascent American Peace Test (APT), it was APT and other organizations committed to NVDA who significantly carried forward the public demand for a total test ban and nuclear abolition into the current decade. Their nonviolent direct actions at the NTS even inspired a namesake movement in Kazakhstan (the Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement) that successfully forced an end to Soviet nuclear tests in Central Asia. This is history made perhaps too simple, but these snapshots illustrate a movement leadership that has sometimes played footsey with success, overlooking or dismissing the significance of acts of conscience while accepting accommodation with policy makers and tax laws.

We have conscience, morality, law, and history on our side as we struggle for nuclear abolition. I hope in your deliberations you will embrace tactics and strategies that embody in their nonviolent character the best of the nuclear free future we envision.

Thanks for considering my views.

Jack Cohen-Joppa

PS FYI - by way of suggested introductions, I first got involved in the movement for nuclear weapons abolition in the fall of 1977, preparing for the April, 1978 Nuclear Crossroads demonstration at Rocky Flats. I then took part in the Rocky Flats Truth Force's NVDA blockade of the railroad tracks at Rocky Flats until the fall of 1979. Since 1980 I have co-edited the newsletter now known as the Nuclear Resister. The Nuclear Resister is a comprehensive chronicle of anti-nuclear and anti-war civil disobedience in the US and Canada, encouraging support for the women and men jailed as a result of these acts of conscience. In this capacity, my co-editor and wife Felice and I have actively sought to network anti-nuclear nonviolent direct actionists across the continent, and have met (sometimes in prison visiting rooms) with NVDA practitioners from coast to coast. There are currently about 800 subscribers in North America, and about 80 overseas. I was the only U.S. resident to participate in the delivery of the Nuclear Weapons Abolition Days Citizens' Summons to NATO heads of state in Madrid, July 1997, on the first anniversary of the ICJ advisory opinion on nuclear weapons. I recently addressed the 2nd National Conference on Civil Disobedience held at American University on the subject of "A Brief History of Anti-Nuclear Civil Disobedience in North America." This talk was taped and occasionally broadcast on C-Span during the last week. I am also an associate coordinator of the US Campaign to Free Mordechai Vanunu.

{from a recent email}

>>Friends,

>>

>>Over 50 people gathered in Lancaster Friends Meeting House last Saturday,  
>>(January 30)  
>>afternoon to hear Ann-Britt and Annika's story about their arrest and  
>>imprisonment on remand following their 13th September action in  
>>Barrow-in-Furness along with Stellan who wasn't able to join us on the day.  
>>  
>>Ann-Britt and Annika's thoughtful and quiet commitment to the nuclear  
>>disarmament cause impressed all who came to pack the small room where  
>>between 20 and 30 people had been expected. ...

>>Dave Knight, Chair CND, spoke of CND's priorities for this final year before  
>>the millennium. He summarised his enthusiasm for ALE - ACTION, LOBBYING &  
>>EDUCATION - something for everybody campaigning, where all contributions  
>>are equally valued. He referred to the significance of NVDA in general and  
>>to the TP2000 actions at Faslane in particular, in challenging official  
>>policy.  
>>

-

To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com"  
with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.  
For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send  
"help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 3 Feb 1999 01:00:17 -0600 (CST)  
From: smirnowb@ix.netcom.com  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Re:(abolition-usa) Tasks for an abolition campaign  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

On 02/02/99 12:39:38 you wrote:

>

Bill & Howard,

I agree. I remember raising this issue many months ago. The 2 people or spokespersons that come to mind immediately are The Pope and The Dalai Lama. Does anyone out there have access directly or indirectly to either of these 2 figures? If one or both were to come out publicly and DEMAND an end to these illegal, immoral, unforgiving, & suicidal weapons the proverbial Pandora's Box might be opened. Especially if they were to make this a recurrent theme. Any feedback? & let's not just confine discussion to these two religious leaders, either.

Beat The Peace Drum,  
Bill Smirnow

>Dear Howard,

>

>I appreciated you "Tasks" structure for the AB2000 Conference Feb.12-14. I  
>expect to be there representing EPF.

>

>In your "How to achieve Influence" section, I would like to add particular  
>emphasis on reaching the Senators of the Senate Armed Services Committee  
>with a delegation of significant religious leaders. If we can reach these  
>Senators by emphasizing the moral aspects of the abolition argument as well  
>as the social and economic aspects, it may be possible to raise the  
>priority of our nuclear abolition cause in that committee's deliberations.

>

>While there are many other pressure points to consider in our Conference, I  
>believe this Senate committee to be a key player to consider influencing.

>

>I'll see you at the Conference---Peace, Bill Stuart-Whistler

>

>

>

>

To: "Dr. Joan Brown Campbell" <joan@nccusa.org>, "Dr. Albert M. Pennybacker" <penny@nccusa.org>, "Bill Robinson" <plough@watservl.uwaterloo.ca>, "Rudiger Noll" <rud@wcc-coe.org>, "Dwain Epps" <dce@wcc-coe.org>, "Salpy Eskidjian" <sal@wcc-coe.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Proposed statement on NATO's nuclear posture  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Friends:

NATO is having a 50th anniversary summit meeting in Washington, D.C. on April 20-23. It comes at a time when even some of the member governments are questioning NATO's nuclear posture, still tied to Cold War strategy. In advance of this meeting it would be desirable for the faith community from NATO states in Europe and North America to speak out against the NATO nuclear policy, indeed to state that it is time for NATO as an alliance to unequivocally to relinquish nuclear weapons. This would go well beyond the first-use doctrine that some are advocating to a no-use and no-threatened-use policy.

I propose that a joint statement be issued by national councils of churches from the NATO countries and by heads of communion in these nations. National conferences of Catholic bishops could also be invited to sign. The World Council of Churches and the Holy See could be encouraged to issue their own statements on this subject.

The statement could be released simultaneously by all national councils of churches which are participating. This might occur on or about Monday, March 29, the day after Palm Sunday, or release might come the week after Easter.

As a point of departure I have drafted the attached statement. It is open to revision, even complete re-writing.

As an initial inquiry, I am addressing this communication to persons who are associated with the Canadian Council of Churches, National Council of Churches in the U.S., Conference of European Churches, World Council of Churches, and Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, all of which have policy positions favoring elimination of nuclear weapons.

If you are interested in pursuing this idea, please let me know. Please provide comments on the first draft and offer suggestions on how to reach out to various national councils of churches and denominations.

Shalom,  
Howard W. Hallman

###

First Draft

A Call for NATO to Relinquish Nuclear Weapons

We, the undersigned, leaders of religious bodies in Europe and North America, note that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is approaching its fiftieth anniversary. We also note that the political and military situation has changed significantly since NATO was founded.

In 1949 Europe was the focus of intense conflict between two antagonistic blocs of nations: the United States and West European allies and the Soviet Union and East European allies. In the following decades the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, stationed large numbers of military forces armed with nuclear weapons in Western Europe and Eastern Europe. Central Europe became the primary focal point of the Cold War.

In contrast in 1999 the Soviet Union no longer exists. With Soviet troops withdrawn nations in Eastern Europe have created new forms of government and are no longer allied with Russia in a military bloc. Russia is absorbed in the enormous task of economic change following the collapse of the communist system. Spared the threat of outside aggression, Western Europe is engaged in developing new forms of economic and political cooperation. Although the United States retains a military presence in Europe, its military forces and weaponry there have been substantially diminished. The challenge in Europe today is not the danger of confrontation from two military superpowers but rather the resolution of ancient ethnic conflicts within particular nations. For these situations nuclear weapons have absolutely no relevance.

In view of this situation it is time for NATO to relinquish its reliance on nuclear weapons. Although some persons urge NATO to change to a no-first-use policy, we find this to be faulty because it retains the possibility of second use. Any use of nuclear weapons in Europe, whether first or second, would yield devastating results for the people and the environment. The correct posture for NATO, therefore, is no use and no threatened use of nuclear weapons, none whatever. Such a policy makes sense because nuclear weapons have lost any utility they may have had for deterrence and war-fighting purposes.

Not only is NATO's nuclear posture outmoded, it is morally corrupt. The doctrine of nuclear deterrence holds innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. This is clearly wrong. The actual use of nuclear weapons would slaughter the innocent and leave lasting effects harmful to future generations. This would be pure, unmitigated evil.

Therefore, we ask the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as an alliance to renounce unequivocally the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons.

We call for withdrawal of all nuclear weapons from Europe beyond the borders of the present nuclear weapons states: United Kingdom, France, and Russia. We advocate creation of a permanent nuclear weapons free zone for all of Europe outside the boundaries of these three states.

Furthermore, we call upon all states possessing nuclear weapons -- United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, China, Israel, India, and Pakistan -- to embark upon a systematic process to achieve total elimination of all nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, under strict and effective international control. As an initial step, we ask all nuclear weapon states to de-alert their nuclear arsenals by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and other means.

Finally, we support a strong global regime to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to any other nation or organization.

Signed by:

This first draft was written by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Telephone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org). Comments are invited.

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Wed, 03 Feb 1999 18:56:24 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: rebuttal to anti-CTBT paper from CATO

February 3, 1999

TO: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball, Director

RE: Pro-CTBT rebuttal to anti-CTBT arguments in CATO paper by Kathleen Bailey  
on the Coalition's Web Site

Last week, the Cato Institute hosted a luncheon discussion for a small group of CTBT experts and defense analysts -- pro, con, and "undecided" -- on the topic of the Test Ban Treaty.

Attendees included Adm. Eugene Carroll from CDI, Chris Paine from NRDC, Steve Andreasen of the National Security Council Staff, Baker Spring of Heritage, Henry Sokolski, and Cato's Ivan Eland (the host). One reporter attended -- Bill Gertz of the W. Times.

Leading off the discussion, Kathleen Bailey (formerly with the Livermore Laboratory) summarized her Cato policy analysis paper, "The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: The Costs Outweigh the Benefits." Chris Paine followed with an excellent point-by-point rebuttal of several claims related to stockpile safety and reliability and CTBT verification. Andreasen followed with a very good summation of broader arguments for the Treaty and a strong rebuttal of several other Bailey arguments. A lively discussion followed.

One of the most interesting points that came out of the session is that although Bailey believes the Senate should reject the CTBT and add funding to resume U.S. nuclear test explosions, she also believes that the Senate should not delay consideration of the CTBT.

For a copy of Chris Paine's rebuttal, "Facing Reality -- Resuming Nuclear Test Explosions Would Harm U.S. and International Security: A Reply to Cato Policy Analysis No. 330," visit the Coalition's CTBT Web Site at <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/nrdc0299.htm>>

Additional analysis, source documents, key statements and information on the CTBT are available at the Coalition's Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Site <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

To see Bailey's paper, visit the Cato Web Site at <<http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-330es.html>>

Thanks to Chris responding so quickly and so effectively to Bailey's paper. If you have further questions or suggestions about our plans for dissemination of further pro-CTBT papers and reports, feel free to contact me.

DK

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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>>

---

Return-Path: <dce@wcc-coe.org>  
Date: Thu, 04 Feb 1999 08:16:13 +0100  
From: Dwain EPPS <dce@wcc-coe.org>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Cc: sal@wcc-coe.org  
Subject: Proposed statement on NATO's nuclear posture -Reply

Good initiative, Howard. It should certainly have the support of the Canadians, who are working hard on this, as you certainly know. Where the Germans, Dutch, French and British will come down is a big question!

Dwain

Return-Path: <brobinson@ploughshares.ca>  
Date: Thu, 04 Feb 1999 12:16:07 -0500  
From: Bill Robinson <brobinson@ploughshares.ca>  
Organization: Project Ploughshares  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Proposals re NATO

Hi, Howard.

I hear you're working on some sort of proposal re churches in NATO countries. Could you send us some info about that?

We are on the point of pursuing such an initiative ourselves (which we will send to you shortly), and it would be very helpful for us to see what's up already.

Thanks,

Bill Robinson.

--

Bill Robinson, Project Ploughshares,  
Conrad Grebel College, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G6  
Phone: 519 888-6541 x264 Fax: 519 885-0806  
E-mail: brobinson@ploughshares.ca  
<http://www.ploughshares.ca>

Project Ploughshares is a member of the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (<http://watserv1.uwaterloo.ca/~plough/cnanw/cnanw.html>)

To: Bill Robinson <brobinson@ploughshares.ca>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Proposals re NATO  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 12:16 PM 2/4/99 -0500, Bill Robinson wrote:

>Hi, Howard.

>

>I hear you're working on some sort of proposal re churches in NATO  
>countries. Could you send us some info about that?

>

>We are on the point of pursuing such an initiative ourselves (which we  
>will send to you shortly), and it would be very helpful for us to see  
>what's up already.

>

Dear Bill:

Yesterday I sent you a proposal, but it bounced because I made a mistake on your e-mail address. It is repeated below.

I'm glad your working on this now. I'm willing to yield if you're ahead of me, or to merge our efforts.

Mine so far has gone to the following: "Dr. Joan Brown Campbell" <joan@nccusa.org>, "Dr. Albert M. Pennybacker" <penny@nccusa.org>, "Rudiger Noll" <rud@wcc-coe.org> [Conference of European Churches], "Dwain Epps" <dce@wcc-coe.org>, "Salpy Eskidjian" <sal@wcc-coe.org>. I also mailed a copy to Msgr. Diarmuid Martin, secretary, Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, inquiring whether the Holy See might issue a parallel statement.

My first reply came from Dwain Epps, World Council of Churches, who wrote:

"Good initiative, Howard. It should certainly have the support of the  
Canadians, who are working hard on this, as you certainly know.

Where the Germans, Dutch, French and British will come down is a big  
question!"

I have some other European contacts from last year when I was in Geneva at the NPT Preparatory Committee meeting. I want to pursue them to soon if it doesn't interfere with what you are doing. Maybe we should have a phone conversation.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

February 3, 1999

Dear Friends:

NATO is having a 50th anniversary summit meeting in Washington, D.C. on April 20-23. It comes at a time when even some of the member governments are questioning NATO's nuclear posture, still tied to Cold War strategy. In advance of this meeting it would be desirable for the faith community from NATO states in Europe and North America to speak out against the NATO nuclear policy, indeed to state that it is time for NATO as an alliance unequivocally to relinquish nuclear weapons. This would go well beyond the first-use doctrine that some are advocating to a no-use and no-threatened-use policy.

I propose that a joint statement be issued by national councils of churches from the NATO countries and by heads of communion in these nations. National conferences of Catholic bishops could also be invited to sign. The World Council of Churches and the Holy See could be encouraged to issue their own statements on this subject.

The statement could be released simultaneously by all national councils of churches which are participating. This might occur on or about Monday, March 29, the day after Palm Sunday, or release might come the week after Easter.

As a point of departure I have drafted the attached statement. It is open to revision, even complete re-writing.

As an initial inquiry, I am addressing this communication to persons who are associated with the Canadian Council of Churches, National Council of Churches in the U.S., Conference of European Churches, World Council of Churches, and Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, all of which have policy positions favoring elimination of nuclear weapons.

If you are interested in pursuing this idea, please let me know. Please provide comments on the first draft and offer suggestions on how to reach out to various national councils of churches and denominations.

Shalom,  
Howard W. Hallman

###

First Draft

A Call for NATO to Relinquish Nuclear Weapons

We, the undersigned, leaders of religious bodies in Europe and North America, note that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is approaching its fiftieth anniversary. We also note that the political and military situation has changed significantly since NATO was founded.

In 1949 Europe was the focus of intense conflict between two antagonistic blocs of nations: the United States and West European allies and the Soviet Union and East European allies. In the following decades the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, stationed large numbers of military forces armed with nuclear weapons in Western Europe and Eastern Europe. Central Europe became the primary focal point of the Cold War.

In contrast in 1999 the Soviet Union no longer exists. With Soviet troops withdrawn nations in Eastern Europe have created new forms of government and are no longer allied with Russia in a military bloc. Russia is absorbed in the enormous task of economic change following the collapse of the communist system. Spared the threat of outside aggression, Western Europe is engaged in developing new forms of economic and political cooperation. Although the United States retains a military presence in Europe, its military forces and weaponry there have been substantially diminished. The challenge in Europe today is not the danger of confrontation from two military superpowers but rather the resolution of ancient ethnic conflicts within particular nations. For these situations nuclear weapons have absolutely no relevance.

In view of this situation it is time for NATO to relinquish its reliance on nuclear weapons. Although some persons urge NATO to change to a no-first-use policy, we find this to be faulty because it retains the possibility of second use. Any use of nuclear weapons in Europe, whether first or second, would yield devastating results for the people and the environment. The correct posture for NATO, therefore, is no use and no threatened use of nuclear weapons, none whatever. Such a policy makes sense because nuclear weapons have lost any utility they may have had for deterrence and war-fighting purposes.

Not only is NATO's nuclear posture outmoded, it is morally corrupt. The doctrine of nuclear deterrence holds innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. This is clearly wrong. The actual use of nuclear weapons

would slaughter the innocent and leave lasting effects harmful to future generations. This would be pure, unmitigated evil.

Therefore, we ask the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as an alliance to renounce unequivocally the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons.

We call for withdrawal of all nuclear weapons from Europe beyond the borders of the present nuclear weapons states: United Kingdom, France, and Russia. We advocate creation of a permanent nuclear weapons free zone for all of Europe outside the boundaries of these three states.

Furthermore, we call upon all states possessing nuclear weapons -- United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, China, Israel, India, and Pakistan -- to embark upon a systematic process to achieve total elimination of all nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, under strict and effective international control. As an initial step, we ask all nuclear weapon states to de-alert their nuclear arsenals by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and other means.

Finally, we support a strong global regime to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to any other nation or organization.

Signed by:

This first draft was written by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036.  
Telephone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org). Comments are invited.

>

Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Thu, 4 Feb 1999 08:53:14 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Check 1180  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,  
The subject check in the amount of \$11 for the balance due on the conference registration didn't clear with this month's statement. Perhaps it is "lost on your desk."

Notwithstanding the above anomaly, our accounts balance and I'm looking forward to receiving the grant money.

Phil

To: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Check 1180  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 08:53 AM 2/4/99 -0500, Phillip H. Miller wrote:

>Howard,  
>The subject check in the amount of \$11 for the balance due on the  
>conference registration didn't clear with this month's statement. Perhaps  
>it is "lost on your desk."  
>  
>Phil,

No, it was lost on the floor beside my desk. I've now cash it. Good eye!

Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
Date: Thu, 4 Feb 1999 17:30:33 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: a2000@mail.silcom.com  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <a2000@silcom.com>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) February 1999 Grassroots Newsletter  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

February 1999 Grassroots Newsletter

#### PETITIONS:

\*\*Petitions keep flowing in from all corners of the globe. Special thanks to Masaaki Sakai and Jan Harwood for their dedication and efforts--I can hardly keep up with all of the petitions they send in! This past month I have received over 4000 petitions, including almost 200 online signers.

Great News From Costa Rica!

Mitzi Stark writes: "We have about 400 signatures so far. Both ex-president Jose Figueres and his mother, Karen Olsen, a prominent political figure on here own, signed the petition. The entire staff at the Juan Santamaria Museum in Alajuela signed it."

Petition gathering carries the added benefit of providing an opportunity to engage people in conversation about nuclear issues.

#### MUNICIPALITIES:

\*\*On December 21, the City Council of Boulder, Colorado approved a resolution in support of nuclear disarmament. The passage of the resolution made the front page in the Boulder Daily Camera. Part of the resolution states "Whereas, while funding for nuclear weapons development grows, funding for the clean-up of radioactive materials at nuclear facilities including Rocky Flats remains far too low, endangering communities including Boulder...." Congratulations to Tom Marshall and the others at Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center for their hard work.

#### NEW ABOLITION 2000 ORGANIZATIONS:

1. Wisconsin Green Party, US
2. Starlab Research Laboratories in Brussels, Belgium
3. Pakistan Institute of Labor Education and Research, Pakistan
4. Office of the Americas in Los Angeles, US
5. National Lawyers Guild in New York, US
6. Committee to Bridge the Gap in Los Angeles, US
7. Committee of Concerned Scientists in Bayside, NY, US
8. Goonellabah Medical Center in NSW, Australia
9. Peace with Justice Center of Pomona Valley, CA, US
10. Buddhist International, US
11. Montclair Monthly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, NJ, US
12. U.S. Pacifist Party, Denver Colorado, US
13. Action Group Mahila Vikas Kendra, India
14. Urban Development Institute, India

15. Women's Intl. League for Peace and Freedom, Los Angeles Branch, US
  16. Arbeiterwohlfahrt Bezirksverband Hessen Sued e.v., Germany
- For a complete list go to [http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/organizs\\_all.html](http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/organizs_all.html)

## CHURCHES AND ABOLITION 2000

**\*\*Thanks to Joe Murray for his efforts to bring Abolition 2000 to his church. We encourage others to follow his example. In a letter to his bishop, he states:**

"Would it not be an eloquent and compelling move for the Diocese of Norwich formally to endorse the action of the Norwich City Council and itself to adopt a resolution calling for the abolition of all nuclear weapons?"

"It goes without saying that economic and political forces in our region are opposed to what Abolition 2000 stands for. Only ten days ago we read that another \$1.5 billion submarine, outfitted with nuclear missiles, has been added to the defense budget. Where else but from the active support of our churches and from the work of grassroots organizations such as Abolition 2000 can change take place?"

"Pope John Paul has spoken out forcefully on the subject of nuclear abolition ever since the 1970s. In the spirit of his goals for the new millennium it would seem to me that there could be no higher priority for us than the promotion of an international treaty banning all nuclear weapons for all times, such as is proposed by Abolition 2000."

**\*\*Reverend Kathleen McTigue, Minister of the Unitarian Society of New Haven, recently gave a sermon called "Disbanding the Nuclear Club."**

"In the spring, when India and then Pakistan detonated nuclear bombs, I felt such sadness. I felt shame and anger too, because I understand that the choices made by India and Pakistan were mirrors of the choices our own country made. We made possession of the bomb equivalent to the most elite kinds of power and strength. We declared a closed circle, those on the inside who could build as many bombs as they wanted and those on the outside who couldn't build any at all. Our blustery, predictable response was to punish them for their small nuclear bombs while righteously clinging to our own horde of enormous ones...Although I still have the vague feeling that I should apologize for raising this unhappy issue before us all, I will instead make you a promise: I will not let us forget it again. There's a group out there called Abolition 2000, and I will gladly supply any of you who want to join me with the action manual they've developed."

## FEEDBACK

**\*\*Esther Farnsworth, from WILPF in Vermont, writes: "Most of our activities are centered on involving and engaging individuals. We believe that when the mass becomes educated and enraged at the insane nuclear policy, they will pressure the government. We have met little resistance. But we still have much work to do in convincing people that we, at the grassroots, are the ones who will bring change."**

**\*\*Dick Bennett wrote: "Last night a group of friends, long advocates of**

peace here in Fayetteville, AR, met to discuss what more we might do, given Clinton's extreme increase in military funds, even including money for Reagan's Star Wars (the extension of militarism to outer space, yes?). Tentatively, we are planning 1) confrontation of the military recruiters in the public schools, and 2) a reading of the names of the dead on both sides including civilians in US wars, invasions, attacks, bombings in the 20th C."

## OPPOSE INCREASE IN MILITARY SPENDING

\*\*We urge you to use Clinton's recent increase in military spending as an opportunity to voice your concern about this and related disarmament issues. Write to your local newspaper and point out that adding \$112 billion to the military budget over the next six years is a step in the WRONG direction. We should not neglect our domestic policies just because our foreign policies are so lucrative for the arms dealers.

## NO-FIRST-USE

\*\*The opinion section of the Christian Science Monitor last week featured an article called "Time for a no-first-use policy." Increased coverage of this issue is encouraging, especially since the writers challenged NATO's outdated defense doctrines. They wrote: "We face a dilemma. If the political value of nuclear weapons is not reduced, many nations will find them hard to resist. Moreover, obtaining these weapons is no longer difficult, thanks to simple and widely available 1945-era nuclear-weapon technology."

<http://www.cwsmonitor.com:80/durable/1999/01/28/p11s1.htm>

## RESOURCES

\*\*New Abolition 2000 four-color brochures are being produced by Physicians for Social Responsibility. Contact Bob Tiller for more information at [btiller@psr.org](mailto:btiller@psr.org)

\*\*This is a link to BASIC's report called Nuclear Futures--Western European Options for Nuclear Risk Reduction: <http://www.basicint.org/nuju3-0.htm>

\*\*Statements of religious leaders on nuclear abolition may be found at <http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/religious.html>

## EVENTS

\*\*February 12-14: U.S. Abolition Campaign meeting in Santa Barbara. For information, email [a2000@silcom.com](mailto:a2000@silcom.com)

\*\*March 5: "People of Faith Call for Abolition" in commemoration of the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Contact Oak Ridge Environmental Peace at [arep@igc.org](mailto:arep@igc.org)

\*\*March 8: Nuclear Power, Nuclear Weapons, and Y2K, Washington, D.C. Features Dr. Helen Caldicott, Michael Kraig, Dr. Ted Taylor, John Pike, and others. Contact: [carrie@noradiation.org](mailto:carrie@noradiation.org) or 516-324-0655

\*\*March 27: UNPLUG Salem Campaign (a coalition of 54 organizations) will

hold a rally at the Salem Nuclear Plant in New Jersey to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Three Mile Island meltdown. Contact Norm Cohen at [norco@hellatlantic.net](mailto:norco@hellatlantic.net)

-  
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: phil  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Ploughshares Grant  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Phil,

I left the Ploughshares Fund grant letter at Foundry for you to sign. Please leave it there for me. I'll pick it up on Monday.

I note that it is a 501(c)(4) grant, which gives us a little more leeway on lobbying. That means when the check comes, it should go into the General Fund.

Shalom,  
Howard



to NATO's current strategic review. This period prior to the April 23-25, 1999 NATO summit in Washington offers a special opportunity for churches to support political openings, particularly among the non-nuclear NATO states, to pursue a significant shift in NATO's nuclear weapons policies and strategies.

Among the ideas we would like to explore is a joint letter or statement signed by the heads of churches in NATO countries, calling for a renewed commitment to the elimination of nuclear weapons, as required under the NPT, and especially calling on NATO to immediately renounce the first-use of nuclear weapons and to de-alert all nuclear weapons in the possession of NATO states. Depending upon the interest, time and resources available, other actions might also be possible.

We have enclosed a draft statement for your consideration, but we emphasize that this is an exploratory letter and that we would welcome your counsel on the most effective means of engaging the churches in an urgent appeal to NATO to take steps that would contribute to the goal of the elimination of all nuclear weapons.

Your participation (and assistance in identifying other participants) in a small steering group to propose and advise churches in NATO countries on appropriate action would be especially helpful. We propose that this "steering group" give leadership to such an initiative over the next several weeks with the intention of generating written and other church representations to NATO member governments and the NATO secretariat during March, as far in advance of the Washington summit as possible. The group will be crucial in developing a strategy for circulating an invitation to participate in this initiative to your member churches and for providing a process by which these concerns can be brought to the attention of governments and church communities in NATO countries.

We look forward to your reply and to further discussions.

Sincerely,

Janet Somerville  
General Secretary  
Canadian Council of Churches

Ernie Regehr  
Director  
Project Ploughshares

-----

Draft  
International Church Statement on  
Nuclear weapons and NATO's Strategic Concept Review  
March 1999

The current review of NATO's Strategic Concept document represents a critically important opportunity for NATO to reverse its present assertion that nuclear weapons "fulfil an essential role" as the "supreme guarantee" of the security of the allies.

A revised Strategic Concept document must commit NATO members to the early elimination of nuclear weapons, in accordance with obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, to immediate steps to reduce the risk posed by current nuclear weapons, and to minimize the political value accorded to them.

We therefore call on the governments of all NATO members to ensure that the new NATO Strategic Concept:

- affirms NATO's support for the rapid global elimination of nuclear weapons and commits the Alliance to take programmatic action to advance this goal;
- commits NATO to reducing the alert status of nuclear weapons possessed by NATO members, and to pursuing effective arrangements for the rapid de-alerting of all nuclear weapons possessed by all states; and
- renounces the first-use of nuclear weapons by any NATO members under any circumstances, and commits NATO to the pursuit of equivalent commitments from other states possessing nuclear weapons.

Contrary to NATO's current strategic concept, nuclear weapons do not, cannot, guarantee security. They deliver only insecurity and peril through their promise to annihilate that which is most precious, life itself and the global ecosystem upon which all life depends. Nuclear weapons have no moral legitimacy, they lack military utility, and, in light of the 1996 advisory opinion of the World Court, their legality under international law is in serious question and all states are legally obligated to "pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects."

--

Bill Robinson, Project Ploughshares,  
Conrad Grebel College, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G6  
Phone: 519 888-6541 x264 Fax: 519 885-0806  
E-mail: brobinson@ploughshares.ca  
<http://www.ploughshares.ca>

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-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
Date: Fri, 05 Feb 1999 12:37:40 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: "abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com" <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>,  
Gordon Clark <paexec@igc.org>, Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>,  
Alistair Millar <amillar@fourthfreedom.org>,  
Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>, Alyn Ware <LCNP@aol.com>,  
Mark Mebane <Mmebane@fourthfreedom.org>, Bob Musil <bmusil@psr.org>,  
Susan Gordon <susangordon@igc.org>, Steve Kent <kentcom@highlands.com>,  
Pamela Meidell <pmeidell@igc.org>,  
Joseph Gerson <afscamb@igc.apc.org>,  
Jonathan Schell <schellj@hotmail.com>,  
Duane Shank Shank <dshank@igc.apc.org>,  
Dave Robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>,  
Alan Cranston <Linda@worldforum.org>,  
Alice Slater <aslater@gracelinks.org>, Sally Light <sallight@igc.org>,  
David Cortright <fff@tln.net>, Eleanor LeCain <EMLECAIN@aol.com>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) [Fwd: Disarmament mission statement]  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Here are some suggestions on mission statement and strategies from  
Arjun Makhijani at Institute for Energy and Environmental Research  
(IEER)

--

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 0172  
E-MAIL: disarmament@igc.org  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>  
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <arjun@ieer.org>  
Received: from pppe-11.igc.org (arjun@pppe-11.igc.org)  
by igce.igc.org (8.9.2/8.9.2) with SMTP id GAA14796  
for <disarmament@igc.org>; Fri, 5 Feb 1999 06:17:37 -0800 (PST)  
Date: Fri, 5 Feb 1999 06:17:37 -0800 (PST)  
Message-Id: <2.2.16.19990205091610.3dc716c0@pop.igc.org>  
X-Sender: arjun@pop.igc.org  
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"  
To: disarmament@igc.org  
From: Arjun Makhijani <arjun@ieer.org>

Subject: Disarmament mission statement

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igce.igc.org id GAA14796

X-Mozilla-Status2: 00000000

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by kds5.kivex.com id MAA20795

Kathy:

Would you please post this to the Abolition list as my contribution the mission statement discussion? Thanks. Arjun

Draft Goals Statement for the US Nuclear Disarmament Campaign  
Arjun Makhijani, 5 Feb. 1999

(Note: Section IV (Analysis) is meant as a contribution to the strategy discussion at the Santa Barbara meeting.)

## I. Goals

The goal of the campaign for enduring nuclear disarmament is to reduce the risk of the nuclear weapons use by design, miscalculation, or accident to the lowest possible level at any given time and to strive to continually lower this risk.

### Explanation

Disarmament is a process in which all nuclear weapons states:

- take interim actions to continually reduce risks of nuclear weapons use arising from any cause
- refrain from actions that might re-ignite a nuclear arms race or that might cause or abet the reversal of prior steps or commitments to nuclear disarmament.

A major milestone in this process would be the achievement of the complete and verified dismantlement of all existing nuclear arsenals and the infrastructure to design, produce, and test them. However, the goal of enduring nuclear disarmament extends well beyond the verified elimination of existing arsenals. Maintaining the grave economic inequalities and injustices in the world - less than four hundred people have more wealth than the world's poorest two billion - requires frequent resort to violence and the threats of violence, from the local to the global. A sustainable state of nuclear disarmament cannot be achieved without addressing such underlying injustices. Therefore, much technical, economic, social, political, and moral effort will be needed to create conditions in which there is no reversion to nuclear weapons after the elimination of present arsenals.

Within the nuclear weapons sphere, a principal requirement for preventing reversion to nuclear weapons will be that governments discard deterrence doctrines as the basis of their strategic postures and plans. Specifically, they must reject all doctrines of nuclear weapons use or threat of use for any reason, including retaliation for an attack of any kind (including nuclear, chemical or biological weapons) by a state or non-state party. The

doctrine of retaliation must be replaced by a non-retaliatory process to bring violators to justice in consonance with the Nuremberg principles and the universal declaration of human rights.

Respect for human rights in the nuclear disarmament context includes taking due account of the severe harm that has already been done by nuclear weapons production and testing to all generations since the start of the nuclear weapons era, extending out for uncounted generations into the future. Therefore, repair of the health and environmental damage to the extent possible as well as sound management of the toxic legacy of nuclear weapons production and testing are essential to the process creating enduring nuclear disarmament. This redress of health and environmental damage must include explicit recognition of the disproportionate harm that nuclear weapons production and testing has inflicted on many colonial and indigenous people.

## II. Morality, Deterrence, and Retaliation

Almost everyone favors nuclear disarmament in principle, but this surface agreement hides differing points of view about nuclear deterrence, which form the core of the controversy about nuclear armaments.

At bottom, the problem of nuclear deterrence is a moral question, as was recently pointed out in a statement signed by 71 Pax Christi Catholic bishops. Those who advocate nuclear deterrence, whether in response to a nuclear strike or as part of a first use strategy, make an implicit moral assumption that pre-dates the nuclear era: they do not differentiate between soldiers and non-combatants in a time of war. It is therefore considered acceptable to kill large numbers of non-combatants in response to such killing by another state.

In fact, over the last few centuries, the distinction between combatants and non-combatants has been steadily eroded. That erosion has been most dramatic in this century with the advent of air power. The terrorization of civilian populations was put forward early in this century as the basic tenet of air warfare and it was carried out with terrible efficiency in World War II: Hitler's bombing of London and Coventry, the British bombings of German cities, the US fire bombings of Dresden and Tokyo, and the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Since the distinction between soldiers and non-combatants has been steadily eroded, partly due to the importance of industry (such as petroleum refineries or electric power plants) in war, one can view the moral problem most clearly by considering the effects of military doctrine on children. The central moral problem of nuclear deterrence is that it involves the planning of the mass killing of people, including children. This is because the core requirement for the success for a deterrence strategy is that, to be effective, there must be a readiness to actually use the weapons. Its reality can be viewed not only in the history of Hiroshima and Nagasaki but also in all the terror bombings of World War II. The central public rationale of the US government put forward for the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was that American soldiers' lives were saved. Trading off children's lives for those of grown-ups was seen as acceptable. (The idea that Japanese civilians were saved due to an early end to the war

as a result of the use of the two nuclear bombs was added as an embellishment after the war to further rationalize their use. Consideration for Japanese civilians, or even Americans of Japanese origin, played no role in the decision to use the bombs, any more than consideration for non-Japanese civilians was part of Japanese war policy. In fact many Americans, mostly of Japanese origin who were trapped in Japan at the start of the war as well as a few US prisoners-of-war, were killed in the Hiroshima/Nagasaki bombings.)

To try to give a moral basis to society in which the killing of the children is unacceptable even in retaliation for such killing by another person or state is neither far-fetched nor unachievable. No one would suggest, for instance, that the children of the Nazis operators of the death camps should have been killed for the actions of their fathers. It would be generally recognized as morally repugnant to suggest that terror be visited upon the family of Timothy McVeigh, whose bombing of the Murrah building resulted in deaths in so many families. Yet, the practice of killing non-combatants, including children, has been integral to modern war-making.

The nuclear establishment's endangerment of the people of their own countries, including children, through environmental damage also raises the same moral questions in an even more immediate way, since nuclear weapons production and testing results in some harm. For instance, atmospheric testing and much underground testing rained fallout on the entire United States, which resulted in high radiation doses to the thyroids of millions of children who drank contaminated milk. The AEC and Pentagon were aware of the patterns of the fallout. The AEC gave advance warning to Kodak about fallout patterns so Kodak could protect its film, but did not warn milk producers and consumers about contaminated milk they knew would result from pastures polluted with iodine-131. Some underground testing has vented large amounts of radioactivity, and it will leave contamination underground to threaten generations for hundreds of thousands of years. The situation is qualitatively similar in other nuclear weapons states, though we have a less detailed idea of the environmental problems created there.

If generations now living have not been adequately consulted, future generations have not been consulted at all. They are likely to bear some of the worst effects of the burden of radioactive waste, and of contaminated soil, water, and materials. Nuclear weapons establishments seem incapable of carrying out clean-up and waste management programs that have technical and environmental integrity, despite the presence of many competent and dedicated technical people inside them who could design and implement such programs. In other words, nuclear-bomb-making seems to be connected with environmental endangerment of children's health, just as they jeopardize children's security. So long as there are nuclear arsenals, we can neither minimize health risks nor security risks.

### III. Steps towards enduring nuclear disarmament

A variety of steps are needed to lay the foundation of a disarmament process that will lead to the elimination of existing arsenals and increase the likelihood that there will be no reversion to nuclear weapons. The measures described below related only to nuclear weapons. Progress in other areas

will also be required. For instance, a good deal of the pressure to maintain arsenals arises from pork-barrel politics. These questions must be addressed in parallel with the steps discussed below as part of the strategy and tactics of actually accomplishing the objectives listed here.

### 1. Short-term measures

Short-term technical measures can be accomplished within about one year (or less). Strategically, they should reduce immediate dangers to the largest possible extent, lay the foundation for verification of stocks of materials, warheads, and delivery systems. On the political side, they are designed to further trust and confidence by strict adherence to existing treaties, reduction of arsenals and elimination of first-strike and first-use postures.

1. Completion of at least one effective de-alerting measure for all nuclear weapons in all eight nuclear weapons states
2. Strict adherence to existing international arms control and disarmament treaties, commitments, and agreements, including the ABM treaty as signed in 1972, Article VI of the NPT as interpreted by the World Court, and the CTBT.
3. Reduction of US and Russian strategic arsenals to less than 1,000 warheads each, with no reserve warheads or materials, permanent removal from the US and Russian arsenals of all remaining "tactical" nuclear weapons, and withdrawal of all weapons based abroad to the territories of the weapons states.
4. Shutdown of production of all weapons-usable radioactive materials for military purposes (plutonium, highly enriched uranium, and tritium).
5. Unilateral declarations of no-first-use policies by all nuclear weapons states (China and India have already made such declarations) and reconfiguration of arsenals, military doctrines and training to correspond to such declarations.
6. A halt to new nuclear weapons production and design, and to modifications of existing weapons. Nuclear warheads deemed unsafe should be dismantled.

### 2. Medium-term measures

Medium-term measures can be accomplished within a few years. They are designed to lay the foundation for a transition to a complete elimination of nuclear arsenals and a treaty that would enable the multilateral verification of that elimination.

1. Removal of all nuclear warheads from all weapons and withdrawal of all delivery systems from deployment; with multilateral monitoring and verification of their storage.
2. Shut down of all commercial plutonium separation and all other operations that result in weapons-usable plutonium or uranium.

### 3. Long-term measures

1. A nuclear weapons convention signed by all parties that would permanently eliminate nuclear arsenals as irreversibly and verifiably as possible. The convention should forbid the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons even in retaliation for such use, as well as withdrawal from that treaty under any circumstances. It should include a verification organization that has explicit provision for verification by non-governmental parties. Strengthening of existing international judicial system to enable it to deal

with use, threats of use, or manufacture of weapons of mass destruction.

#### 4. Continuing measures

1. Dismantlement, decommissioning and clean-up of all nuclear weapons-related facilities, and institution of sound long-term management policies for managing weapons-usable materials and radioactive and toxic waste.
2. Provision of assistance to those whose health may have been affected by those processes, independent of national origin or location, with due recognition of the disproportionate damage done to may indigenous and colonial people.
3. Progressive elimination of secrecy in the nuclear establishment.
4. Destruction of nuclear warhead delivery vehicles and strict controls on and verification of all dual-use (nuclear and non-nuclear) items and technologies.
5. Banning of production of ballistic missiles and strict verification procedures to ensure that no space launch vehicles can be used as nuclear weapon delivery vehicles.

#### IV. Analysis

The Abolition 2000 movement has been a vital part of a huge accomplishment of the global disarmament movement of the last four years. This movement has successfully put the elimination of nuclear weapons at the center of non-proliferation and disarmament agenda. It has done so in a period when the nuclear weapons states, notably the United States, would have preferred to stick to non-proliferation on the part of non-nuclear weapons states alone. The Abolition 2000 Network has also helped to bring greater attention in the international arena to the issue of the disproportionate burden suffered by indigenous and colonial people.

Similarly, the drafting of a peoples' nuclear weapons convention has served as a guide for disarmament advocates, whether they be NGOs or governments. It puts forth criteria by which to judge an official treaty and official claims about the arms reduction process. Its continual refinement is also necessary as we learn more of the complexity of the process and its links to other problems.

##### 1. Clarifying "abolition"

The spirit of the demands in the Abolition 2000 statement, which has been signed by a large number of organizations, is subscribed to by an even larger number of groups. The goal statement proposed here embraces the idea that elimination of existing nuclear arsenals is an essential part of nuclear disarmament. The health and environmental aspects of the disarmament process are also incorporated into it. In these respects, it is very similar to the Abolition 2000 statement and other plans that have advocated a treaty as the route to the abolition of nuclear weapons. But a modification of the approach is necessary both to clarify the goal of "abolition" and the strategy of relying on a treaty as the primary and most immediate vehicle for achieving that end. The clarification of the goal of "abolition" is necessary, among other reasons, for a full consideration of the moral basis for abandoning the doctrine of deterrence.

This statement on enduring nuclear disarmament attempts to address the fact that elimination of existing nuclear weapons will inevitably be an imperfect achievement. We must live with the possibility of nuclear weapons use by a state or non-state party even after all existing nuclear weapons have been verifiably eliminated. Further, given the predictable imperfections of materials accounting and verification, there is no way to guarantee that the process of disarmament will be free of cheating. Indeed, we do not know if nuclear materials have already been sold from existing stocks to third parties, where it cannot now be accounted for.

We need to confront these issues in order to point out clearly how the program we advocate, including elimination of existing arsenals, can greatly reduce risks compared to the present. Today there is a growing risk of a large part of humanity being blown up in any given fifteen-minute period, of nuclear black markets, and of the disintegration of a state with tens of thousands of nuclear weapons. Short-term measures with very wide support would greatly reduce these risks and also lay the foundation for eliminating existing arsenals. At the same time, a goal of continual risk reduction also embraces (i) measures to reduce the risk of weapons use by any party after elimination of known arsenals and (ii) strict adherence to the principle of non-use of nuclear weapons even in retaliation for such use.

## 2. US-Russian context for a treaty

We are not yet in a position to demand a treaty for an end to nuclear weapons because enduring disarmament will involve a very complex process with many details that cannot now be foreseen. Nor can all the important dangers be addressed by a treaty banning nuclear weapons and eliminating existing arsenals. A treaty is far more than a piece of paper. It is the process leading up to it that will give meaning and staying power to it. In order for the end result to be meaningful, the treaty process must be sound and have a level of integrity which is impossible to achieve in the current political and military situation. Given the current US and Russian attachment to nuclear weapons - they both have first use doctrines at present - a treaty would be highly likely to contain huge loopholes. These would probably include provisions for large reserves of nuclear weapons and nuclear-weapons-usable materials.

It is also very likely to entrench the position of one country, the United States, as by far the dominant global power militarily. This is a significant present cause of repeated setbacks in the arms reduction process and in the unreliability of past treaty commitments - such as the ABM Treaty, the NPT, or even the simple matter of payment of United Nations dues (which is a treaty obligation). In this context, asking for yet another treaty of far larger consequence is problematic. Political, social, judicial, economic, and moral barriers of a higher order than characterize the present environment are needed to prevent treaty violations. If a major nuclear weapons state withdrew from a nuclear weapons elimination treaty, it could have consequences that are as disastrous as those we face at present. And a withdrawal from a treaty in a crisis would provide much less leverage to the voices of calm and peace than at present, making it less likely that the world would step back from the brink.

There are a number of other reasons why focussing on a treaty to eliminate

nuclear weapons is the wrong approach at present. One problem is that the Pentagon is currently pursuing a vast program that aims at overwhelming US military superiority over everyone else for the foreseeable future. Under such circumstances, Russia and China are highly unlikely to agree to complete nuclear disarmament, even if the US were to offer to negotiate it. Nuclear disarmament talks in the context of a US goal of overwhelming military superiority would be utterly bogged down in recriminations and the need for action on weapons that are not now considered part of the nuclear arsenal.

The United States is also determined either to pressure Russia to agree to change the ABM treaty or, failing that, to withdraw from it. This could trigger grave instabilities and a new arms race. For instance, China has announced that it will build more strategic weapons should the US deploy ballistic missile defenses and China has the means to do so. The entire process may become unstable and dangerous. Given these dangers, it will be impossible to assemble the coalition that is necessary to pressure the US government to begin negotiations for a nuclear weapons convention.

The situation in Russia is also a great cause for concern, because Russia appears to be relying more and more on its nuclear arsenal in the face of the severe deterioration of its other military capabilities. Russia sees nuclear weapons as its only remaining card in global power politics. This makes the growing global dominance of the United States in military matters an even more important problem in the context of nuclear disarmament.

An effective disarmament statement that embodies the spirit of the Abolition 2000 statement and most of the specifics, but which also fits the conditions described above, is therefore needed. It must address the problems of the stability of the disarmament process and of the prevention of conditions that could create greater dangers of a first strike. For instance, drastic reductions in the Russian arsenal along with US deployment of extensive ballistic missile defenses (BMD) could create such dangers. Hence it is critical to prevent the deployment of BMD during the process of nuclear weapons reduction, especially when these numbers reach into the hundreds of warheads (instead of the thousands in the US and Russian arsenals today).

### 3. Addressing other states with nuclear capability

Furthermore, the nuclear disarmament strategy must address how India, Israel and Pakistan are to be brought into the process of nuclear disarmament without legitimizing their nuclear arsenals, or on the other hand legitimizing the power that the five nuclear weapons states parties to the NPT want to wield over non-parties to the NPT. It is also crucial for the US nuclear disarmament movement to consider the questions related to the real or alleged nuclear weapons capability of Iraq, North Korea, and Iran. These countries are now in various ways in the center of various US military and political establishment plans and public rationalizations of present US military policy that include:

- deploying ballistic missile defenses
- expanding authority of the Pentagon to the continental United States
- the continuation of the nuclear first-use policy to counter threats of use of chemical or biological weapons

- the proposed expansion of NATO authority to cover issues related to weapons of mass destruction.

Given these links, it is essential to develop specific demands that take into account present realities that are also consonant with our principles. Finally, to have a treaty as a goal is to confuse strategy with the overall goal. Treaties are breakable, and we can see that reality in the nuclear arena everyday. The goal for nuclear disarmament must be far bigger and more robust.

#### 4. Conclusions

Calling for strict adherence to existing treaties, verified de-alerting of all nuclear weapons, and the reduction of the US and Russian arsenals to less than 1,000 each, rather than seeking a treaty in the short term, addresses most of the immediate issues raised in this analysis. For instance, India, Israel, and Pakistan could be brought into the disarmament process through a de-alerting process and ratification of the CTBT. Once the short-term objectives are accomplished, much or most of the framework for complete elimination of existing nuclear arsenals would be in place. Then it will be possible to attain a nuclear weapons convention that will allow trust to grow as disarmament proceeds, rather than the mistrust and instability that characterize the present arms reduction process as it is actually evolving. At the present time it is even unclear whether one should demand a new treaty or whether it would be better to demand an amendment to the NPT. This will depend in part on the evolution of the NPT review process.

Finally, enduring nuclear disarmament includes the goal of preventing a reversion to a nuclear-armed state after existing arsenals have been eliminated. This will be at least as difficult to achieve as the elimination of existing arsenals. It requires the nuclear disarmament movement, the nuclear weapons states, other governments, and the public at large to address the underlying moral issues. Specifically, it means that nuclear retaliation must be ruled out under all circumstances, including as a response to nuclear weapons use, as part of the process of agreeing to the elimination of nuclear weapons. Only with advance agreement regarding non-retaliation will it be possible to get a treaty that will provide for the actual elimination of production, design, and testing capabilities, and the conversion of all weapons-usable nuclear materials into non-weapons-usable forms. Without addressing the moral and strategic issues underlying nuclear retaliation, it will most likely be impossible to assemble the coalition needed to get a nuclear weapons convention, much less to actually get a sound treaty or to achieve enduring nuclear disarmament.

The program discussed above does not explicitly address many of the links to other struggles that will need to be made for ensuring the durability of the elimination of nuclear arsenals. For instance, the use of nuclear power does not, in the short-term, conflict with the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons. But it does increase the likelihood of reversion of nuclear weapons in a time of crisis. It also increases mistrust and conflict, as demonstrated by the present US-Russian disputes over Russia's sales of a nuclear reactor to Iran (which is in compliance with IAEA safeguards) and the US agreement to provide North Korea (which is not in compliance with

IAEA safeguards) with a nuclear reactor. A discussion about these links is needed as the disarmament movement attempts to accomplish its short-term objectives, so that the links to other movements and struggles can be effectively made.

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

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

To: Bill Robinson <brobinson@ploughshares.ca>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Churches and NATO review  
Cc: "Rudiger Noll" <rud@wcc-coe.org>, "Dwain Epps" <dce@wcc-coe.org>, "Salpy Eskidjian" <sal@wcc-coe.org>, "Ernie Regehr" <eregehr@ploughshares.ca>  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 11:50 AM 2/5/99 -0500, Bill Robinson wrote:

>Hi, Howard.

>

>Thanks for sending us the information on the work you have been doing.

>We have also been in touch with Salpy Eskidjian and Rudiger Noll over

>the past couple of weeks (and more recently with Paul Wilson), and we

>have now sent our formal proposal to those three.

>I have appended a copy of that letter, and our first shot at a draft

>statement, to this note.

>

>Any comments, suggestions for how to proceed, etc that you may have

>would be gratefully received.....

Dear Bill:

Thanks for sending me information about your initiative regarding NATO's strategic concept review. I'm glad you're doing it. From the last time we corresponded I gained the impression that you wouldn't be moving so soon. That's why I drafted what I did. It's much better for the initiative to come from an official body like the Canadian Council of Churches than from an unofficial group like ours. But I would like to offer comments and help as I can.

Most of all, I urge you to be bolder. Until last spring I was an advocate of no-first-use as an interim policy. I included it in statement I drafted that was issued by Dr. Konrad Raiser and Godfried Cardinal Danneels to delegates of the 1998 NPT Preparatory Committee meeting. But in discussion during that session in Geneva I came to realize that no-first-use retains the option of second use, often in swift retaliation. Therefore, I am advocating no-use under any circumstance. This is the posture that I believe the religious community should take. I hope that you will consider this in your next draft.

I also suggest that you provide a strong underpinning of religious and moral values in your statement. Religious people need to speak loudly and clearly on the inherent evil of nuclear weapons. This element was part of the Raiser-Danneels statement and is contained in my draft on NATO.

As to NATO, a major challenge is to take away the hegemony under U.S. domination. The non-nuclear states of NATO should no longer agree to support the nuclear policies of the U.S., UK, and France. It is not in their self-interest to be under the nuclear umbrella, for it makes them much more subject to attack by Russia while not offering them any true help in defense. There was a small crack in this hegemony at the UN in November and December when many NATO states abstained on the New Coalition Agenda resolution, much to the chagrin of the United States. Churches should strongly advocate total withdrawal by the NATO non-nuclear weapon states from today's NATO nuclear policy.

This won't end the foolhardiness of the U.S., UK, and France believing that nuclear weapons have a utility, but it will help isolate them. We will use other ways to get the nuclear weapons states to move to nuclear disarmament.

Another matter is that six NATO states are in effect surrogate nuclear weapon states because they allow U.S. nuclear warheads to be based on their soil and have personnel trained to participate in use of nuclear weapons. They are the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Greece, and Turkey. I didn't attempt to deal with them in my draft statement, but one objective of a religious coalition should be to rally churches in these six states to demand that their governments

withdraw from the present arrangement and rid their soil of nuclear weapons.

As you rally support, you may be interested in the signers of the Raiser-Danneels statement, who we enlisted in a three-week period. I'm faxing the list to you along with the statement.

Beyond your contacts through official church circles, there are a number of European religious activists who can help get the official church bodies to go along. I can supply you names or join you in reaching out to them. And don't forget the Catholics. Pope John Paul II is an abolitionist. The Holy See might be willing to issue a parallel statement. In Europe some of the national conferences of Catholic bishops might join in signing a religious statement.

Please keep me informed and let me know how I can help further.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
From: Squintyrb@aol.com  
Date: Mon, 8 Feb 1999 13:23:03 EST  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Subject: (abolition-usa) thoughts/fears re: Santa Barbara meeting  
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 KAA15508

I serve on the board of a small grassroots peace organization, North Suburban Peace Initiative, near Chicago. We're one of those few very local, very small shops that has survived the shrinkage of the peace movement. We're not affiliated to a national organization but realize that our efforts are strengthened or weakened by what happens on a nationwide level.

Thanks to being near Chicago, NSPI has the good fortune to work with Kevin Martin at Illinois Peace Action--and I was even involved somewhat with the Chicago meeting for abolition organizers and have seen part of the struggle to get a national abolition campaign up and running.

As things heat up for your big upcoming weekend, I need to express my great fear that this upcoming meeting in Santa Barbara will end as the Chicago and New York meetings have. We, as a movement, desperately need an effective abolition campaign to emerge from this coming weekend. We can't continue to build up the energy for organizational meetings like this and then lose that momentum while waiting for another meeting to be scheduled.

Don't get me wrong, clearly, those meetings were not at all wasted. The Chicago, New York and now Santa Barbara meetings all provide excellent venues for different players to meet each other and build connections that will be critical to the success of any campaign. But despite the strengthened connections, a level of frustration seems to have also been a result of at least the Chicago meeting due to the lack of decisions having been made. Decisions about structure, mission--not even a name has been adopted yet.

On the one hand, this dilemma is the result of a beautiful characteristic of the peace movement--activists are acutely aware that the process is just as important as the end result. And in that concern about the process and the desire not to offend, tough decisions are put off.

On the other hand--if we do not make the difficult decisions and create a unified voice for the abolition movement, we are missing a fantastic opportunity to generate a nationwide outcry against nuclear weapons. For those of you in larger organizations, maybe that is not a concern, you will still be able to generate your materials and create an uproar from your own constituents. Even little NSPI will create it's own pocket of outrage but to do so would mean we are missing out on the opportunity to have our members in Chicago's northern suburbs be energized by those in other parts of the country and vice versa.

I'm assuming we all know how important a national campaign is--we all know how entrenched the nuclear weapons complex is--can we dismantle it if we're working separately like we have been?

Plus, by working together I believe we increase our chances of reaching many more than just our dedicated choir members. And considering the graying hairs in our organization, it is critical to reach beyond our current constituents! This is the opportunity to actually meet and pull together the 80% or so of the population that says they support nuclear abolition. Just the thought of the potential is an exciting proposition!!

So what's been holding a national campaign back? Many of you know the answer to this question much better than I do but I'm hoping that in Santa Barbara these obstacles can be overcome. I just hope that whatever egos and obstacles there are, whether they're organizational or individual, they can be overcome to make the hard decisions and come together behind a unified structure and plan.

I'm also hoping that a major point of discussion will be how to reach and energize those outside of our immediate constituencies. How can we capture not just the minds, but the hearts of those who know nuclear weapons need to go? This goes beyond the need for information. Due to excellent work already done on this issue, we already have the forceful arguments and research needed to run a campaign. Valuable information and resources already exist--and are likely to increase now that it appears Warren Buffet has put money towards a think-tank for General Butler.

But unless there is some charisma and energy and spark injected into this campaign--it seems likely we may still get stuck. I don't have the answer on how to do this -- but I do know it'll require us to think outside our boxes. Inspirational examples are out there:

Bob Geldof pulled together rock stars for famine relief;  
The landmines campaign had graphic images to grab us;  
Amnesty has a powerful logo;  
Promise Keepers had preachers and big rallies to energize the masses;  
Britain has Red Nose Day every other year to raise funds in outrageous ways for developing countries;  
the AIDS campaign has their red ribbons.

We can achieve this. Maybe this letter is simply stating the obvious, but this note is my plea for those of you directly taking on this gargantuan task.

In Peace,  
Debby Reelitz-Bell  
50 Sheldon Lane  
Highland Park IL 60035  
(847) 266-1525  
squintyrb@aol.com

-

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.

To: dave, cramey@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Religious Working Group  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Dave and Clayton:

I'm wondering what you think of the future of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear and the list-serve I established? The three of us are listed as co-chairs, but we haven't done anything since the 1998 NPT PrepCom. The list-serve is in active except for an occasional communication from Francis Boyle.

At the moment my time and interests are such that the Religious Working Group is a low priority. I'm finding other ways more fruitful for working within the faith community, such as the Interfaith Group on the CTBT and some informal contacts developed since Geneva last year. I'm not particularly interested in promoting and using the list-serve. The latter costs us \$9 a month to maintain. This isn't much, but if it's not going to be used, I would just as soon discontinue it.

If either or both of you are going to Santa Barbara this weekend, maybe you'll come away with a fresh perspective on the Religious Working Group and the list-serve. If somebody wants to pick up on the Religious Working Group, I'm willing to step aside as a co-convenor. Unless enough people want to use the list-serve, I'm inclined to terminate it.

Please let me know what you think.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Mon, 08 Feb 1999 14:31:36 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: LAWS CTBT Support Committee launched

February 8, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Lawyers Alliance for World Security launches CTBT Support Committee

In an effort to demonstrate the depth and breadth of support for the CTBT among key national leaders, LAWS Director Tom Graham has organized a CTBT Support Committee, chaired by former Reagan administration arms control negotiator Paul Nitze, with a membership consisting of former Senators Mark Hatfield, Nancy Kassebaum, and James J. Exon and former Congressmen Anthony Beilenson and Lee Hamilton.

On February 4, Ambassador Nitze and the LAWS CTBT Support Committee sent a letter to all U.S. Senators urging approval of the CTBT. Further activities will include meetings with key Senators.

A copy of the LAWS CTBT Support Committee's letter is available on the Coalition's Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Site at:

<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/laws0299.htm>>

For further information, contact <[ctbt@laws.org](mailto:ctbt@laws.org)>

- DK

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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>>

---

Return-Path: <roanne@nccusa.org>  
From: Roanne Paterson <roanne@nccusa.org>  
To: "'mupj@igc.org'" <mupj@igc.org>  
Cc: "CAMPBELL Brown Joan (OGS)" <NCCCUSA/NCCNYC/joan@nccusa.org>,  
WILSON Paul <NCCCUSA/NCCNYC/paulw@nccusa.org>,  
"cswlwr@igc.apc.org" <cswlwr@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: NATO nuclear posture  
Date: Mon, 8 Feb 1999 15:33:47 -0500

February 8, 1999

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

Dear Howard:

Thanks you for your initiative on NATO's nuclear posture.

A new Task Force on Global Common Security and NATO is being formed by the NCCC. It's preliminary meeting is scheduled for February 10. I will pass along your material to them for review and counsel on NCCC's participation.

For further contact you should be in touch with Lisa Wright in our Washington office. She will be serving as a staff member of the new Task Force.

Thanks again.

Regards,

signed "Penny"

The Rev. Dr. Albert M. Pennybacker

C: Joan Brown Campbell  
Paul Wilson  
Lisa Wright

Hallman NATO

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 8 Feb 1999 17:03:54 -0500  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
Importance: Normal  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: The Looming Threat to Disarmament in the U.S. Senate  
To: "Abolition USA" <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>,  
"Abolition 2000" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igce.igc.org id OAA17754  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800

[In the next few weeks, the U.S. Senate, and possibly the House of Representatives, is expected to vote on a bill supporting deployment of a national ballistic missile defense system. While the same legislation was defeated in the Senate last year by one vote, the Senate Republican leadership believes they can win this year. Below is a brief analysis of why this issue is critical to further nuclear disarmament progress. David Culp<dculp@igc.org>]

-----  
**GOING UP THE HILL AND DOWN AGAIN:  
WHY THE ADMINISTRATION'S DECISION ON MISSILE DEFENSE  
IS A GENUINE CRISIS FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT**

By Jonathan Dean  
Union of Concerned Scientists  
Washington, D.C.  
February 4, 1999

Many people believe that deployment of nationwide missile defenses will have negative impact on prospects for nuclear disarmament. That's true. But there is an even more difficult problem: How do you get out of the mess once deployment has actually taken place?

The plans of the Clinton administration announced by Secretary of Defense Cohen on January 20 to proceed with preparations for deployment of a nationwide missile defense system by 2005 mean that the administration may well decide by mid-2000 on the deployment of a "thin" defense in two sites, necessitating extensive renegotiation with Russia on the ABM Treaty -- or U.S. withdrawal from the treaty.

The nearly certain result of missile defense deployment in the United States will be to freeze nuclear arsenals at their present or higher levels for decades to come, postponing deep cuts in nuclear weapons and blocking a stage where complete elimination of nuclear weapons can be seriously discussed.

These highly probable results of deployment mean that those interested in nuclear disarmament should join in strong opposition to deployment of missile defenses.

## Background

Faced by these developments in U.S. policy, in the long run, Russia may agree to amend the ABM Treaty to permit two U.S. sites, as was the case with the original version of the treaty; Russia has a continuing interest in limiting the scope of United States missile defenses. But in return, Russia will also very probably require U.S. acquiescence in maintaining the Russian arsenal at around the 2,000 warhead level, rather than going down to the 1,000 warhead level that has been urged by many Russians. The 2,000 warhead level will be retained to assure Russia that it can still overcome a "thin" nationwide defense. Russia will in turn argue that multiple warheads (MIRVs) be retained in order to enable Russia to maintain a 2,000 warhead level without having to spend a great deal of money in constructing new single warhead "Topol M" missiles. (To do this, SS-19 multiple warhead missiles or even some of the heavy, dreaded SS-18 multiple warhead missiles would be retained in service until a new generation of Topol M multiple warhead missiles can be constructed and deployed.)

If these developments take place, the hope of reducing U.S. and Russian holdings of strategic-range missiles down to about 1,000 each in a few years through a START III Treaty and then bringing the other weapon states into negotiated reductions will have to be postponed indefinitely. China, which has repeatedly criticized the missile defense project, will probably decide to increase the size of its own nuclear arsenal in order to be able to surmount U.S. missile defenses and to maintain a deterrent. It may also develop MIRVs for its missiles if Russia retains them.

Once deployed, a "thin" nationwide defense can be fairly rapidly converted into a heavy nationwide defense and there will be continuing political pressure in the U.S. to do so. Fully effective, high capacity nationwide missile defense against all-out missile attack is probably impossible to achieve. Nevertheless, it is likely that other nuclear weapon states will follow worst case analysis and credit the U.S. with high capability. As a result of developments like these, nuclear disarmament will remain in indefinite stasis until some way around this obstacle can be found.

## Can We Get Out of This Situation?

This is how the U.S. will march up the hill. To evaluate the seriousness of the situation, we have to calculate what it may take to march down again on the far side of the hill toward renewed negotiation of deep nuclear cuts.

One way, the easy way, would be for the grossly inflated threat of rogue missile attack on the United States to collapse before U.S. missile defenses are fully deployed, perhaps with the collapse of the North Korean regime and with peaceful Korean reunification, with collapse of the Iranian threat through emergence of a less theocratic

regime and improved U.S.-Iranian relations, as well as with replacement of Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq. Then, the U.S. might return to leadership of incremental nuclear disarmament and regain Russia's interest in deep cuts through the United States' main source of leverage with Russia - money.

A serious nuclear incident, such as an act of nuclear terrorism, might also restore the momentum of nuclear disarmament.

Other than these fortuitous developments, the remaining possibility for restoring momentum to nuclear disarmament is the emergence of a United States or Russian leader who actively presses for disarmament. Prospects here are not very promising now.

In the material sense, what would have to be done to march down the hill is either to dismantle the "thin" nationwide defenses or abandon them unfinished, as was done with the United States Grand Forks site when the ABM Treaty was signed by President Nixon in 1972.

Then, at the height of the cold war, the U.S. and Russia decided that deployment of nationwide defenses would result in increased deployment of offensive missiles. Now, after the cold war has wound down, this argument lacks force. As stated, deployment of a thin system (and apprehension that it could someday become a thick one), will probably freeze current warhead levels in Russia, and may somewhat increase them in China. But if this takes place, it is improbable that the increased nuclear deployments would be so large that they would mobilize opposition public opinion in the U.S. against missile defenses, or even that public opinion would at this stage be intensely interested in the general problem. Some segments of public opinion might be engaged earlier if they understood that the road to nuclear disarmament might be blocked for a long period.)

That is the point. This new situation, and especially the difficulty of reversing missile defense deployment once it has taken place, means that organizations and individuals who support elimination of nuclear weapons will have to become involved in the opposition to deployment of nationwide missile defenses.

## Arguments Against Missile Defense

There are four main arguments against missile defense:

- 1) It is an expensive waste; the equipment thus far has failed its tests and it probably will not work; countermeasures by attackers will make the task of defense much harder.
- 2) The danger of rogue missile attack has been greatly exaggerated. The contention that North Korea could produce a missile which could reach important areas of the U.S. has probably not been exaggerated. What has been exaggerated out of all proportion is the implication that the damage that could be done by one or two North Korean missiles strike is equivalent to the danger to which the U.S. was exposed in

the cold war nuclear confrontation with Russia.

In the cold war, the entire population of the U.S. and Russia and the northern hemisphere were at stake -- and possibly all life on earth in a global winter. With North Korea, we are talking about one or two missiles with a small payload which probably would not hit their targets but which at worst could do damage in one or two restricted sites, leaving the U.S. fully able to retaliate with very strong conventional forces.

The administration should be pressed to give the U.S. public an accurate account of the limited dangers that actually face it from rogue ICBM attacks.

3) Given the current articulation of U.S. military strategy, the United States is itself increasingly dependent on its own missiles, especially cruise missiles, while trumpeting warnings over the dangers of missile proliferation and possible missile attack on the U.S. Consequently, the U.S. has not undertaken measures to control missiles beyond the Missile Control Technology Regime, whose members are missile-producing governments.

The administration should now be pressed to move step-by-step toward a worldwide regime restricting production, possession and deployment of long-range ballistic missiles for military purposes. One proposal is discussed in Jonathan Dean, "Controlling Ballistic and Cruise Missiles," *Disarmament Diplomacy*, Issue 31, October 1998.

4) Because the great damage from deploying missile defenses is to intensify competition in nuclear weapons, one possible way of mitigating the damage is to insist on maintenance of the ABM Treaty so that deployment of missile defenses can at least be limited rather than be allowed to develop into all-out competition.

Beyond this, it is argued by some that the safest way to move toward nuclear disarmament is to build missile defenses and then to agree on step-by-step nuclear disarmament, replacing deterrence with defense. Such defenses would not protect against attack by aircraft, cruise missiles, land-based rockets and artillery or terrorist action, all of which are more plausible than seriously damaging long-range missile attack or deal with other motives of the weaker states for retaining their weapons. Moreover, agreement to replace deterrence with defense would require the full trust among weapon states from the outset that is the hoped-for end result of step-by-step disarmament. It would also probably require a global missile defense system with global and completely standardized defense components available to all states willing to pay for them.

Even so, the U.S. and other rich countries could buy and deploy more defense systems than other countries -- to its potential military advantage. Consequently, there would have to be an agreed maximum limit per country based on some more or less equitable formula of population and area. All of this would not be an easy project and there is reason for real skepticism about this approach.

A more limited variant of this approach, intended to mitigate negative Russian reaction to U.S. deployment of missile defenses, would be for the U.S. to seek Russian agreement to collaborate on the development of missile defenses. The U.S. and Russia agreed in September 1998 to cooperate in warning of missile launches. But this approach would go beyond that limited agreement to require cooperation in the production of actual defenses. It is difficult to believe that such an undertaking could prosper when it comes to exchanging details of interceptor research, or that suspicious Russians would prefer it to maintaining high levels of Russian offensive missiles.

This brief review illustrates the real difficulty under today's conditions of getting rid of a missile defense system -- once it has been deployed -- in order to resume movement toward nuclear disarmament. It therefore makes clear the importance of energetic opposition to the deployment before it takes place.

\*\*\*\*\*

January 26, 1999

John Holum  
Director  
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency  
320 21st Street, NW, Room 5930  
Washington, DC 20451

Dear John Holum,

With many others, I am worried by some major trends in U.S. defense policy over the past few years. I believe that two current, related Administration policies are having extremely negative effects on efforts to block the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The first is the Administration's very energetic effort to make Americans aware of the dangers of attack by "Weapons of Mass Destruction" by rogue countries.

Over the past two or three years, this possible threat has gradually superseded the two-region war strategy as the dominant public justification, not merely of U.S. counterproliferation efforts, but of the U.S. defense budget generally. And because it is more vague and more menacing than the threat posed to U.S. security by a few small countries like Iraq, Iran or North Korea, this threat provides a more convincing public rationale for the U.S. defense posture.

This emphasis on WMD also gives rise, apparently deliberately, to the impression that the current threats to the United States from "Weapons of Mass Destruction" are equal in their gravity to the cold war threat of all-out nuclear war with the Soviet Union. This approach seriously misleads the American public - one indicator is the rising number of biological warfare hoaxes in this country -- and results in a

distortion of policy and diversion of scarce resources from greater threats to U.S. security than missile attacks by rogue states.

In actuality, other than mass nuclear attack by Russia and possibly China, no conceivable "WMD" attack on the United States for the next decade could affect more than one or two sites in the U.S., sites quite possibly not even the target of the attack. We are no longer in a situation where the entire country could be wiped out by a nuclear exchange. In the long term future, biological weapons might create such a possibility, but not now.

There is an enormous difference between a threat of total annihilation and a threat which may entail limited destruction. One major difference is that, in the case of limited attack, the United States would remain able to retaliate with overwhelming force against any known perpetrator. And if we talking of anything other than a covert terrorist attack, the perpetrator would probably be known. Quite aside from the fact that both chemical and biological weapons have considerable limitations; for the next decades, no country in the world except Russia and possibly China has or will have the delivery capability to do more than strike one or two targets in the United States.

Given these facts, the first negative effect of the current overemphasis on the WMD threat is that it diverts attention and resources from the greatest real threat both of possible direct nuclear attack and of proliferation of nuclear materials and knowledge -- the Russian nuclear arsenal. The Russian situation entails the entire range of threats from nuclear weapons, including accidental launch, illicit launch, launch on warning, threats of use, and, under extreme circumstances, deliberate attack. The dangers also include threats of use or actual use in or on the borders of Russia, violent seizure or theft of nuclear components and fissile material, and export of nuclear material and of expert knowledge. Given in particular the uncertain fate of the START process in Russia and the limited influence the Russian government has over the Duma, these risks amount to the most serious current threat to U.S. national security.

In the current economic misery of the Russian government and people, with its bitterness and anti-American feeling and with confused disputes over Russia's security interests, U.S. capacity to provide Russia money for disarmament actions is by far our greatest source of leverage. To meet our biggest genuine defense emergency, we should be willing to spend several times the cost of current Nunn-Lugar programs and to devise new ones to meet this threat more adequately. In other words, instead of spending \$12 billion additional on force readiness, we should be spending it on buying warhead dismantlement and fissile material from Russia.

Second, the exaggerated focus on possible WMD attack on the U.S. has been accompanied by an Administration policy of deliberate ambiguity on possible retaliatory use of nuclear weapons by the United States, including their possible use in response to chemical or biological

attack. These statements are obviously intended to deter such attack. But, here again, they are dangerous overkill.

I accept that in the event of massive, catastrophic, nationwide chemical or biological attacks on the U.S., any U.S. administration would consider retaliation with any weapon at its disposal, no matter what its stated doctrine on use of nuclear weapons. But we are not talking about such a situation. Only Russia has the delivery means for a nationwide chemical or biological attack and it would be ill-advised in such circumstances to use chemical or biological weapons instead of nuclear weapons. In any event, any form of long-range attack from Russia would presumably be deterred by U.S. second-strike nuclear capability. U.S. nuclear weapons will not be needed if limited biological or chemical attacks occur, nor, for political reasons, is it at all likely that U.S. nuclear weapons would in fact be used in response.

However, deliberate emphasis on the usefulness of nuclear weapons in such a situation is the most powerful advocacy of possession of nuclear weapons heard since the cold war ended. It dangerously undermines nonproliferation goals, first, by greatly increasing the attractions of having nuclear weapons and undermining the norm against any use of nuclear weapons, and second, by frustrating and annoying non-nuclear states which correctly conclude that this policy vitiates U.S. pledges not to use nuclear weapons in NPT negative security assurances and U.S. pledges of non-use in connection with nuclear free zones. This frustration can express itself in increasing support for extreme measures of nuclear abolition, in withholding cooperation for desirable improvements of the non-proliferation regime, and possibly in future demonstrative withdrawal from the NPT to make a political point.

The third negative effect of the overemphasis on the possibility and consequences of WMD attack on the U.S. is that it increases motivation to establish nationwide missile defense and to withdraw from the ABM Treaty. This issue is being widely debated in the United States and there is no consensus over it. However, whatever putative advantages it may have, a U.S. decision to deploy nationwide defenses and withdraw from the ABM Treaty will decrease Russian and Chinese willingness to engage in further steps of nuclear arms control. It could also motivate increases in their nuclear arsenals. As a result, it would perpetuate the risks to U.S. security from existing nuclear weapon arsenals. It would also divert resources from more productive programs and possibilities. For example, other than the MTCR, the administration is doing nothing to tackle the missile problem at the source.

What is needed, instead of current exaggeration of the damage from potential rogue state missile attack on the United States, is for the Administration to put the rogue state problem in perspective with the American public, making clear the wide difference of this threat from the cold war nuclear threat and pointing out that the United States would know where an attack came from, would remain fully capable of response, and would do so with its entire conventional arsenal,

including targeting the decisionmakers involved. This posture would be a more effective deterrent than misleading and damaging threats of nuclear retaliation.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Dean  
Adviser on International Security Issues

Return-Path: <jkstoner@mail.ptd.net>  
Comments: Authenticated sender is <jkstoner@postoffice.ptd.net>  
From: "John K. Stoner" <jkstoner@mail.ptd.net>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Date: Mon, 8 Feb 1999 21:18:38 +0000  
Subject: petition  
Reply-to: jkstoner@ptd.net  
Priority: normal

Dear Howard,

I will promote the CTBT petition through the March 1999 New Call Newsletter. thank you for your work and the invitation and opportunity to be part of this campaign.

John K. Stoner, Coordinator  
New Call to Peacemaking  
PO Box 500  
Akron, PA 17501  
(717)859-1958  
email: jkstoner@ptd.net

To: lintnerj@ucc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: petition  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Jay,

For your information.

Howard

>

Return-Path: <jkstoner@mail.ptd.net>  
>Comments: Authenticated sender is <jkstoner@postoffice.ptd.net>  
>From: "John K. Stoner" <jkstoner@mail.ptd.net>  
>To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
>Date: Mon, 8 Feb 1999 21:18:38 +0000  
>Subject: petition  
>Reply-to: jkstoner@ptd.net  
>Priority: normal

>

>Dear Howard,

> I will promote the CTBT petition through the March 1999 New  
>Call Newsletter. thank you for your work and the invitation and  
>opportunity to be part of this campaign.

>

>John K. Stoner, Coordinator  
>New Call to Peacemaking  
>PO Box 500  
>Akron, PA 17501  
>(717)859-1958  
>email: jkstoner@ptd.net

>

>

To: hipkins  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Membership list  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Jim:

Here is the current membership list in zip code order. At the end I add the names of directors who are on this list, mostly because they haven't contributed financially in the past year, though a couple have. I'm working on corrections.

I'll provide a list of the National Advisory Committee later in the day.

I hope this comes through OK.

Shalom,  
Howard

##

MUPJ Membership February 1999

John A. Moss  
101 Amherst Road  
South Hadley, MA 01075

Nisha Purushothan  
385 Sowans Road  
Barrington, RI 02806

Evelyn Burns  
RFD 1, Box 746  
Norway, ME 04268

Miller A. Wachs  
852 Wilcoxson Avenue  
Stratford, CT 06497

Bert Morris  
76 Mountain Avenue  
Millburn, NJ 07041-2115

George McClain  
76 Clinton Avenue  
Staten Island, NY 10301

Bishop Ernest S. Lyght  
252 Bryant Avenue  
White Plains, NY 10605

George M. Houser  
992 Route 45

Pomona, NY 10970

Bishop Susan M. Morrison  
215 Lancaster Street  
Albany, NY 12210-1131

Rev. Stephen T. Deckard  
135 Brookside Lane  
Fayetteville, NY 13066-1509

Elsie Lewis  
24 W. Street  
Oneonta, NY 13820

Joan D. Overman  
107 Fairview Avenue  
Painted Post, NY 14870-1214

Geraldine B. Heilman  
108 Saint Louis Street, Apt. 5  
Lewisburg, PA 17837

G. Clarke Chapman  
Department of Religion  
Moravian College  
Bethlehem, PA 18018-6650

Kenneth E. Rowe  
6136 Upper Mountain Road  
New Hope, PA 18938

Carol R. Matz  
15 Ash Lane  
Boyertown, PA 19512

Mary B. Kreider  
362 Redding Furnace Road  
Elverson, PA 19520

Donald W. Lyon  
110 Banbury Drive  
Wilmington, DE 19803-2602

Ms. Mary G. White  
24 Matthes Avenue  
Wilmington, DE 19804

Dorothy Beltz  
234 Tuckerman Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20011-1455

Sarah Cadle  
4500 Massachusetts Ave, NW #347  
Washington, DC 20016

Hannah M. Senft  
9616 Aspen Place  
Manassas, VA 20110

John Mathews  
2404 Fairhill Drive  
Suitland, MD 20746

Deborah Schneck  
11319 Commonwealth Drive, #203  
Rockville, MD 20852

Mr. & Mrs. Charles Daggett  
7507 Ferber Place  
Springfield, VA 22151

Pat and Joan Baker  
2713 S. Inge Street  
Arlington, VA 22202

John D. Copenhaver  
215 Laurel Hill Drive  
Stephen City, VA 22655

Anita Billingsley  
P.O. Box 160  
Monterey, VA 24465-0160

Rev. Mary Jo Sims-Baden  
Chapel Office WVMC  
Buckhannon, WV 26201

Constance R. Hicks  
109 Forest Circle  
Murfreesboro, NC 27855

Karen Lee Griffin  
3734 Hayden Drive  
Charlotte, NC 28269

Althea O. Watson  
135 Lakeside Drive  
Ashville, NC 28803

Betty P. Cook  
P.O. Box 1582  
Camden, SC 29020

Margaret Fogle  
Rt 2, Box 230  
Neeses, SC 29107

E. DeVon Ruth

P.O. Box 376  
Prosperity, SC 29127

Joseph W. Alley  
P.O. Box 1705  
Columbia, SC 29202

Dr. Harris Parker  
3537 Raven Hill Road  
Columbia, SC 29204

Bill Belvin  
47 Coronet Drive  
Columbia, SC 29206

Genova McFadden  
121 Willow Oak Drive  
Columbia, SC 29223

Donald Wells  
Sardis Road  
Union, SC 29379

Nena Reynolds  
251 Edgewood Circle  
Woodruff, SC 29388

Abraham B. Jenkins  
1206 Symmes Drive  
Charleston, SC 29407

Roosevelt Geddis  
117 Luetta Lane  
Ridgeville, SC 29472

Angie Sears  
1810 Mars Hill Circle  
Florence, SC 29501

Mary Ann McIver  
P.O. Box 421  
Conway, SC 29527

James E. Stevenson, Sr.  
2169 Gum Circle  
Hartsville, SC 29550

Dr. Samuel B. George, III  
P.O. Box 449  
Johnsville, SC 29555

John A. Redmond  
Box 26  
Greenville, SC 29602

Ms. Ann Bettis  
112 Lake Forest Drive  
Greenville, SC 29609

Ann H. Bettis  
112 Lake Forest Drive  
Greenville, SC 29609

Joyce T. McKenzie  
303 Charing Cross Road  
Taylors, SC 29687

Imogine Steele  
5172 Camp Creek Road  
Lancaster, SC 29720

Dirk Anderson  
1627 Seldon Place  
Rock Hill, SC 29730

Dirk E. Anderson  
1627 Seldon Place  
Rock Hill, SC 29732

Franklin Smalls  
505 Sweat Street  
Walterboro, SC 29812

Helen Woodberry  
410 Jackson Street  
Johnston, SC 29832

Pitts Theology Library  
Emory University  
505 Kilgo Circle  
Atlanta, GA 30322

Ms. Barbara Herjanic  
P.O. Box 248  
Penney Farms, FL 32079

Helen Tittle King  
1143 Woodbrook  
Largo, FL 33770

Elinor Bedell  
1807 Snook Drive  
Naples, FL 34102

Mr. and Mrs. Robert E. Johnson  
3509 Heatherbrooke Court  
Montgomery, AL 36111

Ray Conatser  
4405 Coventry Drive  
Nashville, TN 37211-4505

Bob Coleman  
1502 Edgehill Avenue  
Nashville, TN 37212

Mark S. Womack  
3229 Westonia Drive  
Chattanooga, TN 37412-1361

Carol Green  
411 Belle Meade Drive  
Maryville, TN 37801

Jennifer Skelton  
710 Highway 346  
Rogersville, TN 37857

Charlotte & James Hipkins  
348 Reed School House Road  
Sevierville, TN 37876

Warren & Joan Tropic  
192 Betty Jones Drive  
Lakeside, OH 43440

Margaret A. Duffey  
3519 Devon Hill Road  
Toledo, OH 43606

Mrs. Dora Whipple  
300 Austin St.  
Berea, OH 44017

Thomas Ruth  
6922 North Murray Ridge Road  
Elyria, OH 44038

Jean C. Bowen  
221 Columbus Street  
Elyria, OH 44038

Mrs. Miriam L. Thiel  
35 Ranch Road  
Willoughby, OH 44094-5642

Virginia Goodwin  
1299 Clearview Road  
Cleveland, OH 44124

Betty & Howard Taylor  
32 Fir Hill

Akron, OH 44304-1333

Jean Fagert  
2313 Larchdale Drive  
Cuyahoga Falls, OH 44421-3635

C. Robert Thomas  
228 6th Street, SW  
Strasburg, OH 44680-1210

jes  
Robert E. Airhart  
577 N. St. Route 741, Apt. 405  
Lebanon, OH 45036

Linda Sabin  
3591 Roselawn Drive  
Beavercreek, OH 45430

Ralph C. Jones  
3835 Keswick  
Dayton, OH 45439

Russell P. Valentine  
7355 Hull Road  
Zionsville, IN 46077

Philip & Elaine Amerson  
1019 E. Wylie  
Bloomington, IN 47401

John L. Brown  
10885 N. SR 63  
Perrysville, IN 47974-9702

James L. Rhinesmith  
24399 Berg Road  
Southfield, MI 48034

Richard A. Peacock  
6339 Vernmoor  
Troy, MI 48098

James W. Bristah  
1510 Chateaufort  
Detroit, MI 48207

Henry J. VandenBerg, Jr., MD  
15818 Windmill Pointe Drive  
Grosse Point Park, MI 48230

Mary Fleischmann  
11 Macklin Court  
Saginaw, MI 48602-3358

Joy E. Arthur  
183 Spring Street  
Midland, MI 48640

First United Methodist Church  
315 West Larkin Street, P.O. Box 466  
Midland, MI 48640-0466

Joan and John Chapin  
1566 Maplewood Drive  
Caro, MI 48723

Jeannette Safran  
9822 Sharp Road  
Clifford, MI 48727

George and Lorna Morse  
P.O. Box 189  
Glennig, MI 48737-0189

Rev. Steve Smith  
1400 S. Washington  
Mount Pleasant, MI 48858

Margaret E. Houts  
648 Sugar Bay Lane  
Cedar, MI 49621

Rev. Robert & Muriel Griffin  
P.O. Box 39  
Milton, IA 52570-0039

Rev. Mary Council-Austin  
618 East Second Street  
Fond du Lac, WI 54935

Ms. Nina J. Lang  
700 W. Fabyan Pky, Apt 263D  
Batavia, IL 60510-1291

Frank C. Osterland  
970A Benedetti Drive  
Naperville, IL 60563

Rockford Urban Ministries  
623 Seventh Street  
Rockford, IL 61104

Mildred Gauley Seydel  
909 39th St Ct  
Moline, IL 61265

Margaret E. Hamra

352 Ridgemoor Drive  
Chesterfield, MO 63017-3031

Teri Edwards  
325 Sunnyside, #8  
Festus, MO 63028

Roger N. Jespersen  
8000 Natural Bridge Road  
St. Louis, MO 63121

Bruce Edwards  
Rt 1, Box 242  
Morrison, MO 65061

Robert C. Cook  
2607 Eastwood Drive, Apt. 92  
Columbia, MO 65202

Betty J. Nelson  
4100 Munson  
Topeka, KS 66604

Marileen Johnson  
3026 Paddock Road, #114-A  
Omaha, NE 68124

Ms. Margaret T. St. Amant  
4537 Giibbens Payne Drive  
Baker, LA 70714

Harris D. Copenhaver, Jr.  
9819 Regency Drive  
Baton Rouge, LA 70815

Neil Inman  
7401 Red Fox Trail  
Sport, LA 71129

James Philip Woodland  
2108 Elmwood Street  
Monroe, LA 71201-4506

Dr. Thalia Matherson  
North Texas Conference Sending Servents  
6416 Forest Knoll Trail  
Dallas, TX 75232

Cramer Johnson  
401 State Line Avenue  
Texarkana, TX 75501

Marcie Pollard  
411 Hayden

Carthage, TX 75633

Milton Jordan  
Texas Conference Bd of Church & Society  
P.O. Box 1942  
Marshall, TX 75671

Jeffrey Hastings  
P.O. Box 274  
Panola, TX 75685

Jerry Carpenter  
300 W. Erwin  
Tyler, TX 75702

Mona McShan  
908 Palestine Avenue  
Jacksonville, FL 75766

George Hancock  
P.O. Box 1526  
Quitman, TX 75783

Rev. Milton S. Jordon  
P.O. Box 327  
Buffalo, TX 75831

Dr. Charles M. White  
P.O. Box 218  
Centerville, TX 75833

Ross Poteet  
P.O. Box 412  
Diboll, TX 75941

Jim Ireland  
3600 Montrose, #201  
Houston, TX 77006

Ron Page  
165 West Road  
Houston, TX 77037

Don Waddleton  
4310 Holloway  
Houston, TX 77047

Thomas Hill  
12955 Memorial Drive  
Houston, TX 77079

Rev. W. C. Hall  
Bellville United Methodist Church  
P.O. Box 188

Bellville, TX 77418

Brenda Hardt  
179 Camilla Circle  
Bellville, TX 77418

Bob Sinclair  
P.O. Box 759  
Giddings, TX 77418

Anthony Cecil  
7915 Bayway Drive  
Baytown, TX 77520

Clint Jordan  
P.O. Box 757  
Groves, TX 77619

Florence Isaacs  
P.O. Box 100  
Medina, TX 78055

John Ed. Francis  
7520 E. Harvard Avenue, #102  
Denver, CO 80231

Beth Dear  
4908 Atlantic Drive  
Cheyene, WY 82001

Harold & Ethyl Byrn  
4316 N. 42nd Place  
Phoenix, AZ 85018-4274

Betty Jo Benton  
7550 N. 16th Street, #207-2  
Phoenix, AZ 85020-7604

Jessie Hall  
6949 E. Mesa Grande Drive  
Tucson, AZ 85715

David Buer  
Nevada Desert Experience  
P.O.Box 4487  
Las Vegas, NV 89106

James P. Conn  
230 Pacific, #106  
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Harold W. Wolke  
2613 Knoxville Avenue  
Long Beach, CA 90815-1517

Bob Conger  
10211 Loma Rancho Road  
Spring Valley, CA 92077

Ruth C. Benson  
1278 Agate Street  
San Diego, CA 92109

Joyce E. Georgieff  
2335 N. Park Blvd.  
Santa Ana, CA 92706

Donald M. Fife  
816 South 216th, Apt. 606  
Des Moines, WA 98198-6395

Alfred Dale  
741 Chuckanut Drive  
Bellingham, WA 98226-8983

Mary Fraser  
628 Birch  
Richland, WA 99352

Board members not on above list

Kathleen Brown  
415 Longfellow  
Kirkwood, MO 63122

Rev. Bruce K. Edwards  
Rt 1, Box 242  
Morrison, MO 65061

Howard W. Hallman  
6508 Wilmett Road  
Bethesda, MD 20817

Sherman W. Harris  
11508 Karen Drive  
Potomac, MD 20854

Scott Manning  
1701 N. County Line Road  
Six Lakes, MI 48886

Jayne E. Mardock  
503 Belford Place  
Tacoma Park, MD 20912

Rev. John M. Mecartney  
Nonviolent Action Institute  
O.D. 154, Box 19900

Detroit, MI 48219-0900

Phillip H. Miller  
5122 Cliffhaven Drive  
Annandale, VA 22003

Rev. Schuyler Rhodes  
Wesley Foundation  
2398 Bancroft Way  
Berkeley, CA 94704

Ben Trammell  
12226 Normont  
Houston, TX77070

Donald C. Whitmore  
P.O. Box 1105  
Auburn, WA 98071-1105

Return-Path: <EDBruegge@aol.com>  
From: EDBruegge@aol.com  
Date: Mon, 8 Feb 1999 12:31:29 EST  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Directions to your home

Dear Howard:

We are looking forward to our trip and a visit with you. We await directions to your home. Please note that we will be leaving here on March 5th.

Hope you are both well.

Ed Brueggemann

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: majordomo@lists.xmission.com  
Subject: Welcome to abolition-usa  
Reply-To: majordomo@lists.xmission.com  
Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 14:16:38 -0700

--

Welcome to the abolition-usa mailing list!

Please save this message for future reference. Thank you.

If you ever want to remove yourself from this mailing list,  
send the following command in email to  
<abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com>:

unsubscribe

Or you can send mail to <majordomo@lists.xmission.com> with the following  
command in the body of your email message:

unsubscribe abolition-usa

or from another account, besides mupj@igc.apc.org:

unsubscribe abolition-usa mupj@igc.apc.org

If you ever need to get in contact with the owner of the list,  
(if you have trouble unsubscribing, or have questions about the  
list itself) send email to <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com> .  
This is the general rule for most mailing lists when you need  
to contact a human.

Here's the general information for the list you've subscribed to,  
in case you don't already have it:

## WELCOME TO ABOLITION-USA!

To post to the list, mail to:  
abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

For subscribing, unsubscribing, and so on:  
abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com

## WELCOME TO ABOLITION-USA!

Abolition 2000 was founded in 1995 as a global campaign to eliminate nuclear  
weapons.

PURPOSE OF ABOLITION-USA! "ABOLITION-USA" is a community of  
PURPOSE OF ABOLITION-USA! "ABOLITION-USA" is a list intended to serve the  
community of peace-minded and action-oriented citizens and citizen initiatives

concerned with promoting grassroots action for the abolition of nuclear weapons. This list is intended to help in the coordination and discussion of citizen initiatives in the United States which will change the course of U.S. nuclear policy and enable us to secure a treaty by the year 2000 for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

We invite you to share information about local activities, upcoming events, exemplary actions, political strategies, media strategies, and other ideas which will forward the action and strengthen the network of citizens and grassroots organizations committed to securing a nuclear weapons convention before the next millennium.

**ABOUT ABOLITION 2000:** In April 1995, during the first weeks of the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference, activists from around the world recognized that the issue of nuclear abolition was not on the agenda. Activists met together to write the Abolition 2000 Statement that has become the founding document of the Abolition 2000 Network. Over 1,000 organizations in 76 countries have now signed it and are actively working in ten working groups to accomplish the eleven points listed in it.

Abolition 2000 can be reached at:

<http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>

To view the Abolition statement go to:

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

To see who is participating in the network go to

[http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/organizs\\_index.html](http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/organizs_index.html)

## RESOURCES:

You are also invited to join other listserves of Abolition 2000:

### INTERNATIONAL ABOLITION 2000 CAUCUS

To subscribe to the

International Abolition Caucus e-mail listserv,

send an email message

to: [majordomo@igc.apc.org](mailto:majordomo@igc.apc.org),

leave subject area blank,

write in body of message: `subscribe abolition-caucus youremail@here`

### ABOLITION DAYS WORKING GROUP

To subscribe to the A-days Working Group

e-mail listserv, send an e-mail message

to: [majordomo@xs4all.nl](mailto:majordomo@xs4all.nl),

leave subject area blank,

write in body of message: `subscribe motherearth-a-days youremail@here`

### NATO WORKING GROUP

To subscribe to the

NATO Working Group e-mail listserv,

send an email message

to: [majordomo@igc.org](mailto:majordomo@igc.org),

leave subject area blank,

write in body of message:

`subscribe start3-europenwfz@igc.org youremail@here`

### RELIGIOUS WORKING GROUP

To subscribe to the  
Religious Working Group e-mail listserver,  
contact Howard Hallman  
at [mupj@igc.apc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org)

#### SUPPORT ABOLITION 2000!

Financial contributions for Abolition 2000 network support can be  
wired to us via:

Montecito Bank & Trust, 1000 State Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101 --  
Routing No. ABA - 122 234 783, Account No. 192 036 100  
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123, Santa  
Barbara, CA 93108-2794

We look forward to hearing from you!

Abolition 2000  
Susan Broidy, Coordinator

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 123  
Santa Barbara, California; 93108  
Phone: (805) 965-3443;  
Fax (805) 568-0466;  
e-mail: [a2000@silcom.com](mailto:a2000@silcom.com)  
web-site: <http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/>

\*\*\*\*\*

Sponsored by XMission <http://www.xmission.com>

\*\*\*\*\*

Facilitated by the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

e-mail: [wagingpeace@napf.org](mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org)

web-site: <http://www.wagingpeace.org/>

\*\*\*\*\*

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Mission statement for U.S. campaign  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

I suggest the foundation for the mission statement of the U.S. nuclear abolition campaign should a clear, ringing declaration about the inherent immorality of the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons. A point of departure could be the words that Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, addressed to the delegates to the 1998 meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee. They stated:

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

This could be followed by an unequivocal demand that the United States and other nuclear weapons renounce nuclear weapons and move promptly to the total abolition of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles. Then a pledge to work together for that goal.

Such a straightforward condemnation of nuclear weapons could help galvanize our supporters for action, including hundreds of thousands in the faith community.

With this as the underlying premise, I believe that language about "no first-use" should be excluded from the mission statement. Although I previously included no-first use in listing of steps toward nuclear abolition, I have come to realize that no-first use retains the idea of second use in retaliation. The threat of second use is part of the nuclear deterrence doctrine, which is inherently wrong. Second use by the United States could conceivably occur as rapidly as 20 to 30 minutes after the launching of Russian, Chinese, or North Korean missiles. Moreover, as articulated by Secretary Cohen the U.S. holds in reserve the possibility of using nuclear weapons in response to attack by any weapon of mass destruction, including biological and chemical weapons. That's a perverted notion of second use.

Therefore, I believe that the U.S. nuclear abolition campaign should articulate a policy of no-use of any kind under any circumstance. Although some participating organizations may choose to advocate no-first use as an intermediate step toward nuclear abolition (for we are pluralistic campaign), I believe that the U.S. campaign as a whole should stand firmly for no-use.

Although I won't be attending the meeting in Santa Barbara, I hope it goes well. I hope that a unified campaign will emerge because we need each other in the quest for nuclear abolition.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 13:47:53 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: mupj@pop.igc.org  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) Mission statement for U.S. campaign  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear Colleagues:

I suggest the foundation for the mission statement of the U.S. nuclear abolition campaign should a clear, ringing declaration about the inherent immorality of the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons. A point of departure could be the words that Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, addressed to the delegates to the 1998 meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee. They stated:

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

This could be followed by an unequivocal demand that the United States and other nuclear weapons renounce nuclear weapons and move promptly to the total abolition of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles. Then a pledge to work together for that goal.

Such a straightforward condemnation of nuclear weapons could help galvanize our supporters for action, including hundreds of thousands in the faith community.

With this as the underlying premise, I believe that language about "no first-use" should be excluded from the mission statement. Although I previously included no-first use in listing of steps toward nuclear abolition, I have come to realize that no-first use retains the idea of second use in retaliation. The threat of second use is part of the nuclear deterrence doctrine, which is inherently wrong. Second use by the United States could conceivably occur as rapidly as 20 to 30 minutes after the launching of Russian, Chinese, or North Korean missiles. Moreover, as articulated by Secretary Cohen the U.S. holds in reserve the possibility of using nuclear weapons in response to attack by any weapon of mass destruction, including biological and chemical weapons. That's a perverted notion of second use.

Therefore, I believe that the U.S. nuclear abolition campaign should articulate a policy of no-use of any kind under any circumstance. Although some participating organizations may choose to advocate no-first use as an intermediate step toward nuclear abolition (for we are pluralistic campaign), I believe that the U.S. campaign as a whole should stand firmly

for no-use.

Although I won't be attending the meeting in Santa Barbara, I hope it goes well. I hope that a unified campaign will emerge because we need each other in the quest for nuclear abolition.

Shalom,  
Howard

-

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: <a2000@silcom.com>  
Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 14:14:27 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: a2000@mail.silcom.com  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <a2000@silcom.com>  
Subject: Abolition USA listserv

Hello Howard:

I saw your message posted to the abolition USA listserv and wondered how you got it to work, just in case I have to trouble-shoot any other problems.

Lori

To: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <a2000@silcom.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Abolition USA listserve  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 02:14 PM 2/10/99 -0800, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation wrote:

>Hello Howard:

>I saw your message posted to the abolition USA listserve and wondered how  
>you got it to work, just in case I have to trouble-shoot any other problems.

>

>Lori

>

>Lori,

I followed your suggestion and subscribed as mupj@igc.apc.org, which is my address for outgoing mail. That's what the Institute for Global Communications gave me originally. I subsequently learned that the "apc" wasn't necessary, so I dropped in giving out my e-mail address. That's apparently how I was subscribed to the abolition USA listserve. After I'm comfortable that I'm established with the "apc" address, I'll unsubscribe the address without it.

Thanks for your help,  
Howard

>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>

From: Harry Rogers <cprcrogers@mindspring.com>

To: "'abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com"  
<abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>,  
"'wslf@igc.org"  
<wslf@igc.org>

Subject: (abolition-usa) abolition meeting

Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 08:03:15 -0800

Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

I am writing for the first time to the list because I am hopeful that from Santa Barbara will come a campaign that will recognize the significant work that has been done by the Abolition 2000 campaign around the world. I hope unlike our government that we recognize the United States should not arrogantly dictate to others the terms and conditions of an abolition campaign but rather add our voices and efforts to one that has already made significant progress toward raising awareness and consciences of its necessity. I reaffirm the commitment we made more than a year ago to the principles expressed in the Abolition 2000 statement. I regret I will not be in Santa Barbara with you and trust that your discussions will include the southeast in your planning. We remain disappointed in the lack of followup in previous plannings especially the Reaping What We Sow conference in Oct 97 where we sent a representative at what was a big expense for a small organization such as ours. I have spoken with Alice Slater of GRACE and Jackie Cabasso of WSLF and share their vision of the directions abolition campaigns should take. Please find a place for the Carolina Peace Resource Center at the table.

Harry Rogers

Nuclear Issues Coordinator

Carolina Peace Resource Center

305 South Saluda Ave. 29205

Tel 803-252-2221

Fax 803-252-3832

Email cprcrogers@mindspring.com

-

To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com" with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.

For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send "help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
X-Authentication-Warning: alpha.matrixinet.com: pm10-15.sba1.avtel.net [207.71.237.165] didn't use HELO protocol  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com  
Date: Wed, 10 Feb 1999 18:01:52 -0800  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) Thoughts on Strategy  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear Friends,

Here are a some thoughts on principles related to strategy for a U.S. Abolition Campaign.

1. It should be focused on the goal of abolition and on specific steps along the way (de-alerting, No First Use, no further deployment of missile defense, CTBT ratification, etc). We must be careful and clear about not confusing any one step toward the goal with the goal itself.
2. It should be multi-layered, aimed at both decision-makers, the media, and the public. All efforts should be aimed at particular outcomes that are synergistic. For example, the public should be asked to press decision-makers for specific outcomes.
3. It should be segmentable so that different groups in the campaign can take responsibility for accomplishing clearly defined sub-goals within the campaign.
4. It should have agreed upon symbols and slogans for a large PR campaign.
5. It should have high profile military, political and celebrity spokespersons capable of getting the message out to the country as a whole.
6. It should be so compelling that even politicians and policy-makers will not be able to hold back the public demand for this progress on abolition.
7. It should try to forge links with political leaders and supportive countries as the landmines campaign did so successfully.

David Krieger

\*\*\*\*\*  
NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION  
International contact for Abolition 2000  
a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons  
\*\*\*\*\*  
1187 Coast Village Road, Box 121  
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 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: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1999 08:55:31 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Contributions  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

Last night I picked up checks from Carol R. Matz (\$15) and Mary Council-Austin (\$50) and will deposit the \$65 today to our Education Fund. Their membership forms are still in the box for you. The contributions could have gone into the general fund but that's where we intend to put the next Ploughshares grant.

This increases our Education Fund balance to \$888.51.

Phil

## MEMO

To: Santa Barbara abolition campaign participants and diversity builders  
From: Clayton Ramey, Disarmament Program Coordinator, FOR  
( e-mail: <crramey@igc.org> Tel: (914) 358-4601 Fax 358-4924  
Date: February 10, 1999

Re: Some personal observations and ideas for building a broader, more inclusive, and more mutual nuclear abolition campaign in the USA

Although I won't be able to join you this weekend in California, I'm keenly interested in the shape of our agenda and our discourse on the issue of nuclear abolition. I'm even more concerned that the communities whose voices aren't fully represented in the discussion- Third World people(s) and poor folk- have a significant " place at the table" that both influences our discussion and helps to build a campaign that addressed our own diverse concerns.

Clearly, the current configuration of nuclear abolition advocates doesn't represent the racial, ethnic, and/or class diversity of the USA population. ( I, for example, was the only Africanamerican who attended the October 9 abolition gathering in Chicago, and I didn't see, or couldn't identify, any Latino/a activists there either) Most identifiable abolition activists are middle-upper middle class white people, with the exception usually being some Native people who have organized successfully, especially against nuclear testing on Native land ( which is all of the Americas, in fact). Moreover, I'd venture to guess that nuclear issues don't show up on the agendas of major activist groups in communities of color, or at least in organizations that I can identify in the national Africanamerican community. A friend of mine, without sarcasm, told me once that Black people would deal with nuclear weapons once the problems of unemployment, substandard housing, corporate racism, e!

cono

mic deprivation, failed schools, police violence, crime, and drugs were out of the way.

I suspect that the abolition issue is not a high social or political priority for Third World peoples and organizations because, among other reasons

White abolition leaders and organizers have avoided building mutuality with Third World and working class people and organizations, leading those communities and organization to look at the abolition issue as a "white" and "elitist" thing

Abolition organizations generally lack critical masses of Third World-working class people in leadership positions who "push" the issue in a more inclusive, democratic way

Real information of the social cost of the nuclear age isn't known to, or has not been shared with, opinion shapers and policy makers in our communities, especially those with influence in media, religious, and public policy circles.

But nuclear abolition is an important issue- not just for the handful of people of color and working class folks who actually work on the issue, but to our broader constituents, too: not just because nuclear weapons are equal opportunity mass killers, but because the nuclear infrastructure itself

had been maintained to our disproportional detriment ( and as our Western Shoshone brothers and sisters can testify, at the cause of our disproportional death and sickness).

At the clear risk of overstating the obvious, I maintain here that what is needed is a broad, popular abolition campaign that not only speaks truth to power, but that speaks it in a language and style that can capture and ignite our imaginations and address our real concerns not only for nuclear abolition, but for racial and economic justice as well.

#### SOME IDEAS FOR ABOLITION CAMPAIGN DEVELOPMENT WITHIN AND CONNECTED TO THIRD WORLD PEOPLES AND ORGANIZATIONS

1. Let's make creative use of the Abolition 2000 Resolution for Municipalities. I think that this resolution is a potentially powerful tool for putting the resolution before broader, more numerous constituencies. Remember, town/city councils in North American cities like Philadelphia, Trenton, New Jersey, and Pittsburgh have passed versions of the resolution, as well as dozens of towns and cities in the United Kingdom and Australia.

The proliferation of Black and Brown mayors, city managers, and predominantly Third World town councils throughout the United States, as well as "progressive" local governments, might make the revival of a cities campaign in the context of a broader abolition campaign a good thing to work on. ( In this regard, I'm encouraged by the fact the Detroit City Council passed a resolution last year that called for an end to sanctions against Iraq and supported humanitarian relief efforts). We should organize working groups in various towns to develop popular education strategies and support an abolition resolution might support broader coalition-building efforts.

I'm willing to take on some leadership in developing and shaping this initiative, and I encourage some group to emerge from this meeting who could support this strategy possibly by re-drafting the Model Abolition Treaty 2000 resolution for Municipalities and developing appropriate background information for public education and study, and working on strategies for bringing the resolution to

the attention of more town/city councils, especially in cities and towns with large Third World and working class populations

2. Let's translate Abolition campaign materials into other languages ( Spanish comes to mind immediately), and writing styles. I remember. a successful campaign, some years ago, to get inner-city women to go for free screenings for breast and colon cancer at Harlem Hospital in New York City. One of the key ingredients in the information hand-outs was the fact that stuff was written for people with eighth-grade reading levels. This is not being presumptuous about who can read what, or a what level of "complexity". It does mean, though, that written material that successfully builds mass support for an issue needs to consider that most folks aren't scientists, activists, or scholars.

3. Let's develop a simple, powerful, and compelling piece of writing that makes the issue of nuclear abolition a racial and economic justice issue, too. Perhaps this Santa Barbara group could produce

some people willing to work on this, and maybe produce it in the form of a brochure for mass distribution ( if something like this doesn't already exist. It may).

4. Let's think about community media opportunities, like cable television ( and satellite) broadcasts, writing short pieces for newsletter distribution, Third World-oriented e-mail lists ( like Black Geeks online- no foolin', that's their name), guest columns from Third World abolition activists, trying to get the issue up and running on Black Entertainment Television, etc., etc). The list goes on. But maybe we can start with a strategic brainstorm at Santa Barbara about who in the information-dissemination/media community we might want to reach with compelling information about the imperative for nuclear abolition.

5. We should work on building mutual relationships with more established faith communities, including non-Christian ones. This is something that almost all of us have been talking about. It's pretty self-explanatory, I think.

These are some of my ideas, and not necessarily those of FOR. But I look forward to working with any of you who see potential in developing these ideas in the context of our work to rid the world of nukes! Peace and successful organizing to all.

saved as: C:// sbideas

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1999 17:45:29 -0500

From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility

To: rachel@fcn.org, paexec@igc.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, nbaliga@psr.org, kroberts@psr.org, disarmament@igc.org, kathy@fcn.org, mupj@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, btiller@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org, vision@igc.org, dkimball@clw.org, wandwill@clark.net, ihelfand@igc.org

Subject: Hill briefing on Feb. 19th

I had a good conversation this afternoon with Mark Dooley of Rep. Woolsey's office.

1. He has reserved Cannon 121 for the nuclear weapons briefing at 10:00 AM next Friday. He will look into podium, microphone, etc.

2. He will send out a Dear Colleague to the entire House tomorrow. He will fax a copy to Fran for use by our interns making followup calls.

3. He has lined up Lowell Ungar of Markey's office to speak on Markey's Stockpile Stewardship resolution. Mark will speak on Woolsey's resolution. He will think about whether or not to have a Hill staffer speak on missile defense.

4. He will be the moderator.

5. He said fine to packets of handouts.

6. I told him that we have the following speakers:

-Gordon Clark: missile defense

-Kathy Crandall: statutory requirement for START I levels

-Bob Tiller: slideshow

-Dr. Ira Helfand: de-alerting

I did not tell mention an NGO speaker on Stockpile Stewardship for three reasons: (a) I had not checked with Brad, who was not present when we proposed that he do this, about his willingness to do it. (b) I thought that an NGO speaker on that subject might be duplicative of Lowell Ungar. (c) I got to wondering if we were getting too many speakers. Discuss amongst yourselves -- we can add Brad or someone else on this topic if we wish.

7. Small glitch -- he did not arrange for refreshments, as I thought he was doing. He thought I was doing it. I will try, though time is short and I am leaving town.

I think we are on track for a good event!

Shalom,  
Bob T.

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>  
Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1999 18:07:29 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
CC: rachel@fcn1.org, paexec@igc.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, nbaliga@psr.org,  
kroberts@psr.org, kathy@fcn1.org, mupj@igc.org, paprog@igc.org,  
ledwidge@psr.org, vision@igc.org, dkimball@clw.org, wandwill@clark.net,  
ihelfand@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Hill briefing on Feb. 19th  
References: <36C35D89.7C10@psr.org>

NWWG Folks:

One adjustment to the schedule, a comment, and a reminder:

1) SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENT: Kimberly Robson, WAND will do the START I requirement and otherwise connect military spending issues in a concise, powerful 3 minute presentation - (instead of me)-

2)COMMENT: I share Bob's concern about too many issues, and wonder if we might do better to hold off on other issues like SS, but make it clear we would like to have other briefings, or opportunities to talk to/with staff about things coming up - like SS and the budget. Also, since Ira is coming down from Mass., and doesn't have the same opportunity that we do to speak to staffers, I think we should give him more than 5 minutes, and the slide show -which was requested- is going to be very hard to shorten to just a few minutes. I also think, for various reasons that we discussed this morning, that it would be good not to put too much focus on Star Wars and the House Bill - except to interweave the issues of cost, ineffectiveness etc. in general into the de-alerting and abolition discussion.

2)REMINDER: Please remember to bring a current fact sheet, or other exciting piece of information from your organization to Monday Lobby (which is on Tuesday the 16th) so that I can put them into one cool packet and people won't be overwhelmed by miscellaneous paper

THANKS! GO TEAM!

Bob Tiller wrote:

- > I had a good conversation this afternoon with Mark Dooley of Rep.
- > Woolsey's office.
- >
- > 1. He has reserved Cannon 121 for the nuclear weapons briefing at 10:00
- > AM next Friday. He will look into podium, microphone, etc.
- >
- > 2. He will send out a Dear Colleague to the entire House tomorrow. He
- > will fax a copy to Fran for use by our interns making followup calls.
- >
- > 3. He has lined up Lowell Ungar of Markey's office to speak on Markey's
- > Stockpile Stewardship resolution. Mark will speak on Woolsey's
- > resolution. He will think about whether or not to have a Hill staffer
- > speak on missile defense.

>  
> 4. He will be the moderator.  
>  
> 5. He said fine to packets of handouts.  
>  
> 6. I told him that we have the following speakers:  
> -Gordon Clark: missile defense  
> -Kathy Crandall: statutory requirement for START I levels  
> -Bob Tiller: slideshow  
> -Dr. Ira Helfand: de-alerting  
> I did not tell mention an NGO speaker on Stockpile Stewardship for three  
> reasons: (a) I had not checked with Brad, who was not present when we  
> proposed that he do this, about his willingness to do it. (b) I thought  
> that an NGO speaker on that subject might be duplicative of Lowell  
> Ungar. (c) I got to wondering if we were getting too many speakers.  
> Discuss amongst yourselves -- we can add Brad or someone else on this  
> topic if we wish.  
>  
> 7. Small glitch -- he did not arrange for refreshments, as I thought he  
> was doing. He thought I was doing it. I will try, though time is short  
> and I am leaving town.  
>  
> I think we are on track for a good event!  
>  
> 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 0172  
E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>  
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <paprog>  
Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1999 16:59:29 -0800 (PST)  
From: Fran Teplitz <paprog@igc.apc.org>  
To: btiller@psr.org, disarmament@igc.org  
Subject: Re: Hill briefing on Feb. 19th  
Cc: ctbt@2020vision.org, dkimball@clw.org, ihelfand@igc.org, kathy@fcnl.org,  
kroberts@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org, mupj@igc.org, nbaliga@psr.org,  
paexec@igc.org, rachel@fcnl.org, vision@igc.org, wandwill@clark.net

Everyone's remarks here sound good to me -- and Gordon can keep his remarks to 5 minutes so Ira has more time.

Thanks,  
Fran

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
From: LCNP@aol.com  
Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1999 23:12:00 EST  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) Thoughts on Strategy  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

I agree with mostly with David's suggestions but am cautious about his suggestion on spokespeople. It may be unrealistic to attempt to find spokespeople FOR the Abolition Campaign. While we share some common goals, there are many differing perspectives on how to best achieve those goals and what linkages etc there are. It might not be possible agree on spokespeople to represent us. If that is the case, it would still be possible to have spokespeople who are PART OF the campaign. It would thus be clear that while they can speak in support of the campaign, they are not representing all the groups in it.

I would suggest that survivors of the nuclear weapons cycle (Hibakusha, nuclear industry workers, Downwinders...) be included in the list of spokespeople.

Peace  
Alyn Ware

-

To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com" with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.  
For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send "help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

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

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 09:12:18 -0000

From: "Janet Bloomfield" <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Fw: (Fwd) Nukes and GE-policy

To: <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>

X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host userc253.uk.uudial.com [193.149.95.219] claimed to be jbbloomfieldgn

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 BAB07176

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

From: HAL!otfried (Otfried) <HAL!otfried (Otfried)>

Date: 09 February 1999 13:58

Subject: (Fwd) Nukes and GE-policy

>To: abolition-europe

>Forwarded by: Xanthe Hall

>

>Diese Nachricht ist weitergeleitet von otfried@HAL.UUCP:

>

>

>

>Dear colleagues,

>

>I'd like to to take the opportunity to update you on the

>NW's policy of Germany. Recent events seem to make this useful.

>

>After the initial heated exchange of arguments over the NFU proposal made by

>the German Foreign minister, Joschka Fischer, the debate began to

>calm down. There were lots of speculations, that there would be no

>follow-up. However, the Fischer/Scharping paper distributed to the

>Allies in December had made it clear, that the new German government

>wished to discuss all aspects of NATO's nuclear strategy, whithout

>solely sticking to the NFU proposal. This initiative continues to exist.

>

>During the annual Conference on Security Policy in Munich, held this

>weekend, despite strong US critizism, both Chancelor Gerhard Schröder

>and Foreign Minister Fischer insisted on discussing NATO nuclear

>strategy. Fischer suggested, that during the Summit NATO should

>take the initiative and announce a review of NATO's nuclear strategy

>and thus take the initiative for future steps of nuclear and

>conventional disarmamen as well as strengthening

>WMD-nonproliferation. He did not call for a specific format for such

>a review, however he demanded it should be "open and unprejudiced".

>Chancellor Schröder called the debate "legitime" and said that there

>should not be a taboo, while at the same time saying it was not

>the German intention to make this a major dispute at the Washington

>Summit. Schröder's and Fischer's remarks came despite a Washington

>intervention in the Bonn Chancellory warning that a public debate on

>FU was seen by the US "with substantial concern" and would "proof  
>non-productive and damaging." The intervention came as a reaction to  
>Schröder indicating to the Canadian Prime Minister  
>Chretien, that he was backing Fischer's proposal to discuss NFU.  
>  
>Washington circulated it's intervention among Brussels based NATO  
>diplomats. The paper repeated the US stand and the diplomats were  
>told: "The revised strategic concept should not change the nuclear  
doctrine.  
>We hope you agree". They should be aware of "strong opposition to  
>repeal NATO nuclear policy".  
>  
>US Secretary of Defense used the Munich conference, to sharply reject any  
>calls for a discussion. He stipulated the German proposal a "serious  
>mistake", endangering the security of the Alliance. Furthermore he  
>repeated his call to widen the role of nuclear weapons in NATO's  
>strategy by saying: "It is my firm belief that the best hope for  
>protecting ourselves against those who would unleash weapons  
>of mass destruction, be they nuclear, biological or chemical, is  
>to reserve the right to respond to such attacks with any means  
>at our disposal," Cohen said. "Any question about that policy  
>undermines our deterrent capability. I think we have to make that  
>very clear to all who would contemplate unleashing any sort of a  
>weapon of mass destruction on the alliance."  
>  
>Cohen again did not mention, that NATO does not yet foresee a role  
>for nuclear weapons in offensive counterproliferation. As recent  
>as during NATO's December 1998 Defense Ministerials, when NATO  
>discussed the ministerial guidance for NATO's future force goals,  
countering the  
>threat of WMD has been put under the headline of developing  
>conventional force capabilities, not nuclear forces. According to NATO  
>officials no requirement was agreed that could be interpreted as  
>encouraging the development of a role for nuclear weapons in  
>counterproliferation.  
>  
>Greetings Otfried  
>

To: lwright@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Nukes and German policy  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Lisa;

Since you are now working on NATO policies, you may be interested in this message about German policy on nuclear weapons and a statement by Secretary Cohen on this subject.

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

>From: HAL!otfried (Otfried) <HAL!otfried (Otfried)>

>Date: 09 February 1999 13:58

>Subject: (Fwd) Nukes and GE-policy

>

>

>>To: abolition-europe

>>Forwarded by: Xanthe Hall

>>

>>Diese Nachricht ist weitergeleitet von otfried@HAL.UUCP:

>>

>>

>>

>>Dear colleagues,

>>

>>I'd like to to take the opportunity to update you on the

>>NW's policy of Germany. Recent events seem to make this useful.

>>

>>After the initial heated exchange of arguments over the NFU proposal made

>by

>>the German Foreign minister, Joschka Fischer, the debate began to

>>calm down. There were lots of speculations, that there would be no

>>follow-up. However, the Fischer/Scharping paper distributed to the

>>Allies in December had made it clear, that the new German government

>>wished to discuss all aspects of NATO's nuclear strategy, without

>>solely sticking to the NFU proposal. This initiative continues to exist.

>>

>>During the annual Conference on Security Policy in Munich, held this

>>weekend, despite strong US criticism, both Chancellor Gerhard Schröder

>>and Foreign Minister Fischer insisted on discussing NATO nuclear

>>strategy. Fischer suggested, that during the Summit NATO should

>>take the initiative and announce a review of NATO's nuclear strategy

>>and thus take the initiative for future steps of nuclear and

>>conventional disarmament as well as strengthening

>>WMD-nonproliferation. He did not call for a specific format for such

>>a review, however he demanded it should be "open and unprejudiced".

>>Chancellor Schröder called the debate "legitimate" and said that there

>>should not be a taboo, while at the same time saying it was not

>>the German intention to make this a major dispute at the Washington

>>Summit. Schröder's and Fischer's remarks came despite a Washington

>>intervention in the Bonn Chancellory warning that a public debate on  
>>FU was seen by the US "with substantial concern" and would "proof  
>>non-productive and damaging." The intervention came as a reaction to  
>>Schröder indicating to the Canadian Prime Minister  
>>Chretien, that he was backing Fischer's proposal to discuss NFU.

>>  
>>Washington circulated it's intervention among Brussels based NATO  
>>diplomats. The paper repeated the US stand and the diplomats were  
>>told: "The revised strategic concept should not change the nuclear  
>doctrine.

>>We hope you agree". They should be aware of "strong opposition to  
>>repeal NATO nuclear policy".

>>  
>>US Secretary of Defense used the Munich conference, to sharply reject any  
>>calls for a discussion. He stipulated the German proposal a "serious  
>>mistake", endangering the security of the Alliance. Furthermore he  
>>repeated his call to widen the role of nuclear weapons in NATO's  
>>strategy by saying: "It is my firm belief that the best hope for  
>>protecting ourselves against those who would unleash weapons  
>>of mass destruction, be they nuclear, biological or chemical, is  
>>to reserve the right to respond to such attacks with any means  
>>at our disposal," Cohen said. "Any question about that policy  
>>undermines our deterrent capability. I think we have to make that  
>>very clear to all who would contemplate unleashing any sort of a  
>>weapon of mass destruction on the alliance."

>>  
>>Cohen again did not mention, that NATO does not yet foresee a role  
>>for nuclear weapons in offensive counterproliferation. As recent  
>>as during NATO's December 1998 Defense Ministerials, when NATO  
>>discussed the ministerial guidance for NATO's future force goals,  
>countering the  
>>threat of WMD has been put under the headline of developing  
>>conventional force capabilities, not nuclear forces. According to NATO  
>>officials no requirement was agreed that could be interpreted as  
>>encouraging the development of a role for nuclear weapons in  
>>counterproliferation.

>>  
>>Greetings Otfried

>>  
>  
>

Return-Path: <DeesOffice@aol.com>  
From: DeesOffice@aol.com  
Date: Tue, 9 Feb 1999 00:40:47 EST  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Petition for Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Attn: Howard W. Hallman

I am writing to you on behalf of the Peace with Justice Ministry Team from La Mesa First United Methodist Church. We discussed having copies of the Interfaith Petition for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty for members of our congregation to sign in a few weeks. We were wondering if there is a local contact that we can work with? (La Mesa is near San Diego, CA) Also, is there anywhere that I can get more information on this issue that I can pass on to our group?

Thanks, Dee Baraw

By the way we had a question come out of our meeting... As we read the background section of the petition, we noticed it said there are 44 nuclear-capable countries. Is there a list of all 44 countries?

To: DeesOffice@aol.com, mupj@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Petition for Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 12:40 AM 2/9/99 EST, DeesOffice@aol.com wrote:

>Attn: Howard W. Hallman

>

>I am writing to you on behalf of the Peace with Justice Ministry Team from La  
>Mesa First United Methodist Church. We discussed having copies of the  
>Interfaith Petition for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty for members of our  
>congregation to sign in a few weeks. We were wondering if there is a local  
>contact that we can work with? (La Mesa is near San Diego, CA) Also, is  
>there anywhere that I can get more information on this issue that I can pass  
>on to our group?

>Thanks, Dee Baraw

>By the way we had a question come out of our meeting... As we read the  
>background section of the petition, we noticed it said there are 44 nuclear-  
>capable countries. Is there a list of all 44 countries?

>

>

Dear Friend:

I'm pleased to hear that you are circulating the interfaith CTBT petition in your church. I can't suggest a specific local contact for you to work with. The Interfaith Group for the CTBT is developing state contacts which will be posted on the web page of the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs -- [www.loga.org](http://www.loga.org) -- by February 17. It may have a California contact. Because Senator Feinstein is on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, you may want to urge her to press for public hearings on the CTBT, which Chairman Helms is now blocking.

There is a lot of background information on the CTBT on the web site of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers: [www.crnd.org](http://www.crnd.org). This includes a list of the 44 nuclear-capable countries and the states that have ratified the treaty.

If I can provide further information, please let me know.

Shalom,  
Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 08:22:03 -0500  
To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, rachel@fcn1.org, paexec@igc.org,  
ctbt@2020vision.org, nbaliga@psr.org, kroberts@psr.org,  
disarmament@igc.org, kathy@fcn1.org, mupj@igc.org, paprog@igc.org,  
btiller@psr.org, ledwidge@psr.org, vision@igc.org, wandwill@clark.net,  
ihelfand@igc.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: Re: Hill briefing on Feb. 19th

Bob and Co.

This has potential ... but why so many topics at one event? Is there any commitment to regularize the sessions from Dooley?

If there is any Hill staffer who can/should speak on missile defense, it should be Todd Stein from Tom Allen's office, who is the most likely to put up some opposition to the Cochran-Inoyue bill.

DK

At 05:45 PM 2/11/99 -0500, Bob Tiller wrote:

>I had a good conversation this afternoon with Mark Dooley of Rep.  
>Woolsey's office.  
>  
>1. He has reserved Cannon 121 for the nuclear weapons briefing at 10:00  
>AM next Friday. He will look into podium, microphone, etc.  
>  
>2. He will send out a Dear Colleague to the entire House tomorrow. He  
>will fax a copy to Fran for use by our interns making followup calls.  
>  
>3. He has lined up Lowell Ungar of Markey's office to speak on Markey's  
>Stockpile Stewardship resolution. Mark will speak on Woolsey's  
>resolution. He will think about whether or not to have a Hill staffer  
>speak on missile defense.  
>  
>4. He will be the moderator.  
>  
>5. He said fine to packets of handouts.  
>  
>6. I told him that we have the following speakers:  
> -Gordon Clark: missile defense  
> -Kathy Crandall: statutory requirement for START I levels  
> -Bob Tiller: slideshow  
> -Dr. Ira Helfand: de-alerting  
>I did not tell mention an NGO speaker on Stockpile Stewardship for three  
>reasons: (a) I had not checked with Brad, who was not present when we  
>proposed that he do this, about his willingness to do it. (b) I thought

>that an NGO speaker on that subject might be duplicative of Lowell  
>Ungar. (c) I got to wondering if we were getting too many speakers.  
>Discuss amongst yourselves -- we can add Brad or someone else on this  
>topic if we wish.

>  
>7. Small glitch -- he did not arrange for refreshments, as I thought he  
>was doing. He thought I was doing it. I will try, though time is short  
>and I am leaving town.

>  
>I think we are on track for a good event!

>  
>Shalom,  
>Bob T.

>

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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: relctbt  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Interfaith Group for the CTBT meets on February 16  
Cc: ctbt  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT will meet from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, February 16 in the FCNL Conference, 245 Second Street, NE, Washington, D.C. The proposed agenda is as follows:

1. Introductions
2. Interfaith petition
3. Other activities in key states
4. Materials
  - a. 20/20 postcard
  - b. Coalition brochure
5. Media activities
6. Dealing with Clinton Administration
7. Other matters

If you have suggestions for other agenda items, please let me know.

At the meeting discussion of the petition will take the most time. Please be prepared to report on what you have done with the petition and to offer your suggestions for contacts in key states. If you can't attend, will you please send such information in advance of the meeting to Marijke Haworth in the UCC office: e-mail: [jfdc@ucc.org](mailto:jfdc@ucc.org); phone: 202 543-1517; fax: 202 543-5994. If you can't reach her, send me this information by 11:00 a.m., Tuesday, February 19.

For media activities we want to discuss (i) how we can use denominational publications, including conference, regional, and district newspapers, to provide information on the CTBT and gain support for ratification and (ii) how we can reach out to the broader media. There may be funds available for a media consultant who can help implement our ideas.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: Walter\_Owensby@pcusa.org, lwyolton@prodigy.net  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Targeted petitions  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Walter and Bill:

It's been suggested that we try to circulate the interfaith CTBT petition in home churches of key senators. From the list the Presbyterians include Senators Frist (TN), Bond (MO), and Enzi (WY). Do either of you have contacts who could do this?

Shalom,  
Howard

To: Dringler@umc-gbcs.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Targeted petitions  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Robin:

It's been suggested that we try to get the interfaith petition on the CTBT circulated in home churches of key senators. They include the following United Methodists: Lugar (IN), Thomas (WY), Brownback (KS), Roberts (KS). Do you have contacts who could do this?

Shalom,  
Howard

To: mark.brown@ecunet.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Targeted petitions  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Mark:

It's been suggested that we try to get the interfaith CTBT circulated in the home church of key senators. The one Lutheran on the list is Senator Hollings in South Carolina, the one Democrat we are uncertain about. Do you have a contact who could facilitate this?

Shalom,  
Howard

To: epf@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Targeted petitions  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Mary:

It's been suggested that we try to get the interfaith CTBT petition circulated in the home churches of key senators. Episcopalians include Senators Stevens (AK), Warner (VA), Gorton (WA), Hagel (NE), McCain (AZ), and Roth (DE). I've talked with Tom Hart about this. Between the two of you would it be possible to reach out in this manner?

Shalom,  
Howard

To: lintnerj@ucc.org, jpmdc@ucc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Reformed Church joins  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Jay and Marijke:

I have received word that the Office of Social Witness, Reformed Church in America has sent out an action alert and the Interfaith petition on the CTBT to 800 people. The contact is Rev. John Pallberg, minister for social witness; 212 870-3020.

Responding to a suggestion that we try to circulate petitions in home churches of key senators, I have written to Tom Hart, Mary Miller, Robin Ringler, Mark Brown, Walter Owensby, and Bill Yolton and asked them to facilitate this for senators from their denominations. I've talked with Kimberly Robson of WAND, who has a grant to work among Mormons in the West on the CTBT. I'm going to get in touch with Jean Sammon regarding Catholics. I imagine that you are doing the same for Senator Gregg, the UCC on our list.

This leaves four Baptists, two Orthodox, and Senator Campbell, listed as a Native American in UMC's "Register Christian Opinion". Baptists are Senators Lott (MS), Grassley (IA), McConnell (KY), and Thurmon (SC). I'm making contact with people in Mississippi, and maybe they can find somebody to try Lott's church (perhaps a long shot). Grassley is probably an American Baptist, so maybe we could ask the Baptist Peace Fellowship to help us. Orthodox are Senators Snowe (ME) and Abraham (MI). Would you have any ideas for them?

At Tuesday's meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, the petition will be the first subject up for consideration. We'll look to you for leadership in this discussion.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <WOWensby@ctr.pcusa.org>  
Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 13:50:30 -0500  
From: "Walter Owensby" <WOWensby@ctr.pcusa.org>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: [FROM: "HOWARD W. HALLMAN" <MUPJ@IGC.APC.ORG>]! SUBJECT:  
TARGETED PETITIONS

Howard-

We are doing a mailing to all Presbyterian congregations in the 13 states and I believe this will include the home churches of these three senators. So we shouldn't have to do anything special. -- Walt

<<< "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org> 2/12 10:21a >>>

Dear Walter and Bill:

It's been suggested that we try to circulate the interfaith CTBT petition in home churches of key senators. From the list the Presbyterians include Senators Frist (TN), Bond (MO), and Enzi (WY). Do either of you have contacts who could do this?

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

To: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>, "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: E-Mail Addresses  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 12:37 PM 2/12/99 -0500, David Culp wrote:

>Greetings --

>

>A few questions on your mailing list.

David,

You're really picky. But helpful in your way.

>

>1. Who is <jmskipper@aol.com>?

>

JERE SKIPPER REPRESENTS THE EPISCOPAL OFFICE

>2. Who is <GaryP@ctr.pcusa.org>?

GARY PAYTON IS HEAD OF THE PRESBYTERIAN PEACEMAKING OFFICE AT HEADQUARTERS IN LOUISVILLE. HE ASKED TO BE ON THE LIST AT THE OFFICE AND AT HOME

>

>3. Who is <gdpayton@aol.com>?

SAME AS #2.

>

>4. Jean Sammon of NETWORK has her own e-mail address. It is <jsammon@networklobby.org>. The <network@igc.org> e-mail address that you have is a general organization mailbox address.

>

I DIDN'T KNOW OF JEAN'S OWN ADDRESS. I'LL USE IT

>5. What about adding Tom Hart of the Episcopal Church Washington Office? His e-mail address is <tom.hart@ecunet.org>.

I KNOW TOM'S ADDRESS. EARLIER THEY ASK ME TO SEND THINGS TO JERE SKIPPIER.

>

SHALOM,

Howard

>

Return-Path: <epf@peacenet.org>  
Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1999 12:36:32 -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: Targeted petitions

At 08:02 AM 2/12/99 -0800, you wrote:

>It's been suggested that we try to get the interfaith CTBT petition  
>circulated in the home churches of key senators. Episcopalians include  
>Senators Stevens (AK), Warner (VA), Gorton (WA), Hagel (NE), McCain (AZ),  
>and Roth (DE). I've talked with Tom Hart about this. Between the two of  
>you would it be possible to reach out in this manner?

I've planned to do exactly this - altho EPF hasn't got a lot folks in  
Nebraska or Alaska. We have chapters or large clusters of members in  
Arizona, Virginia, and Washington. I've planned for the chapters in  
non-target states to do the petition also, just on general principles. For  
instance, it's making headway in Maryland - where BTW I don't think one  
ought to take Mikulski for granted.

Now that I know Tom Hart and you have talked, Tom and I need to plot, I  
guess. I'm also behind in CTBT work because of organizational stuff and was  
about to send a note that I can only \*hope\* to make it to the Tuesday  
meeting. I'll have to play it a little by ear on Tuesday but will TRY.

Peace and hope,  
Mary

To: "Mary H. Miller" <epf@peacenet.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Targeted petitions  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 12:36 PM 2/12/99 -0800, Mary H. Miller wrote:

>.....I've planned to do exactly this - altho EPF hasn't got a lot folks in  
>Nebraska or Alaska. We have chapters or large clusters of members in  
>Arizona, Virginia, and Washington. I've planned for the chapters in  
>non-target states to do the petition also, just on general principles. For  
>instance, it's making headway in Maryland - where BTW I don't think one  
>ought to take Mikulski for granted.  
>

Mary,

Thanks for your prompt reply. As a resident of Maryland I'm trying to organize a mini-campaign directed at Senator Sarbanes. He's the second ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, so we can ask him to press Senator Helms for hearings. I'll discuss this with you some time.

Tom Hart says that he looks to you for guidance on the CTBT, so please talk with him.

Shalom,  
Howard

>

To: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Bd Meeting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 12:50 AM 2/13/99 -0500, James Hipkins wrote:

>Howard

>

>Did you send Camile Anders a notice for the meeting? I think I gave the  
>address.

>

>Jim,

Yes. It's in the mail.

Howard

To: lwright@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: UK General Slams "Violent" NATO  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Lisa,

Here's another NATO-related article.

H  
oward  
>Subject: UK General Slams "Violent" NATO

>Dear Abolitionists,

>  
>I thought you should see the following report from the UK Guardian  
>newspaper yesterday 12 February 1999. Please note that the General was  
>addressing the prestigious Royal United Services Institute: and in the  
>latest RUSI newsletter his views are implicitly supported by dismissing  
>threatened air strikes against Yugoslavia as "irrelevant". Perhaps HAP  
>should consider inviting him to speak?

>  
>Best wishes,  
>Rob Green  
>Chair, World Court Project UK  
>\* \* \*

>  
>BRITISH GENERAL LAUNCHES ATTACK ON 'VIOLENT' NATO

>  
>By Richard Norton-Taylor [Guardian: 12 February 1999]

>  
>A former British commander of UN forces in Bosnia yesterday accused NATO  
>governments of promoting a "culture of violence" and said their reaction to  
>the Kosovo crisis created a dangerous precedent for future intervention.

>  
>The remarks of General Sir Michael Rose, UN commander in Bosnia in 1994-95,  
>were clearly directed at Britain and the US. He referred specifically to US  
>cruise missile attacks against Iraq, Afghanistan and the Sudan last year in  
>retaliation for terrorist bombings of US embassies in Africa.

>  
>Firing cruise missiles reflected a "false view that intractable political  
>problems could only be solved by military force", Sir Michael said.  
>"Complex human emergencies demand understanding of the conditions rather  
>than solutions from the barrel of a gun."

>  
>He told the Royal United Services Institute that bombing Serbia would not  
>help the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. It would have a negative impact on  
>the Serbs in Bosnia and on Macedonia. Threats of bombing had already led  
>to nationalists being elected in Serbia. The way NATO responded to the  
>Kosovo crisis could be a "dangerous precedent".

>

>Sir Michael welcomed the US agreement to deploy ground troops in Kosovo  
>along with those from Britain and France. They could only go if invited by  
>the Serbs after all sides had signed a peace deal.

>ENDS

>  
>\*\*\*\*\*

>  
>          Commander Robert D Green, Royal Navy (Retired)  
>          Chair, World Court Project UK

>NZ: Disarmament & Security Centre          UK: 2 Chiswick House  
>  PO Box 8390                          High Street  
>  Christchurch                          Twyford  
>  Aotearoa/New Zealand                Berkshire RG10 9AG

>Tel/Fax: (+64) 3 348 1353          Tel/Fax: (+44) 1189 340258

>  
>          Email: [robwcpuk@gn.apc.org](mailto:robwcpuk@gn.apc.org)

>\*\*\*\*\*

>  
>  
>  
>

Return-Path: <lmehall@ibm.net>  
Reply-To: <lmehall@ibm.net>  
From: "LYNETTE MEHALL" <lmehall@ibm.net>  
To: "Howard W Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Thanks for the greeting!  
Date: Mon, 15 Feb 1999 20:45:08 -0600  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

Dear Howard,

Thank you for the greeting! I actually went out and bought a card for you! Duh! I could have saved money by sending it via the computer!

We celebrated birthdays at Mom's house over the weekend. Rick and I drove up along, because Clint had a Bob Dylan concert and Luke had to work.

Rick and Mike went to the Auto Show in Chicago Sunday! Mom is healing and getting around better. She even baked the birthday cake. I will go up again in two weeks. She has so much she can't do just by not being able to bend over. She goes to the doctor in the city tomorrow for an x-ray to see how things are healing!

I hope you have a very happy birthday! I had good weather for mine - 50's! The house is coming along. The first floor is framed up and they were to have started the second today! It is a slow process, but it should pay off in the end! Take Care! Happy 71! Love, Lynette



Return-Path: <dculp@igc.org>  
From: "David Culp" <dculp@igc.org>  
To: "Nuclear Calendar Recipients" <dculp@igc.org>  
Subject: Nuclear Calendar (Updated)  
Date: Tue, 16 Feb 1999 09:23:59 -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 GAA11830

NUCLEAR CALENDAR  
February 16, 1999

This calendar is usually revised only the first Monday of each month. However, the number of changes warranted a mid-month update. The next calendar will be distributed on Monday, March 1. Changes from last month are marked with an asterisk (\*). David Culp, Plutonium Challenge, <dculp@igc.org>.

- Feb. 13-21 House and Senate President's Day recess
- February 15 National Academy of Sciences, Committee on International Security and Arms Control, MOX Assessment Meeting, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
- \*February 16-20 Energy Secretary Bill Richardson visits South Africa
- February 19 French President Jacques Chirac visits Washington
- \*February 20 Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee travels by bus from New Delhi to Lahore, Pakistan and meets with Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif
- February 22 New Mexico Environment Department, public hearing on the opening of WIPP, Santa Fe, N.M. begins (continues on March 15)
- \*Week of Feb. 22 Senate floor vote on the National Missile or March 1 Defense Act of 1999, S. 257 (Cochran-Inouye bill) (estimate)
- \*February 24 Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing on national missile defense policy
- \*February 25 Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, hearing on the Energy Department budget, 9:00 a.m., SD-366 Dirksen
- February 25 House Armed Services Subcommittee on Subcommittee on Research and Development, hearing on ballistic missile defense with Defense Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology Gansler and BMDO director Gen. Lester Lyles testifying, 10 a.m.
- February Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee chairman Frank Murkowski (R-Alaska)

introduces legislation on interim high-level nuclear waste storage (tentative)

- February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office and Chicago Operations Office, contract awarded for MOX disposition of plutonium  
<<http://www.ch.doe.gov/business/mox/mox.htm>>  
(Believed to be to Duke Power Co., Virginia Power Co. and Cogema for processing and burning MOX fuel at the Catawba nuclear power plant near Rock Hill, S.C., the McGuire plant south of Charlotte, N.C., and the North Anna plant near Mineral, Va.)
- February DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office and Chicago Operations Office, contract award for design of the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility at the Savannah River Site (S.C.) (estimate)
- \*February DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) in-tank precipitation process, notice of intent to prepare a supplemental EIS
- February DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Sandia National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide draft EIS
- February DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide final EIS
- February U.S. and Russia begin negotiations on a plutonium disposition agreement
- \*Feb. or March Senate Armed Services Committee, confirmation hearing for Carolyn Huntoon to be DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management (estimate)
- \*Feb. or March Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, confirmation vote on T.J. Glauthier to be Deputy Energy Secretary and Rose Gottemoeller to be DOE Assistant Secretary for Nonproliferation and National Security (estimate)
- \*Feb. or March Senate Foreign Relations Committee, hearing on Rose Gottemoeller to be DOE Assistant Secretary for Nonproliferation and National Security (estimate)
- Feb. or March Senate Governmental Affairs Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, hearing on DOE's stockpile stewardship program (tentative)
- \*Feb. or March President Clinton nominates John Holum as Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security (estimate)
- Feb. or March U.S. District Judge John Garrett Penn holds a hearing in the case N.M. vs. Richardson on motions regarding the opening of WIPP, Washington

- \*Week of March 1 House Armed Services Committee, markup of the National Missile Defense Act of 1999, H.R. 4 (Weldon-Spratt bill) (estimate)
- \*March 1-2 Secretary of State Madeleine Albright visits Beijing
- \*March 2 Senate Budget Committee, hearing on the Defense Department budget with Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre and Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman Gen. Hoge Shelton testifying, 2 p.m.
- \*March 2 Energy Secretary Bill Richardson addresses the National Press Club, 12:30 p.m.
- March 2 Vermont town meetings, resolutions supporting nuclear weapons abolition will be voted at some meetings
- \*March 3 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on the Defense Department budget with Defense Secretary Bill Cohen, Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman Gen. Henry Shelton, and Defense Department Comptroller Bill Lynn testifying, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn
- \*March 3 Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on the Defense Department budget with Deputy Defense Secretary John Hamre testifying, 10 a.m. SD-192 Dirksen
- \*March 3 Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing on theater and ballistic missile defense
- March 3-4 Energy Communities Alliance annual conference, Washington
- \*March 4 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on the Energy Department budget with Energy Secretary Bill Richardson testifying, 10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn
- 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 (target date)
- 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. continues (began on February 22)
- March 16 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on the DOE Environmental Management and Civilian Radioactive Waste Management budgets, 10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn

March 18 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, hearing on the DOE Defense Programs, Fissile Materials Disposition Office, and Nonproliferation and National Security Office budgets, 10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn (closed)

\*March 23-25 Gore-Primakov Commission meeting, Washington

\*March 24 House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on Ballistic Missile Defense Organization budget with BMDO director Gen. Lester Lyles testifying, 10 a.m., H-140 Capitol (closed)

\*March 25 Senate Armed Services Committee, hearing on strategic nuclear forces

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 House Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power, markup of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1999, H.R. 45 (tentative)

\*March House floor action on the National Missile Defense Act of 1999, H.R. 4 (Weldon-Spratt bill) (estimate)

\*March DOE Defense Programs Office, commercial reactor for tritium final EIS

\*March DOE Savannah River Operations Office, accelerator for the production of tritium final EIS

March DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, record of decision in the Los Alamos National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide EIS

\*March DOE Idaho Operations Office, record of decision in the INEEL advanced mixed waste treatment project EIS

\*March DOE Rocky Flats Operations Office, supplemental record of decision in the Rocky Flats (Colo.) plutonium residues and scrub alloy EIS

\*March DOE ships plutonium to Canada's Chalk River, Ont. reactor as a test for use as fuel in Canadian reactors (tentative)

March Russian Duma, possible vote on ratification of START II

\*March or April Senate Armed Services Committee, field hearing on the DOE stockpile stewardship program, Livermore, Calif. area (estimate)

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 14 Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, hearing on Ballistic Missile Defense Organization budget with BMDO director Gen. Lester Lyles testifying, 10 a.m., SD-192 Dirksen
- April 15 Congress completes action on the budget resolution (target date)
- April 20-23 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, Preparatory Commission meeting, Vienna, Austria
- April 22 Earth Day
- April 23-25 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 27 House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Procurement, markup of the defense authorization bill (includes the DOE Defense Programs, Environmental Management, and Nonproliferation) (tentative)
- \*April 28 House Armed Services Committee, markup of the defense authorization bill, 2118 Rayburn (tentative)
- \*April 30 Deadline for DOE to begin removing nuclear waste from INEEL (Idaho)
- April DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL high-level waste and facilities disposition draft EIS
- \*April DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Calif.), National Ignition Facility draft supplemental EIS
- \*April DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, surplus plutonium disposition final EIS
- \*April DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) spent nuclear fuel management final EIS
- \*April DOE Defense Programs Office, record of decision in the commercial reactor for tritium EIS
- \*April 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

- \*April 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.)
- \*April DOE Savannah River Operations Office, record of decision in the accelerator for the production of tritium EIS
- \*April or May Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott meets with Indian Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh to discuss nuclear issues (estimate)
- \*April Chinese Prime Minister Zhu Rongji visits Washington
- \*April or May Possible signing by India and Pakistan of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- Spring House Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on DOE's tritium production program (tentative)
- Spring Tennessee Valley Authority, experimental tritium-producing rods at the Watts Bar Nuclear Plant (Tenn.) removed and shipped to a DOE laboratory for tests
- May 1 Defense Department reports to Congress on counterproliferation programs (22 U.S.C. 2751 note)
- May 1-9 Senate recess (tentative)
- \*May 6 U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, hearing in the case N.M. vs. EPA concerning the license for WIPP
- 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 general elections
- \*May 17-18 European Union foreign ministers meeting (Agenda will include approval of an EU-Pakistan cooperation agreement if Pakistan has committed to joining the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.)
- May 18 25th anniversary of the first Indian nuclear test (1974) at Pokhran, India
- May 28-June 1 House and Senate Memorial Day recess

May 28 First anniversary of the first Pakistani nuclear test near Chagai, Pakistan

\*May DOE Fissile Materials Disposition Office, record of decision in the surplus plutonium disposition EIS

\*May DOE Savannah River Operations Office, record of decision in the Savannah River Site (S.C.) spent nuclear fuel management EIS

\*May Russian Defense Ministry completes consolidation of its nuclear forces into one command

June 1 Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman Jesse Helms' (R-N.C.) deadline for the Clinton Administration to submit the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty protocols

June 6 Tenth 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 Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site (Wash.) solid (radioactive and hazardous) waste program draft EIS

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

June NATO foreign ministers meeting

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

July DOE Albuquerque Operations Office, record of decision in the Sandia National Laboratory (N.M.) site-wide EIS

Summer President Clinton visits India, Pakistan and Bangladesh (estimate)

\*Summer U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command (Huntsville, Ala.), deployment of a National Missile Defense system draft EIS

July-Sept. New Mexico Environment Department issues mixed nuclear waste permit for WIPP (tentative)

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 Oak Ridge Operations Office, Oak Ridge (Tenn.) Transuranic Waste Treatment Facility (Melton Valley), draft EIS

\*August DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) in-tank precipitation process draft supplemental EIS

August DOE Savannah River Operations Office, Savannah River Site (S.C.) high-level waste tank closure draft EIS

\*August DOE Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (Calif.), record of decision in the National Ignition Facility supplemental 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)

Sept. 29-Oct. 1 First Conference of CTBT Ratification States, United Nations, New York or Vienna (tentative)

dates if held in New York; October 4-6 is also possible; late October if held in Vienna)

- September DOE Idaho Operations Office, INEEL high-level waste and facilities disposition 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 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)
- November 2 Election Day, gubernatorial elections in Kentucky, Louisiana and Mississippi; local elections in other states
- November 9 Tenth anniversary of the DOE Office of Environmental Management
- November 13 25th anniversary of Karen Silkwood's death (Silkwood was a union activist at the Kerr-McGee Cimarron plutonium plant near Crescent, Okla.)
- November 15 Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, summit of heads of state, Istanbul, Turkey
- Nov. 16-18 Sandia National Laboratories, Ninth Annual International Arms Control Conference, Albuquerque, N.M.
- Nov. 16-19 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, Preparatory Commission meeting, Vienna, Austria
- November DOE Idaho Operations Office, record of decision in the INEEL high-level waste and facilities disposition EIS
- December 10 Nobel Peace Prize awarded, Oslo, Norway
- December 19 Russian Duma elections (estimate; exact date in December has not been set)
- \*December DOE Richland Operations Office, Hanford Site

(Wash.), solid (radioactive and hazardous)  
waste program final EIS

\*December U.S.-Russian plutonium disposition agreement  
completed (target date)

2000

January 1 30th anniversary of the National  
Environmental Policy Act

January National Academy of Sciences, Committee on  
International Security and Arms Control,  
final report on plutonium immobilization/MOX  
assessment

\*January DOE Oak Ridge Operations Office, Oak Ridge  
(Tenn.) Transuranic Waste Treatment Facility  
(Melton Valley), final EIS

\*February 7 Iowa presidential caucuses

February 29 New Hampshire presidential primary

\*February DOE Oak Ridge Operations Office, record of  
decision in the Oak Ridge (Tenn.) Transuranic  
Waste Treatment Facility (Melton Valley) EIS

\*February DOE Richland Operations Office, record of  
decision in the Hanford Site (Wash.), solid  
(radioactive and hazardous) waste program

\*February DOE Savannah River Operations Office,  
Savannah River Site (S.C.) in-tank  
precipitation process final supplemental EIS

\*February DOE Savannah River Operations Office,  
Savannah River Site (S.C.) high-level waste  
tank closure final EIS

If you would like to unsubscribe from this list, send an e-mail to David  
Culp <dculp@igc.org>.

Copyright (c) 1999 by Plutonium Challenge. Permission (and encouragement)  
is given to citizens groups to reproduce this calendar. Proper credit is  
appreciated.

Return-Path: <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>  
X-Sender: disarmtimes@pop.igc.org  
Date: Tue, 16 Feb 1999 12:35:26 -0500  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
From: "NGO Comm. on Disarmament" <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: NPT 99/minutes of NGO planning mtg

NGO PLANNING MEETING FOR THE 1999 NPT PREP COM  
6 February 1999, Church Center for the U.N., New York  
(Minutes submitted by Roger Smith, Martin Butcher, Felicity Hill, Brice Friedman)

Meeting called to order at 10:25am Saturday February 6, 1999.

PREPCOM LOGISTICS: The dates of the PrepCom meeting remain up in the air. April 12 -23 is still listed as the scheduled date but may change. The uncertainty around the date greatly complicates efforts to arrange meeting rooms at U.N. headquarters for NGO activities during the PrepCom. It is most likely that NGOs will have one small conference room allotted to them, which probably will have to double as office and meeting room as it did at the 1997 PrepCom. (Our partners in the Secretariat have requested two rooms devoted to NGO use, but say that it will probably be impossible for us to obtain more than one.) The room will be stocked with computers (watch out for viruses!) and a photocopier. The NGO Committee will take responsibility for providing copy paper to NGOs at cost.

It was proposed that the NGO Committee write a letter urgently to the Chairman of the PrepCom, Ambassador Camilo Reyes of Colombia, stationed in Geneva, expressing our request that the dates of the PrepCom meeting be finalized immediately. NGOs involved with the Special NGO Committee for Disarmament in Geneva have scheduled a meeting with Ambassador Reyes.

Because of the difficulties surrounding meeting space, the NGO Committee will investigate the possibilities of reserving meeting rooms in the Church Center across the street from U.N. headquarters. A week-long reservation of the 2nd floor meeting room might be available at a cost of several hundred dollars. Daniel Einbund, Vice President of the New York Nuclear Corporation and a representative of the Uranium Institute, offered offices on the 78th floor of the Empire State Building for use by NGO's during the PrepCom.

Dr. Victor Sidel of IPPNW mentioned his organization's plans to publish a briefing book on the subject of a Nuclear Convention Briefing Book.

#### DISTRIBUTING NGO INFORMATION

The NGO Committee on Disarmament has volunteered to circulate all written literature received before March 1 from NGOs to the NPT delegations (pending the finalized dates of the PrepCom). Material received later can be put on the delegates' desks during the 3-hour session of NGO presentations. It was proposed that the NGO Committee prepare an NGO directory for delegates and press, listing prominent disarmament NGOs likely to be represented at the Prepcom, with brief descriptions of each group's work.

#### PROPOSALS FOR NGO COOPERATION

Several NGOs, including Felicity Hill and Arjun Makhijani, may organize a roundtable briefing for delegates in the Non-Aligned Movement in early March in NY. Alyn Ware suggested preparing the briefing both for NAM and

like-minded states not in the NAM, notably small island states in the Pacific, who also need support and information from NGOs. It was proposed that NGOs work to coordinate and share information about their lobbying efforts, to the extent that they have shared goals.

The group went around the table to discuss objectives for the PrepCom. Among the issues raised were: fulfilling Article VI of the NPT; raising the problems of nuclear sharing arrangements under Articles I and II; enhancing safeguards over nuclear energy; ensuring compliance with treaty obligations in general; pushing the debate within NATO countries towards changes in nuclear strategy; rescuing the viability of the enhanced NPT review process; raising the problems of depleted uranium bullets in one way or another at the PrepCom; dealing with diversions on nuclear materials; protesting U.S. and French laboratory testing as violations of the CTBT. The New Agenda Coalition will play an important role in the PrepCom; the strategy of this coalition may become clearer after a strategy meeting later in the month.

The NGO Committee will arrange an orientation meeting on the Sunday before the PrepCom to brief all who are attending this meeting. Stephanie Fraser, who coordinated such a meeting before the beginning of the 1997 PrepCom, volunteered to share information from her efforts. Arjun Makhijani offered to be a participant in this meeting. Please contact the Committee if you would be interested in helping with this meeting.

## ORAL PRESENTATIONS

It seems highly likely that the PrepCom will grant a single, informal, three-hour meeting in its opening days for the voicing of NGO views. The meeting agreed to follow the precedent of the previous two PrepCom meetings in organizing this session. The meeting agreed to the following guidelines:

- that NGOs prepare no more than twelve oral presentations, all organized around specific themes, plus one concluding presentation;
- that an individual be nominated to serve as "convenor" for each thematic presentation, who will collect input from the widest possible range of interested persons and organizations on the theme, write an initial draft incorporating all the major viewpoints and circulate the initial draft widely, then keep track of responses and incorporate those views into a revised draft. At all times convenors agree not solely to represent the views of their own organizations but of the NGO community as a whole;
- that convenors will not necessarily be presenters;
- that each oral presentation be limited to ten (or at maximum twelve) minutes, roughly two pages written (although a slightly longer written draft could be submitted and edited in delivery);
- that each thematic presentation be drafted to emphasize one, two or three specific points, initiatives or objectives;
- that geographical and linguistic diversity be sought by all possible means in choosing the speakers;
- that individual speakers from the previous year not be invited to deliver presentations this year;
- that copies of the NGO oral presentations from 1998 be made available at the time of this year's session, with mention made that this year's speeches will not repeat the material presented previously;
- that three people should serve as overall coordinators for the presentations, taking responsibility for receiving final drafts and publishing them as a booklet for distribution on the day of the presentations. Martin Butcher (CESD and BASIC) and Roger Smith (NGO

Committee on Disarmament) have agreed to serve in this capacity. Felicity Hill, last year's overall coordinator, offered help only in an advisory role. A third nominee is still desired.

- that the convenors circulate first drafts no later than five weeks before the start of the PrepCom and final drafts about two weeks before. The meeting agreed on the need to have the speeches prepared early, NOT at the last minute. EARLY SUBMISSION OF DRAFTS IS THE ONLY WAY THAT BROAD INPUT CAN BE SOUGHT.

There will be simultaneous translation provided by the U.N. There was a request to have a Russian and French representative among the speakers.

AN INITIAL LIST OF THEMES EMERGED FROM A BRAINSTORM, AND SEVERAL INDIVIDUALS VOLUNTEERED AS CONVENORS. THIS INFORMATION IS INCLUDED BELOW.

#### NGO EVENTS, PANELS ETC.

Very little time was left for discussion of this item. It was stressed that the delay in scheduling the PrepCom will complicate efforts by the NGO Committee and others to secure meeting space in the U.N. for panels and similar events. Several groups and individuals have already announced that they are organizing events and desire for them to be held on specific days. The NGO Committee will keep a running schedule and will endeavor to help all groups that need help finding a suitable venue to hold events. In some cases there might be a cost involved of \$50-200. If your group plans to hold an event in or outside the U.N. during this time, please inform the NGO Committee.

The meeting closed at 3:55.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### NGO Presentations at the NPT PrepCom 1999

The discussion began with a brainstorm of possible topics for the NGO Presentations. The first list below is the results of this brainstorm - all the suggestions both from the meeting and from emails and letters received by the Chair are listed.

The second list you read is the attempt by those present at the meeting to put the brainstorm into a useful format. If there are other formulations or merging of topics that can be suggested by those who were unable to attend the meeting in New York - please forward those suggestions immediately to Roger Smith (disarmtimes@igc.org) or Martin Butcher (cesd@agoranet.be). Possible convenors and co-convenors for a few topics are listed. For many topics there is no convenor. We are calling for convenors to volunteer or be approached to volunteer for the job.

#### The Brainstorm

These are the issues that the meeting felt should be dealt with in the presentations.

- \* Lack of compliance to the treaty - (emphasizing the fragility of the NPT)
- \* CTBT
  - Testing technology, 1999 entry into force conference
  - Lab testing (moratorium essential to implementation to Article VI)

- \*NATO
  - no first use, strategic review, nuclear sharing, out of area issues
- \* Y2K
  - de-alerting
- \*New Agenda Coalition
- \*Nuclear Weapons Convention
- \*Depleted Uranium Weapons
  - new developments in nuclear weaponry, lab testing,
  - space weaponry exploration
- \* Indigenous Perspectives
  - Mining, dumping, environmental contamination
  - Down winders - victims of the nuclear age
- \* Middle East
  - DU, Oil, Iraq
- \*US/Russia
  - START II
- \*conflict in Central Asia
- \*Safeguards
- \*FMCT
- \*Economic cost of nukes
- \*Missile Defences - Space
- \* Spiritual/Moral - Security Beyond Nuclear Deterrence
- \* Inter-sessional Working Group,
  - procedures and possible structures the review conference sets up
- \* South Asia
- \* Warfare in the 21st Century
- \* Environmental & Health Concerns - fuel cycle, DU
- \* Nuclear power, Sustainable energy
- \* Proliferation, Missile proliferation
- \* General and Complete disarmament

It was suggested that possibly we can framework the talks in terms of challenges, and turn the themes into objectives.

\* \* \* \* \*

THE LIST OF SUGGESTED PRESENTATIONS (not in particular order):

1. Focus on the NPT's 2000 Review - the fragility of the NPT, failure of the enhanced review to date, need for compliance, violations (CONVENOR: ARJUN MAKHIJANI)
2. Regional issues: Iraq/Middle East, South Asia, North Korea
3. NATO (CONVENOR, PROJECT ON EUROPEAN NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION NETWORK): NATO Nuclear Strategy Review, No First Use, Pre-emptive Counter-Proliferation
4. Moral/legal/spiritual culture of peace (CONVENOR: WORLD CONFERENCE ON RELIGION AND PEACE)
5. CTBT (CONVENOR: TOM COLLINA)
6. Path to elimination: reductions, de-alerting, Y2K, NWC, NAC

7. US/Russian issues + Safeguards (as these relate primarily to these countries)
8. General and Complete Disarmament, new weaponry, warfare in the 21st century, security concepts beyond deterrence
9. Instruments to multilateralise: NAC, NWC, MPI, Inter-sessional Working Group, CD, 5 + 3 negotiations (CO-CONVENOR: ALYN WARE - NEED A VOLUNTEER HERE AS ALYN WILL NO LONGER BE IN THE U.S.)
10. Indigenous Perspectives, with an emphasis on environment and health (ARJUN WILL HELP WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND HEALTH SCIENCE IF NEEDED)
11. Lab Testing and Nuclear Weapons Development (CONVENOR: LYSIANE ALEZARD)
12. Energy, Article 4, Alternatives
13. Summing up. Daryl Kimball suggests that Martin Butcher presents this having made a summary of the previous 12 speeches. Martin is willing to do this but thinks that if a non-repeat speaker can be found (Martin spoke in 1997), that might be better.

\* \* \* \* \*

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: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Tue, 16 Feb 1999 13:54:10 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Contributions  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

I've deposited today \$25 from Robert D. Conger, 10311 Loma Rancho Drive, Spring Valley, CA 91978 and \$25 from Dirk E. Anderson, 1527 Seldon Place, Rock Hill, SC 29730.

These deposits bring our General Fund balance to \$665.55.

I received the board meeting announcement today. For what its worth, I'm not sure we can afford to fly young people into the meeting unless you know of some material benefits from their participation.

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

At 01:54 PM 2/16/99 -0500, Phillip H. Miller wrote:

>

>I received the board meeting announcement today. For what its worth, I'm  
>not sure we can afford to fly young people into the meeting unless you know  
>of some material benefits from their participation.

>

Phil,

I don't propose flying young people to the board meeting at our expense. Last year their expenses were paid by the UM boards for youth and college students. I'm going to give those boards an opportunity to do so again. If they can't, we would be able to pay the costs.

I've enjoyed the presence of these young people, but we haven't followed through as well as we might. It may be an experiment whose time has passed.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-act-now-napf@lists.xmission.com>

From: owner-act-now-napf@lists.xmission.com

Date: Tue, 16 Feb 1999 13:38:28 -0700

=====  
ACTION ALERT

February 16, 1999  
=====

STOP THE "STAR WARS" BILLS!

Sender: owner-act-now-napf@lists.xmission.com

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: act-now-napf

ISSUE: Although the Senate twice defeated the National Missile Defense Act in 1998, on February 10 the Senate Armed Services Committee endorsed the reintroduced legislation, Cochran-Inouye S.257. It may be introduced before the full Senate during the week of February 22. The House version, sponsored by Representatives Weldon (R-III) and Spratt (D-SC), may be considered in early March.

ACTION: Contact your Senators and Representatives and urge them to vote NO on National Missile Defense ("Star Wars") deployment. Urge your Senators to vote against Cochran-Inouye S.257 and your Representatives to oppose the Weldon-Spratt National Missile Defense System Bill. The Senate switchboard number is 202-334-3121. The House switchboard number is 202-225-3121. Contact information for your Senators and Representatives is available on the web at <http://www.vote-smart.org/congresstrack/c-index.html>. All you have to do is enter your zip code.

ARGUMENTS:

- If enacted, this legislation would push the U.S. closer to deployment of a missile defense system, even if it doesn't work.
- A missile defense system would not protect the U.S. from the most likely means of nuclear terrorism -- nuclear devices delivered by ships, airplanes, or trucks.
- Deployment of the Missile Defense System would derail Russian nuclear disarmament, which could harm U.S. security interests.
- Missile defense has failed miserably in recent Pentagon testing. After spending more than \$100 billion in the past four decades, there is still no reason to believe that a Missile Defense System would work. In fact, a Pentagon review panel characterized the program as "a rush to failure."

According to Tom Z. Collina, Arms Program Director with the Union of Concerned Scientists:

The Cochran-Inouye bill is unnecessary. The bill will not bring about earlier deployment of a national missile defense. The United States is already proceeding as fast as it can with development and testing. The administration has now dedicated \$10.5 billion to permit deployment of a national missile defense by 2005 or sooner, if possible. The administration will make a deployment decision next summer, after key systems tests have been conducted.

The Cochran-Inouye bill oversimplifies the missile defense equation. The bill would require the United States to deploy a national missile defense as soon as is technologically possible, regardless of its effectiveness, expense, and impact on the US-Russian nuclear arms reduction process. These are important considerations that must be factored into any deployment decision.

The Cochran-Inouye bill mandates deployment of a missile defense regardless of the security costs. The bill would require deployment even if the net security costs outweigh the security benefits, as appears to be the case. Russia has made it clear that US deployment of national missile defenses would derail Russian nuclear reductions under the START agreements. Perversely, the bill would thus block those steps that would be most effective in reducing the missile threat to the United States--very deep reductions in Russia's nuclear arsenal. Moreover, US deployment could actually increase the chance of accidental or unauthorized attacks by inducing Russia to rely more on launch-on-warning of its nuclear forces to preserve its deterrent. China, whose arsenal currently includes only some two dozen long-range missiles, has said it would seek to upgrade its nuclear arsenal in the face of US defenses.

The Cochran-Inouye bill mandates deployment of a defense regardless of its effectiveness. The bill says nothing about the performance requirements of the system to be deployed, and opens the door to deployment of a system that may be "technologically" ready against well-behaved test missiles but that could not intercept real-world missiles.

The Cochran-Inouye bill mandates deployment of a defense that is not even designed to protect against most types of missile threats. A national missile defense is completely unable to address several of the missile threats that would be most likely to emerge from hostile nations. For example, short-range missiles--which are much easier to build than long-range missiles--launched from off-shore boats would land so quickly that the defense would have no time to intercept them.

The Cochran-Inouye bill mandates deployment of a defense that cannot work against real-world missile threats. The one threat the system is designed against is a long-range missile carrying a single warhead--perhaps a nuclear weapon. But we have to assume that a nation capable of launching a long-range missile at US territory is also capable of the much simpler task of confusing or evading the defense and that, having acquired missiles, it would be motivated to do so. One relatively simple approach would be to hide the incoming warhead in a mylar balloon, and then release numerous identical balloons along with it. The defense would be unable to find the real warhead, and would run out of interceptors by trying to shoot at all the balloons. Despite decades of research, dealing with such countermeasures remains the key unsolved--and likely unsolvable--problem facing missile defenses.

The Cochran-Inouye bill mandates deployment regardless of the real nature of the emerging threat to the United States. States seeking to attack the United States with weapons of mass destruction have at their disposal more effective ways of delivery--namely, by terrorist-type attacks such as truck-bombs, suitcase-bombs or weapons brought into a harbor by ship. Moreover, while launching a long-range missile makes it clear who the

attacker is, using these other means of covert delivery can help avoid retaliation. It makes no sense to mandate deployment of a system to shoot down missiles when the real emerging threat is likely to be from other means of delivery, especially if deployment would block deep cuts in Russian nuclear weapons.

The Cochran-Inouye bill sends the wrong message to Russia about renegotiating the ABM Treaty. Deploying a national missile defense system would require renegotiating the ABM Treaty--or else withdrawing from it unilaterally, which would seriously harm relations with Russia. Passing the Cochran-Inouye bill now sends a message to Russia that the United States sees the ABM Treaty as irrelevant and would simply withdraw from the treaty if negotiations prove difficult. It sends a message that the United States is unwilling to negotiate in good faith and to take Russian security concerns into account, thus sabotaging any negotiations before they even start.

=====  
S P O N S O R  
=====

List service is being sponsored by XMission, 51 East 400 South Suite 200, Salt Lake City, UT. 84111, voice: 801/539-0852 fax:801/539-0853  
URL: <http://www.xmission.com>

To unsubscribe to act-now-napf, send an email to [majordomo@xmission.com](mailto: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.

-  
To unsubscribe to act-now-napf, send an email to "[majordomo@xmission.com](mailto: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: <brobinson@ploughshares.ca>  
Date: Tue, 16 Feb 1999 17:01:47 -0500  
From: Bill Robinson <brobinson@ploughshares.ca>  
Organization: Project Ploughshares  
To: Rudiger Noll <rud@wcc-coe.org>, Dwain Epps <dce@wcc-coe.org>,  
Salpy Eskidjian <sal@wcc-coe.org>, Paul Wilson <paulw@nccusa.org>  
CC: Ernie Regehr <eregehr@ploughshares.ca>,  
"Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Churches and NATO review  
References: <2.2.16.19990205155922.299f773a@pop.igc.org>

Hello, friends.

Earlier this month we sent you our draft for a proposed joint statement by the churches on NATO nuclear policy. I believe that you also all have received the draft that Howard Hallman proposed when he recently suggested a very similar initiative.

It seems clear that these two initiatives should be folded into one (I believe Howard is of the same view), but this raises the question of what the statement should say. Howard has suggested that subsequent drafts of the Ploughshares-proposed statement include a strong underpinning of religious and moral values, and that they be bolder in the disarmament measures advocated.

Both suggestions are entirely acceptable to us. As far as the measures proposed are concerned, our wish is to get the strongest possible statement that can still receive wide support among churches in the US, Canada, and the European members of NATO. We were of the view that our draft might already be too strong, but if a stronger statement is possible then that is even better. Please let us know what your views are on this question.

While we should state our position on the elimination of nuclear weapons clearly, we do feel that it would be useful also to include some proposals that NATO could adopt at the April Summit. (The prospects of any significant steps being taken seem unfortunately small at this point, but it is at least possible, however unlikely, that further cuts, de-alerting measures, adoption of a no-first-use policy, etc could happen at the summit, whereas there is practically speaking no chance of NATO disavowing all reliance on nuclear weapons -- except in the longterm context of its members' "ultimate" commitment to global nuclear disarmament.)

What are your own views on this? What are the next steps we should be taking?

Sincerely,

Bill Robinson.

--

Bill Robinson, Project Ploughshares,

Conrad Grebel College, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G6

Phone: 519 888-6541 x264 Fax: 519 885-0806

E-mail: [brobinson@ploughshares.ca](mailto:brobinson@ploughshares.ca)

<http://www.ploughshares.ca>

Project Ploughshares is a member of the Canadian Network to Abolish  
Nuclear Weapons (<http://watserv1.uwaterloo.ca/~plough/cnanw/cnanw.html>)

To: Bill Robinson <brobinson@ploughshares.ca>, Rudiger Noll <rud@wcc-coe.org>, Dwain Epps <dce@wcc-coe.org>, Salpy Eskidjian <sal@wcc-coe.org>, Paul Wilson <paulw@nccusa.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Churches and NATO review  
Cc: Ernie Regehr <eregehr@ploughshares.ca>  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 05:01 PM 2/16/99 -0500, Bill Robinson wrote:

>Hello, friends.

>

>Earlier this month we sent you our draft for a proposed joint statement  
>by the churches on NATO nuclear policy. I believe that you also all have  
>received the draft that Howard Hallman proposed when he recently  
>suggested a very similar initiative.

>

>It seems clear that these two initiatives should be folded into one (I  
>believe Howard is of the same view), but this raises the question of  
>what the statement should say....

Dear Friends:

Obviously there should be a single initiative, a single statement. I'm quite willing to step aside and let representatives of church organizations complete the statement, get signers, and release it.

I've had my say on substance. I would opt for a prophetic voice rather than restricting the statement to what NATO is willing to accept at this time. Let governments propose no-first-use, but let the churches insist on no-use as the morally correct position. Somebody has to help the United States, the other nuclear weapon states, and their allies break away from their foolish addiction to nuclear weapons. That's the restorative role the religious community can play.

I hope you keep me posted as the statement develops.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: "Paul Wilson" <paulw@nccusa.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Churches and NATO review  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 05:01 PM 2/16/99 -0500, Bill Robinson wrote:

>Hello, friends.

>

>Earlier this month we sent you our draft for a proposed joint statement  
>by the churches on NATO nuclear policy. I believe that you also all have  
>received the draft that Howard Hallman proposed when he recently  
>suggested a very similar initiative.

>

>It seems clear that these two initiatives should be folded into one (I  
>believe Howard is of the same view), but this raises the question of  
>what the statement should say. Howard has suggested that subsequent  
>drafts of the Ploughshares-proposed statement include a strong  
>underpinning of religious and moral values, and that they be bolder in  
>the disarmament measures advocated.

>

>Both suggestions are entirely acceptable to us. As far as the measures  
>proposed are concerned, our wish is to get the strongest possible  
>statement that can still receive wide support among churches in the US,  
>Canada, and the European members of NATO. We were of the view that our  
>draft might already be too strong, but if a stronger statement is  
>possible then that is even better. Please let us know what your views  
>are on this question.

>

>While we should state our position on the elimination of nuclear weapons  
>clearly, we do feel that it would be useful also to include some  
>proposals that NATO could adopt at the April Summit. (The prospects of  
>any significant steps being taken seem unfortunately small at this  
>point, but it is at least possible, however unlikely, that further cuts,  
>de-alerting measures, adoption of a no-first-use policy, etc could  
>happen at the summit, whereas there is practically speaking no chance of  
>NATO disavowing all reliance on nuclear weapons -- except in the  
>longterm context of its members' "ultimate" commitment to global nuclear  
>disarmament.)

>

>What are your own views on this? What are the next steps we should be  
>taking?

>

>Sincerely,

>

>Bill Robinson.

>

Dear Friends:

Obviously there should be a single initiative, a single statement. I'm quite willing to step aside and let representatives of church organizations complete the statement, get signers, and release it.

I've had my say on substance. I would opt for a prophetic voice rather than restricting the statement to what NATO is willing to accept at this time. Let governments propose no-first-use, but let the churches insist on no-use as the morally correct position. Somebody has to help the United States, the other nuclear weapon states, and their allies break away from their foolish addiction to nuclear weapons. That's the restorative role the religious community can play.

I hope you keep me posted as the statement develops.

Shalom,  
Howard

>  
>

Return-Path: <MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org>  
Sender: MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org  
Date: Wed, 17 Feb 1999 16:06:03 -0500 (EST)  
Subject: MISSISSIPPI AND BISHOP "CHIP" MARBLE  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org (MARY MILLER)

To: mupj@igc.apc.org

Howard and Marie -

Can you tell me whatever you want to about Mississippi in the next two days please? - contacts, names I can drop, clues about where Lott is on the CTBT, whatever.... and specifically what do we want Bishop Marble to do for the cause?

What I'm going to do, I think, is phone the diocesan office (no later than Monday) and ask if a couple of us can see the bishop separate from the conference we're going to. I know he'll be around most of the time - he's scheduled to celebrate the Assembly Eucharist Friday night, for instance. The national EPF chair is going to be at the conference and I thought that David and I could tackle the bishop together.

I'll pick Tom Hart's and Brian Grieves' brains too.

BTW, Tom and I are talking about postcards and alerts and such. He has faxed The Episcopal Church's endorsement to Marie already, I believe. And I've sent EPF's in. I'll use some 20/20 Vision cards; Tom and I will hatch something else for the Episcopal Church's mailing that includes official policy.

paz,

mary h miller, epf

mm

2:55 pm Wed, Feb 17, 1999

To: MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org (MARY MILLER)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: MISSISSIPPI AND BISHOP "CHIP" MARBLE  
Cc: ctbt@2020vision.org  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 04:06 PM 2/17/99 -0500, MARY MILLER wrote:

>To: mupj@igc.apc.org

>

>Howard and Marie -

>

> Can you tell me whatever you want to about Mississippi in the next two  
>days please? - contacts, names I can drop, clues about where Lott is on the  
>CTBT, whatever.... and specifically what do we want Bishop Marble to do  
>for the cause?....

Mary,

I've written the attached letter to Don Fortenberry, executive director of the Mississippi Religious Leaders conference, requesting a course of action and providing a draft letter to Senator Lott. I believe that Bishop Marble is now president of that body. Thus, you can discuss this with him and provide him a copy of the suggested letter to Lott and a copy of the interfaith petition.

It sounds like a great opportunity. Good luck.

Howard

###

February 13, 1999

Mr. Don Fortenberry, Executive Director  
Mississippi Religious Leaders Conference  
P.O. Box 68123  
Jackson, MS 39286

Dear Mr. Fortenberry:

Now that the Senate has concluded the impeachment process, we want to renew our campaign to achieve ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We hope that we can pick up in Mississippi and other states where we left off last fall.

The biggest obstacle remains the same: the refusal of Senator Helms to hold hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee. The second obstacle is Senator Lott's unwillingness to place the CTBT on the schedule for Senate consideration later in this session. To help overcome these obstacles we ask your help in two ways.

First, we would encourage prominent religious leaders in Mississippi to sign a joint letter to Senator Lott, urging him to provide leadership to bring about prompt hearings and to schedule the CTBT for floor action. I have taken the liberty of drafting such a letter, but you may modify it as you deem appropriate. It would be helpful if such a letter could reach Senator Lott by the end of February or early March.

Second, 18 denominations and religious associations are circulating an interfaith petition for the CTBT in churches and synagogues and at other religious gatherings. We are hoping that interfaith delegations can present these petitions to senators or their home-state staff during the Easter/Passover recess. A copy of the petition and background information are enclosed.

We ask your help in distributing the petition through religious networks in Mississippi so that it can be circulated in local churches and then gathered for presentation to the senators. Of your two senators, Senator Lott deserves the greatest attention because of his leadership role. If possible, it would be desirable to get signers in his home church.

I would appreciate hearing from you whether you would be willing to facilitate the sign-on letter from Mississippi religious leaders to Senator Lott and also help distribute and gather petitions. If you need further information, please let me know.

Shalom,  
Howard W. Hallman, Chair

###

Draft

The Honorable Trent Lott  
Room S-230, U.S. Capitol  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Lott:

As the impeachment trial of President Clinton ran its course, we greatly appreciate the way you worked closely with Senator Daschle, the minority leader, to maintain a bipartisan spirit in the process. This was no easy task in face of strongly held positions on each side. Now that trial is over we hope that you will continue to seek bipartisan cooperation in addressing other important matters on the nation's agenda.

In the realm of foreign policy where there is a long bipartisan tradition, we believe it is time for the U.S. Senate to give serious attention to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). This important treaty bans all nuclear test explosions and thereby helps halt the spread of nuclear weapons. This is very much in the U.S. national interest. The treaty has broad bipartisan support from the American public. Numerous religious denominations favor ratification. The treaty has been endorsed by the Pentagon, the nuclear weapons laboratories, and four of the last five retired chiefs of staffs.

Therefore, we ask you to provide leadership to assure that prompt public hearings are held on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. This will provide an opportunity for those who have doubts about the treaty to express their concerns and for proponents to make their case for ratification. This kind of give and take is essential to the legislative process. We also request that, as majority leader, you place the CTBT on the schedule for consideration by the entire Senate during the current session.

As Mississippians we will welcome your leadership in assuring that the Senate has an opportunity to give fair consideration to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Sincerely yours,

To: Dringler@umc-gbcs.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: State contacts  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Robin,

The main thing I want to talk about with you is state contacts for the interfaith petition drive. There is no one for Missouri so far. Your list of peace with justice coordinators show Rev. Dorothy Smith for Missouri East and Jim West for Missouri West. We have on our membership roles Roger Jespersen, and I think that Missouri East paid his dues. Would any of them be a possibility?

In Ohio there is a need for greater participation. Would you have time to talk with Rich Aronson and Linda Sabin? If not, I could fill in.

I've tried to reach John Ed Francis in Colorado, but he is away until February 22. I'm also trying to get in touch with Carol Windrum.

I talked with Kathy Barton-Campbell in Oregon and gave her the name of the state coordinator, Pat Roumer (sp?) in Portland. Kathy gave me a couple of contacts in Idaho.

I've contacted Rich Andrews and Warren Black in Mississippi, and I'm trying to reach Risher Brabham in South Carolina.

Otherwise we need to be certain that United Methodists are active in Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Kansas. I've done no outreach myself. Would you be able to try when you get re-settled?

It would be helpful to have a phone conversation on this. Today, Thursday, February 18, I'll be away from 11:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. On Friday I'll be around after 2:30 p.m. I know, though, that this is a hectic time for you.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>  
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org  
To: MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org (MARY MILLER)  
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)  
Subject: Re: MISSISSIPPI AND BISHOP "CHIP" MARBLE  
Cc: mupj@igc.org, culp@igc.org  
Date: Wed, 17 Feb 1999 18:36:13 -0500

Hi Mary,

This is great. I'll call you tomorrow with some specifics I know about from our call last August--re Episcopalian(s) and other religious folk on call and their follow-up activities.

David would be excellent at giving you the latest word on Lott, so I'm sending him this, too.

Howard, do you know if the Mississippi Religious Leadership Council ever did the letter to Lott they intended after our call?

Marie

>To: ctbt@2020vision.org

>

>Howard and Marie -

>

> Can you tell me whatever you want to about Mississippi in the next two >days please? - contacts, names I can drop, clues about where Lott is on the >CTBT, whatever.... and specifically what do we want Bishop Marble to do >for the cause?

>

> What I'm going to do, I think, is phone the diocesan office (no later >than Monday) and ask if a couple of us can see the bishop separate from the >conference we're going to. I know he'll be around most of the time - he's >scheduled to celebrate the Assembly Eucharist Friday night, for instance. >The national EPF chair is going to be at the conference and I thought that >David and I could tackle the bishop together.

>

> I'll pick Tom Hart's and Brian Grieves' brains too.

>

> BTW, Tom and I are talking about postcards and alerts and such. He has >faxed The Episcopal Church's endorsement to Marie already, I believe. And >I've sent EPF's in. I'll use some 20/20 Vision cards; Tom and I will hatch >something else for the Episcopal Church's mailing that includes official >policy.

>

paz,

> mary h miller, epf mm

> 2:55 pm Wed, Feb 17, 1999

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>

To: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann), MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org (MARY MILLER)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: MISSISSIPPI AND BISHOP "CHIP" MARBLE  
Cc: mupj@igc.org, culp@igc.org  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 06:36 PM 2/17/99 -0500, Marie Rietmann wrote:

>

>

>Howard, do you know if the Mississippi Religious Leadership Council ever  
>did the letter to Lott they intended after our call?

>

>Marie

Marie,

No, I don't. However, I've suggested they write Lott now. I sent you a copy of my draft in a cc. to an e-mail to Mary Miller.

Howard

Return-Path: <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
Date: Wed, 17 Feb 1999 15:17:40 -0500  
From: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Bd. Meeting  
Sender: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard,

Charlotte and I plan to be at the meeting. We will need accomodations on Thurs and Fri. if possible. There is a very good possiblity only one of us will be there. We will be more specific later. At the moment we don't know. Our daughter had a biopsy and its indicated a malignant growth some place. They have had cat scans and sonagrams and found nothing. They had a mamogram still nothing. They removed a lump from under her arm. It was a swollen Lymph node. It was malignant. So they are looking. Depending on what develops, we want to be available if she has any chemo therapy, etc. We are planning to go to Europe, though that is dependent also on development6s. We will keep you posted. Prayers are solicited and appreciated. Thanks. Give our best to your family.

Jim Hipkins

P.S. mailed the Peace Leaf today. 2/17/99.

To: James Hipkins <70761.2655@compuserve.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Bd. Meeting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 03:17 PM 2/17/99 -0500, James Hipkins wrote:

>Howard,  
> Charlotte and I plan to be at the meeting. We will need accomodations on  
>Thurs and Fri. if possible....

Jim,

Our guest is reserved for one or both of you for the nights of April 8 & 9.

I hope all goes well with your daughter. I know her condition is of great concern to you.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3  
Date: Thu, 18 Feb 1999 16:24:36 -0500  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) Fwd: Roche speech on Star Wars  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id PAA03709

Dear Friends,

Our neighbor to the North, Canada, is doing its part to stop the abominable son of star wars. We must do ours. Write today to your Congressperson, Senators, the President, and heir apparent Vice President. Many thanks.  
Peace, Alice Slater

Date: Thu, 18 Feb 1999 14:39:45 -0500

>Subject: Roche speech on BMD  
>Priority: non-urgent  
>X-FC-MachineGenerated: true  
>To: cnanw@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca, abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca  
>X-FC-Forwarded-From: brobinson@ploughshares.ca  
>From: abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca (abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca)

>  
>Just Say 'No' to Missile Defense

>  
>By Senator Douglas Roche, O.C.

>  
>An Address to the Senate of Canada

>  
>February 18, 1999

>  
>  
>The Senate should be aware of a development that will profoundly alter  
>international relations, cripple disarmament work, and tie Canada  
>inextricably to  
>U.S. ill-conceived military plans. I speak of the U.S. government's  
>current design  
>of a ballistic missile defense shield over North America.

>  
>Canadians thought this problem went away when Canada refused the U.S.  
>invitation to participate in the Strategic Defense Initiative (known as  
>"Star Wars")  
>in 1985. SDI itself was abandoned, but in the 1990s it reappeared as a  
>National  
>Missile Defense program designed to provide for the interception of  
>long-range  
>missiles targeted on the United States. A missile defense program for North  
>America is now being promoted and Canada is inexorably being drawn into the  
>web of U.S. military-industrial-complex interests.

>  
>This is being done without the knowledge or consent of the Canadian

>Parliament

>and people. The Government of Canada keeps saying: Relax, nothing's going  
>to  
>happen for a long time.

>

>Honourable Senators, there is plenty to worry about and the time for us to  
>speak

>out against this retrograde, dangerous proposal is now.

>

>The facts, briefly, are these:

>

>1. Discussions are now taking place between the United States and Canada  
>on a North American ballistic missile defense (BMD) system. The U.S.  
>is on track to deploy this system in Alaska and North Dakota possibly  
>by 2005, and the Administration is pumping \$6.6 billion into the project.  
>The time for Canada to decide its course of action is now, not later, on  
>the eve of deployment, when Canada's options will be significantly  
>reduced.

>

>2. The 1994 Defense White Paper unfortunately opened the door to  
>Canadian participation, despite a 1985 Canadian government decision  
>not to participate in U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) research.  
>SDI closed down in the early 1990s. BMD is its successor. The U.S.  
>wants Canada involved in BMD through NORAD.

>

>3. BMD would violate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM),  
>which forbids a nation-wide missile defense system. The ABM Treaty  
>is an essential part of nuclear arms control. It has long been recognized  
>that constructing such national defenses (leaving aside the improbability  
>of their working) would spur opposing nations to develop new offensive  
>weapons to circumvent defense systems. Thus the nuclear arms race  
>would keep accelerating.

>

>4. The U.S. recognizes BMD would violate the existing ABM and  
>has suggested to Russia that the ABM be renegotiated. Russia, so  
>far, adamantly refuses and has threatened to stall START II even  
>further if BMD is proceeded with. The Government of China has  
>warned that a new nuclear arms race will break out in Asia.

>

>5. The Canadian government said in 1995 it opposed abrogating or  
>weakening the ABM, calling it "absolutely essential," for the  
>maintenance of international nuclear security. In 1996, the  
>government added, "Canada remains firmly committed to the  
>1972 ABM Treaty."

>

>6. The Canadian government has consistently said it will work for the  
>continued development of international law. To join in a process of  
>weakening or abrogating the ABM to satisfy the demands of the U.S.  
>military system, which has not lost its appetite for expansion even  
>though the Cold War ended nearly a decade ago, would greatly  
>endanger Canada's credibility in arms control and disarmament work.  
>Canada must speak now. By signaling that Canada is open to the idea,  
>DND is encouraging the U.S. to proceed on the assumption that Canada  
>will be involved.

>  
>7. U.S. proponents claim that BMD will protect the continent  
>against the incoming missiles of "rogue" States. But BMD is a bad  
>idea because it presumes a potential attacker would develop an  
>extremely expensive delivery technology when it could much more  
>easily and reliably deliver a bomb in a commercial airliner or  
>shipping container, methods a BMD would be powerless to stop.  
>  
>Honourable Senators, Canadian interests in the NORAD Agreement are being  
>compromised through U.S. action. NORAD was not meant to be a ballistic  
>missile  
>defense, yet NORAD is being used as the instrument to jump start U.S.  
>ability to  
>fight space wars of the 21st century. U.S. military interests are playing  
>on  
>fears of a ballistic missile attack on North America by some rogue state  
>or terrorist  
>and have even conjured up the ludicrous spectacle of North Korea launching  
>a  
>ballistic missile attack on Montreal. The U.S. Ambassador to Canada has  
>joined in  
>this softening up approach to getting Canada's compliance by references to  
>the  
>need of our two countries to stick together against vague enemies of the  
>future.  
>  
>We must realize what is happening. The U.S. is extending its military  
>capacity in  
>order to be the militarily dominant nation of the 21st century and to  
>secure this power by a comprehensive system of surveillance and  
>communications  
>technologies. Is putting such immense power in the hands of a single state  
>in the  
>best interests of international peace and security? Is abrogating the ABM  
>Treaty  
>justified by such inordinate quest for power? Is Canada, which campaigned  
>hard  
>for a seat on the U.N. Security Council in order to bring forward new  
>ideas for  
>peace and security, served by tying ourselves to a military machine out of  
>control?  
>  
>The Canadian government has got to stop saying: Don't worry, be happy.  
>Every  
>month that goes by without the Government speaking out firmly against  
>participation in a ballistic missile defense system allows the U.S.  
>government to  
>interpret our silence as tacit acceptance. Then, when the system is about  
>to be  
>deployed, it will be too late for us to pull out. Moreover, putting \$600  
>million of  
>Canadian taxpayers' money into this ill-conceived venture would be an  
>unconscionable affront to every Canadian who needs improved health,  
>education

>and social care.

>

>The correct answer to what BMD seeks to accomplish, namely the security of

>North America, is to pursue, as the International Court of Justice has

>called for,

>comprehensive negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons.

>Significant progress in this respect has been made in recent years. This

>progress is

>now jeopardized by BMD. As the prestigious U.S. National Academy of

>Sciences

>concluded in its 1997 report, The Future of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy,

>"deploying missile defenses outside the bounds of the ABM Treaty could

>greatly

>diminish the prospects for future reductions in nuclear weapons." That is

>cautious

>language for what should be stated frankly: we can kiss goodbye to nuclear

>disarmament if BMD proceeds. And if strategic arms control collapses, the

>Non-Proliferation Treaty, which Canada has always championed, will be in

>ruins.

>

>Now is the time to debate this. Now is the time to inform the public. Now

>is the

>time to obtain the consent of the Canadian Parliament.

>

>Honourable Senators, on the basis of my experience in personally meeting

>with

>hundreds of informed Canadians in all 10 provinces on nuclear weapons

>issues, I

>contend that the Canadian public opposes the madness of a missile defense

>system.

>The Canadian Government knows there is little support for the system. Why,

>then,

>dally?

>

>The Government should couple its resistance to missile defense by a

>vigorous

>implementation of the 15 recommendations in the Report of the Standing

>Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Canada and the

>Nuclear

>Challenge: Reducing the Political Value of Nuclear Weapons for the

>Twenty-First Century. This report has rightly pointed the way for Canada

>to work

>with like-minded States in pressing the Nuclear Weapons States to make an

>unequivocal

>commitment to commence negotiations leading to the elimination of nuclear

>weapons. The Committee wants Canada to argue within NATO for less reliance

>on

>nuclear weapons so that the way can be cleared for the NATO nuclear States

>to

>pledge No-First-Use of nuclear weapons and to put their nuclear weapons on

>de-alert status.

>

>That would be a positive contribution by Canada to enhancing peace and

>security

>in the world. That is the way forward, providing confidence-building  
>measures and  
>hope for the Canadian people who want an end to nuclear weapons.

>

>- 30 -

>

>--

>Bill Robinson, Project Ploughshares,  
>Conrad Grebel College, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G6  
>Phone: 519 888-6541 x264 Fax: 519 885-0806  
>E-mail: brobinson@ploughshares.ca  
><http://www.ploughshares.ca>

>

>Project Ploughshares is a member of the Canadian Network to Abolish  
>Nuclear Weapons (<http://watserv1.uwaterloo.ca/~plough/cnanw/cnanw.html>)

>

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: <MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org>  
Sender: MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org  
Date: Thu, 18 Feb 1999 12:24:00 -0500 (EST)  
Subject: MISSISSIPPI  
To: MUPJ@IGC.APC.ORG (HOWARD W. HALLMAN)  
From: MARY\_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org (MARY MILLER)

To: HOWARD W. HALLMAN <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
copy to Marie Rietmann

Thanks much, folks. David Selzer (EPF's chair) and I will share the letters with Bishop Marble when we see him next week.

Marie, if you have time to talk (or e-mail) any specifics you have from the August call, I'm here \*short\* afternoons this week: leaving at 3:45 today Thursday, and 12:45 tomorrow, Friday.

If either of you think of anything more/else, I can deal with e-mail as late as Tuesday afternoon (2/23, 4 pm). Shall get back to you both as soon as I can the first week of March (already! yikes!)

mary h miller, epf                      mm  
11:38 am Thu, Feb 18, 1999

To: Dringler@umc-gbcs.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: More on state contacts  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Robin,

In addition to what I wrote you earlier, Jay Lintner has inquiries regarding United Methodists in three states.

Who did you hear from in California and Ohio? Would they be prospects to help gather petitions and make appointments with senators? If so, would you contact them? But if you're too busy, let me know and I'll make the contact.

Dick Heacock in Alaska suggested that Rev. Dale Kelly in the UM conference office would be the best person to gather petitions. Do you know her? Can you contact her? Or should I go ahead.

A quick e-mail response will suffice.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: cprcrogers@mindspring.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Interfaith petition for CTBT  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Mr. Rogers:

To push for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a broad coalition of faith groups is conducting a petition drive to encourage prompt Senate action. A copy of the petition is available from the web page of the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs: [www.loga.org](http://www.loga.org). If you can't obtain it in that manner, please let me know and I'll fax you a copy.

We ask your help in gaining signatures to the petition in South Carolina. You can make copies and have them circulated for signature in churches, synagogues, mosques, and other religious gatherings. For the petition drive to have greatest effect, the petitions should be hand-delivered to senators or to their staff around the time of the Senate's Passover/Easter recess, March 26 to April 12.

We are looking for some in South Carolina to organize an interfaith delegation to present signed petitions to Senator Hollings. Would you be willing to help us in doing this? If you can't reach Senator Hollings directly, an interfaith delegation could present petitions to staff in his home-state field offices. If this cannot be arranged, batches of petitions can be mailed to the senator. In this case, copies could go to Senator Thurmond as well

More information about this effort is available on the web page of the Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs -- [www.loga.org](http://www.loga.org). Or you can give me a call at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,  
Howard W. Hallman

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

Date: Mon, 22 Feb 1999 13:33:51 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: bmorgan@pop.igc.org

To: btiller@psr.org, bmorgan@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, cdavis@clw.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@fcl.org, wandwill@clark.net, ledwidge@psr.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, armsintern@ucsusa.org, stevenraikin@delphi.com, anitas@ieer.org, syoung@basicint.org, tperry@ucsusa.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, vfp@igc.org, paprog@igc.org

From: Brad Morse <bmorgan@igc.apc.org>

Subject: 1/21/99 NWWG Agenda

NWWG folks,

Here is a draft agenda for Thursday morning's meeting. Please feel free to submit suggestions to myself or Kathy Crandall. See you all Thursday.

Brad

## 2/25/99 NWWG AGENDA

- I. INTRODUCTIONS 9:30
- II. UPDATES 9:35
- III. CTBT 9:45
  - A. Updated Field Activities
  - B. 20/20 Call & Coalition Card
  - C. Inter-Faith Petition Effort
  - D. Lobbying Effort
- IV. WEAPONS COMPLEX ISSUES 10:05
  - A. Nuclear Waste Legislation
  - B. MOX Hearings
  - C. DOE budget/Markey Resolution Update
- V. DE-ALERTING/DEEP CUTS 10:20
  - A. ANA Theme Month/follow-up on letter
  - B. Update from Deep Cuts Meeting
  - C. Woolsey Resolution Update
- VI. MISSILE DEFENSE 10:30
  - A. Star Wars Kit
  - B. Possible hearings/vote
  - C. PSR phone bank
- VII. MEETINGS WITH HILL STAFF 10:40
  - A. Communication upkeep
- VIII. NWWG POLICY UPDATES 10:45

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS

10:50

\*\*\*\*\*

Brad Morse  
Program Assistant  
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability  
1801 18th St., NW  
Suite 9-2  
Washington, DC 20009  
[www.ananuclear.org](http://www.ananuclear.org)

ph:(202) 833-4668 fax:(202) 234-9536

### NOTE NEW E-MAIL ADDRESS EFFECTIVE MARCH 1, 1999 ###

I can be reached via [bamorse@earthlink.net](mailto:bamorse@earthlink.net)

PLEASE UPDATE YOUR RECORDS AND DISTRIBUTION LISTS

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 22 Feb 1999 16:47:19 -0500  
From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: Brad Morse <bmorgan@igc.apc.org>  
CC: btiller@psr.org, bmorse@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, cdavis@clw.org,  
73744.3675@compuserve.com, dkimball@clw.org, dculp@igc.org,  
paprog@igc.org, paexec@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, jsmith@clw.org,  
kathy@fcl.org, wandwill@clark.net, ledwidge@psr.org,  
ctbt@2020vision.org, armsintern@ucsusa.org, stevenraikin@delphi.com,  
anitas@ieer.org, syoung@basicint.org, tperry@ucsusa.org,  
tcollina@ucsusa.org, vfp@igc.org  
Subject: Re: 1/21/99 NWWG Agenda IS REALLY THE 2/25/99 AGENDA  
References: <2.2.16.19990222163322.0d977dd0@pop.igc.org>

It may be similar, but we did really change it - This is the agenda for 2/25/99

Brad Morse wrote:

> NWWG folks,  
> Here is a draft agenda for Thursday morning's meeting. Please feel free to  
> submit suggestions to myself or Kathy Crandall. See you all Thursday.  
>  
> Brad  
>  
> 2/25/99 NWWG AGENDA  
>  
> I. INTRODUCTIONS 9:30  
>  
> II. UPDATES 9:35  
>  
> III. CTBT 9:45  
> A. Updated Field Activities  
> B. 20/20 Call & Coalition Card  
> C. Inter-Faith Petition Effort  
> D. Lobbying Effort  
>  
> IV. WEAPONS COMPLEX ISSUES 10:05  
> A. Nuclear Waste Legislation  
> B. MOX Hearings  
> C. DOE budget/Markey Resolution Update  
>  
> V. DE-ALERTING/DEEP CUTS 10:20  
> A. ANA Theme Month/follow-up on letter  
> B. Update from Deep Cuts Meeting  
> C. Woolsey Resolution Update  
>  
> VI. MISSILE DEFENSE 10:30  
> A. Star Wars Kit  
> B. Possible hearings/vote  
> C. PSR phone bank  
>

> VII. MEETINGS WITH HILL STAFF 10:40  
> A. Communication upkeep

> VIII. NWWG POLICY UPDATES 10:45

> IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS 10:50

> \*\*\*\*\*

> 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

> ### NOTE NEW E-MAIL ADDRESS EFFECTIVE MARCH 1, 1999 ###

> I can be reached via bamorse@earthlink.net

> PLEASE UPDATE YOUR RECORDS AND DISTRIBUTION LISTS

--  
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 0172

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

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

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

A project of: Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

To: "Mark Brown" <mark.brown@ecunet.org>, "Jay Lintner" <lintner@ucc.org>, "Mary Miller" <epf@igc.org>, "Kathy Guthrie" <kathy@fcn1.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Proposed letter to Senator Sarbanes  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

I propose that we ask religious leaders in Maryland to sign a letter to Senator Sarbanes, requesting him to press for public hearings on the CTBT by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He is second ranking Democrat on the committee.

As initial signers, I suggested that we get signatures from United Methodist Bishop May, an Episcopal bishop, a Lutheran bishop, a UCC leader, and a prominent Quaker. I can approach Bishop May and the rest of you can help with your denomination. We will then circulate the letter for additional signatures.

To get this moving, I have drafted the attached letter. I would like your comments on it. After the letter is appropriately revised, would you help get the initial signer from your denomination? Would you then be willing to help get additional signers? I'm thinking that 20 to 30 signers who represents a denominational and geographic cross-section of Marylanders would be sufficient. Then we would seek an appointment with Senator Sarbanes or one of his top staff as follow-through on the letter.

Thanks for your help.

Howard

###

Draft letter.

Dear Senator Sarbanes:

For many years numerous religious denominations have advocated a ban on testing of nuclear weapons. With the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996, this long-sought goal seemed to be in reach. However, since September 1997 when President Clinton submitted the treaty to the U.S. Senate for ratification, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has blocked consideration of this important measure by his refusal to schedule public hearings.

We are deeply disturbed by this situation. Public opinion polls reveal that more than 75 percent of the American public supports ratification of the CTBT. This high level of support prevails among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. The treaty has the support of the Pentagon, the nuclear weapons laboratories, and retired joint chiefs of staffs. In face of this widespread support it is difficult for the public to understand how the Senate can allow one of its members to block consideration of a measure that is strongly in the public interest.

Therefore, we request you as a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to use your influence to achieve committee hearings as soon as possible. We ask you to work with your colleagues on the committee to open the process to proponents and opponents of the CTBT. Let those who have doubts about the treaty raise their concerns. Let treaty advocates respond. This kind of give-and-take is a hallmark of our democracy.

As a follow up to this letter, we request that a small delegation from the faith community have an opportunity to meet with you and discuss how we can work with you and other senators to achieve public hearings by the Foreign Relations

Committee on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Sincerely yours,

Proposed signers: religious leaders in Maryland

Return-Path: <epf@peacenet.org>  
Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1999 09:32:57 -0800 (PST)  
X-Sender: epf@pop.igc.org  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>,  
"Mark Brown" <mark.brown@ecunet.org>, "Jay Lintner" <lintner@ucc.org>,  
"Mary Miller" <epf@igc.org>, "Kathy Guthrie" <kathy@fcnl.org>  
From: "Mary H. Miller" <epf@peacenet.org>  
Subject: Re: Proposed letter to Senator Sarbanes

Howard & Co. -

I should be able to get - easily - the Episcopal bishops. What I need to know is whether you want all of 'em - two active and three retired - at the beginning or just the current Bishop of Maryland. I'm sure Senator Sarbanes knows the present one (new two years ago) but he knows the retired ones a lot better. And having them on the list will be persuasive. FYI, Mrs. Sarbanes is an Episcopalian so the Senator is frequently at our events as well as his own (Greek Orthodox).

I think the letter is fine as it is but will defer to those who are wiser in these things to edit it. Let's do it.

I'm away for the rest of the week and won't see e-mail at this address until next Monday.

Mary

At 07:41 AM 2/23/99 -0800, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

>Dear Colleagues:

>

>I propose that we ask religious leaders in Maryland to sign a letter to  
>Senator Sarbanes, requesting him to press for public hearings on the CTBT by  
>the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He is second ranking Democrat on  
>the committee.

>

>As initial signers, I suggested that we get signatures from United Methodist  
>Bishop May, an Episcopal bishop, a Lutheran bishop, a UCC leader, and a  
>prominent Quaker. I can approach Bishop May and the rest of you can help  
>with your denomination. We will then circulate the letter for additional  
>signatures....

>

>To get this moving, I have drafted the attached letter. I would like your  
>comments on it. After the letter is appropriately revised, would you help  
>get the initial signer from your denomination? Would you then be willing to  
>help get additional signers? I'm thinking that 20 to 30 signers who  
>represents a denominational and geographic cross-section of Marylanders  
>would be sufficient. Then we would seek an appointment with Senator  
>Sarbanes or one of his top staff as follow-through on the letter.

>

>Thanks for your help.

>

>Howard

>  
>###  
>  
>Draft letter.  
>  
>Dear Senator Sarbanes:  
>  
>For many years numerous religious denominations have advocated a ban on  
>testing of nuclear weapons. With the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban  
>Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996, this long-sought goal seemed to be in  
>reach. However, since September 1997 when President Clinton submitted the  
>treaty to the U.S. Senate for ratification, the chairman of the Foreign  
>Relations Committee has blocked consideration of this important measure by  
>his refusal to schedule public hearings.  
>  
>We are deeply disturbed by this situation. Public opinion polls reveal that  
>more than 75 percent of the American public supports ratification of the  
>CTBT. This high level of support prevails among Republicans, Democrats, and  
>Independents. The treaty has the support of the Pentagon, the nuclear  
>weapons laboratories, and retired joint chiefs of staffs. In face of this  
>widespread support it is difficult for the public to understand how the  
>Senate can allow one of its members to block consideration of a measure that  
>is strongly in the public interest.  
>  
>Therefore, we request you as a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign  
>Relations Committee to use your influence to achieve committee hearings as  
>soon as possible. We ask you to work with your colleagues on the committee  
>to open the process to proponents and opponents of the CTBT. Let those who  
>have doubts about the treaty raise their concerns. Let treaty advocates  
>respond. This kind of give-and-take is a hallmark of our democracy.  
>  
>As a follow up to this letter, we request that a small delegation from the  
>faith community have an opportunity to meet with you and discuss how we can  
>work with you and other senators to achieve public hearings by the Foreign  
>Relations Committee on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.  
>  
>Sincerely yours,  
>  
>Proposed signers: religious leaders in Maryland  
>  
>  
>  
>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: <meganhap99@igc.org>

X-Sender: meganhap99@pop.igc.org

Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1999 11:39:55 -0500

To: rootwar-cpeace-list@igc.org, ana@fenix.ifisicacu.unam.mx,

gstassen@fuller.edu, ictur@gn.apc.org, crc@sover.net, wworld@igc.org,  
a.karam@int-idea.se, kclement@gmu.edu, awalker@aol.com,  
root@kprc.bishkek.su, mupj@igc.org, ngumbonz@africaonlineco.2w,  
npc@gn.apc.org, csucc@ncs.com.gh, yadc@ns1.bangla.net,  
blup@altavista.net, amistad@cti.nai.net, kkillleb150@aol.com,  
omaz@omaz.almaty.kz, untv@untv.escom.glas.apc.org,  
root@kprc.bishkek.su, jean@giasbma.vsnl.net.in, mcco@bdonline.com,  
chin@zamnet.zm, riapre@hotmail.com, apcjp@igc.apc.org,  
thais@laneta.apc.org, christina@wassholm@pg.sfn.se,  
hizkias@users.africaonline.co.ke, hlbtimm@citecho.net,  
foc11@columbia.edu, pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in, iascass@public.bta.net.cn,  
ruiz@icu.ac.jp, system@cfws.ac.un, britna@citechco.net,  
sroshan105@aol.com, cesta@es.com.sv, mcco@bdonline.com,  
kkelly@igc.apc.org, epank@peacenet.org, aiwusa@earthlink.net,  
info@oneday.net, p4peace@aol.com, wpeace2000@aol.com, congress@igc.org,  
denoff@aol.com, hrec@igc.org, psaoke@ken.healthnet.org,  
rpchurch@gwu.edu, appel100@worldnet.fr, coc@igc.apc.org,  
bihr@bangla.net, intrac@imfiko.bishkek.su, ihrla@fascom.com,  
earlwal@itis.com, overby@bobcat.ent.ohiou.edu, peace@colgate.edu,  
jmisrack@igc.apc.org, conflict.peace@dartnet.co.uk, pdd@clark.net,  
isis@hetnet.nl, J.Schaake@IFOR.CCMAIL.compuserve.com, earlwal@itis.com,  
wfbn@antenna.nl, edibal@iprolink.ch, pdhre@igc.org,  
CAMDUN@uniworld.demon.co.uk, miquel@sidint.org, fredpax@online.no,  
sstaples@canadians.org, unoy@antenna.nl, gunfree2@sn.apc.org,  
q18@nikhef.nl, benyan@inter.net.il, hca@antenna.nl,  
acc@internetegypt.com, wwsf@iprolink.ch, lie.tahzib@tip.nl,  
mcco@pc.jaring.my, euv-5835@euv-frankfurt-o.de, japragt@knmg.nl,  
bbroadwa@dreamscape.com, zunes@delta.usfca.edu, johndear@interport.net,  
crc@sover.net, ana@fenix.ifisicacu.unam.mx, gstassen@fuller.edu,  
ictur@gn.apc.org, crc@sover.net, wworld@igc.org, a.karam@int-idea.se,  
kclement@gmu.edu, awalker@aol.com, root@kprc.bishkek.su, mupj@igc.org,  
ngumbonz@africaonlineco.2w, npc@gn.apc.org, csucc@ncs.com.gh,  
yadc@ns1.bangla.net, blup@altavista.net, amistad@cti.nai.net,  
kkillleb150@aol.com, omaz@omaz.almaty.kz, untv@untv.escom.glas.apc.org,  
root@kprc.bishkek.su, jean@giasbma.vsnl.net.in, mcco@bdonline.com,  
chin@zamnet.zm, riapre@hotmail.com, apcjp@igc.apc.org,  
thais@laneta.apc.org, christina@wassholm@pg.sfn.se,  
hizkias@users.africaonline.co.ke, hlbtimm@citecho.net,  
foc11@columbia.edu, pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in, iascass@public.bta.net.cn,  
ruiz@icu.ac.jp, system@cfws.ac.un, britna@citechco.net,  
sroshan105@aol.com, cesta@es.com.sv, mcco@bdonline.com,  
kkelly@igc.apc.org, epank@peacenet.org, aiwusa@earthlink.net,  
info@oneday.net, p4peace@aol.com, wpeace2000@aol.com, congress@igc.org,  
denoff@aol.com, hrec@igc.org, psaoke@ken.healthnet.org,  
rpchurch@gwu.edu, appel100@worldnet.fr, coc@igc.apc.org,  
bihr@bangla.net, intrac@imfiko.bishkek.su, ihrla@fascom.com,  
earlwal@itis.com, overby@bobcat.ent.ohiou.edu, peace@colgate.edu,  
jmisrack@igc.apc.org, conflict.peace@dartnet.co.uk, pdd@clark.net,  
cicc2@igc.org, mrenner@mail.peconic.net, petweiss@igc.org,

rootwar-cpeace-list@igc.org  
From: Megan Burke <meganhap99@igc.org>  
Subject: Draft Agenda Part 1

Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st Century  
>DISCUSSION DRAFT (February 1999)

>  
>This Discussion Draft Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st Century  
>has emerged from an intensive process of consultation between the members  
>of the Hague Appeal for Peace Organising and Coordinating Committees, the  
>numerous other organisations that actively participate in the Hague Appeal  
>for Peace process and the Hague Appeal for Peace programme coordinators. It  
>represents, in draft form, what these civil-society organisations consider  
>to be the most important challenges facing humankind as it prepares to  
>embark upon a new millennium.

>  
>The Agenda reflects the four major 'strands' of the Hague Appeal. 1)  
>Disarmament and Human Security 2) Prevention, Resolution and Transformation  
>of Violent Conflict 3) International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law and  
>Institutions and 4) Root Causes of War / Culture of Peace.

>  
>Send Your Feedback  
>In order to develop into a truly global Agenda for Peace and Justice for  
>the 21st Century, this document must grow to reflect even more the  
>priorities of civil-society world-wide. Since feedback should be as  
>representative as possible, we encourage you to mobilise your organisation  
>or network - in cooperation, if possible, with other organisations and  
>networks - to discuss this Agenda. Mark your results "Feedback on the Hague  
>Appeal for Peace Discussion Draft Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st  
>Century," indicate clearly which organisations contributed to drafting the  
>feedback, and send it to:

>  
>The Hague Appeal for Peace, c/o WFM, 777 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017, USA.  
>Fax: +1-212-599-1332. E-mail: <hap99@igc.org>.

>  
>In order to be considered when compiling the Draft Hague Agenda for Peace  
>and Justice for the 21st Century - the core discussion document for the  
>Hague conference - your feedback should reach this address before March 31,  
>1999. Feedback received after this date, however, will be taken into  
>consideration when compiling the final version of the Hague Agenda for  
>Peace and Justice for the 21st Century.

>  
>PREAMBLE

>  
>The world is emerging from the bloodiest, most war-ridden, century in  
>history. On the eve of the new century, it is time to create the conditions  
>in which the primary aim of the United Nations, "to save succeeding  
>generations from the scourge of war", can be realized. This is the goal of  
>the Hague Appeal for Peace.

>  
>Skeptics will say that it cannot be done. The Hague Appeal challenges this  
>assumption. This century has seen unimagined changes. Society now has the  
>means to cure disease, reduce poverty and eliminate starvation. The  
>twentieth century has also seen the creation of a set of universal norms

>which, if implemented, will go a long way toward making war unnecessary and  
>impossible. And this century has seen the replacement of authoritarian  
>forms of government by democratic governance, a phenomenon which enables  
>civil society to play a far greater role than heretofore in the affairs of  
>humanity.

>  
>This historic mission cannot be entrusted solely to governments. Recent  
>years have seen outbreaks of genocide in Cambodia, Bosnia and Rwanda,  
>brutal attacks against civilians and the spread of horrendous weapons of  
>mass destruction capable of ending life on much or all of the planet. In  
>all but a few cases, the world's governments have manifestly failed to  
>fulfill their responsibility to prevent conflict, protect civilians, end  
>war and create the conditions of permanent peace.

>  
>As a result, the Hague Appeal proposes a citizens Agenda for Peace and  
>Justice for the 21st Century. This will entail a fundamentally new  
>approach, building on the recent model of New Diplomacy in which citizen  
>advocates, progressive governments and official agencies have worked  
>together for common goals. We will embrace the moral imagination and  
>courage necessary to create a 21st century culture of peace and to develop  
>national and supranational institutions which ultimately must be the  
>guarantors of peace and justice in this world.

>  
>There is already much to choose from. Civil society has flourished since  
>the end of the Cold War and launched campaigns aimed at eradicating  
>landmines, reducing the traffic in small arms, alleviating third world  
>debt, ending violence against women, abolishing nuclear weapons, stopping  
>the use of child soldiers and building an independent, International  
>Criminal Court. These grass-roots efforts are having a major impact. They  
>are succeeding because they engage ordinary people; because they integrate  
>different sectors (human rights, the environment, disarmament, sustainable  
>development, etc.); because they invite the full participation of women,  
>youth, indigenous peoples, minorities, the disabled and other affected  
>groups.

>  
>These campaigns have generated unity and cohesion and demonstrate what can  
>be done when people are listened to instead of talked at.

>  
>The Hague Appeal for Peace intends to listen, learn and then to build. Out  
>of this process will emerge a new citizens' Agenda for Peace and Justice  
>for the 21st Century. It is a vital and realisable goal.

>  
>THEMES

>Components of the Hague Appeal, from the conference program to the  
>campaigns, are motivated by the following main themes:

>  
>Traditional Failure  
>Traditional approaches to preventing war and building peace have by and  
>large failed disastrously. This is evidenced by the growing brutality of  
>warfare, and the callous disregard for civilian life in such conflicts as  
>Kosovo, the Congo and Sierra Leone. Big-power bullying tactics are not  
>diplomacy. Sanctions that starve the poor are not solidarity. Fire-brigade  
>peacekeeping efforts are no substitute for sophisticated early warning  
>systems.

- >
- >Human Security
  - >It is time to redefine security in terms of human and ecological needs
  - >instead of national sovereignty and national borders. This will establish
  - >new priorities, and redirect funding to sustainable development instead of
  - >armaments.
- >
- >All Human Rights for All People
  - >The violation of human rights is one of the root causes of war. These
  - >violations include the denial of economic, social and cultural rights, as
  - >well as political and civil rights. The artificial distinction between
  - >these two sets of rights can no longer be tolerated.
- >
- >Soft Power
  - >We are profoundly encouraged that civil society and progressive governments
  - >are choosing 'soft power' paths, utilizing negotiation, coalition building
  - >and new diplomacy methods of settling disputes, while rejecting the 'hard
  - >power' dictates of major powers, militaries and economic conglomerates.
- >
- >Replacing the Law of Force with the Force of Law
  - >The rule of law has been contemptuously ignored in contemporary conflicts.
  - >The Hague Appeal seeks to invigorate, develop, and promote universal
  - >adherence to and implementation of international law. It also seeks to
  - >create and invigorate the international institutions of law, like the
  - >International Court of Justice and the new International Criminal Court.
  - >International law must also be made more accessible to individuals.
- >
- >Taking the Initiative in Peace-Making
  - >It is time for people to assert their commitment to peace and - if
  - >necessary - to wrest peace-making away from the exclusive control of
  - >politicians and military establishments. Too often, peace initiatives are
  - >proposed as a last resort, with negotiations restricted to the warmongers,
  - >and imposed on those most affected (particularly women and children). Those
  - >who have suffered most must have a place at the table when peace agreements
  - >are drawn up, with equal representation for women. If necessary, civil
  - >society should also convene peace initiatives before a crisis gets out of
  - >control, and lives are lost. This could help to turn early warning from a
  - >slogan into a reality.
- >
- >Bottom-up Globalization
  - >The alarming concentration of economic power and the irresponsible
  - >imposition of neo-liberal, macro-economic policies are destroying the
  - >environment, generating poverty and desperation, widening divisions and
  - >fomenting war. The Hague Appeal encourages efforts to challenge this
  - >destructive model of globalization through community-based coalitions such
  - >as the Jubilee 2000 call for debt forgiveness and through campaigns to
  - >eradicate poverty.
- >
- >Democratic International Decision-Making
  - >The United Nations system and other multilateral institutions have the
  - >capacity to be a unique and universal force for peace. Yet in recent years
  - >they have been treated with cynicism, politicized and under-funded. The
  - >international system must be revived, democratized and provided with
  - >resources if it is to realise its potential in peace-building. In

>particular, we call for a Security Council that can serve human security  
>rather than Great Power interests and for a radical reorientation of  
>international financial institutions to serve human rather than corporate  
>needs.

>

#### >Humanitarian Intervention

>The Hague Appeal demands the speedy and effective intervention of  
>humanitarian forces, subject to the prescriptions of the United Nations  
>Charter, when civilians are threatened by genocide, war crimes, crimes  
>against humanity and extreme national disasters. It is extraordinary that  
>so little attention has been paid to the idea of establishing a standing  
>intervention force. Civil society should consider new forms of civilian  
>intervention as a matter of urgency.

>

#### >Finding the Money for Peace and Starving the Funds for War

>The allocation of resources is seriously distorted. Many of today's  
>conflicts are fueled by economic greed and the grab for raw materials,  
>while billions are spent on the arms trade and other forms of  
>militarization. At the same time, many worthwhile peace initiatives and  
>programs for human security suffer from a lack of funds even though  
>governments have adopted an extraordinary series of global action plans at  
>the historic world conferences convened during the last ten years. These  
>priorities must be reversed. In addition to eliminating weapons of mass  
>destruction and drastically curbing the arms trade, military budgets must  
>be progressively reduced.

>

#### >MAIN ACTIONS.

>

>The Hague Appeal for Peace will serve as a launch pad for several major,  
>new initiatives and actions. It will also infuse many important, ongoing  
>campaigns with increased momentum. Other campaigns will be identified  
>between now and May 1999. Among these campaigns will be:

>

#### >Small Arms

>The International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA) will launch the next  
>major grass-roots disarmament campaign, for a drastic reduction in the  
>trade in small arms.

>

#### >Landmines

>The International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) will unveil its first  
>report on implementation of the Ottawa mine ban treaty and renew the call  
>for its universal ratification.

>

#### >The International Criminal Court

>The Coalition for an International Criminal Court (CICC) will launch a  
>global campaign to ratify the statute and complete the establishment of the  
>new court.

>

#### >Nuclear Weapons

>Abolition 2000 and the Middle Powers Initiative will present their campaign  
>for a convention outlawing nuclear weapons, building on the momentum  
>generated by the 1996 International Court of Justice advisory opinion and  
>the New Agenda Coalition.

>

>Global Action to Prevent War

>The Hague Appeal with the Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies,  
>Union of Concerned Scientists and World Order Model Project, will promote  
>the launch a major new program for a phased reduction in military  
>establishments over a period of years, accompanied by the creation of  
>effective mechanisms for conflict prevention and resolution.

>

>Humanitarian Intervention

>The Helsinki Citizens Assembly and a number of other groups plan to start a  
>world-wide coalition of peace forces to promote humanitarian intervention.

>

>Education for a Culture of Peace

>The Hague Appeal will call for a major campaign (1) to make universal peace  
>education compulsory in primary and secondary schools and in teacher  
>education, (2) to include, as standard offerings, human rights- and  
>peace-studies in universities and compulsory international law education in  
>law schools, and (3) to strengthen cooperation with UNESCO's program to  
>promote a culture of peace.

>

>Child Soldiers

>The Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers will intensify its campaign  
>to prohibit the recruitment and use in hostilities of children under the  
>age of 18.

>

>Poverty

>Actions on poverty, i.e. raising economic rights to the same level as civil  
>and political rights, are being planned.

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>Gouri Sadhwani

>Campaign Coordinator

>The Hague Appeal for Peace 1999

>c/o WFM 777 UN Plaza

>New York, NY 10017 U.S.A.

>Phone: 212.687.2623

>Fax: 212.599.1332

>Email: [gourihap99@igc.apc.org](mailto:gourihap99@igc.apc.org)

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

>

-----  
Megan Burke

Program Coordinator: Root Causes of War/Culture of Peace

The Hague Appeal for Peace 1999 - New York Office

c/o WFM

777 U.N. Plaza

New York, NY 10017

Tel: (212) 687-2623

Fax: (212) 599-1332

<http://www.haguepeace.org>

-----



Return-Path: <meganhap99@igc.org>

X-Sender: meganhap99@pop.igc.org

Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1999 11:38:48 -0500

To: rootwar-cpeace-list@igc.org, ana@fenix.ifisicacu.unam.mx,

gstassen@fuller.edu, ictur@gn.apc.org, crc@sover.net, wworld@igc.org,  
a.karam@int-idea.se, kclement@gmu.edu, awalker@aol.com,  
root@kprc.bishkek.su, mupj@igc.org, ngumbonz@africaonlineco.2w,  
npc@gn.apc.org, csucc@ncs.com.gh, yadc@ns1.bangla.net,  
blup@altavista.net, amistad@cti.nai.net, kkillleb150@aol.com,  
omaz@omaz.almaty.kz, untv@untv.escom.glas.apc.org,  
root@kprc.bishkek.su, jean@giasbma.vsnl.net.in, mccoym@bdonline.com,  
chin@zamnet.zm, riapre@hotmail.com, apcjp@igc.apc.org,  
thais@laneta.apc.org, christina@wassholm@pg.sfn.se,  
hizkias@users.africaonline.co.ke, hlbtimm@citecho.net,  
foc11@columbia.edu, pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in, iascass@public.bta.net.cn,  
ruiz@icu.ac.jp, system@cfws.ac.un, britna@citechco.net,  
sroshan105@aol.com, cesta@es.com.sv, mccoym@bdonline.com,  
kkelly@igc.apc.org, epank@peacenet.org, aiwusa@earthlink.net,  
info@oneday.net, p4peace@aol.com, wpeace2000@aol.com, congress@igc.org,  
denoff@aol.com, hrec@igc.org, psaoke@ken.healthnet.org,  
rpchurch@gwu.edu, appel100@worldnet.fr, coc@igc.apc.org,  
bihr@bangla.net, intrac@imfiko.bishkek.su, ihrla@fascom.com,  
earlwal@itis.com, overby@bobcat.ent.ohiou.edu, peace@colgate.edu,  
jmisrack@igc.apc.org, conflict.peace@dartnet.co.uk, pdd@clark.net,  
isis@hetnet.nl, J.Schaake@IFOR.CCMAIL.compuserve.com, earlwal@itis.com,  
wfbn@antenna.nl, edibal@iprolink.ch, pdhre@igc.org,  
CAMDUN@uniworld.demon.co.uk, miquel@sidint.org, fredpax@online.no,  
sstaples@canadians.org, unoy@antenna.nl, gunfree2@sn.apc.org,  
q18@nikhef.nl, benyan@inter.net.il, hca@antenna.nl,  
acc@internetegypt.com, wwsf@iprolink.ch, lie.tahzib@tip.nl,  
mccoym@pc.jaring.my, euv-5835@euv-frankfurt-o.de, japragt@knmg.nl,  
bbroadwa@dreamscape.com, zunes@delta.usfca.edu, johndear@interport.net,  
crc@sover.net, ana@fenix.ifisicacu.unam.mx, gstassen@fuller.edu,  
ictur@gn.apc.org, crc@sover.net, wworld@igc.org, a.karam@int-idea.se,  
kclement@gmu.edu, awalker@aol.com, root@kprc.bishkek.su, mupj@igc.org,  
ngumbonz@africaonlineco.2w, npc@gn.apc.org, csucc@ncs.com.gh,  
yadc@ns1.bangla.net, blup@altavista.net, amistad@cti.nai.net,  
kkillleb150@aol.com, omaz@omaz.almaty.kz, untv@untv.escom.glas.apc.org,  
root@kprc.bishkek.su, jean@giasbma.vsnl.net.in, mccoym@bdonline.com,  
chin@zamnet.zm, riapre@hotmail.com, apcjp@igc.apc.org,  
thais@laneta.apc.org, christina@wassholm@pg.sfn.se,  
hizkias@users.africaonline.co.ke, hlbtimm@citecho.net,  
foc11@columbia.edu, pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in, iascass@public.bta.net.cn,  
ruiz@icu.ac.jp, system@cfws.ac.un, britna@citechco.net,  
sroshan105@aol.com, cesta@es.com.sv, mccoym@bdonline.com,  
kkelly@igc.apc.org, epank@peacenet.org, aiwusa@earthlink.net,  
info@oneday.net, p4peace@aol.com, wpeace2000@aol.com, congress@igc.org,  
denoff@aol.com, hrec@igc.org, psaoke@ken.healthnet.org,  
rpchurch@gwu.edu, appel100@worldnet.fr, coc@igc.apc.org,  
bihr@bangla.net, intrac@imfiko.bishkek.su, ihrla@fascom.com,  
earlwal@itis.com, overby@bobcat.ent.ohiou.edu, peace@colgate.edu,  
jmisrack@igc.apc.org, conflict.peace@dartnet.co.uk, pdd@clark.net,  
cicc2@igc.org, mrenner@mail.peconic.net, petweiss@igc.org,

rootwar-cpeace-list@igc.org  
From: Megan Burke <meganhap99@igc.org>  
Subject: Draft Agenda Part 2

>AGENDA ITEMS:

- >
- >1. Disarmament and Human Security
- >
- >
- >1. Implement a Global Action Plan to Prevent War.
- >Implement a Global Action Plan to Prevent War that will Complement Measures  
>to Protect Human Rights and Strengthen Nonviolent Conflict Resolution with  
>the following major steps: (1) Strengthening Global and Regional Security  
>Institutions; (2) Replacing Unilateral Military Intervention with  
>Multilateral Defense against Aggression and Genocide; and (3) Negotiating  
>Deep, Phased Reductions in Military Forces, Weapons and Budgets, aiming for  
>a Global Defensive Security System.
- >
- >2. Demilitarize the Global Economy by Reducing Military Budgets and  
>Shifting Resources Towards Human Security Programs.
- >As a first step toward disarmament and demilitarization, the Hague Appeal  
>for Peace endorses the Women's Peace Petition, which calls for a 5%  
>reduction a year for 5 years in military spending and the reallocation of  
>these substantial resources toward human security - educational, health  
>care, environmental, food, housing and employment programs.
- >
- >3. Negotiate and Ratify an International Treaty to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons
- >Nuclear weapons still threaten the survival of all human kind. In order to  
>comply with their legal obligations under Article VI of the  
>Non-Proliferation Treaty, all states should negotiate and conclude a  
>Nuclear Weapons Convention within five years. Failure to comply would  
>result in states being brought before the International Court of Justice.  
>The Advisory Opinion on Nuclear Weapons of the International Court of  
>Justice in July 1996 explained that the obligation points to negotiations  
>aimed at reaching total nuclear disarmament.
- >
- >The New Agenda Coalition's resolution, adopted by the First Committee of  
>the United Nations, calls on the nuclear weapons states to commit to taking  
>the immediate practical steps and negotiations required to comply with  
>legal obligations under Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- >
- >Steps toward nuclear disarmament include: ratification of Comprehensive  
>Test Ban Treaty; adherence to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty;  
>de-alerting; no-first use; the de-nuclearization of regional security  
>arrangements; extension of nuclear free zones; and a ban on fissile  
>materials and subcritical tests. In the interest of transparency and  
>accountability, stocks and warheads being made by nuclear weapons states  
>should be declared. Fissile material stocks and nuclear warheads, withdrawn  
>after arms control agreements, should come under international control.
- >
- >4. Prevent Proliferation and Use of Conventional Weapons Including, Light  
>Weapons, Small Arms and Guns and Safeguard Personal Security.
- >Small arms, light weapons and landmines pose the biggest threat to human

>security; their use results in the majority of civilian deaths. The Hague  
>Appeal for Peace endorses the campaign of the International Action Network  
>on Small Arms. All states should negotiate and implement a comprehensive  
>global code of conduct for all exports of all types of conventional  
>weapons, including light weapons, small arms and guns. Perpetrators of  
>violence should be held legally accountable as well as local justice  
>systems that guarantee individual rights. International institutions  
>prosecuting these criminals should be supported and international laws  
>enforced.

>  
>Steps toward stopping the flow of weapons include: controlling legal  
>transfers between states; safeguarding the availability, use and storage of  
>small arms within states; preventing  
>and combating illicit transfers; preventing weapons transfers to human  
>rights violators; collecting and increasing transparency and  
>accountability; reducing demand by reversing cultures of violence;  
>reforming public security institutions; creating norms of non-possession;  
>promoting more effective and sustainable demobilization and reintegration  
>of former combatants.

>  
>5. Ratify and Implement the Landmine Ban Treaty.

>All states should sign, ratify and adhere to Mine Ban Treaty on the  
>Prohibition of the Use, Production, Stockpiling and Transfer of  
>Anti-personnel Landmines and on their Destruction. Globally, 133 nations  
>have signed and 58 have ratified. The treaty, which opened for signature in  
>December 1997, will enter into force on 1 March 1999, faster than any other  
>major international treaty.

>  
>In addition to the vital and urgent task of demining, the International  
>Campaign to Ban Landmines puts a high priority on governments destroying  
>their stockpiles of mines as a form of "preventive mine action."  
>Transparency on stockpiles, and other mine-related matters is essential.

>  
>Funds should be made available for victim assistance and demining by  
>diverting a percentage of military budgets.

>  
>6. Prevent the Development and Use of New Weapons and New Military  
>Technologies, including a Ban on the Deployment of Weapons in Space.  
>The Hague Appeal for Peace calls for mechanisms to assess the impact of new  
>weapons (e.g. depleted uranium) and technologies and to determine if the  
>use of new and indiscriminate weapons violate international law.

>  
>The Hague Appeal calls for universal adherence to the Outer Space Treaty  
>(1967) in order to prevent the deployment of "weapons of mass destruction"  
>in space by any nation. The treaty, ratified by 91 countries, states that  
>nations should "avoid" activities that could produce harmful contamination  
>of space as well as adverse changes in the environment of earth. This  
>treaty, which is the basic framework for international space law, requires  
>universal adherence to prevent the deployment of weapons in space.

>  
>7. Strengthen Universal Implementation and Adherence of Biological Weapons  
>Convention and Chemical Weapons Convention.

>All countries should ratify the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) and the  
>Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) as part of a global effort to abolish all

>weapons of mass destruction.

>

>All countries should adopt strong national legislation that fully  
>implements the BWC and CWC conventions without qualification and should  
>participate in current efforts to enhance compliance with the BWC. Parties  
>to CWC should not dilute inspection and verification through domestic  
>legislation or executive actions.

>

>All state parties that are in compliance with the BWC and CWC should  
>receive equal treatment with respect to trade in the agents and equipment  
>covered by these treaties. In particular, the Australia Group, which  
>coordinates the export controls of 30 mainly industrialized countries in  
>private, with no international accountability for its decisions, must be  
>replaced by international controls managed with the frameworks of the  
>relevant conventions.

>

>8. Hold States Accountable for the Impact of Military Production, Testing  
>and Use on the Environment and Health.

>The nuclear weapons states must acknowledge their responsibility for the  
>health and environmental impacts of past nuclear tests. They must introduce  
>or extend programs for monitoring, clean up and rehabilitation of former  
>nuclear test sites and for compensation to former test site workers,  
>civilian and military personnel at the sites and neighboring local  
>communities.

>

>The successful decommissioning of nuclear and chemical weapons in  
>industrializing countries should not lead to the export of resulting toxic  
>chemical and nuclear wastes to developing countries. Information on the  
>impact of military production, testing and use at military bases and other  
>sites must be made available by states to ensure transparency and to  
>facilitate restoration.

>

>9. Build a Civil Society Movement for the Abolition of War  
>A new culture of diplomacy is transforming international relations.  
>Abolishing war will require building the institutions and the capacity to  
>safeguard the profound achievements of the past (such as the treaties  
>banning chemical and biological weapons, landmine and nuclear testing) as  
>well as to bring about the difficult negotiations to eliminate all nuclear  
>weapons and to stop the flow of small arms and light weapons.

>

>Civil society has a central role to play in democratizing international  
>relations. Civil society organizations and citizens have brought the  
>demands of people directly to the international level and have created a  
>"new diplomacy." The Hague Appeal for Peace affirms the necessary role of  
>civil society in the 21st century in international and transnational  
>disarmament and security negotiations.

>

>2. Prevention, Resolution and Transformation of Violent Conflict

>

>

>10. Strengthen Local Capacities

>If efforts to prevent, resolve and transform violent conflict are to be  
>effective in the long-term, they must be based on the strong participation  
>of local civil-society groups committed to building peace. Strengthening

>such "local capacities for peace" may take many forms, including education  
>and training, nurturing the volunteer spirit in society and highlighting  
>the work of local peacemakers in the media.

>  
>11. Strengthen the United Nations' Capacity to Maintain Peace  
>Strong civil-society support of the aims and purposes of the United Nations  
>is vital to achieving its full potential as the guardian of international  
>peace and security. In particular, civil-society should support the  
>improvement of the UN's capacity to prevent violent conflict; for example  
>through the creation of a permanent UN volunteer military force for use in  
>humanitarian interventions and by suggesting alternative ways in which the  
>UN could finance its peace operations.

>  
>12. Prioritise Early Warning and Early Response  
>Civil-society organisations, governments and inter-governmental bodies  
>should recognise that prevention is better than cure and dedicate more  
>attention and, especially, resources to preventing, as opposed to reacting  
>to, violent conflict. In particular, this should include generating the  
>political will needed for early response and thinking now about the  
>probable sources of future violent conflict.

>  
>  
>13. Promote the Training of Civilian Peace Professionals  
>There is a strong need to promote the specialized training of civilian  
>women and men to carry out peacebuilding tasks especially in pre- and  
>post-conflict situations. The long-term aim should be the creation of an  
>international body of "civilian peace professionals" that can be called  
>upon to carry out civilian duties in conflict areas at short notice.

>  
>14. Refine the Use of Sanctions  
>UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, has demanded that economic sanctions  
>become "more effective and less injurious." We need to develop ways of  
>better targeting economic sanctions so that their effect cannot be  
>transferred from those whose behaviour they are meant to change, on the one  
>hand, to innocent civilians, on the other.

>  
>15. Strengthen Mechanisms for Humanitarian Intervention  
>In order to help avoid future acts of genocide and gross violations of  
>human rights, it is necessary to create mechanisms that will allow for  
>humanitarian intervention to protect the lives of people in danger.

>  
>16. Engender Peace Building  
>There is a need for: (1) Specific initiatives aimed at understanding the  
>inter-relationships between gender equality and peace building, (2)  
>strengthening women's capacity to participate in peace building initiatives  
>and (3) equal participation of women in conflict resolution at  
>decision-making levels.

>  
>17. Empower Young People  
>Wars are initiated by leaders, but it is young people who are their most  
>vulnerable victims, both as civilians and as conscripts. Their experience,  
>perspectives and new ideas need to be heard, integrated and acted upon at  
>all levels of society.

>

>18. Listen to the Voices of Unrepresented Peoples

>Resolving conflicts between unrepresented peoples and the recognised states  
>within which they live represents a major challenge for governments, civil  
>society and unrepresented peoples themselves. It is imperative that a  
>constructive dialogue, involving a broad range of groups and interests,  
>begin as soon as possible.

>

>19. Strengthen Coalition-Building Between Civil-Society Groups

>The effectiveness of civil-society activity is often hampered by a lack of  
>coordination between groups operating in similar fields. The result is  
>often that scarce resources are wasted through duplication of tasks and a  
>failure to achieve synergy. There is a great need to create networks that  
>promote coalition- and constituency-building between civil-society  
>organisations.

>

>20. Strengthen Regional and Sub-Regional Capacities for Peace

>Strengthening regional capacities for peace, for example, in the form of  
>the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the  
>Organisation for African Unity (OAU), the Association of South East Asian  
>Nations (ASEAN), the Organisation of American States (OAS), etc., would  
>help to ensure that largely ignored conflicts receive the attention, and  
>efforts at resolution, that they deserve.

>

>21. Mainstream Multi-Track Diplomacy

>In the next century, we should aim to make "multi-track diplomacy" -- joint  
>problem-solving by numerous sectors of society, governments and  
>intergovernmental structures working together -- the standard approach to  
>preventing, resolving and transforming violent conflict.

>

>22. Utilise the Media as a Proactive Tool for Peacebuilding

>We must explore ways (1) to promote objective, non-inflammatory reporting  
>of conflict situations so that the media serves the cause of peace rather  
>than war  
>and (2) to use the media in creative, new ways to build peace and promote  
>reconciliation.

>

>23. Make "Conflict Impact Assessment" a Requirement

>In order to maximise the benefit of development aid, dispensing bodies --  
>governmental, inter-governmental and private -- should be required to  
>assess and report on the likely impact of their development aid policies in  
>terms of whether they will heighten or reduce the risk of violent conflict.

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>Gouri Sadhwani

>Campaign Coordinator

>The Hague Appeal for Peace 1999

>c/o WFM 777 UN Plaza

>New York, NY 10017 U.S.A.

>Phone: 212.687.2623

>Fax: 212.599.1332

>Email: gourihap99@igc.apc.org

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

>

-----  
Megan Burke  
Program Coordinator: Root Causes of War/Culture of Peace  
The Hague Appeal for Peace 1999 - New York Office  
c/o WFM  
777 U.N. Plaza  
New York, NY 10017  
Tel: (212) 687-2623  
Fax: (212) 599-1332

<http://www.haguepeace.org>  
-----

Return-Path: <meganhap99@igc.org>

X-Sender: meganhap99@pop.igc.org

Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1999 11:39:28 -0500

To: rootwar-cpeace-list@igc.org, isis@hetnet.nl,

J.Schaake@IFOR.CCMAIL.compuserve.com, earlwal@itis.com,  
wfbn@antenna.nl, edibal@iprolink.ch, pdhre@igc.org,  
CAMDUN@uniworld.demon.co.uk, miquel@sidint.org, fredpax@online.no,  
sstaples@canadians.org, unoy@antenna.nl, gunfree2@sn.apc.org,  
q18@nikhef.nl, benyan@inter.net.il, hca@antenna.nl,  
acc@internetegypt.com, wwsf@iprolink.ch, lie.tahzib@tip.nl,  
mccoy@pc.jaring.my, euv-5835@euv-frankfurt-o.de, japragn@knmg.nl,  
bbroadwa@dreamscape.com, zunes@delta.usfca.edu, johndear@interport.net,  
crc@sover.net, ana@fenix.ifisicacu.unam.mx, gstassen@fuller.edu,  
ictur@gn.apc.org, crc@sover.net, wworld@igc.org, a.karam@int-idea.se,  
kclement@gmu.edu, awalker@aol.com, root@kprc.bishkek.su, mupj@igc.org,  
ngumbonz@africaonlineco.2w, npc@gn.apc.org, csucc@ncs.com.gh,  
yadc@ns1.bangla.net, blup@altavista.net, amistad@cti.nai.net,  
kkillleb150@aol.com, omaz@omaz.almaty.kz, untv@untv.escom.glas.apc.org,  
root@kprc.bishkek.su, jean@giabma.vsnl.net.in, mccoy@bdonline.com,  
chin@zamnet.zm, riapre@hotmail.com, apcjp@igc.apc.org,  
thais@laneta.apc.org, christina@wassholm@pg.sfn.se,  
hizkias@users.africaonline.co.ke, hlbtimm@citecho.net,  
foc11@columbia.edu, pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in, iascass@public.bta.net.cn,  
ruiz@icu.ac.jp, system@cfws.ac.un, britna@citechco.net,  
sroshan105@aol.com, cesta@es.com.sv, mccoy@bdonline.com,  
kkelly@igc.apc.org, epank@peacenet.org, aiwusa@earthlink.net,  
info@oneday.net, p4peace@aol.com, wpeace2000@aol.com, congress@igc.org,  
denoff@aol.com, hrec@igc.org, psaoke@ken.healthnet.org,  
rpchurch@gwu.edu, appel100@worldnet.fr, coc@igc.apc.org,  
bihr@bangla.net, intrac@imfiko.bishkek.su, ihrla@fascom.com,  
earlwal@itis.com, overby@bobcat.ent.ohiou.edu, peace@colgate.edu,  
jmisrack@igc.apc.org, conflict.peace@dartnet.co.uk, pdd@clark.net,  
cicc2@igc.org, mrenner@mail.peconic.net, petweiss@igc.org,  
rootwar-cpeace-list@igc.org, ana@fenix.ifisicacu.unam.mx,  
gstassen@fuller.edu, ictur@gn.apc.org, crc@sover.net, wworld@igc.org,  
a.karam@int-idea.se, kclement@gmu.edu, awalker@aol.com,  
root@kprc.bishkek.su, mupj@igc.org, ngumbonz@africaonlineco.2w,  
npc@gn.apc.org, csucc@ncs.com.gh, yadc@ns1.bangla.net,  
blup@altavista.net, amistad@cti.nai.net, kkillleb150@aol.com,  
omaz@omaz.almaty.kz, untv@untv.escom.glas.apc.org,  
root@kprc.bishkek.su, jean@giabma.vsnl.net.in, mccoy@bdonline.com,  
chin@zamnet.zm, riapre@hotmail.com, apcjp@igc.apc.org,  
thais@laneta.apc.org, christina@wassholm@pg.sfn.se,  
hizkias@users.africaonline.co.ke, hlbtimm@citecho.net,  
foc11@columbia.edu, pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in, iascass@public.bta.net.cn,  
ruiz@icu.ac.jp, system@cfws.ac.un, britna@citechco.net,  
sroshan105@aol.com, cesta@es.com.sv, mccoy@bdonline.com,  
kkelly@igc.apc.org, epank@peacenet.org, aiwusa@earthlink.net,  
info@oneday.net, p4peace@aol.com, wpeace2000@aol.com, congress@igc.org,  
denoff@aol.com, hrec@igc.org, psaoke@ken.healthnet.org,  
rpchurch@gwu.edu, appel100@worldnet.fr, coc@igc.apc.org,  
bihr@bangla.net, intrac@imfiko.bishkek.su, ihrla@fascom.com,  
earlwal@itis.com, overby@bobcat.ent.ohiou.edu, peace@colgate.edu,

jmisrack@igc.apc.org, conflict.peace@dartnet.co.uk, pdd@clark.net  
From: Megan Burke <meganhap99@igc.org>  
Subject: Draft Agenda Part 3

### 3. International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law and Institutions

- >
- >
- >24. Advance the Global Campaign for the Establishment of the International  
>Criminal Court  
>The Hague Appeal for Peace will support the work of the NGO Coalition for  
>an International Criminal Court (CICC) in expanding upon its global efforts  
>to establish the permanent International Criminal Court, through an  
>intensive education and ratification campaign, and through active  
>participation in the sessions of the United Nations Preparatory Commission  
>for the International Criminal Court. The CICC will be seeking new NGO  
>partners at the Hague Appeal and building upon valuable advocacy and  
>networking lessons from the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and the  
>Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers.  
>
- >25. Encourage Close Cooperation Between the Converging Fields of  
>International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law  
>The Hague Appeal for Peace recognizes the increasing convergence between  
>the fields of international humanitarian and human rights law, a  
>development critical to the effective protection of victims of both human  
>rights and humanitarian law violations. The Hague Appeal will advocate for  
>changes in the development and implementation of laws in both of these  
>fields, in order to close critical gaps in protection and to harmonize  
>these vital areas of international law.  
>
- >26. Reinforce Support for the International Criminal Tribunals  
>The international criminal tribunals for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda  
>represent the first steps which the international community has taken since  
>the end of World War II towards holding individuals accountable for  
>violations of international humanitarian and human rights law. The Hague  
>Appeal will call for the immediate indictment and arrest of alleged war  
>criminals who remain at large. The Hague Appeal will also focus on the  
>practices and working methods of the tribunals, to combat propaganda  
>suggesting that the tribunals are partisan and to determine how civil  
>society, regional and international organizations may best be able to  
>participate in the implementation of international humanitarian and human  
>rights laws in these arenas and in similar tribunals in the future.  
>
- >27. Enforce Universal Jurisdiction for Universal Crimes: Building Upon the  
>Pinochet Precedent  
>It is now generally recognized that war crimes, crimes against the peace  
>and violations of universally recognized human rights principles are  
>matters of global rather than merely national concern. Not every person  
>committing a universal crime can be tried by the International Criminal  
>Court once it is established, or by an ad hoc tribunal such as those for  
>Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. Civil society and domestic courts must do  
>their part, as those of Spain are trying to do in the case of Pinochet. The  
>Hague Appeal will call upon national legislative and judicial systems  
>worldwide to move toward the principle universal jurisdiction for such  
>crimes as well as torts.

>  
>28. Reform and Expand the Role of the International Court of Justice in  
>the Context of a More Comprehensive System of Global Justice  
>The International Court of Justice must serve as the locus of a more  
>effective, integrated system of international justice. The Hague Appeal  
>will advance proposals for strengthening interrelationships between  
>national, regional and international legal institutions, with the aim of  
>fostering a more comprehensive global system of justice. Initiatives which  
>further this aim are expanding the advisory opinion and conflict resolution  
>functions of the court to provide access for civil society, regional and  
>international organizations, instituting compulsory jurisdiction for  
>states, and encouraging cooperation among international legal institutions  
>and alternate fora for dispute resolution.

>  
>29. Strengthen Protection of and Provide Reparation for the Victims of  
>Armed Conflict  
>The Hague Appeal for Peace will advocate greater measures of protection for  
>the most vulnerable and frequent victims of conventional arms proliferation  
>and armed conflict, including internally displaced persons and refugees,  
>asylum seekers, women and children. The Hague Appeal will also seek more  
>consistent adherence to the standards of international humanitarian and  
>human rights law by non-State combatants and quasi-state paramilitary  
>forces and will examine the role of the United Nations in situations of  
>armed conflict. Finally, the Hague Appeal will demand that victims of armed  
>conflict and human rights violations be made whole through the  
>establishment of national, regional and international victim compensation  
>funds and other reparation measures.

>  
>30. Stop the Use of Child Soldiers  
>More than 300,000 children under 18 years of age are believed to be  
>currently participating in armed conflicts around the world. Hundreds of  
>thousands more are members of armed forces or groups and could be sent into  
>combat at almost any moment. The Coalition to Stop the Use of Child  
>Soldiers, UNICEF and the ICRC are actively campaigning for the end of this  
>unconscionable practice. The Hague Appeal will provide other  
>non-governmental organizations the opportunity to contribute to these  
>campaigns and to explore other methods by which children's rights may be  
>protected.

>  
>31. Help Victims to Hold Abusers Accountable Under International  
>Humanitarian and Human Rights Law  
>Recent trends in national and regional litigation and prosecution make it  
>possible for victims of gross human rights and humanitarian law violations  
>to hold abusers accountable for those violations. This right exists in some  
>domestic courts and regional tribunals, including the European and  
>Inter-American Courts of Human Rights, and has led to litigation against  
>members of the private sector, such as mercenary, arms manufacturing and  
>other corporations, for violations of international humanitarian and human  
>rights law which occurred, either as a direct or indirect result of their  
>actions. The Hague Appeal for Peace will advocate for the extension of this  
>right throughout the international legal order.

>  
>32. Protect Human Rights Defenders, Humanitarian Workers and Whistleblowers  
>The year 1998 saw more civilian representatives of the United Nations

>killed in action than military peacekeepers. In addition, countless human  
>rights defenders and humanitarian workers from national, regional and  
>international organizations have been injured or killed in the course of  
>their work. The Hague Appeal will propose and demand improvements in  
>protection for human rights defenders and humanitarian workers in the field  
>and mechanisms by which violations of these individuals' rights may be  
>monitored and lessened. The Hague Appeal will also call for strengthened  
>protection for whistleblowers, individuals who expose illegal actions or  
>international law violations by governments, corporations and other  
>institutions at the risk of their careers, and sometimes their lives.

>  
>

>33. Train Grassroots Organizations to Use National, Regional and  
>International Mechanisms in the Enforcement of International Law  
>There are increasing opportunities for grassroots organizations to seek  
>remedies for violations at the local or national level through regional and  
>international mechanisms, such as the European or American court systems or  
>the UN treaty bodies and extra-treaty monitoring mechanisms. However, these  
>organizations must first be aware of such mechanisms and how to make best  
>use of them. The Hague Appeal will strive to provide training and awareness  
>programs, which will heighten understanding of these remedies and how  
>grassroots organizations may work together or singly to ensure that access  
>to these mechanisms is unrestrained and utilized. The Hague Appeal will  
>also provide an opportunity for activists to learn how they may be involved  
>in identifying violators in their communities and bringing them to account  
>for their actions.

>

>34. Promote Increased Public Knowledge, Teaching and Understanding of  
>International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law  
>The increasing likelihood of international involvement in armed conflicts  
>underscores the need for effective human rights and humanitarian training  
>for peacekeepers, in parallel with similar training for national military  
>institutions, in order to promote awareness of and adherence to the  
>requirements of international law. This phenomenon, in turn, reflects the  
>need for a greater awareness of international humanitarian and human rights  
>law among national lawmakers and law enforcers. The Hague Appeal for Peace  
>will call for mandatory training in international humanitarian and human  
>rights law for lawyers, legislators, judges and politicians, as a crucial  
>step towards greater respect for these standards.

>

>35. Integrate Human Rights Protections into Conflict Prevention,  
>Resolution and Post-Conflict Reconstruction  
>International intervention in conflicts, as practiced by NATO, the UN, and  
>the Office of the High Representative in Bosnia and Herzegovina, is a  
>growing phenomenon in the world of conflict resolution and post-conflict  
>reconstruction. Increasingly, the international community has taken on the  
>responsibility for political, legal, social and economic  
>institution-building in post-conflict societies. The Hague Appeal will  
>advocate for measures to ensure that long-term, systematic protection of  
>human rights is central to these processes.

>

>36. Build Upon the Successes and Failures of Truth Commissions and  
>Political Amnesties  
>The field of post-conflict reconstruction has seen remarkable new

>developments over the last few decades, in particular the use of truth  
>commissions and political amnesties as tools for mending torn social  
>structures. The Hague Appeal will examine the failures and successes of  
>past truth commissions and political amnesties, as well as proposals for  
>new truth commissions in Bosnia and the United States, to support  
>improvements in the overall effectiveness of these reconciliation processes  
>and to ensure that they continue to play a productive role in tandem with  
>the international criminal tribunals and the International Criminal Court.

>  
>37. Establish a Universal and Effective System of Habeas Corpus  
>The thousands of individuals arrested each year on political, ethnic and  
>other illegal grounds need an effective system by which they or their  
>representation can call attention to their plight before they are killed,  
>tortured or disappeared. Article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil  
>and Political Rights must be given teeth by providing for a rapid and  
>effective system of habeas corpus, with the right of appeal to regional or  
>supraregional human rights commissions or courts.

>  
>  
>38. Subject Warming to Democratic Controls  
>Nothing is more subversive of democracy than leaving the power to take a  
>country to war  
>in the hands of the executive branch of government. The Hague Appeal for  
>Peace will call on all countries and international organizations to take  
>constitutional or legislative action requiring parliamentary approval to  
>initiate armed conflict, except in extreme cases requiring immediate action  
>for self-defense.

>  
>4. Root Causes of War/Culture of Peace

>  
>  
>39. Educate for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy  
>In order to combat the culture of violence that pervades our society, the  
>coming generation deserves a radically different education- one that does  
>not glorify war but educates for peace. The Hague Appeal for Peace seeks to  
>launch a world-wide campaign that will:  
>Insist that peace education be made compulsory at all levels of the  
>education system.  
>Demand that education ministries systematically implement peace education  
>initiatives at local and national level.  
>Call on development assistance agencies to promote peace education as a  
>component of their teacher training and materials production.

>  
>40. Combat the Adverse Effects of Globalization  
>Economic globalization has marginalized broad sections of the world's  
>population, further widening the gap between rich and poor. The Hague  
>Appeal for Peace supports the creation of a just global economy with  
>special emphasis on:  
>An international campaign among local, national, international and  
>intergovernmental organizations promoting respect for labor rights.  
>Democratic reform of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and  
>the World Trade Organization.  
>Regulation of the international financial system.  
>Accountability of multinational corporations, including proposals for the

- >granting of international charters and their revocation in cases of gross
- >abuse.
- >Financing economic development from new sources, such as modest levies on
- >international transfers of arms or funds (the Tobin tax).
- >Expanding the United Nations G8 to G16 by including eight countries from
- >the developing world.
- >Cancellation of the crushing debts of the world's poorest countries.
- >Recognition and implementation of economic, social and cultural rights,
- >including the right to development.
- >
- >41. Advance the Sustainable and Equitable Use of Environmental Resources
- >As stated in the 1998 United Nations Development Program Human Development
- >Report, "The world's dominant consumers are overwhelmingly concentrated
- >among the well-off - but the environmental damage from the world's
- >consumption falls most severely on the poor." The Hague Appeal for Peace
- >supports initiatives to:
- >Strengthen international environmental law and its implementation by, i.a.,
- >promoting the concept of a basic right to a clean and healthy environment.
- >Address the problems of overconsumption and misallocation of environmental
- >resources.
- >Consider the increasingly serious problem of the inequitable allocation of
- >water.
- >Support the campaigns to save the world's forests and species (including
- >human kind) from environmental degradation.
- >Develop plans to tackle militaries as the world's largest polluters.
- >Identify alternative approaches to sustainable development.
- >
- >42. Eradicate Colonialism and Neocolonialism
- >The perception that colonialism is a thing of the past is inaccurate. Many
- >unrepresented nations and peoples are suffering from ethnic and cultural
- >genocide, the suppression of their right to self-determination, language
- >and religion, and the militarization and nuclearization of their lives and
- >lands. The Hague Appeal for Peace endorses efforts to:
- >Assist those people and nations still under colonial domination in their
- >peaceful struggle for justice and the exercise of their right to
- >self-determination.
- >Eliminate new forms of colonialism, particularly in the economic sphere.
- >Stop the dumping of the industrialized countries' toxic materials in
- >developing countries.
- >Close down foreign military bases.
- >
- >43. Eliminate Racial, Ethnic, Gender and Religious Intolerance
- >Ethnic, religious and racial intolerance and nationalism are among the
- >principal sources of modern armed conflict. The Hague Appeal for Peace
- >supports:
- >Efforts to eliminate the political manipulation of racial, ethnic, gender
- >and religious differences for political and economic purposes.
- >The implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of
- >Racial Discrimination
- >Preparations for the United Nations World Conference on Racism and Racial
- >Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance (2001).
- >The inclusion of hate crimes in the world's judicial systems.
- >Education and legislation designed to overcome homophobia.
- >The promotion of affirmative action until the consequences of past

>discrimination have been redressed.

>

#### >44. Promote Gender Justice

>The costs of the machismo that still pervades most societies are high for men whose choices are limited by this standard, and for women who experience continual violence both in war and in peace. The Hague Appeal for Peace supports:

>The active participation of women in significant numbers in all decision and policy-making forums.

>Recognition of the role of women as peace-makers. The implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

>The redefinition of distorted gender roles that perpetuate violence.

>

#### >45. Protect and Respect Children and Youth

>Children and youth continue to be exploited and victimized, particularly in violent conflict situations where harming children has become not only a consequence, but frequently a strategy of war. The Hague Appeal for Peace supports initiatives to:

>Ensure the universal adoption and implementation of the Convention of the rights of the Child including the elimination of child labor and the use of child soldiers.

>Rehabilitate children who have been exposed and traumatized by violent conflict.

>Recognize the role of children and youth as peacemakers.

>

#### >46. Promote International Democracy and Just Global Governance

>The promotion of democracy at all levels of society is a prerequisite for replacing the rule of force with the rule of law. The Hague Appeal for Peace endorses the following:

>The reform and democratization of the United Nations, and particularly the Security Council.

>The promotion of regional institutions to advance peace through adherence to international law.

>The recommendations of the Commission on Global Governance, including the participation of civil society in global governance.

>

#### >47. Eliminate Communal Violence at the Local Level

>Violence in local communities paves the way for conflicts at national and international levels. The Hague Appeal for Peace supports initiatives to:

>Reintegrate into society the young people and some of their elders who have been marginalized, often as a result of limited economic opportunities, and whose marginalization has led them into violent behavior.

>Promote local peace initiatives, including gun exchanges, peace camps and conflict resolution training.

>

#### >48. Proclaim Active Non-Violence

>It is commonly assumed but has never been proved that violence and warfare are inherent in human nature. In fact, many traditions and examples prove that active non-violence is an effective way to achieve social change. The

>Hague Appeal for Peace supports:

>Replacing the glorification of militarism with models of active

>non-violence. A campaign to eliminate, or at least reduce, violence in the

>media and in everyday language.

>Activities surrounding The United Nations Year and Decade for a Culture of  
>Peace and Nonviolence (2001-2010).

>

>

>

>END

>

>

>

>

>\*\*\*\*\*

>

>Gouri Sadhwani

>Campaign Coordinator

>The Hague Appeal for Peace 1999

>c/o WFM 777 UN Plaza

>New York, NY 10017 U.S.A.

>Phone: 212.687.2623

>Fax: 212.599.1332

>Email: gourihap99@igc.apc.org

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

>

-----  
Megan Burke

Program Coordinator: Root Causes of War/Culture of Peace

The Hague Appeal for Peace 1999 - New York Office

c/o WFM

777 U.N. Plaza

New York, NY 10017

Tel: (212) 687-2623

Fax: (212) 599-1332

<http://www.haguepeace.org>

-----

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1999 13:40:18 -0800  
From: David Krieger <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Million Family March on Washington  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Authentication-Warning: beach.silcom.com: pm2-41.sba1.avtel.net [207.71.218.141] didn't use HELO protocol  
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Following our meeting in Santa Barbara, I am convinced that we must think big and be bold and imaginative in our strategy to move the U.S. government to become serious about abolishing nuclear arms. I therefore, suggest that the centerpiece of our strategy for the next two years be a ONE MILLION FAMILY MARCH ON WASHINGTON FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS ABOLITION. I believe this should take place in MID-JUNE 2000, while Congress is in session, school is out, and before the political party conventions. This would mobilize and focus our efforts and provide a reason for grassroots organizing in every community in the country. Leading up to the event, we could involve the churches, the military leaders, the students, the disempowered, the downwinders, the artists, the rock groups, etc. Following the event (as well as leading up to it), we could raise the issue of abolition in every Congressional race and in the Presidential primaries and election. We would make our voices heard in a tangible way. It would be action that the media throughout the country and the world could not ignore.

We could have a poster with a nuclear cloud over a family (perhaps picnicking). The caption could read, "A Nuclear Cloud Hangs Over the Human Family. It's Time to End the Threat. Join the One Million Family March on Washington, DC, June -- 2000."

This would give new meaning and bring new life to Abolition 2000 and a U.S. Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons. It could spark support from throughout the world. It would be bold enough to awaken the public, and put the issue of abolition on the political agenda.

This is a call to action. Everyone is welcome to join in making this happen.

Please think positively. We can take bold steps, make our presence felt and change the world.

David Krieger

\*\*\*\*\*

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

International contact for Abolition 2000

a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

\*\*\*\*\*

1187 Coast Village Road, Box 121

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

Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1999 14:04:27 -0800

From: David Krieger <wagingpeace@napf.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Inspiration

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

X-Authentication-Warning: beach.silcom.com: pm2-41.sba1.avtel.net [207.71.218.141] didn't use HELO protocol

X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Here are a few of the comments I noted at the U.S. Abolition Campaign Organizing meeting, February 12-14, 1999 that I found inspirational. We really need to face the problem of nuclear weapons with efforts that are big enough and bold enough to be commensurate to the challenge. Our time is now, and "the gift of time" is slipping through our fingers. It is time to put our national and international campaigns squarely on the global agenda and all domestic political agendas.

David Krieger

-----  
I would like to see a spiritual fire go out from this place that will burn so bright that it cannot be ignored in Washington.

- Pilulaw Khus

We live in a culture of violence, and nuclear weapons serve that culture. The abolition of nuclear weapons is about creating new ways of living in a democracy.

- Betty Burkes

The single most important thing we can do on this weekend is to decide on a unified activity that can be done throughout the country, from sea to shining sea.

- Jonathan Schell

I think one of our major strategies should be electoral. We should be ready to take back the Congress. I think the people are sympathetic to this.

- Alice Slater

The reason I do this work is that it is what makes me human.

- Brian Watson

We have to be more assertive and make the bad guys defend the indefensible. Threatening to incinerate people is indefensible. Spending \$35 billion on nuclear weapons is indefensible.

- Kevin Martin

You cannot accomplish anything by being apart. We must come together and be one.

- Corbin Harney

\*\*\*\*\*

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION  
International contact for Abolition 2000  
a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

\*\*\*\*\*

1187 Coast Village Road, Box 121  
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: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>

X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3

Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1999 18:11:56 -0500

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>

Subject: (abolition-usa) Santa Barbara Report, US Abolition Campaign

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 QAA09460

REPORT FROM SANTA BARBARA  
MEETING ON US NUCLEAR ABOLITION CAMPAIGN

Dear Friends,

In Santa Barbara, on February 12-14, about 60 organizations working for nuclear weapons abolition gathered in Santa Barbara, California to continue the work begun in New York and Chicago last year to launch a US Nuclear Weapons Abolition Campaign. The Chicago group, in October, agreed to broaden our diversity before making any decisions for the Campaign and it was worth waiting for! An Interim Coordinating Committee was set up in Chicago to plan the Santa Barbara meeting and we raised some funds that enabled us to include more indigenous peoples, Afro-Americans, and downwinders who made enormous contributions to our understanding. Not to mention the wonderful sunrise service on St. Valentine's Day conducted by Corbin Harney, the spiritual leader of the Western Shoshone Nation, which only the week before endured the abuse of yet another US sub-critical test on their land.

We adopted a mission statement and a related "Santa Barbara Declaration" which follows. Participants volunteered to be the contact people for twelve working groups to develop a number of strategies that were discussed during the meeting. Those groups are listed below and you are invited to join them. There was a sense of urgency at the meeting to begin immediate work to halt the development of Clinton's \$6.6 billion proposal for son of Star Wars, which, if it goes ahead will make our efforts to abolish nuclear weapons even more difficult. Additional people volunteered to serve with those original members of the Interim Coordinating Committee who wished to continue on a Facilitation Committee to help move our organizing efforts ahead in the next six months when we will meet again. We prepared a timeline of events, and discussed various structure and strategy proposals and names for the Campaign. Listed below are reports and information from various participants with special thanks to David Krieger, Susan Gordon, Kathy Crandall, Lori Beckworth, and Andy Lichterman for

forwarding the various sections of this report. Peace, Alice Slater

## Mission Statement

To ensure a just, secure, healthy and sustainable world for our children, grandchildren, all future generations and all living things, we aim to educate public opinion and mobilize persistent popular pressure to move the United States government to take prompt and unequivocal actions to eliminate nuclear weapons.

These actions must include halting continued development of new and modified nuclear weapons, de-alerting nuclear forces, addressing the environmental degradation and human suffering arising from testing, production, deployment and use of nuclear weapons, and undertaking negotiations with other countries on a treaty for their elimination.

Our objective is nothing less than the universal, complete, verifiable, and enduring abolition of nuclear weapons.

## SANTA BARBARA DECLARATION

>From all corners of this land, representing diverse constituencies and traditions, including indigenous nations, we have come together in common cause, determined to end the threat to all life posed by nuclear weapons.

We recognize that nuclear weapons and the nuclear fuel cycle have caused widespread suffering, death and environmental devastation. We further recognize that resources used for nuclear arms need to be redirected to meeting human and environmental needs.

The United States bears special responsibility as the only country to use nuclear weapons in war. It continues to spend vast sums on its massive nuclear weapons complex, and its current policies would upgrade and maintain a huge nuclear arsenal far into the future.

The conference has initiated a campaign tailored to address the unique obstacles in the United States to achieving nuclear weapons abolition. Our campaign builds upon the foundations laid by Abolition 2000 and other efforts to abolish nuclear arms. We commit our hearts, our spirits, and our energy to achieving a world free of nuclear weapons and invite all people of good will to join us.

Santa Barbara, February 14, 1999

## Facilitators Group

(See Below For Contact Information For All Participants)

John Burroughs, Lawyers Committee for Nuclear Policy  
Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation  
Gordon Clark, Peace Action  
Kathy Crandall, Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Alan Cranston, World Forum

Matteo Ferreira, Shundahai Network  
Joe Gerson, American Friends Service Committee  
Anthony Guarisco, Alliance of Atomic Veterans  
Alan Haber, Michigan Coalition of Peace and Environmental Organizations  
Jan Harwood, WILPF  
Steven Kent, Kent Communications  
Pelulaw Khus, Coastal Band of Chumash Nation  
David Krieger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation  
Sally Light, TriValley Cares  
Mark Mebane, Fourth Freedom Forum  
Pamela Meidell, Atomic Mirror  
Robert Musil, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Claudia Peterson, Utah Downwinders  
Joe Peterson, Nebraskans for Peace  
Clayton Ramey, Fellowship of Reconciliation  
Dave Robinson, Pax Christi  
Jonathan Schell, The Nation Institute  
Susan Shaer, Women's Action for New Directions  
Alice Slater, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment  
Jonathan Granoff, Lawyers Alliance for World Security

#### Working Groups

STAR WARS/ABM (URGENT)

Kathy Crandall: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org);  
(202)898-0150 ext. 232

NATO 50TH ANNIVERSARY MEETING, APRIL 23 (URGENT)

Mark Mebane: [mmebane@fourthfreedom.org](mailto:mmebane@fourthfreedom.org); 219-543-3402

#### INTERNATIONAL CONNECTIONS AND ISSUES

Richard Salvador: [salvador@hawaii.edu](mailto:salvador@hawaii.edu); (818)956-8537 or 3691

Alice Slater: [aslater@gracelinks.org](mailto:aslater@gracelinks.org); (212)726-9161;

David Krieger: [wagingpeace@napf.org](mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org); (805)965-3443

#### AFFECTED COMMUNITIES

Joseph Gerson: [jgerson@afsc.org](mailto:jgerson@afsc.org); (617)661-6130

#### RESEARCH FUTURE DIRECTIONS OF THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS COMPLEX

Arjun Makhijani: [ieer@ieer.org](mailto:ieer@ieer.org); (301)270-5500

#### CIVIL SOCIETY CAMPAIGN TO ENROLL ORGANIZATIONS IN A BRIEF ABOLITION STATEMENT AND CITY DIALOGUES ON NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT WITH PROMINENT MOVERS AND SHAKERS

Pamela Meidell: [pmeidell@igc.org](mailto:pmeidell@igc.org); (805)985-5073

Ed Aguilar: (610)668-5470

#### CONGRESS/ADMINISTRATION FOCUS

Alan Haber: [od4life@aol.com](mailto:od4life@aol.com); (734)761-7967

#### MEDIA/CAMPAIGN LAUNCH

Steve Kent: [kentcom@highlands.com](mailto:kentcom@highlands.com); ((914)424-8382

#### YOUTH/CAMPUSES

Odile Haber: [od4life@aol.com](mailto:od4life@aol.com); (734)761-7967

## DIRECT ACTION

Matteo Ferreira: shundahai@shundahai.org; (702)647-3095

## INDIGENOUS PEOPLE ORGANIZING AND CONCERNS

Pilulaw Khus:(805)771-8922

Michele shundahai@shundahai.org; (702)647-3095

Richard Salvador: salvador@hawaii.edu; (818)956-8537

BOTTOM UP ORGANIZING (LOCAL MOVEMENT BUILDING AND MAKING THE CONNECTION TO OTHER ISSUES) -- Andrew Lichterman: alichterman@igc.apc.org; (510)839-5877 AFTER MARCH 1 alichterman@worldnet.att.net

## STRUCTURE DISCUSSION (notes from Kathy Crandall)

A total of 5 structure proposals were made

1)To ask for organizations to volunteer to serve on a U.S. Abolition Campaign Committee.

\*\*\*\*\*

2) From Peace Action, PSR, WAND, Disarmament Clearinghouse & Susan Gordon

### Campaign Structure Proposal

We are proposing that the emerging US nuclear abolition campaign have a 12 member Coordinating Committee, that is broadly representative of the organizations that are focused on nuclear disarmament. We will probably

struggle to identify who will fill these seats, but this can be accomplished. This Committee should include diverse representation of national grassroots membership organizations, geographic diversity, people of color, and be conscious of gender balance. National membership groups should hold half of the seats on the committee, and organizations with verifiable constituencies should hold the other half of the seats on the committee. The Committee would have two co-chairs to convene meetings and share the work-load.

This body would meet together twice a year, face-to-face, to share one year time-lines, identify actions and hopefully move toward agreement on coordinated efforts and messages. This would allow each organization to continue to do their work but increase opportunities to amplify messages and actions, coordinate targets, and serve as beginning steps in working together. The Coordinating Committee would be looking out one year at a time, but working specifically on coordinated actions during the next six months. They would not be able to dictate decisions, rather they would be recommending message and actions.

At one of the meetings each year, the broader community would be invited for a separate day of activities. We could provide training workshops on issues, organizing, campaign actions, fund-raising, etc. This would help to build relationships, serve to broaden the base, and help to

amplify the campaign.

The Coordinating Committee would be responsible for setting agendas for meetings, for developing and forwarding any grant proposals or funding requests and provide oversight for staff. It would not be able to speak on behalf of other groups. The Campaign will only have organizational members, not individual members. The Web page would be primarily a link to organizations participating in the Campaign. No newsletter is needed. A single staff person would serve in a coordinating role that would support the campaign and work to aid communication between the participating organizations, coordinate meetings, maintain the web page and convene conference calls.

Fund-raising efforts will focus on projects that will collectively help our work and is not something that any individual organization can do on

its own, i.e.: media campaigns, postcard campaigns, etc. The campaign will coordinate its fund-raising with and be supportive of fund-raising efforts of its constituent organizations.

\*\*\*\*\*

3) -From the Floor  
Geographically Based

- regional offices (existing orgs.) responsible for Campaign in region
- regional offices represented on Coordinating Committee

\*\*\*\*\*

4) -From the Floor (Marylia Kelley)

-Would operate as described in proposal #2 -with the below modifications-

12 member Facilitators Group - a "Board"

-Limited Mandate

- Business
- Coordinator
- Communication
- fund-raising

-Working Group Structure

- self-selected
- open membership
- substantive programs/ projects

\*\*\*\*\*

5. From the Floor (Dave Robinson)

1. Coordinating Committee (12 is ok)
2. Coordinator for Campaign (one) and work groups
3. Coordinator & Committee raise money to convene "congress" (once or twice per year.)

This money may come from groups in network and/ or independent sources

4.Member groups at "Congress" are part of determining priorities,

actions and messages

\*\*\*\*\*

Following discussion, we then discussed strategy, and on Sunday morning / and afternoon we came up with the following interim structure:

A Facilitation Committee will continue for 6 months. All of the former ICC members are welcomed to participate in the continuing ICC (Susan Gordon noted that she will not continue on the ICC). In addition several others volunteered to join. (SEE LIST OF FACILITATORS, ABOVE)

The tasks of the Facilitation Committee will be to

- 1) Formulate a longer-term structure,
- 2) Bring forward strategic activities
- 3) Suggest a name for the campaign
- 4) Plan the next meeting

Following further strategy discussion working groups were also formed to begin work in different strategy areas.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### STRATEGY (Andrew Lichterman)

A number of proposals for both general approaches and particular campaigns were put forward, but there was little time available for discussion of strategy by the group as a whole. Most the meeting was occupied by other matters, including drafting of a mission statement, choice of a name, and structure for continuing the process of forging a national campaign. No conclusions on strategy were reached by the gathering, but preliminary working groups were identified to facilitate the development of strategy proposals for the next meeting.

There was a small group break out and report back on Saturday which produced a number of good ideas about strategy, but there was no time available for further general discussion on Saturday. On Sunday afternoon those who remained, recognizing that many had left and that hence no substantive decisions could be made, divided the remaining time among various matters. Strategy issues were sent to a small group to develop a list of subjects which could be the focus of working groups. These working groups would then be able to continue to develop strategy initiatives between now and the next general meeting. Unfortunately, there was time only for a report back without further general discussion. The report back included both a list of possible working groups and some general ideas about the relationship between the working groups and the program set forth in the previously agreed upon Mission Statement.

The strategy small group used the Mission Statement (which was agreed upon by the entire meeting) as a guide for its discussions. It generally concluded that the purpose of the working groups would be to implement the substantive goals set forth in the mission statement, including seeking a more just world, commencement of negotiations with other countries on a treaty for abolition, halting the development of new and modified nuclear weapons, and addressing the continuing ecological and human toll of nuclear weapons testing, production, and deployment. Other

areas not specifically addressed in the mission statement identified by the strategy group included raising awareness of the dangers of current nuclear weapons policies and of the impact on the economy of nuclear weapons spending and of the nuclear weapons industry.

Some working groups by their nature would work on particular aspects of the general program expressed in the mission statement, while others (for example, those which focus on particular venues or means of communication, like the "media" and "legislative/federal government" groups) would likely work on using particular means to advance all facets of the campaign program. The strategy small group also identified some general themes, particularly the need to give the campaign a "human face," for example by focusing on the people affected by a half century on the nuclear road, from atomic veterans and downwinders in the United States to the indigenous peoples worldwide whose land and communities have been devastated from one end of the nuclear weapons cycle to the other, from uranium mining to nuclear weapons testing. It was also noted that this "human face" should include the "whodunnit," the people who have made and sustained the nuclear weapons complex.

Because of the short time available for discussion and the fact that the group remaining Sunday afternoon was not empowered to make decisions, the set of working group topics settled upon is preliminary. The topics range from particular campaign proposals which had attracted interest to more general approaches. For each working group at least one individual present Sunday afternoon agreed to be the initial convener so that the groups could get going. These groups will exist only to the extent that people and organizations participate, so contact the convener of groups you are interested in. The future shape of these groups is in the hands of those who choose to participate. This list is not exhaustive; there could be others if people want to constitute them. Conveners might wish to circulate descriptions of their current visions for the various working groups.

WORKING GROUPS: LISTED ABOVE

1999 TIMELINE OF UPCOMING ACTIVITIES AND EVENTS (Susan Gordon)  
(not complete listing of all activities, but a pretty good start)

## FEBRUARY

Feb 19 Briefing for House staff on de-alerting and abolition by  
Nuclear

Weapons Working Group

Feb 20 IPPNW delegation to India & Pakistan

Feb 22 STOP the STAR WARS REVIVAL Action & Resource kit- distribution  
by

Disarmament Clearinghouse (202)898-0150 ext. 232

Senate vote on Star Wars Deployment Bill

Misc. Peace Action - Now through 2000 - Gathering signatures on  
Abolition

petitions, with plans to pressure on candidates on disarmament issues  
(202)862-9740

Interfaith Petition Drive - Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace With

Justice (301)896-0013

Disarmament Clearinghouse - continue to pitch "It's Our Move Mailers" ( second run of approximately 20,000) (202)898-0150 ext 232

20/20 - postcard action alert (202)833-2020

US & Russian begin negotiations on a plutonium disposition agreement

Distribution of Alliance for Nuclear Accountability De-alerting Theme Month materials (206)547-3175

Physicians for Social Responsibility Abolition slide shows & new brochures available (202)898-0150

## MARCH

Mar 2 Vermont Town Meetings - votes on nuclear weapons abolition resolutions

House vote on Star Wars Deployment Bill

Mar 6 Nebraskans for Peace Annual Conference - Bishop Thomas Gumbleton keynote, Abolition 2000 workshop - (402)556-9057

Mar 8 Y2K Congressional Briefing on Capitol Hill by Helen Caldicott, BASIC, NIRS & STAR 516-324-0655, carrie@noradiation.org

Mar 15 Dept. of Defense reports to Congress on Russian tactical nuclear weapons

Mar 18 House Appr. Sub-committee on Energy & Water Hearing on Dept. of Energy's Defense programs

Mar 25 10th Global Kids Conference - Human Rights - Right On! (212) 226-0130

Mar 26-Apr 12 Senate Recess - coordinated lobbying in home states misc. Possible vote in Russian Duma on START II ratification

ANA De-Alerting Theme Month participation encouraged (206)547-3175

Introduction of resolution in VT State Legislature to reduce the risk of an accidental nuclear weapons attack - WAND campaign to work with state women legislators (781)643-6740

AFSC begins organizing regional & national US Hibakusha speaking tours (617)661-6130

New England Nuclear Abolition Network meets in Maine (207)772-0680 - Wells Staley-Mays

## APRIL

Apr 2 Good Friday Action at Livermore Lab - Tri-Valley CAREs (925)443-7148

Apr 9-10 Japanese meeting in NY on nuclear non-proliferation & disarmament (closed to NGOs)

Apr 12-23 Nonproliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee meeting at UN, NY

New Agenda Coalition activities

Y2K workshop by Helen Caldicott STAR & Abolition 2000 (212)726-9161

Apr 16-29 Megiddo Project - "Transforming Armageddon" - peace pilgrimage in Israel and

Palestine(734)761-7967

Apr 23 NATO's 50th Anniversary/Conference in DC

Fourth Freedom Foundation Alternative Citizens Summit in DC (800)233-6786

Apr 22 - 25 PSR Student Conference in Seattle - (206)547-2630

Apr 25-28 Interfaith Legislative Briefing - lobby days Friends  
Committee  
on National  
Legislation (202)547-6000  
Apr 25-28 ANA DC DAYS (202)833-4668  
(4 days of training & lobbying for grassroots activists)  
Apr 26 Chernobyl Anniversary Day  
Apr 26/May 14 UN Disarmament Commission Annual Meeting

#### MAY-AUG

Opportunity for grassroots activists to table at street fairs,  
events, etc.

Disarmament Clearinghouse will have It's our Move Mailers & CTBT  
Flyer

20/20 plans radio call-in on CTBT

Plan for house parties

#### MAY

May 1 Dept. of Def. reports to Congress on counter-proliferation  
programs

May 7-10 Healing Global Wounds Action at the Nevada Test Site  
(702)647-3095

May 7-10 Nuclear Gambling: Who Wins? - Episcopal Peace Fellowship  
(202)783-3380

May 8-9 Mother's Day Weekend - Missiles to Sunflowers' Campaign - US, in  
Sarasota, CA (707)575-8902

May 10 Conference on Disarmament begins second session in Geneva

May 11 Anniversary of India's nuclear weapons tests

May 11- 16 Hague Appeal for Peace 1999 Conference (212)687-2623

May 13-14 Pittsburgh Coalition for Abolition 2000 is holding a  
simultaneous conference to

coincide with Hague Appeal for Peace, Gen Butler to speak PSR - Dan & Anita  
Fine (724)339-2242

May 17 International NIX MOX Day - Nuclear Information Resource Service  
(202)328-0002

May 28 Anniversary of Pakistan's nuclear weapons tests

#### JUNE

June 10 Key CTBT Date - Kennedy Speech  
(encourage floor speeches on CTBT)

misc. Center for Defense Information releases video on CTBT  
(202)862-0700

Disarmament Clearinghouse will be organizing house  
parties

(202)898-0150 ext 232

Phila. Project, Leadership Dialogue on Nuclear

Abolition

Ed Aguilar, Lawyers Alliance for World Security

(610)668-5470

#### JULY

July 16 Trinity 54th Anniversary

July 23-25 4th Tokyo Forum on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament

July 26 Conference on Disarmament 3rd session begins

## AUGUST

Aug 6 Hiroshima Day  
Mayors Letter supporting abolition to be released  
-State of  
the World Forum (415)561-2345  
WAND will be coordinating the Utah release (202)543-8505  
Aug 6 Livermore Lab Action, risk arrest, Tri-Valley CARES  
(925)443-7148  
Aug 6- 9 Peace Action National Congress, Abolition  
Conference and  
Nonviolent Protest in New Mexico. All are welcome to attend!  
(202)862-9740  
Aug 7 2nd Missiles of Sunflowers' Campaign - US (707)575-8902  
Aug 7-9 Resistance Action to Trident at Bangor Submarine Base, WA  
(360)377-2586  
Aug 9 Nagasaki Day  
Aug 9 Peace Action organized Nonviolent demonstration and civil  
disobedience at the Los Alamos Lab in New Mexico. All are welcome to attend!  
(202)862-9740

## SEPTEMBER

Sept 24 CTBT signing anniversary  
Sept 27 Clinton addresses UN General Assembly in NY  
Sept 29/Oct 1 The first conference of the CTBT Ratification States  
misc. AFSC organizer packets available (617)661-6130

## OCTOBER

Oct 15 University Teach-in  
Oct 25 NGO Committee on Disarmament week symposium in NY  
misc. Conference on revising Entry-into-force rules of CTBT

## NOVEMBER

## DECEMBER

12/21 Mass Civil Disobedience at Nevada Test Site

Upcoming fall events - Sleepwalking to Armageddon Film - The Clearinghouse  
has been planning to do house parties

2000

April NPT Prepcom

Jun 30-Aug 9 People's Campaign for Nonviolence: A call to action -  
Disarmament &  
Justice Now (inviting all peace & justice groups/movements) just forming -  
contact National Fellowship of Reconciliation (914) 358-4601

## PARTICIPANTS EMAIL LIST

## PEOPLE WITHOUT EMAIL ADDRESSES

Ed Aguilar: tel: 215-248-4760 fax: 215-563-1623

435 E. Sedgwick St., Philadelphia, PA 19119

Pilulaw Khus: tel: 805-771-8922

P.O. Box 718

Morro Bay, CA 93443

Keith Bush (Loulena Miles, who has email, said she would convey any messages to him).

Jane Podesta: tel: 831-423-9232

115 Majors St., Santa Cruz, CA 95060

(Jan Harwood said she would convey all messages to her).

<Bernice Kring> wiednerb@aol.com,  
<Inga Olson> iio1@pge.com,  
<Sally Light> marylia@igc.apc.org,  
<Joseph Gerson> JGerson@afsc.org,  
<Marylia Kelley> marylia@igc.apc.org,  
<Bruce Martin> AFSCCT@igc.apc.org,  
<Steve Kent> kentcom@highlands.com,  
<Alan Cranston> forum@worldforum.org,  
<Tad Daley> CNUNC@aol.com,  
<Susan Shaer> shaer@wand.org,  
<Sonya Ostrom> metropeace@aol.com,  
<Robert Manning> abolishnukes@igc.org,  
<Alan Haber> od4life@aol.com,  
<Jackie Hudson> jackisue@ix.netcom.com,  
<David Krieger> wagingpeace@napf.org,  
<Jackie Cabasso> wslf@igc.apc.org,  
<John Burroughs> jburroughs@earthlink.net,  
<Alice Slater> aslater@gracelinks.org,  
<Don Larkin> quercus@concentric.net,  
<Anthony Guarisco> aav1@ctaz.com,  
<Mark Mebane> mmebane@fourthfreedom.org,  
<Susan Gordon> susangordon@igc.org,  
<Kathy Crandall> disarmament@igc.org,  
<Robert Tiller> btiller@psr.org,  
<Bob Musil> bmusil@psr.org,  
<Pamela Meidell> pmeidell@igc.apc.org,  
<Claudia Peterson> claudiap@sginet.com,  
<Gordon Clark> paexec@igc.apc.org,  
<Dave Robinson> dave@paxchristiusa.org,  
<Jan Harwood> jahn@cruzio.com,  
<Jonathan Parfrey> psrsm@psr.org,  
<Jonathan Schell> schellj@hotmail.com,  
<Arjun Makhijani> arjun@ieer.org,  
<Jo Peterson> geln38a@prodigy.com,  
<William Stuart-Whistler> stuwhis@enter.net,  
<Esther Pank> epank@peacenet.org,  
<Dolores Cogan> dccogan@aol.com,  
<Bob Alpern> mccarolyn@pon.net,  
<Masaaki Sakai> newpath@hotmail.com,  
<Kathryn Smick> ksmick@wenet.net,  
<Betty Burkes> bjburkes@capecod.net,  
<Abha Suhr> asur@mit.edu,  
<Esther Hilsenrad> globalkids@igc.apc.org,

<Corbin Harney> shundahai@radix.net,  
<Kevin Martin> ilpeace@igc.org,  
<Cecilia Freeman> quercus@concentric.net,  
<Ian Zabarte> zabarte@nevada.edu,  
<Matteo Ferreira> shundahai@radix.net,  
<Richard Salvador> salvador@hawaii.edu,  
<Lori Beckwith> a2000@silcom.com,  
<Loulena Miles> lamiles@ibm.net,  
<Eleanor LeCain> EMLECAIN@aol.com,  
<Bob Downing> ufwpa@aol.com,  
<Wilson Riles> wriles@afsc.org,  
<Peter Ferenbach> capazaction@igc.org,  
<Lori Beckwith> A2000@silcom.com

#### PARTICIPANTS LIST WITH FULL INFORMATION

Edward Aguilar LAWS 435 E. Sedgwick St. Philadelphia, PA  
19119-1307 215-248-4760 fax: 215-563-1623

Bob Alpern Friends Committee on National Legislation 9280 Mill  
Creek Rd. Healdsburg, CA 95448 707-433-2236 mccarolyn@pon.net

Lori Beckwith NAPF 1187 Coast Village Rd. #123 Santa Barbara, CA  
93108 805-965-3443 a2000@silcom.com

Anne Beier WSLF 1440 Broadway Suite 500 Oakland, CA 94612  
530-839-5877 wslf@igc.apc.org

Betty Burkes AFSC P.O. Box 653 Wellfleet, MA 02667  
508-349-7988 bjburkes@capecod.net

John Burroughs WSLF 1440 Broadway Suite 500 Oakland, CA 94612  
530-839-5877 jburroughs@earthlink.net

Keith Bush 831-457-2115

Jackie Cabasso WSLF 1440 Broadway Suite 500 Oakland, CA 94612  
530-839-5877 wslf@igc.apc.org

Gordon Clark Peace Action 1819 H. St. NW Suite 640 Washington,  
D.C. 20006 202-862-9740 paexec@igc.apc.org

Doloris Cogan Peace Links 666 11th St. NW #202 Washington, D.C.  
20001 202-783-7030 dccogan@aol.com

Kathy Crandall Disarmament Clearinghouse 1101 14th Street NW #700  
Washington DC 20005 202-898-0150 ext. 232 disarmament@igc.org

Alan Cranston State of the World Forum 27080 Fremont Los Altos  
Hills, CA 94022 650-948-6556 forum@worldforum.org

Tad Daley State of the World Forum 4350 Beryman #2 Los  
Angeles, CA 90066 310-2883544 CNUNC@aol.com

Bob Downing United Farm Workers 18 W. Lake Ave. Watsonville, CA

95076 408-763-4904 ufwpa@aol.com

Matteo Ferreira Shundahai Network 5007 Elmhurst Ln. Las Vegas,  
NV 89108-1304 702-647-3095 shundahai@radix.net

Cecilia Freeman Santa Cruz Abolition 2000 189 Hollywood Ave.  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060 831-457-2275 quercus@concentric.net

Peter Ferenbach California Peace Action 3127 B Mission St. San  
Francisco, CA 94110 415-695-9077 capazaction@igc.org

Joseph Gerson AFSC 2161 Mass. Ave. Cambridge, MA 02140  
617-661-6130 JGerson@afsc.org

Susan Gordon ANA 1914 N. 34th St. #407 Seattle, WA 98013  
206-547-3175 susangordon@igc.org

Anthony Guarisco Alliance of Atomic Veterans P.O. Box 32  
Topock, AZ 86436 520-768-6623 aav1@ctaz.com

Alan Haber Coalition of Peace and Environmental Orgs. 531 3rd St.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103 734-761-7967 od4life@aol.com

Odile Haber Coalition of Peace and Environmental Orgs. 531 3rd St.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48103 734-761-7967 od4life@aol.com

Corbin Harney Shundahai Network 5007 Elmhurst Ln. Las Vegas,  
NV 89108-1304 702-647-3095 shundahai@radix.net

Jan Harwood WILPF 312 Elm St. Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
831-471-9992 jahn@cruzio.com

Esther Hilsenrad Global Kids 561 Broadway, 6th floor New York,  
NY 10012 212-226-0130 globalkids@igc.apc.org

Jackie Hudson Ground Zero 3495 Dyes Inlet Rd. Bremerton, WA  
98312 360-377-2586 Jackiesue@ix.netcom.com

Marylia Kelley Tri-Valley CARE 2582 Old First Street Livermore, CA  
94550 925-443-7148 marylia@igc.apc.org

Steve Kent Kent Communications P.O. Box 431 Garrison, NY 10524  
914-424-8382 kentcom@highlands.com

Pilulaw Khus Costal Band of Chumash Nation P.O. Box 718 Morro Bay,  
CA 93443 805-771-8922

David Krieger NAPF 1187 Coast Village Road Suite 123 Santa  
Barbara, CA 93108 805-965-3443 wagingpeace@napf.org

Bernice Kring Grandmothers for Peace 1724 H St. #1 Sacramento, CA  
95814 916-443-4553 wiednerb@aol.com

Don Larkin Santa Cruz Abolition 2000 189 Hollywood Ave.

Santa Cruz, CA 95060 831-457-2275 quercus@concentric.net

Eleanor LeCain 43 Samoset Street Boston, MA 02124  
617-436-4875 EMLECAIN@aol.com

Andrew Lichterman WSLF 1440 Broadway Suite 500 Oakland, CA 94612  
530-839-5877 alichterman@worldnet.att.net

Sally Light Tri-Valley CARES 2582 Old 1st St. Livermore,  
CA 94550 925-443-7148 marylia@igc.apc.org

Arjun Makhijani IEER 6935 Laurel Ave. Takoma Park, MD 20812  
301-270-3029 arjun@ieer.org

Robert Manning Unity Foundation 4731 Stoetz Lane Sebastopol,  
CA 95472 707-874-9133 abolishnukes@igc.org

Bruce Martin AFSC/CT 55 Van Dyke Ave. Hartford, CT 06106  
860-522-5985 AFSCCT@igc.apc.org

Kevin Martin Illinois Peace Action 202 S. State St. #1500 Chicago, IL  
60604 312-939-3316 ilpeace@igc.org

Mark Mebane Fourth Freedom Forum 803 North Main St. Goshen, IN  
46528 219-534-3402 mmebane@fourthfreedom.org

Pamela Meidell Atomic Mirror/EarthWays Foundation P.O.B. 220,  
Port Hueneme, California, USA 93044 805-985-5073  
pmeidell@igc.apc.org

Loulena Miles WILPF-USCS 615 Poplar Ave. Santa Cruz, CA 95062  
831-457-2115 lamiles@ibm.net

Bob Musil PSR 1101 14th St. NW, Suite 700 Washington, D.C.  
20005 202-898-0150 bmusil@psr.org

Inga Olson Grandmothers for Peace 1400 Commons Drive Sacramento,  
CA 95825 415-973-5618 iio1@pge.com

Sonya Ostrom Metro New York Peace Action 475 Riverside Dr. #549 New  
York, NY 10015 718-377-7788 metropeace@aol.com

Marion Pack WAND/Aliance for Survival 230 E. 17th St. #201  
Costa Mesa, CA 92627 949-722-7574 nonukes@cris.com

Esther Pank Peace Links 666 11th St. NW #202 Washington, D.C.  
20001 202-783-7030 epank@peacenet.org

Jonathan Parfrey PSR 1316 Third Street, Promenade, Suite B!  
Santa Monica, CA 90401 310-458-2694 psrsm@psr.org

Claudia Peterson St. Geroge Utah Downwinder 2042 West Moonglow  
Pl. St. George, UT 84770 435-673-2972 claudiap@sginet.com

Jo Peterson Nebraskans for Peace 4924 Aucago St. Omaha, NE 68132  
402-556-9057 geln38a@prodigy.com

Jane Podesta WILPF 115 Majors St. Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
831-423-9232

Wilson Riles AFSC 65 Ninth St. San Francisco, CA 94103  
415-565-0201 wriles@afsc.org

Dave Robinson Pax Christi 532 West 8th St. Erie, PA 16502  
814-453-4955 dave@paxchristiusa.org

Masaaki Sakai Southern California Federation of Scientists 3318  
Colbert Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90066 310-390-3898 newpath@hotmail.com

Richard Salvador PIANGO 2424 Maile Way Honolulu, HI 96822  
808-956-8537 salvador@hawaii.edu

Jonathan Schell The Nation Institute 33 Irving Place New York, NY  
202-209-5417 schellj@hotmail.com

Susan Shaer Womens Action for New Directions 691 Massachusetts  
Avenue Arlington, MA 02476 781-643-6740 shaer@wand.org

Alice Slater GRACE 15 East 26th St. Rm. 915 New York, NY 10010  
212-726-9161 aslater@gracelinks.org

Kathryn Smick PSR-San Fransisco 2288 Fulton Street #307 Berkeley,  
CA 94704 925-284-7689/510-845-8395 ksmick@wenet.net

William Stuart-Whistler Episcopalian Peace Fellowship 620 S. Orange St.  
Media, PA 19063-4012 610-567-7806 stuwhis@enter.net

Abha Suhr South Asian Forum 131 Antrim Street #3 Cambridge,  
MA 02139 617-576-2388 asur@mit.edu

Robert Tiller PSR 1101 14th St. NW, Suite 700 Washington, D.C.  
20005 202-898-0150 ext. 220 btiller@psr.org

Brian Watson Ground Zero 2132 NE Sunset Ln. Bremerton, WA  
98310 479-698-3113

Ian Zabarte Western Shoshone National Council P.O. Box 210  
Indian Springs, NV 89018 702-879-5203 zabarte@nevada.edu

#### ACTIVE MEMBERS WHO COULDN'T ATTEND THE MEETING

Alyn Ware  
LCNP@aol.com  
211 E. 43rd St. #1204  
New York, NY 10017  
212-818-1857

Lachlan Forrow  
lforrow@igc.org  
330 Brookline Ave.  
Boston, MA 02215  
617-667-3095

Tom Roderick  
esrmetro@agc.com  
475 Riverside Drive, Rm 554  
New York, NY 10115  
212-870-3318

David Cortright  
dcortright@fourthfreedom.org  
Fourth Freedom Forum  
803 N. Main St.  
Goshen, IN 46528  
800-233-6786

Peter and Cora Weiss  
petweiss@igc.org  
5022 Waldo Ave.  
Bronx, NY 10471

New Volunteer for Facilitators Group not at meeting  
Jonathan Granoff  
JGG786@aol.com  
124 Colwyn Lane  
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004  
610-668-5470

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

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" with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.  
For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send "help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3  
Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1999 18:42:53 -0500  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) Addendum to Santa Barbara Report  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear Friends,

I thought it was important to add this message from David Krieger about our Santa Barbara meeting, to the report which I just posted. A drafting committee for the Santa Barbara Declaration could not include an issue which many of us thought should be noted in our Campaign, because of time pressures which did not permit the full group to review an expanded Declaration. In soliciting our approval for the Santa Barbara Declaration through email, the drafting committee wrote as follows:

>The Committee also believes that a separate statement should be developed  
>over the next few months on the subject of "Democracy, Power and Nuclear  
>Weaponry." We felt that these issues are too complex to go into this  
>Declaration and deserve far more consideration. This will, therefore, be  
>referred to the Facilitating Committee.

If you wish to work with David on this, contact him at [dkrieger@napf.org](mailto:dkrieger@napf.org)

Many thanks,

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: <btiller@psr.org>

Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1999 17:40:08 -0500

From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility

To: kathy@fcnl.org, wand@wand.org, laura@2020vision.org, ctbt@2020vision.org,  
disarmament@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, paprog@igc.org, bmorse@igc.org,  
dculp@igc.org, jsmith@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org, ieer@ieer.org,  
btiller@psr.org, cdavis@clw.org, cpaine@nrdc.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org,  
rachel@fcnl.org, nbaliga@psr.org, kroberts@psr.org

Subject: Possible NWWG topic ---- Call-in day

At the NWWG meeting of 2-11-99 we discussed the possibility of a call-in day to the White House on de-alerting. Folks were interested, and several people said they would go back to their organizations, talk about it further, and come to the next meeting prepared to make a decision.

I am hopeful that we can move ahead on this, and I think May 14th is a good day for it. In our previous meeting some folks said it should be earlier than May 14th, but I want to demur.

(a) We need to provide plenty of lead time so that organizations can get the date into their activist mailings. If we schedule it too soon, we won't have enough publicity.

(b) This is a good activity for U.S. activists during the Hague Appeal for Peace.

So I am hopeful that we take up this topic at NWWG this Thursday and settle some details.

Shalom,  
Bob T

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>

Date: Tue, 23 Feb 1999 17:24:42 -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: Re: NWWG

References: <367EAD88.3DD8@psr.org>

Two months ago I posted this e-mail:

> 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.

The following people and organizations have (I think) said that they want to remain on the NWWG e-mail list: Brad Morse, IEER, Tom Collina, Laura Kriv, Marie Rietmann, Chris Paine, Chris Davis, David Culp, Jenny Smith, Fran Teplitz, Howard Hallman, Kimberly Robson, Daryl Kimball, Kathy Guthrie, Rachel Philips, Kathy Crandall, Bob Tiller, Nisha Baliga and Kimberly Roberts.

Is this accurate? Does anyone else want to be on the NWWG e-mail list?

Shalom,  
Bob T.

To: lintnerj@ucc.org, jpmc@ucc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Contacts for CTBT petition drive  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

February 24, 1999

Dear Jay, Marijke, and Robin:

Here is a report on my outreach to particular states. Mostly things are still pending. I'm sharing this information with Robin so we won't duplicate our outreach to United Methodists.

Alaska. I talked with Rev. Dale Kelley on Tuesday, February 23 and faxed her information. She was going to discuss with a district superintendent our request to serve as a state collector of petitions and get back to me.

Colorado. John Ed Francis on the staff of the United Methodist Rocky Mountain Conference sent out petitions with his peace with justice newsletter on February 1. He sees Bob Kinsey from time to time and will talk with him about the petition. His work number is 303 733-3736 if you want to share it with Bob.

Idaho. I obtained two names in Idaho. I reached one, a man in his 80s, who will circulate the petition in his church but couldn't take on the task of state coordinator. I haven't reached the other one.

Indiana. I'm trying to find Senator Lugar's home church but haven't succeeded. Then I'll try to find someone who can get petitions circulated there.

Kansas. I have discovered that Senator Brownback's is member of First UMC in Topeka, a downtown church which historically has displayed social concerns. I'm looking for someone to circulate petitions there. I'm still trying to find out Senator Roberts' home church.

Mississippi. I've written to Don Fortenberry, executive director of the Mississippi Religious Leaders Conference, provided a draft letter to Senator Lott from religious leaders, and asked him to help circulate petitions and be the state coordinator. We've played phone tag but haven't made connections yet. Mary Miller is in Mississippi this week and will talk with Episcopal Bishop Marble, who I believe is current president of the Religious Leaders Conference.

Ohio. I have a lead on a United Methodist local church peace advocate who might help coordinate collecting petitions, but I'm still lacking an e-mail address or phone number to contact her.

Oregon. I talked with Kathy Barton-Campbell, United Methodist peace with justice coordinator, who is circulating petitions. I gave her Pat Rumer's number. If you want to share Kathy's number with Pat, it is (w, in a.m.) 503 364-2844, (h) 503 399-1584.

South Carolina. I have a lead on a possible coordinator and have e-mailed him information. I haven't heard and so far haven't found his phone number for follow through.

Washington. Robert Hughes, United Methodist conference peace with justice coordinator, is sending out petitions. I told him that Sara Fleming, who he knows, is state coordinator. If you want to pass Bob's phone number to her, it is 206 232-0598.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action has put an article about the petition in its newsletter and gave me as a contact for further information.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <kathy@fconl.org>  
From: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fconl.org>  
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: RE: Proposed letter to Senator Sarbanes  
Date: Wed, 24 Feb 1999 14:34:33 -0500

Howard,  
I have had many Quakers return the petition to me from Maryland. I am sure we can get a good number of filled out ones for a meeting with Sarbanes. The problem we have, of course, is there is no Quaker leader in Maryland. I could ask Alison Oldham, or another of our committee folks to sign, but don't have that "name Quaker."

Kathy

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org]  
Sent: Tuesday, February 23, 1999 10:42 AM  
To: Mark Brown; Jay Lintner; Mary Miller; Kathy Guthrie  
Subject: Proposed letter to Senator Sarbanes

Dear Colleagues:

I propose that we ask religious leaders in Maryland to sign a letter to Senator Sarbanes, requesting him to press for public hearings on the CTBT by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He is second ranking Democrat on the committee.

As initial signers, I suggested that we get signatures from United Methodist Bishop May, an Episcopal bishop, a Lutheran bishop, a UCC leader, and a prominent Quaker. I can approach Bishop May and the rest of you can help with your denomination. We will then circulate the letter for additional signatures.

To get this moving, I have drafted the attached letter. I would like your comments on it. After the letter is appropriately revised, would you help get the initial signer from your denomination? Would you then be willing to help get additional signers? I'm thinking that 20 to 30 signers who represents a denominational and geographic cross-section of Marylanders would be sufficient. Then we would seek an appointment with Senator Sarbanes or one of his top staff as follow-through on the letter.

Thanks for your help.

Howard

###

Draft letter.

Dear Senator Sarbanes:

For many years numerous religious denominations have advocated a ban on testing of nuclear weapons. With the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996, this long-sought goal seemed to be in reach. However, since September 1997 when President Clinton submitted the treaty to the U.S. Senate for ratification, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has blocked consideration of this important measure by his refusal to schedule public hearings.

We are deeply disturbed by this situation. Public opinion polls reveal that more than 75 percent of the American public supports ratification of the CTBT. This high level of support prevails among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. The treaty has the support of the Pentagon, the nuclear weapons laboratories, and retired joint chiefs of staffs. In face of this widespread support it is difficult for the public to understand how the Senate can allow one of its members to block consideration of a measure that is strongly in the public interest.

Therefore, we request you as a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to use your influence to achieve committee hearings as soon as possible. We ask you to work with your colleagues on the committee to open the process to proponents and opponents of the CTBT. Let those who have doubts about the treaty raise their concerns. Let treaty advocates respond. This kind of give-and-take is a hallmark of our democracy.

As a follow up to this letter, we request that a small delegation from the faith community have an opportunity to meet with you and discuss how we can work with you and other senators to achieve public hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Sincerely yours,

Proposed signers: religious leaders in Maryland

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](mailto: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: Wed, 24 Feb 99 18:14:00 -0500  
From: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>, <Dringler@umc-gbcs.org>  
Subject: CTBT ORGANIZING

Attached is the list of 21 states where we now have state contacts,  
which Mark is putting on the web

Friends are still working on about 8 states, we are working on another  
4, and some we hope will be recruited by you two. These are:

alaska  
california  
mississippi  
north carolina  
ohio  
south carolina

Robin indicated she had peace with justice staff in 3 of these.

We also have a number of states where no one is working. You may have  
an obvious person in one of these, which helps fill up our web page  
but where we may not put together delegation to visit and so don't  
really need collector. For example, two Disciple churches have phoned  
me in Texas, and I've simply told them to mail them directly to the  
two Senators. Neither thought a visit would be productive. But if we  
have a contact we can put it up. States are:

Alabama  
Arkansas  
Louisanna  
Nev  
NJ  
ND  
OK  
SD  
TX  
WV

Ohio and Alaska are the two on your list where we really need a  
meeting. The Council of Churches exec thought that the Episcopal  
Bishop could get a meeting, and he (Heacock) might well approach him  
if we ask, or Dale could.

Ohio is complicated, and we need to discuss how to get visit. We have  
plenty of power there, and need to use it. However, this is a meeting  
needed for floor vote, not immediate action, so we could let the  
petition drive last longer there.

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\92ctsto.wpd

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

Date: Wed, 24 Feb 1999 17:33:45 -0800

From: David Krieger <wagingpeace@napf.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Results of Santa Barbara Meeting

To: abolition-caucus@igc.org

X-Authentication-Warning: alpha.matrixinet.com: pm8-28.sba1.avtel.net [207.71.222.178] didn't use HELO protocol

X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

The Santa Barbara Declaration and the Mission Statement were drafted at the U.S. Abolition Campaign Organizing Meeting in Santa Barbara February 12-14, 1999. They will help to define a course of action for abolition in the United States.

## SANTA BARBARA DECLARATION

>From all corners of this land, representing diverse constituencies and traditions, including indigenous nations, we have come together in common cause, determined to end the threat to all life posed by nuclear weapons.

We recognize that nuclear weapons and the nuclear fuel cycle have caused widespread suffering, death and environmental devastation. We further recognize that resources used for nuclear arms need to be redirected to meeting human and environmental needs.

The United States bears special responsibility as the only country to have used nuclear weapons in war. It continues to spend vast sums on its massive nuclear weapons complex, and its current policies would upgrade and maintain a huge nuclear arsenal far into the future.

The conference has initiated a campaign tailored to address the unique obstacles in the United States to achieving nuclear weapons abolition. Our campaign builds upon the foundations laid by Abolition 2000 and other efforts to abolish nuclear arms. We commit our hearts, our spirits, and our energy to achieving a world free of nuclear weapons and invite all people of good will to join us.

Santa Barbara  
February 14, 1999

---

## MISSION STATEMENT

To ensure a just, secure, healthy and sustainable world for our children, grandchildren, all future generations and all living things, we aim to educate public opinion and to mobilize persistent popular pressure to move the United States government to take prompt and unequivocal actions to eliminate nuclear weapons.

These actions must include halting continued development of new and modified nuclear weapons, de-alerting nuclear forces, addressing the environmental degradation and human suffering arising from testing, production, deployment and use of nuclear weapons, and undertaking negotiations with other countries on a treaty for their elimination.

Our objective is nothing less than the universal, complete, verifiable, and enduring abolition of nuclear weapons.

Santa Barbara  
February 14, 1999

\*\*\*\*\*

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

International contact for Abolition 2000

a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

\*\*\*\*\*

1187 Coast Village Road, Box 121

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: <Dringler@umc-gbcs.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: CTBT ORGANIZING  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 06:14 PM 2/24/99 -0500, JAY LINTNER wrote:

>  
> Attached is the list of 21 states where we now have state contacts,  
> which Mark is putting on the web  
>  
> Friends are still working on about 8 states, we are working on another  
> 4, and some we hope will be recruited by you two. These are:  
>  
> alaska  
> california  
> mississippi  
> north carolina  
> ohio  
> south carolina  
>  
>  
> Robin indicated she had peace with justice staff in 3 of these....  
>

Robin,

Would you please call me Thursday afternoon or Friday to discuss this.

Thanks,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
From: "Sally Light" <sallight@earthlink.net>  
To: <wagingpeace@napf.org>  
Cc: <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) Re: Name  
Date: Thu, 25 Feb 1999 21:26:17 -0000  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear David (cc to Sally): While I share your desire to get on with the campaign, I am concerned about the assumption that no negative feedback within 48 hours via email means consensus or agreement. This may cause the campaign unnecessary problems and delay down the road. For example, with the name, there was no clear favorite emanating from the meeting. Moreover, Mateo mentioned to me that while we who were at the meeting may have understood the U.S. in names with "U.S. Campaign" to be directed at U.S. weapons, that was not likely how it would be interpreted by some who would later hear the name in Newe Segobia and other native nations. He was concerned that the U.S. in "U.S. Campaign" and other similar formulations would be interpreted as excluding those folks who did not consider their territory as part of the U.S. geographically. Therefore, I recommend two things. (1) The interim steering committee discuss the name on its conference call next week. That way there is some process, and hence some additional legitimacy behind what is chosen; and (2) If Abolition USA is chosen as the name, the tag line should be amended so that the name says more simply -- "Abolition USA: The Campaign to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons," as that makes the name somewhat less focused on the U.S. as geography, and more clearly focused on its weapons. The whole name also sounds less redundant that way. Further, while I recommended Abolition USA at the meeting, and I still favor its snappy ring, I would be content with something else if the steering group can come up with something better. Peace, Marylia P.S. - this is not posted to the abolition-usa list serve because I have never been able to post to it for some strange and mysterious reason. --mk

Dear Friends,

> I've had many responses to my message regarding the name--none  
> have been negative. I believe there is general agreement with the name:  
> "Abolition USA: The U.S. Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons." I suggest  
> that we consider the name adopted, and move on to issues of strategy.

> I've listed below some of the comments received.

>

> David Krieger

>

> "GO WITH THE NAME!!!! LET'S GET IT ROLLING....."

> --Jackie Hudson

>

> "I'm hoping over time, as we get better known, we will be referred to as  
> ABOLITION USA."

> --Inga Olson

>

> "I think the name is great. Go for it."

>--Bob Musil  
>  
>"I'm OK with Abolition USA and the subtext. Hope we can nail it down."  
>--Alice Slater  
>  
>"Indeed, go with it! It is straight-forward and unambiguous, especially  
>with the subtitle."  
>--Sue Ablao  
>  
>"AAV was in support of the name "Abolition USA when it was first  
>introduced. It's catchy and has a lot of zzzip."  
>--Anthony from AAV  
>  
>  
>  
>\*\*\*\*\*  
>NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION  
>International contact for Abolition 2000  
>a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons  
>\*\*\*\*\*  
>1187 Coast Village Road, Box 121  
>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/>  
>\*\*\*\*\*

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.

-  
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.



To: "Angela Gay Kinhead" <nymo@aol.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: MUPJ Board Meeting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Angela:

For the last three years it is been a privilege to have a representative of the National Youth Ministry Organization serve on the Board of Directors of Methodists United for Peace with Justice and participate in our annual board meeting in Washington, D.C. First it was Jonathan Randolph and then Ben Trammell. Their insights were valuable to our discussion.

If you would like to continue this relationship, our next board meeting will take place on Friday, April 9, 1999 from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. at Foundry United Methodist Church, Washington, DC. We would be able to provide housing but our slim treasury prevents us from paying for transportation. Three years ago we had a grant from the General Board of Church and Society for this purpose, the second year you paid part of the cost, and last year you paid all. You would have to determine whether you have resources this year for this purpose and whether this venture is worth the expense.

If you are interested in continuing this relationship, please let me know who your representative will be. I will arrange to meet the person at airport and provide suitable housing (perhaps at Wesley Seminary as we did the past two years). I will also want to send your representative briefing material.

Please call me at 301 896-0013 if you would like to discuss this further.

Shalom,

To: "Harold Hartley" <hhartley@gbhem.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: MUPJ Board Meeting  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Hal:

For the last three years it is been a privilege to have a representative of the Methodist Student Movement serve on the Board of Directors of Methodists United for Peace with Justice and participate in our annual board meeting in Washington, D.C. First it was Morie Griffin and then Scott Manning. Their insights were valuable to our discussion.

If you would like to continue this relationship, our next board meeting will take place on Friday, April 9, 1999 from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. at Foundry United Methodist Church, Washington, DC. We would be able to provide housing but our slim treasury prevents us from paying for transportation. Three years ago we had a grant from the General Board of Church and Society for this purpose, the second year as I recall you paid part of the cost, and last year you paid all. You would have to determine whether you have resources this year for this purpose and whether this venture is worth the expense.

If you are interested in continuing this relationship, please let me know who your representative will be. I will arrange to meet the person at airport and provide suitable housing (perhaps at Wesley Seminary as we did the past two years). I will also want to send your representative briefing material.

Please call me at 301 896-0013 if you would like to discuss this further.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sat, 27 Feb 1999 14:51:44 -0800 (PST)  
From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@igc.apc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: OOPS! CORRECTION TO NEW E-MAIL ADDRESS  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org, abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com,  
jburroughs@igc.org, alichterman@igc.org, veiluvawslf@igc.org,  
abeier@igc.org, putton@igc.org, olins@pacbell.net, dnesbitt@idiom.com,  
wravison@sirius.com, wslf@igc.org, agapefn@sirius.com, kellyq@ran.org,  
quercus@concentric.net  
X-Sender: wslf@pop.igc.org (Unverified)

Dear friends, I goofed! Please disregard my earlier message.  
My CORRECT new e-mail address is: wslf@earthlink.net  
Sorry for the confusion. -- Jackie Cabasso

\*\*\*\*\*

WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

1440 Broadway, Suite 500

Oakland, CA USA 94612

Tel: (510)839-5877

Fax: (510)839-5397

wslf@igc.apc.org

\*\*\*\*\* Part of ABOLITION 2000 \*\*\*\*\*

Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Sat, 27 Feb 1999 19:07:11 -0800 (PST)  
From: marylia@igc.org (marylia)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: New email address  
To: marylia@igc.org  
X-Sender: marylia@pop.igc.apc.org (Unverified)

Hi. I will have a new email address as of March 1, 1999. Please update your records. And, please note that Tri-Valley CAREs' web site address will not change (check it out!). Both addresses are below, in the signature of this message. Small note of desparation: the installation software from my new provider has not yet arrived -- so I may be out of commission for a short while. Wish me luck!!!! Peace, Marylia

++++++ Please note that my email address will change to  
<marylia@earthlink.net> on 3/1/99 ++++++

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!  
Our web site will remain at this location. Only my email address is  
changing on 3/1/99.

(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>

Cc: "Janet Bloomfield" <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>,

"Oxford Research Group" <org@oxfrg.demon.co.uk>, <a2000uk@gn.apc.org>

Date: Mon, 1 Mar 1999 12:04:55 -0000

From: "Janet Bloomfield" <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: NEW BRITISH OPINION POLL ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND NATO.

To: <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>, <abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de>

X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host userc782.uk.uudial.com [194.69.99.240] claimed to be jbloomfieldgn

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

FROM:

Oxford Research Group,

51, Plantation Road,

Oxford,

OX2 6JE,

UK.

Tel: +44 (0)1865 242819

Fax: +44 (0)1865 794652

e-mail: org@oxfrg.demon.co.uk

www: www.oxfrg.demon.co.uk

PRESS INFORMATION:

Embargo: 00.01 hours Monday March 1st, 1999.

## VAST MAJORITY OF BRITISH PUBLIC IN FAVOUR OF BLAIR TAKING LEAD ON REMOVING NUCLEAR WEAPONS

A new MORI opinion poll commissioned by the independent research organisation, the Oxford Research Group, shows that a vast majority of British people would support the Prime Minister if he were to take a lead in negotiations for worldwide nuclear disarmament. The poll is released on the day that Defence Secretary George Robertson MP makes a major speech on defence policy at Aberdeen University.

Seven out of ten Britons agree that "I would think more highly of the Prime Minister, Tony Blair, if he were to take a lead in negotiations to remove nuclear weapons worldwide", with a third agreeing strongly. Nearly one in five disagree - but relatively few strongly (6%). Mr Blair should note that Labour voters are more likely than the public as a whole to agree with the statement.

The poll also shows that the public would like to see NATO move towards a policy of no-first use of nuclear weapons, with a substantial proportion supporting a non-nuclear NATO. Around three in ten are in favour of NATO not being able to use nuclear weapons unless NATO countries have been attacked with nuclear weapons, while a similar proportion would like NATO to dispose of its nuclear weapons altogether. This comes at a time when NATO is preparing to celebrate its 50th Anniversary and is in the process of reviewing its nuclear strategy. Relatively few (11%) of British people would support a move to the use of nuclear weapons first against non-nuclear threats.

Commenting on the poll Scilla Elworthy, Director of the Oxford Research Group, said:

"These findings should be of great interest to politicians and policy makers involved in review of both British nuclear weapons and NATO strategy. The public are ready not only for further progress on reducing the emphasis on the nuclear component of defence policy, but they also want Britain's Government to take the lead in negotiating the elimination of all nuclear weapons."

ENDS: (Poll results attached)

For further information:

Janet Bloomfield (Oxford Research Group) 01799 516189

e-mail: [jbloomfield@gn.apc.org](mailto:jbloomfield@gn.apc.org)

Michele Corrado or Kay Wright (MORI) 0171 928 5955

e-mail: [michele.corrado@mori.com](mailto:michele.corrado@mori.com) or [kay.wright@mori.com](mailto:kay.wright@mori.com)

Oxford Research Group - Nuclear Defence Poll

MORI Topline Results 15/2/1999

1,978 ADULTS AGED 15+

INTERVIEWED FACE-TO-FACE, IN-HOUSE

BETWEEN 5-8 FEBRUARY 1999

164 SAMPLING POINTS THROUGHOUT GREAT BRITAIN

DATA WEIGHTED TO NATIONAL PROFILE

Question One:

A. Britain currently has nuclear weapons available and ready to be used:

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Strongly agree             | 34% |
| Tend to agree              | 44% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 8%  |
| Tend to disagree           | 5%  |
| Strongly disagree          | 2%  |
| Don't know                 | 8%  |

B. I feel that Britain needs nuclear weapons to increase my sense of security

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Strongly agree             | 11% |
| Tend to agree              | 30% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 12% |
| Tend to disagree           | 26% |
| Strongly disagree          | 18% |
| Don't know                 | 3%  |

C. The nuclear weapons currently aboard Royal Navy Trident submarines should be disposed of (safely)

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Strongly agree             | 19% |
| Tend to agree              | 27% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 14% |
| Tend to disagree           | 24% |
| Strongly disagree          | 11% |
| Don't know                 | 5%  |

D. I would think more highly of the Prime Minister, Tony Blair, if he were to take a lead in negotiations to remove nuclear weapons worldwide

|                            |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Strongly agree             | 33% |
| Tend to agree              | 35% |
| Neither agree nor disagree | 12% |
| Tend to disagree           | 10% |
| Strongly disagree          | 6%  |
| Don't know                 | 3%  |

QUESTION TWO:

A. NATO should reserve the right to use nuclear weapons before nuclear weapons are fired upon NATO countries

24% Agree.

B.NATO should not use nuclear weapons until nuclear weapons are fired upon NATO countries

28% Agree.

C.NATO should dispose of its nuclear weapons altogether

27% Agree.

D.NATO should have the right to use nuclear weapons before nuclear or any other types of weapons are fired against NATO

11% Agree

Don't know/no opinion

11%

For more details try: [www.oxfrg.demon.co.uk](http://www.oxfrg.demon.co.uk)  
[www.mori.com](http://www.mori.com)

```
<!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 4.72.3110.7" name=GENERATOR>
```

```
</HEAD>
```

```
<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2></FONT>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>FROM:</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>Oxford Research Group,</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>51, Plantation Road,</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>Oxford,</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>OX2 6JE,</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>UK.</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>Tel:&nbsp;+44 (0)1865 242819</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>Fax: +44 (0)1865 794652</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>e-mail: <A
```

```
href="mailto:org@oxfrg.demon.co.uk">org@oxfrg.demon.co.uk</A></FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>www: <A
```

```
href="http://www.oxfrg.demon.co.uk">www.oxfrg.demon.co.uk</A></FONT></DIV></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>PRESS INFORMATION:<BR>Embargo: 00.01 hours
```

```
Monday March 1st, 1999.</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2><BR>VAST MAJORITY OF BRITISH PUBLIC IN FAVOUR OF  
BLAIR TAKING LEAD ON REMOVING NUCLEAR WEAPONS</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
```

```
<DIV><FONT color=#000000 size=2>A new MORI opinion poll commissioned by the  
independent research organisation, the Oxford Research Group, shows that a vast  
majority of British people would support the Prime Minister if he were to take a
```







Return-Path: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Date: Mon, 1 Mar 1999 08:00:59 -0500  
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
Subject: Income  
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Content-Disposition: inline

I am today depositing the Ploughshares grant of \$10,000 and a membership contribution of \$20 from Joan Chapin to our general fund.

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

At 08:00 AM 3/1/99 -0500, Phillip H. Miller wrote:

>I am today depositing the Ploughshares grant of \$10,000 and a membership  
>contribution of \$20 from Joan Chapin to our general fund.

>

Dear Phil:

That's good news that the Ploughshares check has come through. After you know it has cleared please pay me \$2,000 for 10 days work in February @ \$200/day on activities related to the CTBT.

Thanks,  
Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Mon, 01 Mar 1999 10:18:50 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: news and report: "Jump-START"

March 1, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: Committee on Nuclear Policy Jump-START report, 2/26

On Friday, the Committee on Nuclear Policy issue released "Jump-START: Retaking the Initiative to Reduce Post-Cold War Nuclear Dangers." The Committee is a collaborative group of project directors of several independent non-governmental organizations who research nuclear weapon policy, including several Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers organization directors and the Coalition's director.

The report argues that Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) process should be supplemented with new initiatives to directly address the new nuclear realities and risks of the post-Cold war period.

For an electronic copy of the report, see  
<<http://www.stimson.org/policy/jumpstart.htm>>

In case you missed the New York Times article and the editorial from 2/26, they are attached below.

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

U.S. Urged to Reduce Nuclear Arsenal to Revive Russian Talks  
Steven Lee Myers  
New York Times  
February 26, 1999

WASHINGTON -- A coalition of nuclear-weapons experts called on the Clinton administration Thursday to revive stalled arms-control negotiations with Russia by making a series of bold and, if necessary, unilateral gestures to reduce nuclear stockpiles and build confidence.

In a report issued here, the Committee on Nuclear Policy, which represents a variety of arms-control organizations and research groups, said the administration was losing the initiative by waiting indefinitely for the Russian Parliament to ratify the second strategic arms reduction treaty, or START II, before taking new steps to reduce nuclear weapons.

Instead, the experts recommended, the United States and Russia should

each begin to reduce total stockpiles to 1,000 nuclear weapons, including strategic and battlefield warheads. At the peak of the Cold War each side had more than 10,000 warheads, but the total number of nuclear weapons -- bombs or missiles -- has never been made public.

The experts, who include Robert McNamara, the former secretary of defense, and Gen. Andrew Goodpaster, a former NATO commander, also said both sides should take more missiles off alert and remove from their war plans options that call for massive nuclear strikes.

Although the committee said the United States and Russia should work together on these objectives, it concluded that the administration could by itself give new impetus to arms control and reduce what the experts view as dangerous instability in Russia's nuclear forces.

"To continue to rely solely on the stalemated START process is to needlessly increase the costs and risks of maintaining U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals at levels well in excess of what is needed to deter an attack," the committee's report concluded.

Under START I, signed in 1991, the United States and Russia have reduced their strategic nuclear warheads from more than 10,000 to about 6,000. START II would reduce each side's arsenal to 3,000 to 3,500 warheads. The Senate approved the treaty in 1995, but it has languished in Russia's Parliament for six years.

Although President Boris Yeltsin's government supports ratification, votes have been repeatedly postponed, most recently in the wake of December's American-led raids on Iraq, which Russia opposed.

Robert Bell, special assistant to the president for defense policy and arms control at the National Security Council, said the recommendations were "well intentioned" but went too far. "At the end of the day, the proposals are too ambitious and too idealistic," he said.

But the coalition, coordinated by the Henry L. Stimson Center in Washington, cited President Bush's sweeping, unilateral decision in 1991 to remove tactical nuclear weapons from overseas bases and from surface ships, and to take 1,000 warheads on B-52s and some missiles off alert. Former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev quickly reciprocated, clearing the way for the START 2 agreements.

Michael Krepon, president of the Stimson Center, an independent military research organization, said the administration -- and Congress -- had not paid enough attention to the extent of the deterioration of Russia's nuclear forces, driven by its collapsing economy.

"They'll become very focused on this problem after something terrible happens," he said.

The committee also called on the administration to spend far more to improve safeguards for Russia's nuclear arsenal. Clinton has proposed increasing such spending to \$4.5 billion over the next five years, from

the \$2.5 billion now budgeted.

\*\*\*\*\*

## UNFINISHED COLD-WAR BUSINESS

New York Times Editorial

February 26, 1999

History will judge the Clinton Administration's foreign policy record partly by its success in helping Russia reduce the nuclear remnants of the cold war. Nothing would do more to protect American security in the decades ahead than insuring that Russia's immense stockpile of nuclear weapons and materials is diminished and adequately controlled. The modest amount of money needed to achieve these goals now could save Washington many billions of dollars in the future to deal with the Russian nuclear threat if it is not reduced.

Moscow still has 6,000 nuclear warheads poised for long-distance delivery. Weapons-grade plutonium from dismantled warheads is stored in poorly secured buildings, vulnerable to theft. Russia also has tens of thousands of underpaid weapons scientists and workers in 170 scientific institutes and 10 closed cities that house the Russian nuclear weapons complex. If President Clinton hopes to leave an enduring mark in international affairs, he will work on these problems in the remaining 23 months of his term. Specifically, he should look for innovative ways to further reduce nuclear weapons and speed the conversion of Russia's nuclear establishment to civilian activities.

The last nuclear arms reduction treaty, negotiated more than six years ago, has yet to be ratified by Russia's Parliament. That treaty alone would cut nuclear weapons totals nearly in half. Prime Minister Yevgeny Primakov recognizes the treaty's value for Russia, both in foreign policy and budget savings terms. Mr. Clinton should work closely with President Boris Yeltsin and Mr. Primakov to achieve ratification.

But hopes for deep nuclear cuts need not depend on Russia's Communist-dominated Parliament. In coordination with Russia's leaders, Mr. Clinton should initiate steps that go beyond the treaty, including parallel nuclear reductions and taking more weapons off hair-trigger alert. Such methods proved effective when tried by Presidents George Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev a decade ago.

Shrinking Russia's nuclear infrastructure also requires expanding the cooperative programs developed under legislation originally sponsored by Senators Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar. These efforts have already supported the dismantling of some 5,000 Russian warheads. Additional work is needed now to safely convert as much of the plutonium and enriched uranium from these bombs into less dangerous forms and to store what remains under much more secure conditions. The Administration rightly seeks large spending increases in these programs in next year's budget. It is essential that Congress approve these requests.

Washington should also press ahead with its efforts to re-employ Russian

weapons scientists in civilian work. Two American programs managed by the Energy Department are designed to achieve that goal. One, begun in 1994, is aimed at Russia's scientific institutes. A newer program deals with the closed nuclear cities. The scientific institutes program has succeeded in re-employing thousands of Russian scientists at home and keeping them out of the reach of terrorists or countries eager to make nuclear, biological or chemical weapons. But a report prepared for Congress this week by the General Accounting Office called attention to some problems, including taxation by Russia of some of the aid money and allegations that some assistance went to institutes and scientists still engaged in weapons work. However cash-starved the Russian Government is, taxation of American aid money is unacceptable. Nor should American subsidies support Russian weapons development.

The G.A.O. report calls for slowing down the nuclear-cities program until the problems in the institutes program have been resolved. That would be a mistake. The nuclear-cities agreement is more carefully drawn than its predecessor and already provides for exemption from Russian taxation. Tightened project review procedures are in place to make sure that Washington is not inadvertently subsidizing new Russian weapons development. These programs, along with Washington's contributions to Russia's plutonium and uranium conversion and security programs, should go forward as part of a coordinated drive to substantially eliminate Russia's cold-war nuclear infrastructure before the Clinton Administration leaves office.

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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>>

---

Return-Path: <owner-disarm-news@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 01 Mar 1999 10:13:30 -0500  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-disarm-news@igc.org  
Subject: JUMP START Report  
To: disarm-news@igc.org  
X-Accept-Language: en  
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id HAB19535

On Feb. 25, 1999, The Committee on Nuclear Policy released a series of new initiatives to deal with the current deadlock on nuclear issues.

The Committee, a collaborative group of project directors of a number of organizations, urges the Clinton administration to:

== Reduce nuclear forces to levels far lower than currently envisioned under a START III treaty;

== Take the majority of U.S. forces, alongside Russia, off hair-trigger alert; and,

== Secure, monitor, and greatly reduce fissile materials and warhead stockpiles.

The Committee proposes a coherent and comprehensive set of recommendations for each of these initiatives that are parallel, reciprocal, and verifiable.

For a complete copy of the report, see: <http://www.stimson.org/policy/>

A copy of the press release summarizing the report follows.

February 25, 1999 Washington, D.C.— The Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) process should be supplemented with new initiatives to directly address the new nuclear realities and risks of the post-Cold war period. That is the conclusion of the report released today by the Committee on Nuclear Policy, a collaborative group of project directors of several independent non-governmental organizations who research nuclear weapon policy issues.

In the report, Jump-START: Retaking the Initiative to Reduce Post-Cold War Nuclear Dangers, the Committee argues "that the formal treaty negotiation process, used by the United States and the Soviet Union/Russian Federation to manage their Cold War nuclear rivalry, has not dealt effectively with new post-Cold War realities." In particular, the Committee argues further, "the pace of this process has not kept up with the expansion of nuclear dangers inside Russia" that have been created by that country's ongoing economic collapse.

The fact that the process is slow and cumbersome, and also has been

stalled for the last six years, is only part of the problem, according to the Committee. The content and context of the negotiations have not kept up either, asserts the Committee. "The START II Treaty, signed in 1993, aims at force levels (3,000–3,500 deployed strategic warheads) that are no longer appropriate for today, let alone for the 21st century," the report states.

The report contains a series of disturbing incidents in Russia that demonstrate the urgency with which the risks of accidental or unauthorized launch of Russian missiles, or of poorly protected bomb-making materials falling into hostile hands, must be addressed. Characterizing these incidents as "the tip of a nuclear iceberg," the Committee urges the Clinton administration to: reduce nuclear forces to levels far lower than currently envisioned under a START III treaty; take the majority of U.S. forces, alongside Russia, off hair-trigger alert; and, secure, monitor, and greatly reduce fissile materials and warhead stockpiles. The Committee proposes a coherent and comprehensive set of recommendations for each of these initiatives that are parallel, reciprocal, and verifiable.

Contact: Jesse James, Executive Director, Committee on Nuclear Policy  
\*\*\*\*\*

New York Times  
February 26, 1999

## U.S. Urged to Reduce Nuclear Arsenal to Revive Russian Talks

By STEVEN LEE MYERS

WASHINGTON -- A coalition of nuclear-weapons experts called on the Clinton administration Thursday to revive stalled arms-control negotiations with Russia by making a series of bold and, if necessary, unilateral gestures to reduce nuclear stockpiles and build confidence.

In a report issued here, the Committee on Nuclear Policy, which represents a variety of arms-control organizations and research groups, said the administration was losing the initiative by waiting indefinitely for the Russian Parliament to ratify the second strategic arms reduction treaty, or START II, before taking new steps to reduce nuclear weapons.

Instead, the experts recommended, the United States and Russia should each begin to reduce total stockpiles to 1,000 nuclear weapons, including strategic and battlefield warheads. At the peak of the Cold War each side had more than 10,000 warheads, but the total number of nuclear weapons -- bombs or missiles -- has never been made public.

The experts, who include Robert McNamara, the former secretary of defense, and Gen. Andrew Goodpaster, a former NATO commander, also said both sides should take more missiles off alert from their war

plans options that call for massive nuclear strikes.

Although the committee said the United States and Russia should work together on these objectives, it concluded that the administration could by itself give new impetus to arms control and reduce what the experts view as dangerous instability in Russia's nuclear forces.

"To continue to rely solely on the stalemated START process is to needlessly increase the costs and risks of maintaining U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals at levels well in excess of what is needed to deter an attack," the committee's report concluded.

Under START I, signed in 1991, the United States and Russia have reduced their strategic nuclear warheads from more than 10,000 to about 6,000. START II would reduce each side's arsenal to 3,000 to 3,500 warheads. The Senate approved the treaty in 1995, but it has languished in Russia's Parliament for six years.

Although President Boris Yeltsin's government supports ratification, votes have been repeatedly postponed, most recently in the wake of December's American-led raids on Iraq, which Russia opposed.

Robert Bell, special assistant to the president for defense policy and arms control at the National Security Council, said the recommendations were "well intentioned" but went too far. "At the end of the day, the proposals are too ambitious and too idealistic," he said.

But the coalition, coordinated by the Henry L. Stimson Center in Washington, cited President Bush's sweeping, unilateral decision in 1991 to remove tactical nuclear weapons from overseas bases and from surface ships, and to take 1,000 warheads on B-52s and some missiles off alert. Former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev quickly reciprocated, clearing the way for the START 2 agreements.

Michael Krepon, president of the Stimson Center, an independent military research organization, said the administration -- and Congress -- had not paid enough attention to the extent of the deterioration of Russia's nuclear forces, driven by its collapsing economy.

"They'll become very focused on this problem after something terrible happens," he said.

The committee also called on the administration to spend far more to improve safeguards for Russia's nuclear arsenal. Clinton has proposed increasing such spending to \$4.5 billion over the next five years, from the \$2.5 billion now budgeted.

--

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 0172

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

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

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

A project of: Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com>

From: owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com

Date: Mon, 1 Mar 1999 13:01:20 -0700

=====

THE SUNFLOWER

=====

ISSUE NO. 22, March 1999

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

=====

The Sunflower is a free, monthly electronic newsletter providing educational information on nuclear weapons abolition and other issues relating to peace in the Nuclear Age.

[http://www.wagingpeace.org/the\\_sunflower.html](http://www.wagingpeace.org/the_sunflower.html)

Sender: owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: sunflower-napf

=====

IN THIS ISSUE

=====

=====

NEWS

=====

PROLIFERATION

Russia Requests \$3 Billion to Fix Y2K Problem

Subcritical Nuclear Weapons Test Conducted February 9

NON-PROLIFERATION

India and Pakistan Sign Limited Nuclear Weapons Accord

Rep. Woolsey Re-Introduces Disarmament Legislation

=====

ENERGY AND WASTE

=====

Russia Seeks to Import U.S. Nuclear Waste

Administration Opposes "Mobile Chernobyl"

Russian Court Rejects Nikitin's Latest Bid

EPA to Fine Hanford Nuclear Reservation

# ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE

# ABOLITION GRASSROOTS NEWS

# EVENTS

# RESOURCES

=====

NEWS

=====

## PROLIFERATION

### Russia Requests \$3 Billion to Fix Y2K Problem

---

Russia has asked the U.S. and NATO for \$3 billion to fix the Y2K "millennium bug" computer problem in its nuclear weapons systems which could cause Russian radar to give a false warning indication of a nuclear attack. The U.S. has offered to set up an early warning center with Russia in December 1999. Some analysts also see potentially serious problems for Russia and Ukraine's nuclear power plants. The recent federal budget proposed by President Clinton requests \$4 billion for "Nunn-Lugar" funds to be spent over six years to help Russia dismantle nuclear weapons. However, much of the proposed funding is not allotted to fix Y2K problems. An expert with Jane's Information Group fears that nuclear power plants, unable to obtain accurate temperature information, could experience another Chernobyl. On February 24 a Deputy CIA Director also express concern that potential Y2K problems could affect Russian and Chinese missile systems. (Associated Press, February 3, Reuters February 22, 1999)

### Subcritical Nuclear Weapons Test Conducted February 9

---

The sixth U.S. subcritical nuclear weapons test was conducted at the Nevada Test Site February 9. The underground testing program began in 1997. The test was designed to expand the knowledge of scientists in national laboratories participating in the Department of Energy's \$60 billion Stockpile Stewardship Program for nuclear weapons research and development. (Shundahai Network, February 10, 1999)

## NON-PROLIFERATION

### India and Pakistan Sign Limited Nuclear Weapons Accord

---

India and Pakistan have signed a number of agreements designed to reduce tensions between the two countries that increased after nuclear tests were conducted last May. Agreements include advance warning of ballistic missile tests and a pledge to reduce the risks of accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons. While welcoming this development, most analysts concluded that much work is needed to improve India-Pakistan relations, particularly a solution to the half-century old Kashmir dispute. (Reuters, February 21, 1999)

### Rep. Woolsey Reintroduces Nuclear Disarmament Legislation

---

On February 24 Representative Lynn Woolsey (D-CA)reintroduced legislation to begin the process of global disarmament. The resolution urges the President to bring the international community together to adopt a treaty to abolish nuclear weapons. Details:  
[http://www.napf.org/res\\_a2000\\_woolsey.html](http://www.napf.org/res_a2000_woolsey.html)

---

## ENERGY AND WASTE

---

---

## Russia Seeks to Import U.S. Nuclear Waste

---

In a letter of December 23, 1998 to U.S. Energy Secretary Richardson, the Russian Minister of Atomic Energy offered to consider a long-term commercial arrangement to import spent fuel from U.S. nuclear power plants into Russia for storage. Russian anti-nuclear activists argue that current Russian law prohibits importation of foreign radioactive materials. The Duma is currently considering legislation to allow this practice. Last month Greenpeace leaked documents indicating that Russian officials are planning to import nuclear waste from a number of other countries in addition to the U.S. (Environmental News Service, February 8, 1999)

## Administration Opposes "Mobile Chernobyl"

---

On February 10 the Clinton Administration renewed its opposition to "Mobile Chernobyl" before a hearing of the House Commerce Committee. Proposed legislation calls for shipping all of the nation's high-level nuclear waste to a temporary storage facility in Nevada. The Administration favors a permanent repository to be built in the Yucca Mountain region of the state. (Reuters, February 10, 1999)

## Russian Court Rejects Nikitin's Latest Bid

---

On February 4 Russia's Supreme Court refused to drop treason and spying charges against dissident Alexander Nikitin. He was a former captain who accused the Russian navy of dumping radioactive waste into the Arctic Sea. Nikitin vows to continue to fight. (Reuters, February 4, 1999) Background and updates are available from <http://www.bellona.no/e/russia/nikitin/index.htm>

## EPA to Fine Hanford Nuclear Reservation

---

Violations of hazardous waste management laws at the Hanford nuclear reservation have drawn a proposed fine of \$367,000 from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Violations include failure to have an up-to-date contingency plan and storage of hazardous waste without a permit. (Associated Press, February 11, 1999)

---

---

## ACTIONS YOU CAN TAKE

---

---

### Stop the "Star Wars" Bills

---

Although the Senate twice defeated the National Missile Defense Act in 1998, on February 10 the Senate Armed Services Committee endorsed the reintroduced legislation, Cochran-Inouye S.257. The House version, sponsored by Representatives Weldon (R-II) and Spratt (D-SC), HR 4, was marked up by the House Armed Services Committee on February 25.

Contact your Senators and Representatives and urge them to vote NO on National Missile Defense ("Star Wars") deployment. Urge your Senators to vote against Cochran-Inouye S.257 and your Representatives to oppose the Weldon-Spratt National Missile Defense System Bill. The Senate switchboard number is 202-334-3121. The House switchboard number is 202-225-3121. Contact information for your Senators and Representatives is available on the web at <http://www.vote-smart.org/congresstrack/c-index.html>. For more background, see [http://www.napf.org/aa/99\\_02.html](http://www.napf.org/aa/99_02.html).

---

---

=====

A B O L I T I O N G R A S S R O O T S N E W S

=====

For the latest nuclear weapons abolition grassroots news, visit <http://www.napf.org/abolition2000/news/>

---

---

E V E N T S

=====

March 1: Global Crisis Solutions Conference, Alumni House, University of California, Berkeley. The conference will be a benefit fundraiser for the Global Peace Walk 1999-2000 which will be carrying the "survival issue" messages presented there to the United Nations and to Washington, DC, as part of its campaign for Global Peace Zone 2000 by fostering acceptance of its prayer for "Global Peace Now!" as a universal human resolve. Details: [gear2000@lightspeed.net](mailto:gear2000@lightspeed.net).

March 3-5: Conference "Space Use and Ethics, Criteria for the Assessment of Future Space Projects" at the Darmstadt University of Technology (TUD), Germany. Contact Regina Hagen (Darmstaedter Friedenforum) at [regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de](mailto:regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de)

March 5: "People of Faith Call for Abolition" in commemoration of the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Contact Oak Ridge Environmental Peace at [arep@igc.org](mailto:arep@igc.org)

March 5-6: Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space, Darmstadt, Germany. Contact Darmstaedter Friedensforum, c/o Regina Hagen, Teichhausstrasse 46, D-64297 Darmstadt, Germany; tel 49.6151.47114; Fax 9.6151.47105; [regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de](mailto:regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de)

March 8: Nuclear Power, Nuclear Weapons, and Y2K, Cannon Caucus Room, Cannon House Bldg., Washington, D.C. Sponsored by STAR (Standing for Truth About Radiation). Features Dr. Helen Caldicott, Michael Kraig, Dr. Michio Kaku, Dr. Ted Taylor, John Pike, and others. Details: [carrie@noradiation.org](mailto:carrie@noradiation.org) or 516-324-0655. Background links on Y2K and nuclear weapons and nuclear energy are available at <http://www.napf.org/y2k.html>

March 10-11: Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, Palais des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland, contact WILPF, 41-22-733-6175; [wilpf@iprolink.ch](mailto:wilpf@iprolink.ch)

March 27: UNPLUG Salem Campaign. A coalition of 54 organizations will hold a rally at the Salem Nuclear Plant in New Jersey to commemorate the 20th Anniversary of the Three Mile Island meltdown. Contact Norm Cohen at [norco@hellatlantic.net](mailto:norco@hellatlantic.net).

April 8-10: The Peace Studies Association 11th Annual Conference: Case Studies in Peacemaking, Siena College, Loudonville, NY [imh@csd.uwm.edu](mailto:imh@csd.uwm.edu).

April 10-11: National Youth Conference, Hague Appeal for Peace. World Federalist Association, [loregost@aol.com](mailto:loregost@aol.com); 1-800-932-0123.

April 26-May 14: UN Disarmament Commission Meeting, New York.

April 30: Michael Douglas will present General Lee Butler the Distinguished Peace Leadership Award, Santa Barbara, CA. For details, contact the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, (805) 965-3443; [napf@wagingpeace.org](mailto:napf@wagingpeace.org).

May 6-16: 7th Annual International Conference on Conflict Resolution (ICR) St. Petersburg, Russia. Details: <http://ahpweb.org/cbi/home.html>.

May 7-10: Healing Global Wounds Spring Gathering, Nevada Test Site. Details at <http://www.shundahai.org/HGW/> or [hgw@scruznet.com](mailto:hgw@scruznet.com).

May 11-15: Hague Appeal for Peace, The Netherlands. This is an international conference that will focus on building a culture of peace and the delegitimization of war. Contact: Karina Wood, U.S. Outreach Coordinator, [kwood@igc.apc.org](mailto:kwood@igc.apc.org)

May 24-26: Sixth World Peace Science Congress, Amsterdam, details: <http://www.copri.dk/ipra/ipra-bb.htm>

June 1-July 28: Nuclear Waste Transportation Corridors Tour, an extensive trip through communities and cities on the major nuclear waste corridors to help facilitate educational outreach, organizational and cultural networking and action planning around nuclear waste issues. Details: [shundahai@shundahai.org](mailto:shundahai@shundahai.org); 702-647-3095.

June 3-6: Second Interdisciplinary Conference on the Evolution of World Order: Global and Local Responsibilities for a Just and Sustainable Civilization, Ryerson Polytechnic Institute, Toronto, Canada, details: <http://www.pgs.ca/woc/>

June 6-16: 7th Annual International Conference on Conflict Resolution, St. Petersburg, Russia. Contact [solweean@aol.com](mailto:solweean@aol.com) or visit <http://www.ahpweb.org/cbi/home.html>.

=====

## RESOURCES

=====

\*\*\* The website for PBS Frontline's recent report on the security of the Russian nuclear arsenal is <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/russia/>

\*\*\*BMD-List is a news service covering missile defense and special weapons issues. Special weapons news is archived at <http://www.fas.org/news/>

BMD-List is an information service of Special Weapons Monitor,

<http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/>

\*\*\*Up to five copies of the Stop the Star Wars Revival Resource & Action

Kits are available free from the Disarmament Clearinghouse,

[disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)

\*\*\*A new informational brochure, "STOP the Cassini Earth Flyby" (August

18) is available from Grandmothers for Peace International,

[Wiednerb@aol.com](mailto:Wiednerb@aol.com), 916-684-8744.

BASIC has published a new report, Nuclear Futures-Western European Options

for Nuclear Risk Reduction at <http://www.basicint.org/nufu3-0.htm>

\*\*\*Pacific Action has a new website,

<http://www.pasifika.net/pacific-action/>. The organization provides a voice

for Indigenous and Non-Indigenous People working together to re-create an

independent and peaceful Pacific.

\*\*\* The proceedings of the "1998 International Symposium on Health Effects

of Low Doses of Ionizing Radiation" is available for \$40 (Canadian) per

copy from Patricia Cullen, University of Ottawa, 5 Calixa-Lavallee St., PO

Box 450, Station A, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1N 6N5. Fax 613-562-5873.

\*\*\*The Nuclear Atlas has been launched on the Internet at

<http://www.antenna.nl/nukeatlas>, a resource for research and analyses of

interest to the global community of anti-nuclear activists.

\*\*\*OneWorld's Online Guide to Energy,

<http://www.oneworld.org/guides/energy/front.html> has just been published.

At that site you will also find links to guides on nuclear weapons and

nuclear power.

\*\*\*A copy of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Draft Contingency Plan

for Year 2000 is available at <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/Y2K/Y2KCP.html>.

\*\*\* Green Scissors 1999 energy report exposes substantial waste in federal

nuclear energy programs. <http://www.foe.org/eco/scissors99/energy.html>

=====  
E D I T O R S  
=====

David Krieger, J.D, Ph.D., Christoph Hanterman, Ph.D., Lori Beckwith

=====  
S P O N S O R  
=====

List service is being sponsored by XMission, 51 East 400 South Suite 200,

Salt Lake City, UT 84111; voice: 801/539-0852 fax: 801/539-0853 URL:

<http://www.xmission.com>

-  
To unsubscribe to sunflower-napf, send an email to "[majordomo@xmission.com](mailto:majordomo@xmission.com)"  
with "unsubscribe sunflower-napf" in the body of the message.

For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send

"help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 1 Mar 1999 17:31:20 -0800 (PST)  
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <a2000@silcom.com>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: March 1999 Grassroots News  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: a2000@mail.silcom.com

March 1999 Grassroots Newsletter

**\*\*NEW ABOLITION 2000 ORGANIZATIONS:**

The International Peace Project, CA, USA  
San Mateo County Peace Action, CA, USA  
The Mockingbird Project, NY, USA  
International Institute for Sustainable Future, Bombay, India  
This brings the total number of organizations to 1295.

**\*\*MUNICIPALITIES:**

Lawrence Township, NJ, USA.  
Thanks to Robert Moore and others from Coalition for Peace Action for seeing this through. Robert has sent me his helpful guidelines for getting municipalities to pass resolutions in support of Abolition 2000; please email a2000@silcom.com for a copy.  
This brings the total number of municipalities to 219.

**\*\*SANTA BARBARA MEETING UPDATE:**

On February 12-14, some 70 people met to plan the launch of a U.S. campaign for nuclear weapons abolition. Visit <http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition2000/usa99.html> for the mission statement, declaration and photos from the meeting. For a longer report, including a 1999 timeline of upcoming activities and events and a list of participants, contact a2000@silcom.com

**\*\*NEWS:**

\*Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey's office in Washington, DC sent us word that Rep. Woolsey has reintroduced her nuclear weapons legislation. The resolution (H. RES 82) is intended to begin the process of global nuclear disarmament and urges President Clinton to initiate multilateral negotiations leading to the completion of a nuclear weapons treaty to abolish nuclear weapons. It also presents the "Model Nuclear Weapons Convention," which outlines procedures to dismantle and destroy nuclear weapons, safeguard radioactive materials, and ensure compliance with the treaty. PLEASE CONTACT YOUR REPRESENTATIVE AND URGE HIM/HER TO SUPPORT THIS RESOLUTION. For more information, contact Aimee Feinberg at 202-225-5161.

\*The U.S. ambassador joined senior Ukrainian defense officials Friday to watch Ukraine destroy the last one of more than 100 SS-19 nuclear missiles under a U.S.-financed disarmament program. The country earlier surrendered

all its nuclear warheads to Russia and pledged to remain nuclear-free.  
<http://www.nytimes.com/aponline/i/AP-Ukraine-Missiles.html>

\*The Landmine Treaty enters into force on Monday, March 1, 1999. Those working for the elimination of nuclear weapons should gain inspiration from the fact that the International Campaign to Ban Landmines succeeded because grassroots efforts eventually overpowered the government's opposition to this treaty. We must keep up our efforts!

\*According to an opinion poll released today, March 1, the vast majority of British people are in favor of Tony Blair taking the lead in negotiations for worldwide nuclear disarmament. A new MORI opinion poll commissioned by the independent research organization, the Oxford Research Group, finds seven out of ten Britons agree that "I would think more highly of the Prime Minister, Tony Blair, if he were to take a lead in negotiations to remove nuclear weapons worldwide."

\*Citizens Inspection Update: On February 21, a large group of Belgian members of Parliament, artists, authors, leaders of social cultural groups and activists carried out a new Citizens Inspection of the Belgian - NATO base of Kleine Brogel. 160 people gathered and requested the Commander Buyse to be allowed to do an inspection of the nuclear vaults and the US part of the base. Following a refusal by the commander to give access to a delegation of Belgian Members of Parliament and NGO representatives, a large number of people "cut their own door through the fence" and inspected the base. Over 120 people had been arrested inside the NATO base.

#### \*\*NEW WEBSITES:

1. Nuclear Free Pacific <<http://www.pasifika.net/pacific-action>> provides a voice for Indigenous and Non-Indigenous People working together to re-create an independent and peaceful Pacific.

\*NOTE: From our friends in New Zealand we received a reminder that March 1st was Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific Day. It commemorates the 45th anniversary of the U.S. "Bravo" nuclear bomb detonated at the Bikini Atoll. It is a day to remember those who have suffered and died in the struggle for independence around the Pacific and as a result of the nuclear weapons states' use of the Pacific for nuclear weapons testing, nuclear waste dumping and uranium mining.

2. Norbert's bookmarks for active people (in German and English) provides 15,000 links on global issues: peace, disarmament, human rights, social justice, politics, non-violence and sustainable development.  
<http://www.dfg-vk.de/english/bookmark.htm>

3. The Nuclear Atlas has been launched on the Internet at <http://www.antenna.nl/nukeatlas>. It is a resource for research and analyses of interest to the global community of anti-nuclear activists.

#### \*\*EVENTS:

March 5: "People of Faith Call for Abolition" in commemoration of the

signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Contact Oak Ridge Environmental Peace at [arep@igc.org](mailto:arep@igc.org)

March 5-6: Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space, Darmstadt, Germany. Contact Darmstaedter Friedensforum, c/o Regina Hagen, Teichhausstrasse 46, D-64297 Darmstadt, Germany; tel 49.6151.47114; Fax 9.6151.47105; [regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de](mailto:regina.hagen@jugendstil.da.shuttle.de)

March 8: Nuclear Power, Nuclear Weapons, and Y2K, Cannon Caucus Room, Cannon House Bldg., Washington, D.C. Sponsored by STAR (Standing for Truth About Radiation). Features Dr. Helen Caldicott, Michael Kraig, Dr. Michio Kaku, Dr. Ted Taylor, John Pike, and others. Details: [carrie@noradiation.org](mailto:carrie@noradiation.org) or 516-324-0655. Background links on Y2K and nuclear weapons and nuclear energy are available at <http://www.napf.org/y2k.html>

March 10-11: Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space, Palais des Nations, Geneva, Switzerland, contact WILPF, 41-22-733-6175; [wilpf@iprolink.ch](mailto:wilpf@iprolink.ch)

March 27: UNPLUG Salem Campaign. A coalition of 54 organizations will hold a rally at the Salem Nuclear Plant in New Jersey to commemorate the 20th Anniversary of the Three Mile Island meltdown. Contact Norm Cohen at [norco@hellatlantic.net](mailto:norco@hellatlantic.net).

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Mon, 01 Mar 1999 15:42:13 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: REMINDER: CTBT Wkg. Grp Mtg., 3/5

March 1, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball, Director; Tom Collina, CTBT Working Group Chair

RE: CTBT Working Group Meeting this Friday, March 5

Your are invited to attend this Friday's CTBT Working Group meeting of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers to help implement the initial elements of our strategy for ratification in 1999.

A short meeting on CTBT lobbying activities will follow immediately after in the same room.

WHEN: Friday, March 5, 1999, 9:30 - 11:00 AM  
WHERE: UCS 7th Conference Room, 1616 P Street, NW

DRAFT AGENDA: The CTBT Working Group meeting will address our work related to:

- \* special conference on CTBT entry into force
- \* Hill report
- \* report on upcoming public education efforts
- \* report on administration activities
- \* review of strategy plan -- revisions and new projects including:

- op-ed campaign
- editorial campaign
- letters of support
- brochure update

Please bring your ideas and energy! If you cannot attend, please contact Tom or Daryl ahead of time to relay what your organization is doing in connection with the test ban.

If you have any other questions or suggestions, please contact us: Tom Collina (332-0900) or Daryl Kimball (546-0795 x136).

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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>, "Tom Collina" <tcollina@ucsusa.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: REMINDER: CTBT Wkg. Grp Mtg., 3/5  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 03:42 PM 3/1/99 -0500, Daryl Kimball wrote:

>March 1, 1999

>

>TO: Coalition members and friends

>FR: Daryl Kimball, Director; Tom Collina, CTBT Working Group Chair

>

>RE: CTBT Working Group Meeting this Friday, March 5

>

>Your are invited to attend this Friday's CTBT Working Group meeting of the

>Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers to help implement the initial elements

>of our strategy for ratification in 1999.....

Daryl, Tom:

I suggest that at the Friday meeting we give some time to discuss how to bring in other allies for the final push for CTBT ratification. I'm thinking specifically of the environmental movement and women's organizations, such as LWV and AAUW. This has been discussed from time to time, but as far as I know, no one has taken responsibility for doing this on a systematic basis. I hope that some members of the CTBT Working Group will pick up on this task.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <tcollina@ucsusa.org>  
From: tcollina@ucsusa.org  
Date: Tue, 02 Mar 99 09:52:05 -0500  
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>, <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: Re[2]: REMINDER: CTBT Wkg. Grp Mtg., 3/5  
Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

good idea Howard. will do. tom

\_\_\_\_\_  
Reply Separator

Subject: Re: REMINDER: CTBT Wkg. Grp Mtg., 3/5  
Author: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Date: 3/2/99 4:23 AM

At 03:42 PM 3/1/99 -0500, Daryl Kimball wrote:

>March 1, 1999

>

>TO: Coalition members and friends

>FR: Daryl Kimball, Director; Tom Collina, CTBT Working Group Chair

>

>RE: CTBT Working Group Meeting this Friday, March 5

>

>Your are invited to attend this Friday's CTBT Working Group meeting of the  
>Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers to help implement the initial elements  
>of our strategy for ratification in 1999.....

Daryl, Tom:

I suggest that at the Friday meeting we give some time to discuss how to bring in other allies for the final push for CTBT ratification. I'm thinking specifically of the environmental movement and women's organizations, such as LWV and AAUW. This has been discussed from time to time, but as far as I know, no one has taken responsibility for doing this on a systematic basis. I hope that some members of the CTBT Working Group will pick up on this task.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>

Date: Tue, 02 Mar 1999 11:17:30 -0500

From: Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>

Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse

X-Accept-Language: en

To: 20/20 Vision <vision@igc.org>, Anita Seth <anitas@ieer.org>, Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, Brad Morse <bamorse@earthlink.net>, Bruce Hall <panukes@igc.org>, Chris Davis <cdavis@clw.org>, Chris Paine <cpaine@nrdc.org>, Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>, David Culp <dculp@nrdc.org>, Fran Teplitz <paprog@igc.org>, Gordon Clark <paexec@igc.org>, Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>, IEER <ieer@ieer.org>, ISIS <73744.3675@compuserve.com>, Jenny Smith <jsmith@clw.org>, Kathy Crandall <disarmament@igc.org>, Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>, Kimberly Robson <>wandwill@clark.net>, Marie Rietman <ctbt@2020vision.org>, Maureen Eldredge <maureene@earthlink.net>, Stephen Young <syoun@basicint.org>, Todd Perry <tperry@ucsusa.org>, Tom Clements <clements@nci.org>, Tom Collina <tcollina@ucsusa.org>, Veterans for Peace <vfp@igc.org>, Laura Kriv <laura@2020vision.org>, Rachel <rachel@fcnl.org>, Kimberly Roberts <kroberts@psr.org>, Esther Pank <epank@peacenet.org>

Subject: New Addresses

On Your NWWG list - please add:

Maureen Eldredge at ANA

maureene@earthlink.net (different from her pre-sabbatical e-mail)

and change bmorse@igc.org to bamorse@earthlink.net - to reach Brad Morse at ANA.

Add kcrandall@psr.org to reach me after Friday 3/5. (The disarmament address will still work \*hopefully\*, to get to the "Clearinghouse", but I will be regularly checking the new address after Friday.)

Kathy

--

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 0172

E-MAIL: disarmament@igc.org

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

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

A project of: Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>  
X-Sender: disarmtimes@pop.igc.org (Unverified)  
Date: Tue, 02 Mar 1999 13:41:26 -0500  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
From: "NGO Comm. on Disarmament" <disarmtimes@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: NPT/NGO convenors needed

NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY PREPCOM 1999  
NGO presentations: feedback and volunteer convenors needed

The Third Preparatory Committee meeting for the Year 2000 NPT Review Conference is tentatively scheduled for April 12-23, 1999; the dates are still being negotiated. It is expected that this PrepCom will hold an informal three-hour meeting for the oral presentation of NGO viewpoints. These presentations, like those delivered at the 1997 and 1998 PrepComs, will be prepared collaboratively and organized around a series of themes. For each theme, an individual will serve as convenor of an informal working group. The convenor's role is to collect input from the widest possible range of interested persons and organizations on the theme, prepare an initial draft incorporating all the major viewpoints and circulate the draft widely, then keep track of responses and incorporate the feedback into a revised draft of about two pages (a maximum of ten or twelve minutes orally). At all times convenors agree not solely to represent the views of their own organizations but of the NGO community as a whole. Convenors will not necessarily deliver each presentation.

An NGO planning meeting held on February 6 agreed on an initial list of themes. Immediate feedback on the topics and their organization is needed. We also are in need of volunteers to serve as convenors on many of the themes listed. Please contact the NGO presentation coordinators:

|                                       |                                            |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Roger Smith                           | Martin Butcher                             |
| NGO Committee on Disarmament          | Center for European Security & Disarmament |
| 777 U.N. Plaza #3B, New York NY 10017 | 115 rue Stevin, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium   |
| tel 1.212.687.5340 fax 1.212.687.1643 | tel 32.2.230.0732 fax 32.2.230.2467        |
| disarmtimes@igc.org                   | cesd@agoranet.be                           |

P.S. We're also looking for a third coordinator!

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

NPT PREPCOM 1999: SUGGESTED NGO PRESENTATIONS (not in particular order):

1. Focus on the NPT's 2000 Review: the fragility of the NPT, failure of the enhanced review to date, need for compliance, violations (CONVENOR: ARJUN MAKHIJANI, INST FOR ENERGY & ENVIR. RESEARCH, USA)
2. Regional proliferation issues: Middle East/Iraq, South Asia, North Korea
3. NATO: Nuclear Strategy Review, No First Use, Pre-emptive Counter-Proliferation (CONVENOR, PROJECT ON EUROPEAN NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION NETWORK)
4. Moral/legal/spiritual culture of peace (CONVENOR: MYRNA PENA, WORLD CONFERENCE ON RELIGION AND PEACE, USA)

5. CTBT (CONVENOR: TOM COLLINA, UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS)
6. Path to elimination: reductions, de-alerting, Y2K, qualitative disarmament measures (CONVENOR: DAVID KRIEGER, NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION)
7. US/Russian issues (START process, ABM treaty) + Safeguards (relating primarily to these countries) (SEEKING A RUSSIAN CONVENOR)
8. General and Complete Disarmament: new weaponry, depleted uranium weaponry, space weaponization, warfare in the 21st century, security concepts beyond deterrence
9. Instruments to multilateralise: NAC, NWC, MPI, Inter-sessional Working Group, CD, 5 + 3 negotiations (CO-CONVENOR: ALYN WARE, LAWYERS COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR POLICY - NEED A VOLUNTEER HERE AS ALYN WILL NO LONGER BE IN THE U.S.)
10. Indigenous Perspectives, with an emphasis on environment and health (ARJUN MAKHIJANI WILL HELP WITH THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND HEALTH SCIENCE IF NEEDED)
11. Lab Testing and Nuclear Weapons Development (CONVENOR: LYSIANE ALEZARD, LE MOUVEMENT DE LA PAIX, FRANCE)
12. Energy, Article 4, Alternatives
13. Summing up. (CONVENOR: MARTIN BUTCHER, CENTER FOR EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DISARMAMENT, BELGIUM)

\* \* \* \* \*

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: <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
Date: Tue, 02 Mar 99 13:11:20 -0500  
From: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
To: <wowensby@ctr.pcusa.org>, <marsusab@aol.com>, <mupj@igc.org>, <haworthm@ucc.org>  
Subject: CTBT MEETINGS WITH SENATORS

Can we meet next Monday or Tuesday afternoon?

These dates work for Howard, Walt and I. You were out when I called, Mark.

Monday 1:30 first choice. Tuesday at 4 second choice.

Maybe you can hit the reply button for all of us, Mark, if either of these work for you.

Agenda: we've all been talking to grassroots, and learned a few things. I'd like to go over the 14 states and see where we are, with particular reference to how we actually get the meeting with the Senator. Several states have asked for some help; others need nudge; others are charging ahead in my reading.

We need to compare notes and make next steps.

We have 24 state contacts in place in 24 states.

Four of us are working on more:

Jay 2  
Marijke 2  
Robin/HH 5  
Kathy 4

That would bring us to 37 if we get them all.

Idaho is the only top 25 state where we are not actively recruiting, a second tier state. Anyone surface anybody in Idaho?

Official list attached. Mark, you can post this; Kathy and I have added some more to your old list. We may have more by end of day.

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\92ctsto.wpd

To: lintnerj@ucc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: South Carolina contact  
Cc: cprcrogers@mindspring.com  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Jay:

We now have a South Carolina contact for the Interfaith Petition on the CTBT. He is:

Harry Rogers, Carolina Peace Resource Center, 305 S. Saluda Avenue, Columbia, SC 29205; 803 252-2221;  
cprcrogers@mindspring.com.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
Date: Tue, 02 Mar 99 15:46:57 -0500  
From: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>, <wowensby@ctr.pcusa.org>, <marsusab@aol.com>  
Subject: ctbt meeting with senators

I've put what is in my head on to paper, what I know about where we are in arranging meetings. It is now on the attached document, which can serve as starter for our Monday or Tuesday meeting.

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\93ctbtmt.wpd

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
Date: Tue, 02 Mar 1999 18:33:29 -0500  
From: Stephen Young <syoun@basicint.org>  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: Abolition Caucus <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,  
USA Abolition <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) A Strategy for the NATO Summit  
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 PAA08131

Preparing for Future Nuclear Disarmament - The Summit and the Steps Ahead

by Daniel Plesch, Director, BASIC  
and Otfried Nassasauer, Director, BITS

March 1999

Throughout 1999 and early 2000 nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation will be at a crossroads. Until the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, the world faces crucial decisions on both nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, with these areas closely interlocking. If the wrong decisions are made, the existing non-proliferation regime will be substantially weakened, additional nuclear armed powers are likely to emerge, and nuclear weapons will be assigned new tasks within NATO. If the right decisions are made, great opportunities for nuclear disarmament and strengthening the NPT will open up, and nuclear weapons will be devalued as a means of national power.

Throughout 1998 steps were taken in a destabilizing direction. India and Pakistan tested nuclear weapons, and began the process of integrating them into their military arsenals. Russia has not ratified START-II, while the US bombed the chance that this would happen in late 1998 with its strikes against Iraq. Both Russia and NATO are independently discussing an increased role for their nuclear weapons. The fate of START II is unsure again, in both Russia and also the US, where the Senate must reexamine the Treaty. Russia considers making first use a part of her military doctrine and argues that her nuclear weapons are needed to outbalance NATO's conventional superiority. The US is pushing NATO into considering whether nuclear weapons should have a role in deterring and fighting all weapons of mass destruction, whether owned by states or non-state actors. NATO has engaged in this debate in the midst of its first real post-cold war strategy review.

While the general objective is to move towards global nuclear disarmament by the shortest and quickest route possible, the current situation is that progress is made glacially slow - with the prospect that the pace of 1987-1992 cannot be resumed. The initiative needs to be taken primarily by the US and in addition by its allies. All other parties are in relatively weak positions and have comparably little room

to manoeuvre.

In general the three Western Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) have cared and continue to care little for the UN disarmament fora and the disarmament provisions of the NPT. Instead, they continue to regard decisions on nuclear weapons as central to their role in the world. NATO's decisions on nuclear weapons (NW) are important to US and UK geo-political strategies. In international fora these NWS are mainly supported by their allies in Europe. However, a gradual erosion of allied support for these NWS in NATO has recently become visible in UN votes, the independent action of some non-nuclear NATO countries in the Conference on Disarmament and during the German initiated debate on NATO reviewing its first use policy.

However, both NATO and Russia are also facing strong incentives to take new initiatives on nuclear disarmament and safeguarding the NPT. Russia can no longer finance her nuclear arsenal, neither her strategic weapons nor her tactical ones. Neither the current posture nor the ones envisaged under either START-II or START-III can be maintained, without investing huge resources into their maintenance and modernisation. However, Russia is interested in maintaining parity with the US. Deep cuts into both sides' arsenals are the only way to accomplish Russian aims. The US also has a serious interest in cutting strategic forces to much lower levels for cost saving reasons. In addition, NATO and the US share a strong interest in making Russian tactical nuclear weapons disarmament a treaty obligation and reducing proliferation risks.

While Russia is not in a good position to take the initiative, the US and its Western Allies are. The ongoing NATO strategy review is a key opportunity to discuss and agree change for the better among Western nations. NATO can make use of existing opportunities to dramatically reduce the numbers of existing nuclear weapons and help safeguard the NPT. Key decisions should be taken by NATO's April Summit, including on the following issues.

1. NATO's strategy review should contain a statement that the fundamental purpose of NW in the Alliance is to provide a last resort for deterrence purposes. NATO should explain that "last resort" covers only the one case the International Court of Justice (ICJ) didn't rule out as illegal, i.e. if the very existence of one or several member states is at stake. The role of NATO's nuclear weapons would be greatly reduced.
2. NATO should eliminate all language on substrategic NW's in its new strategy. (This opens the option to take a decision on elimination of this category of weapons after the Summit, maybe unilaterally by the US.)
3. The US and Russia should conclude work on a politically binding framework (such as the Helsinki framework agreement) for an arms control agreement which covers tactical nuclear weapons and includes a withdrawal of US-owned European-deployed tactical nuclear weapons. This could happen within or outside the START-framework. If such a framework proves impossible, because NATO-Russia relations have deteriorated too

much, NATO should agree to unilaterally withdraw all US free-fall bombs from Europe.

4. This would allow the European states to make their own input and declare that they no longer require such weapons during peacetime. It would also likely smoke out secret progress in NATO's Nuclear Planning Group towards supporting the US in its push for pre-emptive nuclear counter-proliferation preparations, because forward deployed B-61s may form part of that strategy.

5. The Alliance should adopt the new members' standard on nuclear co-operation for all non-nuclear NATO-members. Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic have joined NATO as first class members while accepting that they will be eligible to participate in NATO nuclear planning and consultation agreements. However under current and foreseeable circumstances all new members will neither deploy nuclear weapons on their soil, nor host the infrastructure for doing so, nor train pilots to participate in NATO nuclear operations, nor enter Programs of Cooperation. They have no requirement to deploy nuclear-capable aircraft either. If Poland, NATO's new 'front-line' state, does not need nuclear arms then clearly there is no need for other countries, such as Greece and Belgium, to prepare to fly nuclear missions. A number of arguments and political developments, outlined later in this paper, support such a change.

6. NATO should issue a separate document on nuclear policy during the Summit. This paper should include statements on nuclear policies agreed earlier by the NWS, such as the 1985 commitment that the NPT is valid under all circumstances or the 1995 commitment entered in the context of the NPT "Principles and Objectives" as well as the statement on the Middle East and on Article VI. Because NATO states have successfully insulated their military policies (and officers) from the NPT commitments they will be reluctant to re-issue these commitments, however refusal will be hard to sustain and extremely damaging to the NPT as it would constitute a revocation of the core political commitments made in the permanent extension of the NPT permanent. The US in particular is keen to dismiss the statement on the Middle East - something Europeans approach differently.

7. NATO should change its first use doctrine. However the change should be put in a different context. No first use is no longer primarily the European security issue that it was when the idea was discussed in the 1980s. Today, NATO should commit itself to a no first use policy in the context of meeting the Alliance's obligations under existing negative security assurances, which NATO would violate in almost all cases if the Alliance ever were to use nuclear weapons first against a non-nuclear weapon state.

8. The Alliance should state that it no longer requires SLBMs to be kept on short notice to fire. This is a concrete means of adding to the de-alerting debate as well as indicating that NATO is willing to implement a no first use policy. The UK has already announced that it can operate its SLBMs at a reduced notice to fire - although it does not call this de-alerting. NATO's fighter bombers are already off quick

reaction alert. If the US maintains its forces on alert it should do so without an alibi from Europe.

For some five years the PENN Network, working transatlantically, has sought to re-open political debate within Europe on NATO related nuclear weapons issues. Today, this debate has been re-opened. NATO faces challenges over its nuclear policies from a wide variety of perspectives:

- \* NATO members are facing strong demands to meet their commitments on nuclear disarmament

- \* NATO members are being challenged over the political legitimacy and the legality of NATO nuclear sharing under the NPT. Neutral and Non-Aligned States have called on NATO to revoke nuclear sharing arrangements, since they are incompatible with the NPT.

- \* NATO members are likely to face both the risks resulting from future nuclear proliferation and the blame for not having acted in time in making progress on nuclear disarmament and safeguarding the NPT.

NATO's nuclear weapon states have tried to avoid the change urgently required. Thus they have risked the future of both nuclear disarmament and the NPT. Since they did not succeed in entirely prohibiting the debate within the Alliance, they are now indicating they might be willing to discuss the nuclear aspects of NATO's strategy after NATO's April Summit within a high level NATO group. However, this position is likely to be changed once NATO has adopted its new strategy during that Summit and - maybe - some minor changes to the nuclear paragraphs have been made. Unless NATO enters a firm and binding commitment to fully revisit the role of nuclear weapons in its strategy and to draw conclusions at its autumn 1999 Ministerials, i.e. in time for the world community to prepare positions for the 2000 NPT Review Conference - NATO's nuclear members are likely to argue that no further change is required for a strategy just adopted after a thorough review. This would close the window of opportunity for fresh momentum to nuclear disarmament existing today and would put the NPT under risk.

-

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: <MARK\_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org>  
Sender: MARK\_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org  
Date: Tue, 2 Mar 1999 22:51:08 -0500 (EST)  
Subject: CTBT UPDATE  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: MARK\_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org (MARK BROWN)

To: mupj@igc.apc.org

Jay,

Thanks for your message. Unfortunately I am booked both times you mentioned. I would encourage you to go ahead and meet and let me know what to post.

I have posted the latest list on the LOGA web page. Let me know when you have more updates.

Mark

Mark B. Brown  
Assistant Director (International Affairs and Human Rights)  
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs  
Washington, D.C.  
Tue, Mar 2, 1999

Return-Path: <owner-disarm-news@igc.org>  
Date: Wed, 03 Mar 1999 12:11:38 -0500  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-disarm-news@igc.org  
Subject: Richardson on Russian NW & CTBT  
To: disarm-news@igc.org  
X-Accept-Language: en

Thanks to Jenny Smith at the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers for passing on the transcript and news of Sec. of Energy Richardson's speech yesterday at the National Press Club. I am told that C-Span covered the event so check your tv schedules. . .

02 March 1999

## RICHARDSON SAYS SENATE PASSAGE OF CTBT "CRITICALLY IMPORTANT"

(Cites DOE efforts in energy and non-proliferation efforts) (830)  
By Susan Ellis  
USIA Staff Writer

Washington -- Achieving Senate passage of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is a priority for the Clinton Administration, says Department of Energy (DOE) Secretary Bill Richardson. Speaking to the National Press Club March 2, he said CTBT "is an issue where the whole cabinet is going to be deployed" to urge ratification.

"I believe that if this bill is allowed on the floor of the Senate, we can get the votes. We are building support," Richardson said, adding that he gives odds of "better than 50-50" for passage.

"There's going to be a very, very active concerted effort. This is an issue where the whole cabinet is going to be deployed," he continued. "I believe if we're going to encourage India and Pakistan to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, if we are going to participate in an upcoming meeting where we engage in strategy to improve nuclear safety and other ways to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons, it is critically important that we pass CTBT this year."

On the subject of Russia, Richardson was asked where the money would come from for programs DOE is conducting to upgrade that country's nuclear weapons accounting system and to employ Russian scientists at home in non-weapons capacities to keep them "from selling out to rogue nations." He responded that Congress must "realize that this is not Russian foreign aid....These are programs in our national security."

Richardson said the President has asked for \$525 million over the next four years for the Russian programs, adding he believes Congress "will respond positively," although "there are those critics who don't want to invest in this potentially most urgent national security threat

that we have."

Asked whether Russia's vast nuclear stockpile, "powerful presence of organized crime," and backwardness on preparations to avert Year 2000 computer problems are not "becoming a recipe for a terrorist disaster," Richardson countered that he has asked the appropriations committees in Congress to "reprogram some funds to deal with the Russian Y2K problem."

"There is a problem in their reactors and potentially at some of their weapons sites," he acknowledged, saying he is "challenging Congress" to grant about \$15 million to rectify the problems. Although Congress has not yet responded, Richardson said he hopes to have a good response in the days ahead.

In terms of chemical-biological defense efforts, he said a \$32 million request strikes him "as a good investment." For DOE's national laboratories, Richardson said he has asked for two things: "that we have a joint national center among our labs to improve response and detection; and most important, to come up with some timelines that are useful for probably the next huge event on our shores that involves potential threats and that's the Olympics." . . .

\*\*\*\*\*

02 March 1999

TEXT: RICHARDSON SAYS DOE HELPS PROMOTE RUSSIAN NUCLEAR SAFETY

(Cites non-weapons jobs, good nuclear accounting) (4170)

Washington -- Energy Secretary Bill Richardson says that his Department, with its roots in the World War II-era nuclear Manhattan Project, is "the primary agent for maintaining a safe and reliable nuclear deterrent."

Speaking at the National Press Club March 3, he said the Department of Energy (DOE) is taking "a systematic approach to finding solutions to proliferation challenges," which includes preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction, detecting such weapons, reversing proliferation where it has already occurred and "responding to emergencies if these weapons are ever used."

One thrust of DOE's program is to "help Russia secure its weapons-usable nuclear materials from theft or diversion by terrorists and rogue states," Richardson said. Currently, DOE and its national laboratories are working at more than 40 Russian sites to help secure nuclear materials and to install modern security and accounting systems. Because of the critical importance of this issue, President Clinton has asked for an additional \$4.5 billion over the next five years for urgent Russian national security programs, he noted.

In an innovative attempt to keep Russian scientists "employed in Russia, instead of in Iraq or North Korea," Richardson said, his Department has launched the Nuclear Cities Initiative to develop

non-weapons jobs in 10 Russian nuclear cities.

DOE is also helping to thwart nuclear smuggling by stepping up training of border enforcement officials and by developing a tiny, hand-held device similar to a beeper to detect radiation.

Richardson said his Department is also working to respond to chemical and biological threats. "Our DOE labs have just developed an instrument the size of a suitcase that can detect a biological agent within hours by decoding its DNA," he said, adding that his labs are working on a detector "small enough to fit into the hand of a fireman or a cop that tells within seconds if a chem-bio agent is present" and what kind of agent it is, such as anthrax or a plague virus.

\*\*\*\*\*

Following is the text of Richardson's prepared remarks:

(begin text)

The FBI receives word of a phone threat that radioactive material is aboard an AMTRAK train in Montana and that its passengers are in danger.

Within hours, specialists including the Department of Energy's Nuclear Emergency Search Team arrive. Both the eastbound and westbound trains are diverted to a lonely stretch of track and searched for a potential killer.

This is not a plot twist in a Tom Clancy thriller nor a figment of a Hollywood screenwriter's imagination.

This incident occurred February 20th, aboard the Empire Builder in central Montana.

No radioactive material was found. No one was injured. This time.

We have passed 50 years into the atomic age without a nuclear terrorist incident. We have not been so lucky in terms of other weapons of mass destruction. A few years ago in Tokyo, a fringe group released poison gas in a subway. Dozens were killed, thousands injured.

The lightning pace of technology has made chemical, biological and nuclear weapons more accessible than ever before. For the first time in human history, weapons of mass destruction powerful enough to rock the security of nations do not require national efforts for development, deployment or use.

President Clinton has declared that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction -- nuclear, chemical and biological weapons -- constitutes a national emergency. Speaking recently at the National Academy of Science, the President called on his cabinet to take aggressive steps to counter this emerging threat to American security and prosperity.

Today, I want to discuss the Department of Energy's response to the President's call for action. My focus is on the role -- now and in the future -- of the Department of Energy and our national laboratories in

protecting the American people from these threats.

The Department of Energy, from its roots in the Manhattan Project, was and remains the primary agent for maintaining a safe and reliable nuclear deterrent. In this new era, we have the equally challenging job of drawing down our nuclear complex, keeping nuclear materials from falling into the wrong hands, and containing the knowledge needed to make nuclear weapons.

This challenge is particularly difficult in Russia. Russia's system of protecting nuclear materials declined along with the Soviet police state, and worsens with the decay of their economy. Some see opportunities to exploit these difficulties -- to illicitly obtain nuclear materials from Russia's production sites, or to purchase Russian nuclear know-how from the many scientists and engineers facing desperate economic circumstances.

At DOE we are uniquely positioned to address this nuclear threat. Our labs at Oak Ridge and Los Alamos developed the first atomic weapons. The Department is a central federal storehouse of information and expertise on nuclear weapons at home and abroad.

While the Department's work in nuclear sciences and technology is well known, our capabilities in the chemical and biological sciences are less familiar.

The Department's work in the biological sciences began with the study of radiation's effects on the human body. It continues today with efforts to sequence the human genome. These capabilities, joined with our national security expertise, uniquely position DOE to fight chemical and biological threats.

America's security against nuclear, biological, and chemical dangers now hinges on creating tomorrow's tools today so we can defeat threats posed not by a Cold War-era totalitarian superpower but by terrorists, criminals and regimes such as those in Libya, Iraq, Iran and North Korea.

The Department of Energy can - and will -- help meet these threats.

The Department of Energy is taking a systematic approach to finding solutions to proliferation challenges. Our programs cross the spectrum from preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction, to detecting it where it is emerging, to reversing it where it has already occurred, to responding to emergencies if these weapons are ever used.

Prevent. Detect. Reverse. Respond. That is our defense-in-depth-concept.

I want to give you some concrete examples of ongoing and future measures to prevent, to detect, to reverse, to respond at each stage of this emerging threat from weapons of mass destruction.

Let me start by describing some of our efforts to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction, or better yet, to prevent them from coming into existence in the first place.

## Preventing Proliferation

One of the first jobs in our anti-proliferation effort at DOE is to help Russia secure its weapons-usable nuclear materials from theft or diversion by terrorists and rogue states. Nuclear materials such as plutonium and highly enriched uranium are the essential ingredients for a nuclear weapon and the hardest to obtain. For the most part, only nations can afford the industrial infrastructure and know-how needed to produce plutonium and highly enriched uranium.

So far, this reality has checked efforts by terrorist organizations to acquire crucial bomb materials. But imagine what might happen if a terrorist group gets enough plutonium for a bomb without having to manufacture it. Imagine if such a group could buy plutonium on the black market, or steal it from a place not properly secured.

It only takes a small quantity of these materials to produce a nuclear bomb -- a piece of plutonium the size of a softball is enough to produce an explosion several times the size of that in Hiroshima in 1945.

That is why it is so important that we keep our nuclear materials highly secure, and fully accounted for. In Russia, the historic system of controls over nuclear facilities and materials has weakened, and resources are simply not available to maintain it. We have also learned that Russia's nuclear bookkeeping ignored modern systems of control and accounting and relied instead on police-state security measures.

Today, the Department of Energy and our national laboratories are working at more than 40 Russian sites to help secure nuclear materials and to install modern security and accounting systems. Our ability to establish this crucial program of cooperation -- called the Materials Protection, Control, and Accounting Task Force -- succeeded largely because of our laboratories. Scientists from DOE labs were able to gain access to Russian facilities by working on a laboratory-to-laboratory basis.

As we meet here today, dozens of dedicated DOE experts are at work in Russia installing basic safeguards, standards and procedures to arrange for the long-term protection of these weapons-grade materials.

We are proud of this program. Our Russian counterparts have shown us extraordinary goodwill and cooperation. We are now cooperating at virtually every single site in Russia that stores or uses plutonium or highly enriched uranium. To date we have completed security upgrades for over 30 metric tons of weapons usable nuclear materials. By the end of the year, we expect to bring an additional 20 tons under improved control. And by the end of 2000, we expect that number to double for a total of 100 metric tons.

But we harbor no illusions about the complexity of problems in Russia. The current economic crisis makes our efforts even more urgent. We have moved quickly to address special needs -- such as providing basics like winter clothes, warm boots and space heaters to guards at facilities. It

sounds simple, but this modest investment has kept guards at their posts and helped us keep our security work going through this volatile period.

Because of the critical importance of this issue, the President has requested an additional \$4.5 billion over the next five years for urgent Russian National security programs. The Department anticipates an increase of \$100 million for each of the next five years for our materials security programs, as well as several other Russian programs.

Included in the President's increased budget request are funds for DOE's program to help prevent Russian weapons scientists and engineers from selling their services to those seeking nuclear arms.

I was with the President in Russia last September, and have seen the hardships Russian nuclear workers face each day. As their nuclear complex downsizes, tens of thousands of nuclear experts living among the nuclear cities face unemployment or underemployment. We are seeking ways for them to channel their energy and expertise into new scientific and economic opportunities, to keep these scientists employed in Russia, instead of in Iraq or North Korea.

The danger of Russian nuclear materials or nuclear expertise falling into the hands of terrorists or rogue states is a matter of life and death for all of us. Just one of the 10 Russian nuclear cities stores more plutonium than the entire stockpile of France, China and Great Britain -- combined.

To peacefully fight this threat, the Department has launched the Nuclear Cities Initiative. It is designed to develop -- in cooperation with private industry -- non-weapons jobs in the 10 Russian nuclear cities. Last September, I signed the Nuclear Cities Agreement with Russian Minister of Atomic Energy Adamov. Under this Initiative, we are planning projects such as:

- establishing commercial software enterprises in the formerly secret nuclear cities of Sarov and Snezhinsk.

- extending telecom links into these city centers and into Zheleznogorsk, our third focus city during FY 1999

- and opening business centers in all three cities to spur commercial development.

As these cities gear up for commercial activities, business opportunities will be created. But our progress cannot blunt the truth about the serious challenges we face.

Since 1994, we have employed more than 4,000 scientists at about 170 institutes and organizations throughout Russia and other Newly Independent States. This initiative has already attracted \$38 million in private investment. The Proliferation Prevention Program is successfully keeping Russian weapons scientist at home, instead of selling their services to terrorists, criminal organizations or outlaw states.

The New York Times in an editorial Friday (February 26) said Washington should press ahead with its efforts to re-employ Russian weapon scientists in civilian work. It is critical that we continue these programs.

I agree.

Let me describe one final Russia-related program in the area of prevention -- our program to counter the smuggling of nuclear materials.

Along with our work to account for and protect highly enriched uranium and plutonium stockpiles, we are stepping up efforts to stop nuclear smuggling.

Through a program established years ago, the Department routinely provides technical and analytical support to the law enforcement, diplomatic, and intelligence communities for assessing black market nuclear transactions. We believe DOE has the world's most comprehensive database of global nuclear materials trafficking incidents and information.

Since the first "sales" case came to our attention in 1978, DOE assessors have worked more than 525 black market cases, from attempted sales and buys to reported thefts.

While the overwhelming majority of these incidents involve scams perpetrated by con-artists and opportunists, we must be on guard against any appearance of genuine plutonium and highly enriched uranium on the black market and any attempt to buy it by terrorist organizations or states.

DOE labs are already involved in programs to beef up efforts to thwart black market nuclear smuggling among law enforcement agencies of former Soviet and Eastern European nations. By next year, more than 200 border enforcement officials from 12 of these countries will have completed anti-proliferation training under the "Joint International Border Security Program" with the U.S. Customs Service and the Department of Defense. By 2002, we expect to have trained and provided specialized equipment to officials from all former Soviet and Eastern European countries.

Among the innovations our remarkable national laboratories have made in the field of detection is a nuclear materials detection device similar to a beeper. When it goes off, however, it is not your boss checking in or your spouse asking you to pick up a pizza on the way home. This tiny, hand-held device indicates the presence of radiation. It is already in use among law enforcement officers fighting nuclear smuggling here and in Europe.

Last summer, Bulgarian border officials seized nuclear production equipment headed for Iran. They credited their success to their Department of Energy-developed training and equipment. Today, portable detection technologies devised by DOE labs are being used in Poland, Lithuania, Georgia, Kazakhstan, and Russia. Within the next year,

systems will be deployed in Bulgaria, Romania, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Estonia, Slovakia, and Hungary.

We are hopeful that nations once behind the Iron Curtain will now form a barrier to any nuclear terror spreading from Central Europe. President Clinton has frequently stated that we now face no greater threat than the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. As these weapons spread the danger grows that someday they will be used. We must continue our struggle to keep that future from coming to pass. That is why the Clinton-Gore administration and we at the Department are urging the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty this year.

Ratification is essential. Without it, we lose one of the most important tools available to us for constraining the development of more advanced nuclear weapons, and limiting the spread of nuclear weapons to new states.

Failure to ratify will erode our ability as a nation to lead in non-proliferation matters. We will not be eligible to join with other nations later this year to discuss ways to enforce the Treaty. The failure to act would reduce -- not increase -- our national security. I have told you of ways DOE is working to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction. Now I will tell you what we are doing to detect the development of these weapons of terror at the earliest possible stage.

### Detecting Proliferation

Detecting the proliferation of foreign nuclear weapons capabilities is an increasingly daunting task. A number of countries are seeking to acquire nuclear weapons. These nations and organizations take great pains to elude detection. For example, we are concerned about an underground facility at Kumchang-Ni in North Korea that could be intended for use as a nuclear facility.

CIA Director George Tenet said in recent Congressional testimony that, quoting now, "U.S. intelligence is increasing its emphasis and resources on many of these issues, but ... there is a continued and growing risk of surprise."

The challenge is to detect and understand the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction at the earliest stage of development, to guide diplomatic actions and, if necessary, a military response. We must also deter the use of such weapons by being able to trace a weapon to its source before its use. Or, God forbid, after its use.

The Department of Energy laboratories are the nation's repository of expertise on nuclear weapons design and production. For more than 50 years, the nation has tapped this resource in assessing foreign nuclear weapons programs. The labs have also supplied detection technologies to monitor these programs.

Our technology will get even better. Because it must. Rogue countries, terrorists and the suppliers of the nuclear, biological, and chemical

tools of their trade are using increasingly sophisticated means to evade detection. Our methods and technology must outpace this growing threat.

There is no simple solution to this problem, and DOE alone cannot solve it. But through advances in technology and analysis techniques, we can make a quantum leap in our ability to detect and understand these threats. Within the next 12 months, I challenge our labs, in cooperation with our interagency partners, to identify technical breakthroughs which, if successful, will revolutionize our proliferation detection capabilities. I am not seeking baby steps but giant strides. I am seeking ten-fold to hundred-fold improvements in performance by the year 2005.

Detecting nuclear weapons requires not only better technology, but also better ways of interpreting the information that is gathered. DOE labs now analyze information about proliferation from a variety of different sources without systematic coordination with other labs. Our labs can provide the best capability in the country for analyzing information on nuclear proliferation. To fulfill this potential, they must work together as a unit. We must form a network to harness the powerful tools, of knowledge and information available in our national laboratories.

Therefore, today I am also directing our national labs to form a Nuclear Proliferation Data Exploitation Center. I want them to focus their expertise in nuclear-related design, production and technology in a joint effort to develop new tools and methods in the study of nuclear proliferation. I expect this Center to provide rapid, first-rate scientific support to the U.S. Intelligence Community. To ensure this, I am pulling together an interagency steering group to help guide its formation.

## Reversing

It is not enough to be able to detect nuclear proliferation as it starts. We must also continue to reduce the number of our nuclear weapons, and the nuclear materials from which those weapons are made.

The Energy Department is advancing global arms control by carrying out nuclear reductions of historic proportions. We have already dismantled more than 11,000 nuclear weapons. And if we meet the President's goal of further reductions under the START III framework, we will have drawn down our deployed arsenal by 80 percent compared to its Cold War peak. The next level in strategic arms reductions calls for warheads themselves to be eliminated in cooperation with our Russian partners.

The challenge will not end once these weapons are taken apart. In some ways it is just beginning. We must dispose of the excess nuclear material harvested from that process, to neutralize it, to keep it out of the hands of nations, groups or individuals with an agenda of terror and destruction.

And while securing nuclear materials in place itself boosts global security, our mission in Russia goes beyond that. Excess materials in

the United States and Russia must be disposed of lest they fall into the wrong hands. Congress, too, recognizes the urgency of this mission, and appropriated \$525 million in emergency funding this year to help speed up our efforts to dispose of plutonium and highly enriched uranium (HEU).

The U.S. is beginning to blend down its surplus highly enriched uranium for peaceful use in commercial reactor fuel and we are pushing an agreement with Russia to buy 500 metric tons of their HEU. Already through this agreement, 36 tons of such Russian uranium has been blended down and delivered to America for use as reactor fuel. Think about it: enough nuclear material for over 2,500 nuclear weapons has been transferred from one former mortal enemy to another. Disposing of plutonium is much more complicated -- but we're making progress. We have reached understandings with Russia on the basics of a mutual effort to dispose of up to 50 tons of weapons plutonium. Within the next three years we will begin constructing the U.S. facilities needed to achieve this mission. We recognize that Russia cannot address this problem alone. We are working with the G-8 countries and others to find ways to support Russia's plutonium disposal effort, and are collaborating with Russian scientists to create and implement a technology road map for the Russian program.

## Responding

Let me turn now to some of the work we are doing to respond to the possible use of a nuclear, chemical, or biological weapon. You may be familiar with our long-established program to respond to nuclear emergencies. Today, I want to describe our work to respond to the chemical and biological threat.

Chemical and biological weapons pose a particularly insidious danger. They are relatively easy to produce. They can be deadly in small doses over large areas. They can be delivered anonymously by simple means. There may be no warning that a population has been exposed to a biological attack until victims turn up in emergency rooms days later.

To respond to this threat we must draw on our best scientific and technological expertise. At the Department of Energy we are engaging our laboratories in an aggressive effort to help with this urgent fight by developing the next generation of chemical and biological detection systems.

Right now, detecting the presence of a chem-bio agent can take days with equipment that fills a room in a laboratory. Our DOE labs have just developed an instrument the size of a suitcase that can detect a biological agent within hours by decoding its DNA. This giant leap forward essentially brings our labs into the field.

But we can't stop there. Within three years, I want our labs to develop biological agent detectors small enough to fit into the hand of a fireman or a cop that tells within seconds if a chem-bio agent is present. And what kind of agent it is, such as whether it is anthrax or a plague virus.

The fast detection of the release of a dangerous agent could turn a medical nightmare into a manageable problem. With the right detection tools, health and safety officials can act quickly to treat victims and protect others from exposure.

There's more: I have challenged our best and brightest in the national laboratories to develop, demonstrate and deliver the first phase of a biological detection system -- an integrated network of sensors and analytical software -- that will help us protect critical assets such as subway systems, or major events such as a Super Bowl or the Olympics. I've challenged our national laboratories to complete this important system by 2002 -- in time to make it available for use at the Olympics in Salt Lake City.

This will not be easy. Because of that, we must start immediately. We have a unique responsibility to temper this threat and defuse its dangers. The Department of Energy is committed to fulfilling this responsibility. To support this urgent mission, I have requested an increase in funds of nearly 70 percent for our chem-bio defense efforts next year -- raising our total request to \$32 million in FY 2000 for this critical work.

For the second half of this century, human kind has lived under the shadow of nuclear war. That shadow has deepened with the advent of sophisticated biological and chemical weapons.

At the dawn of the atomic age more than 50 years ago, American statesman Bernard Baruch, spoke of a life-and-death challenge we continue to face as we enter a new century:

"Science has torn from nature a secret so vast that our minds cower from the terror it creates ... For each new weapon a defense has been produced, in time. But now we face a condition in which adequate defense does not exist. Science, which gave us this dread power, shows that it can be made a giant help to humanity, but science does not show us how to prevent its baleful use." I am here today to say that the Department of Energy and its labs can provide that help to humanity. I am challenging the Department of Energy and our scientific resources to help devise a more adequate defense to these dreaded new weapons -- the number one threat to America's national security.

--

#### 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 0172

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

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

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

A project of: Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility

and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Wed, 03 Mar 1999 13:16:08 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: news: Richardson on CTBT, 3/2/99

March 3, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Energy Sec. Richardson remarks on "critical importance of CTBT" and other weapons of mass destruction issues

In a luncheon address to the National Press Club yesterday, Secretary of Energy Richardson reiterated the Administration's call for the Senate to ratify the CTBT this year and in answer to a question, he said the "entire cabinet is going to be deployed" in the effort. He said that he thinks chances of ratification this year are better than 50/50.

Attached below is the relevant question and answer and a USIA account of the entire speech. For the full text of the speech, see the Coalition's Web Site at <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/rich0399.htm>>

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

EXCERPTS FROM Q&A SESSION FOLLOWING REMARKS OF BILL RICHARDSON TO NATL. PRESS CLUB, 3/2

**QUESTION:** The president and national security advisor have called on the Senate to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to help stop nuclear proliferation, but the Senate has refused to consider it. What do you and Mr. Clinton plan to do to see that CTBT through, and what are the chances in the Senate?

**SEC. RICHARDSON:** Well, I'd say the chances are better than 50-50. When the president goes to the Congress and deems a national security priority, usually the president gets what he requests. I believe that if this bill is allowed on the floor of the Senate we can get the votes. We are building support. There's going to be a very, very active, concerted effort. Remember, we're just starting this session of Congress.

But this is an issue where the whole Cabinet is going to be deployed and I believe, in the end, if we are going to promote India and Pakistan and encourage them to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, if we are going to participate in an upcoming meeting where we engage in strategy to improve nuclear safety and other ways to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons, it is critically important that we pass this CTBT this year.

I think that we will do so; I believe the odds are better than 50-50, and when a president -- when the president puts his mind to something in the Congress, he generally has gotten it.

\*\*\*\*\*

02 March 1999

## RICHARDSON SAYS SENATE PASSAGE OF CTBT "CRITICALLY IMPORTANT"

(Cites DOE efforts in energy and non-proliferation efforts) (830)

By Susan Ellis

USIA Staff Writer

Washington -- Achieving Senate passage of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is a priority for the Clinton Administration, says Department of Energy (DOE) Secretary Bill Richardson. Speaking to the National Press Club March 2, he said CTBT "is an issue where the whole cabinet is going to be deployed" to urge ratification.

"I believe that if this bill is allowed on the floor of the Senate, we can get the votes. We are building support," Richardson said, adding that he gives odds of "better than 50-50" for passage.

"There's going to be a very, very active concerted effort. This is an issue where the whole cabinet is going to be deployed," he continued.

"I believe if we're going to encourage India and Pakistan to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, if we are going to participate in an upcoming meeting where we engage in strategy to improve nuclear safety and other ways to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons, it is critically important that we pass CTBT this year."

On the subject of Russia, Richardson was asked where the money would come from for programs DOE is conducting to upgrade that country's nuclear weapons accounting system and to employ Russian scientists at home in non-weapons capacities to keep them "from selling out to rogue nations." He responded that Congress must "realize that this is not Russian foreign aid....These are programs in our national security."

Richardson said the President has asked for \$525 million over the next four years for the Russian programs, adding he believes Congress "will respond positively," although "there are those critics who don't want to invest in this potentially most urgent national security threat that we have."

Asked whether Russia's vast nuclear stockpile, "powerful presence of organized crime," and backwardness on preparations to avert Year 2000 computer problems are not "becoming a recipe for a terrorist disaster," Richardson countered that he has asked the appropriations committees in Congress to "reprogram some funds to deal with the Russian Y2K problem."

"There is a problem in their reactors and potentially at some of their weapons sites," he acknowledged, saying he is "challenging Congress" to grant about \$15 million to rectify the problems. Although Congress has not yet responded, Richardson said he hopes to have a good response in the days ahead.

In terms of chemical-biological defense efforts, he said a \$32 million request strikes him "as a good investment." For DOE's national laboratories, Richardson said he has asked for two things: "that we have a joint national center among our labs to improve response and detection; and most important, to come up with some timelines that are useful for probably the next huge event on our shores that involves potential threats and that's the Olympics."

Of his recent meeting with Venezuela's new minister of energy and mines, Ali Rodriguez-Araque, Richardson said the United States wants to expand its energy ties with Venezuela. "We think that Venezuela is a leader. They are our "number one" or "number two" provider of oil -- it's either them or Saudi Arabia, it depends. Every month it changes," he said, adding, "We want to have Venezuela respect the sanctity of our contracts (in that country). We want Venezuela to keep the opening for American and foreign investment in Venezuela in the energy sector. We think that's been a good policy and we see no reason why this policy won't be continued."

He added, "What we want to do with Venezuela is develop markets for our independents in the gas area, and in other energy and technology arenas. But Venezuela and the United States right now, and Mexico, will soon be working together to develop a hemispheric energy meeting, to talk about energy cooperation and also climate change."

Richardson harked back to his previous post as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations to answer a charge that the UN weapons inspections in Iraq had failed.

He said UNSCOM has not failed. "Since the end of the Persian Gulf War, the UN inspectors, UNSCOM, have destroyed over 60,000 weapons of mass destruction. The capability of Saddam Hussein in that area has been contained. But he remains a threat.

"The United States is not going to lift sanctions; we're going to continue a policy of containing him (Saddam Hussein). I recently read that he is now considering cooperating with the United Nations again on the inspections. That remains to be seen; his word has not been good. But look at where we are now. We have effectively contained him; we have used force where necessary to send that message. A lot of his infrastructure has been hurt or destroyed. He is a pariah in the region. I think our policy has worked."

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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>>

---

Return-Path: <kathy@fcnl.org>  
From: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>  
To: "'Howard W. Hallman'" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: RE: Proposed letter to Senator Sarbanes  
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 13:52:17 -0500

Howard,  
I talked with Alison Oldham, who now lives in Silver Spring. She will be the Quaker to visit Sarbanes with your religious group. If you want a Quaker signer, she can do that too, since we don't have any state Quaker leader. Anyway, she did wonder about trying to get a Catholic and a Jew in the group of reps. She's also our state contact for Maryland.

Kathy

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Wed, 03 Mar 1999 17:32:01 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: news: full Q&A on Richardson, 3/2

March 3

TO: Coalition members  
FR: Daryl

A couple of folks asked for the full set of Qs and As on the Secretary Bill Richardson's talk yesterday. Attached below is the FNS transcript of them.

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

MR. LIPMAN: Mr. Secretary, before I begin asking the questions, I'd like to recognize some journalism students in our gallery from George Washington University. You're welcome to be here.

Questions actually fell into several groups, and I'll try to make sure that we touch on all the groups before we finish here. As you were speaking, I kept wondering, "Where are you going to get the money for all this?" You're challenging the labs to do this and that and the other. And a question comes across along the same lines I was wondering: Congress has been reluctant to fund DOE's international nuclear security initiatives. What is your forecast for fiscal year 2000? And speak about the proposal that you have and the chance of Congress actually approving that.

SEC. RICHARDSON: The Congress has to realize that this is not Russian foreign aid programs; these are programs in our national security. It is in our national security to attack potential chem-bio attacks, to deal with keeping Russian nuclear weapons safe, to keep scientists from selling out to rogue nations. These are programs in our national security.

The president has asked, in the Russia programs over the next four years, for \$525 million. I believe that the Congress will respond positively. But again, there are those critics that don't want to invest in this potentially most urgent national security threat that we have.

What we're talking about, in terms of the chem-bio detection, \$32 million strikes me as a good investment in some of the programs.

Our national labs -- basically I've asked for two things: that we have a joint national center among our labs to improve response and detection, and most importantly, to come up with some time lines that are useful for probably the next huge event on our shores that involves

potential threats, and that's the Olympics.

MR. LIPMAN: Several people asked about you personally. Let me see if I can touch on the gist of those questions.

You're often described as a potential running mate for presidential candidate Al Gore. Others say you've seriously considered going back to New Mexico to run for governor.

Now the politic answer, we already, is you'd be happy -- you're happy doing your job at DOE. But since you're a self-described risk-taker -- (laughter) -- give us some insight into the thinking that would go behind political considerations like that. More simply put, are you planning to run for governor of New Mexico or the vice presidency? (Soft laughter.)

SEC. RICHARDSON: You know, several of you, when I came in, said, "Well, it seems that you've cleaned up your appearance. You've lost a little weight." The answer to both is, I have a new tailor. (Laughter.)

And look, I know these questions start surfacing. Let me just say that I'm very happy where I am -- (laughter) -- that I'm flattered by this discussion. I just want to do a good job at the Department of Energy.

You know, there hasn't been a lot of stability in jobs at DOE. I think we had a few secretaries the last three years. And I want to establish a record of going beyond a year -- (laughs) -- a couple of years.

Any decision for the future is something that is not in my hands.

MR. LIPMAN: I think that line was rehearsed in "Major League." I think I saw that movie. The president and national security advisor have called on the Senate to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to help stop nuclear proliferation, but the Senate has refused to consider it. What do you and Mr. Clinton plan to do to see that CTBT through, and what are the chances in the Senate?

SEC. RICHARDSON: Well, I'd say the chances are better than 50-50. When the president goes to the Congress and deems a national security priority, usually the president gets what he requests. I believe that if this bill is allowed on the floor of the Senate we can get the votes. We are building support. There's going to be a very, very active, concerted effort. Remember, we're just starting this session of Congress.

But this is an issue where the whole Cabinet is going to be deployed and I believe, in the end, if we are going to promote India and Pakistan and encourage them to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, if we are going to participate in an upcoming meeting where we engage in strategy to improve nuclear safety and other ways to reduce the threat

of nuclear weapons, it is critically important that we pass this CTBT this year.

I think that we will do so; I believe the odds are better than 50-50, and when a president -- when the president puts his mind to something in the Congress, he generally has gotten it.

MR. LIPMAN: Russia has a vast nuclear stockpile, a powerful presence of organized crime and is well behind on year 2K preparations and has other serious problems. Is there anything we can realistically do to avoid having this become a recipe for terrorist disaster?

SEC. RICHARDSON: Well, I have recently asked the appropriations committees in the Congress to reprogram some funds to deal with the Russian Y2K problem. There is a problem in their reactors, potentially at some of their weapons sites. I am challenging the Congress to give me this money. We're talking about 15, 14 million dollars. We think it's critically important. The Congress has not responded. We hope, in the days ahead, that we'll get a good response. These are threats that are critically important.

MR. LIPMAN: Mr. Secretary, I'm going to jump around and make sure that we hit a lot of these issues and then come back for some more in-depth questions on some of them. What are your plans for electric reform? Will you have a proposal that you'll be sending to the Hill soon, and will you be working closely with Congress on this issue? How hard will DOE push an electric restructuring bill?

SEC. RICHARDSON: Well, our department and I personally are going to push very hard. In six weeks, we will have an electricity reform restructuring bill. The American people can pick a physician, they can pick their telephone system; they can pick their electric utility system that is best and most competitive and cheapest and most efficient for them.

Nineteen states have adopted deregulation of the electric industry. We have a bill that we will be submitting soon that changes the last bill in two areas: it is more consumer-friendly, it is greener, it is more competitive, it is also designed policy-wise to be better, and most importantly, to get a few more votes. That's not saying much, because there weren't that many votes there last year.

But I am going to push this bill. At the end of this congressional session I predict that we will have an electricity reform bill that is a bipartisan bill.

MR. LIPMAN: Several people asked questions about the Y2k computer bug problem. Let me see if I can boil them down into a few questions.

The Y2k problem has led OMB to urge government agencies to get independent verification of the area they deal with, yet DOE is relying on the power industry's own group, the NERC. Isn't this like letting the fox into the chicken house?

SEC. RICHARDSON: Well, the White House, John Koskinen (sp) is supervising a national effort to have as many of our industries and our government agencies comply with Y2k.

The electricity industry has done a good job. They formed a group, as you mentioned. We participated about seven weeks ago in a statement that basically said that the industry is Y2k-compliant, that there will not be any power failures. We stand behind that assessment.

I'm also very proud to say that our department, when I came on board from Congressman Horn's committee on government Y2k accountability, or some name like that, we got an F. And we recently got latest grades, and we got a B.

Now, let me just say that a lot of our agencies got into the B category after performances were not good. But a lot of agencies have redirected priorities and brought new people in. I brought a very strong person from the Air Force named John Gilligan (sp) to help me with this. Of course, we have the Undersecretary of Energy Ernest Muniz (sp). It's Muniz (sp). Muniz (sp). And he is our chief scientist, and he's making sure that all of this happens. So I am very confident that we are going to make compliance, and I am certain that most agencies will.

MR. LIPMAN: There are two other Y2K questions that I think are relevant: "What contingency plans does the DOE have to minimize possible brownouts or other power disruptions on and after January 1st?"

And -- although I might question the premise of this question: "Many people have left urban areas for the country to escape potential Y2K problems. Yet aren't rural power companies among the least prepared for Y2K?"

SEC. RICHARDSON: I am confident that there will be no power failures; small power companies, big power companies. Our electricity grid is in good shape to meet this challenge.

Let me also say that I experienced -- I was a little concerned, maybe five months ago; I was flying into San Francisco, when there was a big brownout in San Francisco, and my plane was told maybe it can't land. That brought the problem a little bit closer to me.

But I will say that PG&E, Pacific Gas and Electric, moved rapidly. They admitted it was human error; it was not Y2K.

And I think if there is a dialogue with the public that explains the problem, that assures the public that they don't need to panic -- there are a lot of concerns that you should buy gasoline December 31st. Don't do that. We are going to make it. I think the nation is prepared to deal with this problem, and that goes for the private sector, too.

MR. LIPMAN: Here is a question that bridges the gap between Y2K and terrorism: "To what extent will Y2K increase the chance of a

terrorist attack?"

SEC. RICHARDSON: Well, I mentioned the importance of Russia and having the Congress give us funds for Y2K, as it relates to Russian reactors and weapons.

I believe that -- Rosie, you want to answer that one? (Cross talk.) You want to hear the question? (Laughs.) (Laughter.)

MR. LIPMAN (?): Why don't you do it?

SEC. RICHARDSON: Okay. Let me -- I don't think there is a link.

When you see terrorists and when you look at their methods of operation, while they have gained technologically, we believe that we have the technological means with our detection equipment, with our national laboratories, with our ability to put some of this equipment into the first responders -- firemen, cops -- that we would be able to sustain an attack. And on the technology front with our labs, I think we are far ahead of any terrorists, but there is always that element of surprise.

MR. LIPMAN: We have a couple of questions related to nuclear proliferation. The department's efforts to safeguard Russian special nuclear materials is laudable. However, security personnel here in the United States complain that budgets and personnel levels are insufficient to protect American materials from possible terrorist attack. What is the department doing to address security of special nuclear materials here at home?

And is the storage of nuclear waste in this country a priority? Please explain DOE's recent decision to create more than 70 on-site waste dumps instead of moving faster to one central site, in terms of the potential threat of theft or accidents.

SEC. RICHARDSON: Let me take the first part. On the first part, I do believe that we have the transportation systems. With our special nuclear transporting that takes place in this country there's not been one accident. And this happens all the time. And there's a lot of classified information here. I believe too that the work at our laboratories that deal with our weapons is the best, and we feel very secure not just of the potential of preventing any theft, we've upgraded our security. We believe very strongly that there should be interagency integration. That is happening; that used to be a problem. But we believe our weapons here are secure.

On your second question on nuclear waste, I want to resolve the nuclear waste issue with the Congress. And just last week we floated an idea that we not necessarily have developed fully or endorsed, and that is that instead of having interim storage at Yucca Mountain -- which scientifically has not been proven as something that we should do, because the legislation that the Congress drafted says that the suitability decision on Yucca Mountain, where we would have a permanent

repository, would not be made until 2001 -- that we move ahead and work with the Congress to develop an effort where the Department of Energy takes title, simply takes title at 72 sites around the country to our nuclear waste materials until we have a permanent repository. This doesn't mean a dramatic change of what exists right now; it just takes title. Our DOE personnel would be involved. What you would have is, I think, an opportunity to work with the utilities. The United States wants all lawsuits dropped. We're being sued and are exposed -- potentially exposed for millions of dollars. We want the utilities to drop their suits. There's a utility fund of close to \$7 billion that would pay for this transaction. But we want a dialogue with the environmental community, with the utilities, with the cities.

Some utilities have already responded favorably. Wisconsin has recently contacted me -- a couple others. Other utilities are against this, there's no question.

But rather than have a train wreck with the Congress, let's see if we can work something out so that we don't have to oppose an interim storage bill at Yucca Mountain (sp), which we will oppose, and see if we can enter a dialogue and resolve this problem that affects all of us.

MR. LIPMAN: These are two questions related to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project. I understand the failure to open WIPP in the very near future may have serious national security implications. Would you please comment?

And will the Waste Isolation Pilot Project open and accept waste from Los Alamos National Laboratory before the waste bypass highway around Santa Fe is finished? Will radioactive waste from Los Alamos be shipped down Saint Francis this year?

SEC. RICHARDSON: Those are my New Mexico reporters still around. (Soft laughter.) Bless them. I kind of miss them, to be honest.

Let me just say that the Waste Isolation Pilot Plan low-level transuranic waste site that has been under construction, that has been certified safe by the Environmental Protection Agency -- certification by EPA -- is ready to open, in our view. We are having some disputes with the state of New Mexico as for some of the waste that would be transported there. We have to honor an agreement with Idaho that by the end of April we have some of their waste going to this WIPP facility. We're looking at options to meet that and other objectives that we have to get waste into WIPP, including some from Los Alamos.

We're negotiating with the state of New Mexico. But as I've said before to the state of New Mexico, if we are not able to meet these deadlines, some of the funding that goes to WIPP-related activities I'm going to have to move to other states to take care of the storage of some of these commitments that we have made.

So --

MR. LIPMAN: Critics of the United Nations arm inspection regime in Iraq argue that while a large number of weapons or potential weapons have been destroyed, Iraq in reality has been free to play a shell game with the makings of biological and nuclear materials. At the U.N., you spearheaded efforts to maintain that regime. At DOE, you're charged with trying to prevent nuclear materials from reaching Iraq. How do you defend against charges that this is a system almost designed to fail?

SEC. RICHARDSON: Well, it hasn't failed. Since the end of the Persian Gulf War, the U.N. inspectors, UNSCOM, have destroyed over 60,000 weapons of mass destruction. The capability of Saddam Hussein in that area is being contained, but he remains a threat.

The United States is not going to lift sanctions. We're going to continue a policy of containing him. I recently read that he is now considering cooperating with the U.N. again on the inspections. That remains to be seen; his word has not been good. But look at where we are now: We have effectively contained him; we have used force when necessary to send that message; a lot of his infrastructure has been hurt or destroyed; he is a pariah in the region, and I think our policy has worked.

MR. LIPMAN: I've got two questions related to Venezuela. What new actions is the United States and Venezuela considering as far as the energy initiatives for this hemisphere? Did you talk about this with your Venezuelan colleague yesterday? And Venezuela was unable to penetrate Florida's market with its new energy product, oremulsion (sp). Do you think Venezuela should try some other place in the United States, and if so, where?

SEC. RICHARDSON: Well, on the first part, I had a good meeting with the new energy minister from Venezuela. He's been in office, he reminded me, 38 days, so he is still developing his policy.

We want to expand our energy ties with Venezuela. We think that Venezuela is a leader. They're our number one or number two provider of oil. It's either them or Saudi Arabia, it depends, every month; it changes. We want to have Venezuela respect the sanctity of our contracts in Venezuela. We want Venezuela to keep the opening for American and foreign investment in Venezuela in the energy sector. We think that's been a good policy. We see no reason why this policy won't be continued.

What we want to do with Venezuela is develop markets for our independence in the gas area, in other energy and technology arenas. But Venezuela and the United States right now, and Mexico, will soon be working together to develop a hemispheric energy conference meeting to talk about energy cooperation and also climate change.

MR. LIPMAN: Mr. Secretary, before I ask the last question, I would like to thank you for coming here, and present you with the National Press Club's much coveted coffee mug. (Laughter.) I think this is your second. And a certificate of appreciation, suitable for framing. (Laughter.)

And the last question is: Does the administration have any plans to assist those states impacted economically by low oil prices?

SEC. RICHARDSON: Our policy on energy, recognizing that we have depressed energy markets in this country, but at the same time consumers benefitting enormously from low prices -- transportation sector, airlines, trains, et cetera, buses; we recognize that while we are a free market administration that does not interfere in oil markets, does not interfere in market forces that change oil prices, we have taken several steps in the last month to deal with the problems in our domestic oil sector, and we will be doing more in the days ahead.

Specifically, 28 million dollars of barrels that we moved at the Department of Energy to fill up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; increasing the space for the commercial petroleum reserve with private companies paying in oil. We have taken other steps to make it easier to drill and explore in federal lands, with the cooperation of the Energy Department. Just three days ago, I announced a joint plan with the Small Business Administration where some of these independents that are hurting can apply for loans to help themselves. We are also looking at other ways to eliminate paperwork for our energy sector.

But we are concerned. I come from New Mexico. Our energy producing states in the oil and gas sector are hurting, and we want to come up with ways that are fair, that are honest. We're considering, as an administration, for marginal well-producers some tax credits. That is not administration policy; we haven't decided on this. We're working through some initiatives where we can respond to our oil-producing states. We've done that.

I will be visiting the oil sector. I'll be going to Oklahoma soon at the invitation of Senator Nickles and the governor. I will be visiting other states and having continued discussions with the energy sector. We're going to be meeting at the White House very soon with representatives of the industry and our top White House officials that deal with these issues. We're ready to come up with a plan to help. But we will not interfere in oil markets or oil prices.

MR. LIPMAN: Secretary Richardson, I'd like to thank you for coming today, and I'd like to also thank National Press Club staff members Leigh Ann Boren, Mandy Blackwell, Joann Booze, Pat Nelson, Melanie Abdow Dermott, and Howard Rothman for organizing today's lunch. Thanks also the National Press Club library for their research.

We're adjourned. (Sounds gavel, applause.)

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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>>

---

Return-Path: <MARK\_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org>  
Sender: MARK\_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org  
Date: Wed, 3 Mar 1999 20:49:00 -0500 (EST)  
Subject: CTBT HEARINGS  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
From: MARK\_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org (MARK BROWN)

To: mupj@igc.apc.org

TO: Howard Hallman/CTBT Working Group  
FROM: Mark Brown  
DATE: March 3, 1999

Howard,

Please include Bishop Mocko on the letter to Senator Sarbanes regarding the effort to get public hearings on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Rev. George Paul Mocko, Bishop  
Delaware-Maryland Synod  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America  
7604 York Road  
Baltimore, MD 21204-7570

phone: 410-825-9520  
fax: 410-825-6745

Please mail and fax to Bishop Mocko and to LOGA a copy of the final letter to Senator Sarbanes as soon as it is available.

Thanks for your work on this!

Mark

Mark B. Brown  
Assistant Director (International Affairs and Human Rights)  
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs  
122 C Street NW, Suite 125  
Washington, D.C. 20001

phone: 202-626-7932  
fax: 202-783-7502

cc: Bishop Mocko

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Thu, 04 Mar 1999 09:47:49 -0500  
To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: news: China to ratify CTBT

March 4, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends  
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: news -- China says it will ratify CTBT

Thanks to persistent diplomacy by Japan, momentum for ratification of the CTBT by additional countries is growing. The Kyodo news report attached below describes the results of Japan's effort to date. The most significant news is that China has confirmed that it will ratify. (Thanks to Simon Carroll of Greenpeace for forwarding the article.)

Japan is also pressing for the convening of the Special Conference on CTBT entry into force (if necessary) in New York shortly after the September 24 anniversary/deadline established in Article XIV of the treaty.

For further information about the status of CTBT ratification see the Coalition's Web <<http://www.crnd.org>>

DK

\*\*\*\*\*

"China tells Japan it plans to ratify CTBT soon"

TOKYO, March 3

(Kyodo) -- China has told Japan that it plans to ratify soon the global Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on nuclear weapons, Foreign Ministry officials said Wednesday. China made this known in response to a letter from Foreign Minister Masahiko Komura who urged Beijing to ratify the pact as early as possible, the officials said. Komura sent such letters last November to 29 countries which have yet to ratify or sign the CTBT.

Of the 29 countries, 18 nations revealed their plans to ratify the pact. The other 11 nations -- including India, Israel, Pakistan, Russia and the United States -- replied that they are not yet ready to ratify or sign the treaty. India and Pakistan, which conducted nuclear tests last year, have not signed the treaty.

Komura also sent letters to 13 nations that have already ratified the treaty to seek their cooperation in persuading other countries to ratify it, the officials said.

Those 13 countries expressed their support for the Japanese initiative, they said.

"We intend to step up efforts to press the nonratifying countries," one official said.

The CTBT, adopted by the U.N. General Assembly in 1996, must be ratified by 44 countries, including the five declared nuclear states and all other countries believed to have nuclear potential before it can take effect. Three states with nuclear potential or suspected of having it -- India, Pakistan and North Korea -- have refused to sign the treaty.

In September last year, Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee and Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif indicated in speeches to the U.N. General Assembly session that they may sign the treaty.

The five declared nuclear states are Britain, China, France, Russia and the U.S. have all signed the treaty.

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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>>

---

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3  
Date: Thu, 04 Mar 1999 10:49:34 -0500  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, dealertingana@list.speakeasy.org,  
disarmament@igc.org, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) UK has already taken weapons off alert  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

>  
> Dear Friends,

As we work on efforts for dealerting, I think it would be useful to make reference to the rarely discussed UK Strategic Defence Review(SDR), July 1998, which notes that UK Trident warheads "will routinely be at a "notice to fire" measured in days rather than the few minutes quick reaction alert that we sustained throughout the Cold War". The full report can be found at <http://www.mod.uk/policy/sdr/nuclear.htm> Below is an excerpt from the SDR.

>  
> NUCLEAR DETERRENT

>  
-----  
>  
> – The SDR has confirmed that in a changing and uncertain world, Britain  
> continues to require a credible and effective minimum nuclear deterrent  
> based on the Trident submarine force. This has provided Britain's only  
> nuclear system since the withdrawal of the last of the RAF's free-fall  
> nuclear bombs earlier this year, performing both the strategic and  
> sub-strategic role.  
>  
> – We will therefore continue to maintain a posture of continuous deterrent  
> patrols with a total force of four Trident ballistic missile submarines.  
> The last Trident submarine, VENGEANCE, will enter service as previously  
> planned around the turn of the century.  
>  
> – Our Trident force will continue to be allocated to NATO in both the  
> strategic and sub-strategic roles. It will however remain operationally  
> independent and available for use by the United Kingdom alone in a case of  
> supreme national need.  
>  
> – But continuing improvements in the overall international environment  
> allow us to maintain our nuclear forces at reduced readiness and to make  
> reductions in warhead numbers.  
>  
> – The SDR has concluded that we can maintain a credible deterrent while  
> making the following changes in our nuclear posture:  
>  
> a.. the single Trident submarine on deterrent patrol at any time will

- > carry 48 warheads (the same number as deployed on each Polaris submarine
- > when they entered service);
- > a.. we will maintain a stockpile of fewer than 200 operationally
- > available warheads;
- > a.. the submarines will routinely be at a "notice to fire" measured in
- > days rather than the few minutes quick reaction alert that we sustained
- > throughout the Cold War;
- > a.. submarines on patrol will carry out a variety of secondary tasks,
- > without compromising their security, including hydrographic data
- > collection, equipment trials and exercises with other vessels;
- > a.. we plan over time to reduce to single crews for each submarine,
- > reflecting reduced operational tempo and reducing operating costs.
- > – We have also taken an initiative to increase openness about our nuclear
- > capabilities by releasing details of our defence stocks of plutonium and
- > highly enriched uranium.
- >
- > – In parallel, the Government will press for multilateral negotiations
- > towards mutual, balanced and verifiable reductions in nuclear weapons.
- > British nuclear weapons will be included in such negotiations when the
- > Government is satisfied with verified progress towards the goal of the
- > global elimination of nuclear weapons.
- >
- >
- > -----
- > -----
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >

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: <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
Date: Wed, 03 Mar 99 16:49:32 -0500  
From: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
To: <marsusab@aol.com>, <wowensby@ctr.pcusa.org>, <mupj@igc.org>, <kathy@fcnl.org>, <ctbt@2020vision.org>  
Subject: ctbt monday meeting

Mark Brown cannot make either Monday or Tuesday meeting, while others can't make later week meeting.

So we'll go with Howard Hallman's favorite time, 1:30 pm on Monday 3/8, in my office.

Kathy has recruited two more states, NC and AZ, and I made change in IL, plus hit spell check at Mark's encouragement, and found two typos. So latest file is attached for state contacts.

If Robin Ringler surfaces, invite her to meeting. She is in a packing box, as far as I know, with disconnected phone and email.

Marie, you are welcome to attend or duck.

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\93ctbto.wpd

To: MARK\_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org (MARK BROWN)  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Letter to Senator Sarbanes  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Mark,

Thanks for lining up Bishop Mocko as a signer of the letter to Senator Sarbanes. I'm proceeding to ask other denominational staff working for the CTBT to get their top person(s) in Maryland to sign.

Attached is the letter to Sarbanes.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

Proposed letter to be signed by ecumenical leaders in Maryland.

The Honorable Paul S. Sarbanes  
309 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Sarbanes:

For many years numerous religious denominations have advocated a ban on testing of nuclear weapons. With the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996, this long-sought goal seemed to be in reach. However, since September 1997 when President Clinton submitted the treaty to the U.S. Senate for ratification, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has blocked consideration of this important measure by his refusal to schedule public hearings.

We are deeply disturbed by this situation. Public opinion polls reveal that more than 75 percent of the American public supports ratification of the CTBT. This high level of support prevails among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. The treaty has the support of the Pentagon, the nuclear weapons laboratories, and retired joint chiefs of staffs. In face of this widespread support it is difficult for the public to understand how the Senate can allow one of its members to block consideration of a measure that is strongly in the public interest.

Therefore, we request you as a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to use your influence to achieve committee hearings as soon as possible. We ask you to work with your colleagues on the committee to open the process to proponents and opponents of the CTBT. Let those who have doubts about the treaty raise their concerns. Let treaty advocates respond. This kind of give-and-take is a hallmark of our democracy.

As a follow up to this letter, we request that a small delegation from the faith community have an opportunity to meet with you and discuss how we can work with you and other senators to achieve public hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Sincerely yours,

Religious leaders in Maryland

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Bethesda, Maryland

Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail:mupj@igc.org

To: gpowers@nccbuscc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Letter to Senator Sarbanes  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Jerry,

In our effort to move the CTBT, we are urging members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to press for hearings. For this purpose I have drafted the attached letter to Senator Sarbanes and am seeking top denominational leaders in Maryland as signers. Would you be willing to approach Cardinal Keeler and ask him to sign?

In our initial outreach we have a commitment from Lutheran Bishop George Paul Mocko and UCC Conference Minister Rev. Dr. John Deckenback to sign. We have approached United Methodist Bishop Felton May and Episcopal Bishop Robert W. Ihloff and expect them to sign. Through denominational representatives on the Interfaith Group for the CTBT we will be approaching persons of similar rank from the American Baptist Church, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Church of the Brethren, Presbyterian Church, and Society of Friends. We will also seek a prominent Jewish leader and will reach out to Black denominations. Signers will be limited to denominational heads in Maryland and will not include representatives from unofficial associations (such as my organization).

If Cardinal Keeler is disinclined to sign a group letter, perhaps he would be willing to write Senator Sarbanes with a similar message.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

Proposed letter to be signed by ecumenical leaders in Maryland.

The Honorable Paul S. Sarbanes  
309 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Sarbanes:

For many years numerous religious denominations have advocated a ban on testing of nuclear weapons. With the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996, this long-sought goal seemed to be in reach. However, since September 1997 when President Clinton submitted the treaty to the U.S. Senate for ratification, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has blocked consideration of this important measure by his refusal to schedule public hearings.

We are deeply disturbed by this situation. Public opinion polls reveal that more than 75 percent of the American public supports ratification of the CTBT. This high level of support prevails among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. The treaty has the support of the Pentagon, the nuclear weapons laboratories, and retired joint chiefs of staffs. In face of this widespread support it is difficult for the public to understand how the Senate can allow one of its members to block consideration of a measure that is strongly in the public interest.

Therefore, we request you as a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to use your influence to achieve committee hearings as soon as possible. We ask you to work with your colleagues on the committee to open

the process to proponents and opponents of the CTBT. Let those who have doubts about the treaty raise their concerns. Let treaty advocates respond. This kind of give-and-take is a hallmark of our democracy.

As a follow up to this letter, we request that a small delegation from the faith community have an opportunity to meet with you and discuss how we can work with you and other senators to achieve public hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Sincerely yours,

Religious leaders in Maryland

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Bethesda, Maryland  
Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail:mupj@igc.org

To: Walter\_Owensby@pcusa.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Letter to Senator Sarbanes  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Walter:

In our effort to move the CTBT, we are urging members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to press for hearings. For this purpose I have drafted the attached letter to Senator Sarbanes and am seeking top denominational leaders in Maryland as signers. Would you be willing to ask a top Presbyterian leader to sign? (More than one if appropriate.) For instance, one listing I have lists Rev. Dr. Herbert D. Valentine as executive presbyter, Presbytery of Baltimore.

In our initial outreach we have a commitment from Lutheran Bishop George Paul Mocko and UCC Conference Minister Rev. Dr. John Deckenback to sign. We have approached United Methodist Bishop Felton May and Episcopal Bishop Robert W. Ihloff and expect them to sign. Through denominational representatives on the Interfaith Group for the CTBT we will be approaching persons of similar rank from the Catholic Church, American Baptist Church, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Church of the Brethren, and Society of Friends. We will also seek a prominent Jewish leader and will reach out to Black denominations. Signers will be limited to denominational heads in Maryland and will not include representatives from unofficial associations (such as my organization).

Please call me if you have any questions.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

Proposed letter to be signed by ecumenical leaders in Maryland.

The Honorable Paul S. Sarbanes  
309 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Sarbanes:

For many years numerous religious denominations have advocated a ban on testing of nuclear weapons. With the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996, this long-sought goal seemed to be in reach. However, since September 1997 when President Clinton submitted the treaty to the U.S. Senate for ratification, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has blocked consideration of this important measure by his refusal to schedule public hearings.

We are deeply disturbed by this situation. Public opinion polls reveal that more than 75 percent of the American public supports ratification of the CTBT. This high level of support prevails among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. The treaty has the support of the Pentagon, the nuclear weapons laboratories, and retired joint chiefs of staffs. In face of this widespread support it is difficult for the public to understand how the Senate can allow one of its members to block consideration of a measure that is strongly in the public interest.

Therefore, we request you as a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to use your influence to achieve committee hearings as soon as possible. We ask you to work with your colleagues on the committee to open the process to proponents and opponents of the CTBT. Let those who have doubts about the treaty raise their concerns.

Let treaty advocates respond. This kind of give-and-take is a hallmark of our democracy.

As a follow up to this letter, we request that a small delegation from the faith community have an opportunity to meet with you and discuss how we can work with you and other senators to achieve public hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Sincerely yours,

Religious leaders in Maryland

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Bethesda, Maryland  
Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail:mupj@igc.org

To: "Daryl Byler" <mccwjdb@erols.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Letter to Sarbanes  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Daryl,

In our effort to move the CTBT, we are urging members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to press for hearings. For this purpose I have drafted the attached letter to Senator Sarbanes and am seeking top denominational leaders in Maryland as signers. Is there a top Mennonite leader in Maryland you you could ask to sign?

In our initial outreach we have a commitment from Lutheran Bishop George Paul Mocko and UCC Conference Minister Rev. Dr. John Deckenback to sign. We have approached United Methodist Bishop Felton May and Episcopal Bishop Robert W. Ihloff and expect them to sign. Through denominational representatives on the Interfaith Group for the CTBT we will be approaching persons of similar rank from the Catholic Church, American Baptist Church, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Church of the Brethren, Presbyterian Church, and Society of Friends. We will also seek a prominent Jewish leader and will reach out to Black denominations.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

Proposed letter to be signed by ecumenical leaders in Maryland.

The Honorable Paul S. Sarbanes  
309 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Sarbanes:

For many years numerous religious denominations have advocated a ban on testing of nuclear weapons. With the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996, this long-sought goal seemed to be in reach. However, since September 1997 when President Clinton submitted the treaty to the U.S. Senate for ratification, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has blocked consideration of this important measure by his refusal to schedule public hearings.

We are deeply disturbed by this situation. Public opinion polls reveal that more than 75 percent of the American public supports ratification of the CTBT. This high level of support prevails among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. The treaty has the support of the Pentagon, the nuclear weapons laboratories, and retired joint chiefs of staffs. In face of this widespread support it is difficult for the public to understand how the Senate can allow one of its members to block consideration of a measure that is strongly in the public interest.

Therefore, we request you as a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to use your influence to achieve committee hearings as soon as possible. We ask you to work with your colleagues on the committee to open the process to proponents and opponents of the CTBT. Let those who have doubts about the treaty raise their concerns. Let treaty advocates respond. This kind of give-and-take is a hallmark of our democracy.

As a follow up to this letter, we request that a small delegation from the faith community have an opportunity to meet

with you and discuss how we can work with you and other senators to achieve public hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Sincerely yours,

Religious leaders in Maryland

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Bethesda, Maryland  
Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail:mupj@igc.org

To: lintnerj@ucc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Letter to Senator Sarbanes  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Jay,

Mark Brown has persuaded me that signers of the letter to Senator Sarbanes should be basically top denominational officials in Maryland, such as bishops, conference ministers, etc., and not a broader list. Along those lines, would you be willing to ask Rev. Dr. Chris Hobgood, regional minister, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) to sign?

I'm trying to get this completed by Thursday or Friday of next week.

Thanks,  
Howard

To: jsmith@clw.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Interfaith list  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Jenny,

Here are the e-mail addresses for the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

ograbc@aol.com  
"Jim Matlack" <denhartz@erols.com>  
washofc@aol.com  
adelorey@erols.com  
tom.hart@ecunet.org  
jmskipper@aol.com  
epf@igc.org  
crramey@igc.org  
joe@fcnl.org  
kathy@fcnl.org  
rachel@fcnl.org  
mark.brown@ecunet.org  
mccwjdb@erols.com  
mknolldc@igc.org  
lwright@igc.org  
jsammon@networklobby.org  
network@igc.org  
dave@paxchristiusa.org  
Walter\_Owensby@pcusa.org  
GaryP@ctr.pcusa.org  
gdpayton@aol.com  
lwyolton@prodigy.net  
uuawo@aol.com  
arosenbaum@uahc.org  
lintnerj@ucc.org  
jpmc@ucc.org  
Dringler@umc-gbcs.org  
gpowers@nccbuscc.org  
mupj@igc.org  
hnolen@igc.org

I hope this is useful to you.

Howard

To: Hammondc@aol.com, mupj@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: CTBT  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 07:16 PM 3/4/99 EST, Hammondc@aol.com wrote:

>Dear Mr. Hallman:

>

>Linda Sabin told me that you needed someone to help coordinate CTBT petitions  
>in Ohio. Since I live in Columbus, I would be glad to help as much as  
>possible. It is getting very close to Easter recess. Please let me know what  
>is involved. I can probably get members of Columbus Campaign for Arms Control  
>to help.

>

>Also, I would like to know more about MUPJ.

>

>Thanks, Connie Hammond

>

Dear Connie,

Yes, we do need somebody in Ohio. Please let me know your phone number so that I can call you to discuss it. Or you can call me at 301 896-0013. I'll be out on Friday, March 5 from 8:30 a.m. until 2:30 p.m. but available after that or on Saturday (I work from home).

More information on the petition campaign is available at [www.loga.com](http://www.loga.com).

I look forward to talking with you.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>  
Date: Thu, 04 Mar 1999 16:23:06 -0500  
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>  
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility  
To: disarmament@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, panukes@igc.org, paprog@igc.org,  
bmorse@igc.org, dkimball@clw.org, hisham@ieer.org, jdean@ucsusa.org,  
tcollina@ucsusa.org, jdi@clw.org, syoung@basicint.org,  
epank@peacenet.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, laura@2020vision.org  
Subject: Dinner invitation

You are aware of the Nuclear Y2K Symposium which will be held on Monday, March 8th in the Cannon Caucus Room.

Alice Slater and Helen Caldicott of STAR would like to have a small strategy meeting to follow up the symposium, bringing together some of the speakers with some of us based in D.C. The purpose is to explore how we can work together on next steps.

They have asked me to invite some people to the strategy meeting, so I am inviting you. It will be a dinner session, and you **WILL** be expected to pay for your own dinner.

date: Monday, March 8th

time: 6:30 p.m.

place: B. Smith's Restaurant, Union Station

Any questions, please call Carrie Clark at STAR, 516-324-0655. I hope to see you on Monday.

If I have omitted someone from this e-mail who should be invited, please let me know.

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller

To: arosenbaum@uahc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Letter to Senator Sarbanes  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Adina,

In our effort to move the CTBT, we are urging members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to press for hearings. For this purpose I have drafted the attached letter to Senator Sarbanes and am seeking top denominational leaders in Maryland as signers. Could you help us find one or two top Jewish leaders in Maryland to sign this letter?

In our initial outreach we have a commitment from Lutheran Bishop George Paul Mocko and UCC Conference Minister Rev. Dr. John Deckenback to sign. We have approached United Methodist Bishop Felton May and Episcopal Bishop Robert W. Ihloff and expect them to sign. Through denominational representatives on the Interfaith Group for the CTBT we will be approaching persons of similar rank from the Catholic Church, American Baptist Church, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Church of the Brethren, Presbyterian Church, and Society of Friends. We are also seeking a Mennonite leader and will reach out to Black denominations.

We are trying to have the signers by March 11 or 12. Please call me if you have any questions.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

Proposed letter to be signed by ecumenical leaders in Maryland.

The Honorable Paul S. Sarbanes  
309 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Sarbanes:

For many years numerous religious denominations have advocated a ban on testing of nuclear weapons. With the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996, this long-sought goal seemed to be in reach. However, since September 1997 when President Clinton submitted the treaty to the U.S. Senate for ratification, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has blocked consideration of this important measure by his refusal to schedule public hearings.

We are deeply disturbed by this situation. Public opinion polls reveal that more than 75 percent of the American public supports ratification of the CTBT. This high level of support prevails among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. The treaty has the support of the Pentagon, the nuclear weapons laboratories, and retired joint chiefs of staffs. In face of this widespread support it is difficult for the public to understand how the Senate can allow one of its members to block consideration of a measure that is strongly in the public interest.

Therefore, we request you as a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to use your influence to achieve committee hearings as soon as possible. We ask you to work with your colleagues on the committee to open the process to proponents and opponents of the CTBT. Let those who have doubts about the treaty raise their concerns. Let treaty advocates respond. This kind of give-and-take is a hallmark of our democracy.

As a follow up to this letter, we request that a small delegation from the faith community have an opportunity to meet

with you and discuss how we can work with you and other senators to achieve public hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Sincerely yours,

Religious leaders in Maryland

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Bethesda, Maryland  
Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail:mupj@igc.org

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

Date: Fri, 05 Mar 1999 08:07:36 -0500

From: Joseph Gerson <jgerson@afsc.org>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: USA - Vermont Cities & Towns Vote Overwhelmingly for Nuclear Weapons Abolition

To: lforrow@igc.apc.org, bostonmobe@igc.apc.org, fellman@binah.cc.brandeis.edu, choffman@ci.cambridge.ma.us, rweiz@world.std.com, crramey@igc.apc.org, forsberg@idds.org, ipis@igc.apc.org, spearce@igc.apc.org, masspa@gis.net, rush@hnrc.tufts.edu, jhanley@emerald.tufts.edu, gailjacob@aol.com, aalpert@igc.apc.org, atwood@umbsky.cc.umb.edu, starfurry@worldnet.att.net, dbryan@emerald.tufts.edu, jburroughs@igc.apc.org, wslf@earthlink.net, ippnwbos@igc.apc.org, joegrassroots@juno.com, mdonlan@aol.com, moniesser@aol.com, fellman@binah.cc.brandeis.edu, ctmul@aol.com, forsberg@idds.org, tfoss@afsc.org, MizBert@aol.com, ascbos@erols.com, khirouchi@clarku.edu, gailjacob@aol.com, twist@gis.net, ebkatz@aol.com, j.lamperti@dartmouth.edu, jloretz@medglobe.tiac.net, traprock@crocker.com, a\_nogawa@salem.mass.edu, aspennel@world.std.com, aperry7247@aol.com, lizzy@cybertours.com, lrand@simmons.edu, jriseman@aol.com, grudolph@clarity-dev.com, ruff@mbcmr.unimelb.edu.au, tom\_sauer@Harvard.Edu, schiavon@aecom.yu.edu, wand@world.std.com, pam@nlis.net, ipis@igc.apc.org, alexcathy@aol.com, kwood@igc.apc.org, wprewitt@mail.cyberzone.net, froines@umbsky.cc.umb.edu, kazue@acs-mail.bu.edu, iview@technologist.com, AFSC@crocker.com, AFSCCT@IGC.APC.ORG, AFSCVT@TOGETHER.NET, TCLARKE@AMHERST.EDU, aswift@phast.umass.edu, ytsuda@earthlink.net, lena@brandeis.edu, wsantelmann@peacenet.org, BruceF@PETA-Online.org, bplumley@earthlink.net, paulvfp@gis.net, pwork@igc.apc.org, aslater@gracelinks.org, sfcny@igc.org, handinhand@clinic.net, lrotolo@excite.com, JOHNFEFFER@aol.com, BJBURKES@capecod.net, BREENS@MAIL.MMC.ORG, drush@gis.net, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org, Msimmons@afsc.org, SSegall@afsc.org, Diana.Roose@oberlin.edu, ntonzi@icon.co.za, eaqiar@aol.com, saumweber@bigpond.com.kh, afsc-ec@ecnet.ec, wandac@coqui.net, Jerb@afsc.org, idme@afsc.org, SHamilton@afsc.org, Bpinguel@afsc.org, bplumley@earthlink.net, lorries@igc.org, Gillespie@afsc.org, AFSCVT@TOGETHER.NET, Jgerson@afsc.org, msingsen@aol.com, kern@aloha.com, prhodes@adm.law.du.edu, eagai@aol.com, icaphoenix@igc.apc.org, dgann@surgery1.umaryland.edu, KaraNewell@afsc.org, Bmartin@afsc.org, Salam@afsc.org, qunony@pipeline.com, lnorth@afsc.org, pawss@hampshire.edu, alichterman@worldnet.att.net, riek-a@email.msn.com, bsarwar@shoa.net, BJBURKES@capecod.net, claudiap@sginet.com, no-nukes-asia@netasia.net, Dgagne52@aol.com, e.kimura@focusweb.org, joe@local.fcnl.org, fbp@igc.apc.org, f\_kataoka@email.msn.com, fujimttk@msn.com, jcpccint@mb.infoweb.ne.jp, salvador@hawaii.edu, sandrapark@post.harvard.edu, sandy@isaacs.mv.com, forum@worldforum.org, hiroshitaka@classic.msn.com, tpalomba@tmfnet.org, v.geirdal@swipnet.se, "=?iso-2022-jp?B?WW9uZXphd2EbJEIhIRsoS1N1Z3VydQ==?=" <yone1938@silver.ocn.ne.jp>, zia@Princeton.EDU

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id GAA21563

X-Sender: jgerson@mail.afsc.org

For immediate release           Contact: Joseph Gainza,  
March 5, 1999                   802 229-2340  
                                     afscvt@together.net

VERMONTERS URGE ABOLITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS  
IN "TOWN MEETING DAY" FORUMS ACROSS STATE

MONTPELIER, VT. – Citizens meeting in 33 towns across the state yesterday called on the United States and all other nuclear weapon states to "secure on an urgent basis a nuclear weapons abolition treaty."

The votes against nuclear weapons came during Town Meeting Day, an annual civic tradition in the state that has been called the "most democratic forum in the United States." While the Town Meeting Day votes do not carry the weight of law, nor do they compel public officials to change policy, the forums have been hailed as a measure of public opinion on important policy questions.

At 39 town meetings across the state, Vermonters debated, among several issue, whether to urge the US and other governments to negotiate a treaty which includes a "early timetable for the elimination of nuclear weapons in a manner that is mutual and verifiable among all nations." Thirty six towns voted "yes."

"This is a clear message from the hills of Vermont for abolition of nuclear weapons," said Joseph Gainza, coordinator of AFSC's Vermont Program.

Gainza said that the effort to have the nuclear weapons question considered during Town Meeting Day was organized by the Vermont Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, of which AFSC is a founding organization. The campaign is part of an international network of over 1,100 organizations working to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and to eliminate those which already exist.

Gainza noted that yesterday's vote was the second time Vermonters at their town meetings had voted for abolition. The first time was in the middle of the 19th century, when Vermont voters called for the abolition of slavery. Although their state constitution forbade slavery in the Green Mountain State, Vermont abolitionists wanted to send a message to the rest of the nation that slavery in the US must end.

Esther Farnsworth, a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, another founder of the Vermont campaign, said that supporters of the nuclear weapons abolition article see a parallel situation.

"Today nuclear weapons proponents argue that the weapons are 'a necessary evil,' 'cost effective,' 'not against the law' and that 'there is no alternative.' These are the same arguments made by slave owners in the 19th century. Also, supporters of abolition share the same sense of overwhelming power to defend the status quo. And yet, the modern day abolitionists point out, slavery was ended," she said.

-- more --

Vermont/AFSC  
Page 2

Anti nuclear weapons activists in Vermont and elsewhere have expressed concern regarding the Clinton Administration's nuclear policy. Last year the president stated that nuclear weapons remain a "cornerstone" of US military planning.

Proponents of abolition point out that the US and other nuclear weapon states are already legally obligated to work toward the elimination of their nuclear arsenals and that this was confirmed by the International Court of Justice. The Court, on July 8, 1996, unanimously found 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."

Gainza noted that the article voted on by 39 Vermont towns echoes the Court's findings in both its sense of urgency and its call for effective means to verify compliance.

Several towns passed the article either unanimously or, in the words of several town coordinators, "overwhelmingly." In two towns where the article was defeated, it failed by five and seven votes.

Vermont organizers plan to be back at town meeting next year when they hope to bring the number of towns voting for abolition to 200.

\*\*\*\*\*

The American Friends Service Committee is a Quaker organization which includes people of various faiths who are committed to social justice, peace and humanitarian service. Its work is based on the belief in the worth of every person and faith in the power of love to overcome violence and injustice.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>  
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3  
Date: Fri, 05 Mar 1999 11:47:42 -0500  
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>  
Subject: (abolition-usa) Fwd: Re: UK has already taken weapons off alert  
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com  
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

>Date: Fri, 05 Mar 1999 16:15:31 -0500  
>Subject: Re: UK has already taken weapons off alert  
>To: aslater@gracelinks.org, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
>From: acronym@gn.apc.org (acronym@gn.apc.org)  
>  
>Thanks to Alice for putting up some sections of the UK Strategic Defence  
>Review (SDR). I think we need to exercise some caution, however, about  
>equating the UK announcement with de-alerting, a term the government has  
>specifically avoided.  
>For more analysis on what the SDR meant for nuclear policy, you can find  
>six  
>short critiques (from a range of perspectives) in Disarmament Diplomacy 28  
>(on our website) and some pertinent extracts and documentation from the SDR  
>and its supporting essays in the same edition. For your interest, I am  
>copying a couple of paragraphs I wrote on the implications of the 'reduced  
>day to day alert' status announced, after discussing in more detail during  
>a  
>meeting with MOD officials and Frank von Hippel.  
>In encouraging the other NWS to do likewise, it is perhaps useful to use  
>the  
>UK as a positive example of taking the first step, but we should not  
>congratulate my esteemed government too much, as they specifically ruled  
>out  
>taking any of the more substantial or verifiable de-alerting steps that had  
>been proposed for the SDR.

>  
>EXTRACT FROM DISARMAMENT DIPLOMACY 28 (JULY 1998) ON UK STRATEGIC DEFENCE  
>REVIEW

>'STILL PUNCHING ABOVE OUR WEIGHT' by Rebecca Johnson

>  
>....Significantly, Labour announced that its nuclear forces were on a  
>"reduced day-to-day alert state", not targeted, and normally at "several  
>days 'notice to fire'". This appears to be an unverifiable operational  
>decision, rather than technical de-alerting. It provides a welcome  
>protection against accidental, hair trigger or unauthorised firing, but  
>falls a long way short of the kind of confidence-building measures and  
>operational marginalisation of nuclear weapons that had been called for by  
>many citizens' groups and analysts. Indeed, Despite the MOD's actual  
>failure to provide continuous 24-hour patrols during the past decade,  
>Labour  
>confirmed the aim of having at least one Trident submarine at sea at all  
>times. The argument for mothballing the fourth submarine was rejected.  
>All  
>four will be brought into service, with the intention of having two in port

>while one is on patrol. The implication is that deterrence requires  
>continuous readiness, if not hair trigger alert. Relying on arguments  
>about  
>'surprise attack' and potential misunderstandings, the SDR rejected  
>proposals for 'de-weaponising' Trident by separating and storing the  
>warheads on land. On the contrary, it pledges to "ensure that we can  
>restore a higher state of alert should this become necessary at any time."  
>Stating that the "credibility of deterrence also depends on retaining an  
>option for a limited strike that would not automatically lead to a full  
>scale nuclear exchange", the SDR proposes a 'sub-strategic' role for  
>Trident, but fails to say what that might look like.  
>  
>Although the SDR states that "the Government wishes to see a safer world in  
>which there is no place for nuclear weapons", it clearly does not envisage  
>Britain giving them up any time soon: "while large nuclear arsenals and  
>risks of proliferation remain, our minimum deterrent remains a necessary  
>element of our security". Elsewhere, the SDR refers to nuclear deterrence  
>as  
>"longer term insurance" for NATO.....

>website address is below.

>  
>  
>  
>  
>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>

>  
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: <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
Date: Fri, 05 Mar 99 12:38:27 -0500  
From: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Letter to Senator Sarbanes

Sure. Who attends the meeting? Am I asking Hobgood and Deckenback to attend or only to sign?

---

Reply Separator

---

Subject: Letter to Senator Sarbanes  
Author: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org> at internet-mail  
Date: 3/4/99 9:13 AM

Jay,

Mark Brown has persuaded me that signers of the letter to Senator Sarbanes should be basically top denominational officials in Maryland, such as bishops, conference ministers, etc., and not a broader list. Along those lines, would you be willing to ask Rev. Dr. Chris Hobgood, regional minister, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) to sign?

I'm trying to get this completed by Thursday or Friday of next week.

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: <J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mail.mcc.org>  
From: J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mail.mcc.org  
X-Lotus-FromDomain: MCC  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Date: Fri, 5 Mar 1999 14:11:36 -0500  
Subject: CTBT  
Content-Disposition: inline

Howard:

I can't think of a "denominational leader" from Maryland, but I'd be happy to contact Mel Schmidt, pastor of Hyattsville Mennonite Church, if that is appropriate. His congregation would be quite supportive of the CTBT.

Is it o.k. to go with a pastor vs. a more churchwide leader?

Warm regards,  
Daryl

Please note email address change:

Old address: mccwjdb@erols.com  
New address: J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mcc.org

Return-Path: <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
Date: Fri, 05 Mar 99 13:51:21 -0500  
From: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Proposed letter to Senator Sarbanes

John signed on. Add his name to letter:

The Rev. John Deckenback  
Conference Minister  
Central Atlantic Conference  
916 So. Rolling Rd.  
Baltimore, MD 21228-5318  
410-4190

Forward Header

---

Subject: Re: Proposed letter to Senator Sarbanes  
Author: <Jrdeck@aol.com > at internet-mail  
Date: 3/5/99 1:14 PM

Feel free to add my name to the letter. Thanks for asking.

I will be in Cleveland all next week and then back for a week before leaving to complete my oft-postponed sabbatical....back April 13. If something works out March 15-19 or after April 13, let me know.

See you next week.

JOHN

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\RFC822.TXT

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>  
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]  
Date: Fri, 05 Mar 1999 17:44:50 -0500  
To: dkimball@clw.org  
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>  
Subject: CTBT direct lobbying workplan (updated, March 5)

March 5, 1999

RE: Summary of CTBT lobbying assignments to date

TO: T. Z. Collina, UCS  
D. Culp, Pu Challenge  
K. Guthrie and Joe Volk, FCNL  
H. Hallman, MUPJ  
J. Isaacs, CLW  
J. Lintner, UCC  
B. Morse, ANA  
M. Rietmann, 20/20  
K. Robson, WAND  
F. Teplitz, Peace Action  
B. Tiller, PSR

CC: T. Graham, LAWS, c/o Doug Shaw  
C. Paine, NRDC  
E. Pages, BENS  
M. Brooks, LWV  
J. Parachini, Monterrey  
S. Shaer, WAND  
S. Gordon, ANA  
B. Musil, PSR  
G. Clark, Peace Action  
M. Krepon, Stimson

FR: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

\*\*\*\* Please DO NOT forward this message outside your office \*\*\*\*

In the interest of developing and maintaining our momentum on our Hill-related CTBT work with key Senators and to keep one another better informed, I'm sending this, the SECOND of several regular messages on our direct lobbying work to those friends of the CTBT who do direct lobbying on the Hill on the CTBT.

Attached below are our agreed assignments for meetings with key Senate staff over the next two weeks -- the goal of which is to secure meetings before the Congressional Easter recess.

1. COMMUNICATION: We will have the opportunity to share legislative information gathered from Hill meetings and other communications at the lobbying meeting following the Coalition CTBT Working Grp. Mtg. Updated

"swing" lists will be available at these meetings.

Other important opportunities are the bi-weekly Nuclear Weapons Working Group Mtg., the Interfaith CTBT Working Group Mtg., and when necessary and possible, by e-mail.

2. GENERAL MESSAGE/PURPOSE OF MARCH MEETINGS: Gathering information about Senators' views, questions, and abt. upcoming hearings on the treaty and to make the case for the Senators to publicly communicate their support for approval of the CTBT and/or hearings on the treaty this year.

3. ASSIGNMENTS: The asterisk (\*) indicates the lead person for setting up and organizing the mtg.

Lugar -- David\*, Jay Lintner, Howard Hallman (Wed. Feb. 10 - DONE)

Rohlfing at DOE -- David\*, Marie, Daryl, Tom Collina, Brad (Thurs. Feb. 11 - DONE)

Hagel -- Jay Lintner,\* Daryl Kimball (IN PROCESS OF BEING SCHED.)

Gorton -- David Culp\*

G. Smith -- Marie Rietmann,\* Daryl Kimball, David Culp (Feb. 19 - DONE)

Specter -- Marie Rietmann,\* Daryl Kimball, David Culp (Feb. 19 - DONE)  
Marie to call back by 3/8

Brownback -- Daryl Kimball\* (IN PROCESS OF BEING SCHED.)

Roberts -- Daryl Kimball\* (IN PROCESS OF BEING SCHED.)

Voinovich -- Daryl Kimball\* (IN PROCESS OF BEING SCHED.)

Warner -- Daryl Kimball\* (first week in April, TBD)

Collins -- Bob Tiller\* (Wed., March 17)

Chafee -- Bob Tiller,\* Tom , Kimberly (Friday, March 5)

Snowe -- Bob Tiller\* (IN PROCESS OF BEING SCHED.)

Bennett -- Kimberly Robson\* (IN PROCESS OF BEING SCHED.)

Frist -- Bob Tiller\* (IN PROCESS OF BEING SCHED.)

Bayh -- T. Z. Collina\* (IN PROCESS OF BEING SCHED.)

Edwards -- T. Z. Collina\* (IN PROCESS OF BEING SCHED.)

Schumer -- T. Z. Collina\* (IN PROCESS OF BEING SCHED.)

Lincoln -- T. Z. Collina\* (IN PROCESS OF BEING SCHED.)

PLEASE CONTACT me if there are any changes, corrections or suggestions.  
Also, let me know if you need any information for delivery at these or  
other CTBT meetings (such as national public opinion polling data,  
state-specific polling data from OH/CO/OR/UT/KS/NE/TN, the LAWS CTBT  
Support Committee letter, or other select pieces).

---

Daryl Kimball, Executive 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: J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mail.mcc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: CTBT  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 02:11 PM 3/5/99 -0500, J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mail.mcc.org wrote:

>Howard:

>

>I can't think of a "denominational leader" from Maryland, but I'd be happy to  
>contact Mel Schmidt, pastor of Hyattsville Mennonite Church, if that is  
>appropriate. His congregation would be quite supportive of the CTBT.

>

>Is it o.k. to go with a pastor vs. a more churchwide leader?

Daryl,

Yes, go ahead with Pastor Schmidt.

Howard

Return-Path: <Hammondc@aol.com>  
From: Hammondc@aol.com  
Date: Sun, 7 Mar 1999 11:50:45 EST  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: Re: CTBT

I will try to reach you. In case we don't connect this weekend  
Connie Hammond  
614-268-2637 (evenings)  
Address: 166 Acton Rd. Columbus, Ohio 43212

Return-Path: <owner-disarm-news@igc.org>  
Date: Sun, 07 Mar 1999 20:05:47 -0500  
From: disarmament@igc.org  
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse  
Sender: owner-disarm-news@igc.org  
Subject: Goodbye -Go Forth and Create a Nuclear Weapons-Free World  
To: disarm-news@igc.org  
X-Accept-Language: en

Dear Disarmament Advocates and Friends of the Disarmament Clearinghouse:

ENCLOSED PLEASE FIND:

- 1) Kathy leaves Clearinghouse Position
- 2) Resource People for You to Contact on Urgent Issues
- 3) Job Announcement for New Coordinator

\*\*\*\*\*

I am leaving my position as Coordinator for the Disarmament Clearinghouse on Monday March 8, 1999.

I will continue to work for the CTBT and a nuclear weapons-free world as the Associate Director for Security Programs at Physicians for Social Responsibility. I hope to continue working with many of you in my new job.

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is working hard to find a new Coordinator (see the enclosed job announcement - please distribute it far and wide to any qualified applicants). In the meantime, there will be a break in the news and action alerts you receive from "disarm-news", and while we will be checking the disarmament@igc.org account occasionally, we won't check it daily.

You may have urgent/ important questions or news to share on some disarmament related topics. Let me suggest these resource people:

\*\*\*\*\*

On STAR WARS (National Missile Defense) & Yes there are votes expected this week:

\*\*\*\*\*

- Bob Tiller at PSR, btiller@psr.org (202) 898 0150 ext. 220
- Fran Teplitz at Peace Action, paprog@igc.org (202) 862 9740 ext. 3004
- Kimberly Robson at WAND, wand@wand.org (202) 543 8505

\*\*\*\*\*

On the CTBT - Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW Campaign

\*\*\*\*\*

If you haven't already done so, subscribe to CTBT-Organize, an interactive list where anyone can post the latest information. (Send a message to disarmament@igc.org this week)

Also contact:

Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision ctbt@2020vision.org, (202) 833 2020  
and for information and assistance on the Interfaith Petition Drive contact:

Kathy Guthrie, FCNL, kathy@fcnl.org (202) 547 6000

\*\*\*\*\*

On De-Alerting and START Moving disarmament progress

\*\*\*\*\*

Bob Tiller at PSR btiller@psr.org (202) 898 0150 ext. 220  
Fran Teplitz & Bruce Hall at Peace Action (Fran) paprog@igc.org,  
(Bruce) panukes@igc.org , 202 862 9740 (Fran -ext.3004) (Bruce -ext.  
3038)

\*\*Also don't miss out on the Alliance For Nuclear Accountability's Theme  
Month Activist Kit on De-Alerting: contact Christina Malecka, ANA,  
cmalecka@earthlink.net (or Peace Action and PSR can tell you how to get  
one)

\*\*\*\*\*

On the Emerging US Nuclear Abolition Campaign and initiatives such as  
theWoolsey

Resolution on a Nuclear Weapons Convention:

\*\*\*\*\*

Bob Tiller at PSR btiller@psr.org (202) 898 0150 ext. 220  
Fran Teplitz & Bruce Hall at Peace Action (Fran) paprog@igc.org,  
(Bruce) panukes@igc.org , 202 862 9740 (Fran -ext.3004) (Bruce -ext.  
3038)

\*\*\*\*\*

On Stockpile Stewardship Issues - including this year's Markey  
Resolution to be introduced in the next coming weeks:

\*\*\*\*\*

Bob Tiller at PSR btiller@psr.org (202) 898 0150 ext. 220  
Fran Teplitz & Bruce Hall at Peace Action (Fran) paprog@igc.org,  
(Bruce) panukes@igc.org , 202 862 9740 (Fran -ext.3004) (Bruce -ext.  
3038)

\*\*\*\*\*

You can best reach me now at (202) 898 0150 ext. 222. The e-mail  
account is not quite set-up yet. I'll let you all know when I'm  
officially on line.

I cannot fully express my thanks to all of you - who have taught me so  
much about how to be effective and inspired me with your dedication and  
hard work.

-Kathy

\*\*\*\*\*

POSITION AVAILABLE  
DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE COORDINATOR

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a joint project of major national  
grassroots membership organizations, Friends Committee on National  
Legislation, Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility and  
Women's Action for New Directions. The Clearinghouse provides  
information, assistance, resources, and action tools to grassroots  
activists and policy makers working on nuclear disarmament, and develops  
and coordinates campaigns on nuclear disarmament measures such as the  
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

\*\*\*\*\*

We are looking for someone with the following qualifications:

\*\*\*\*\*

- 1) Commitment to promoting a nuclear weapons-free world and knowledge of nuclear disarmament issues including the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the nuclear weapons abolition movement, and other nuclear disarmament measures.
- 2) Strong writing and oral communication skills, especially for an activist audience.
- 3) Strong organizing skills with at least one year's experience organizing national issue/ policy campaigns and experience working with peace activists.
- 4) Knowledge of the legislative process and key policy makers on nuclear weapons issues.
- 5) Computer skills - Familiarity with e-mail list maintenance, word processing, desk top publishing, database management, and basic web design.
- 6) Ability to work efficiently and carry-out several projects simultaneously
- 7) Ability to work effectively in coalitions, and be accountable to the Steering Committee organizations.
- 8) Ability to work independently.
- 9) B.A./B.S. degree is required. Advanced degree in international or public policy helpful

\*\*\*\*\*

The tasks of the Coordinator will include:

\*\*\*\*\*

- 1) Provide via e-mail, mailings, fax, phone, and web postings timely news and analysis of nuclear disarmament issues to grassroots activists and policy makers.
- 2) Produce educational and organizing resources such as sample letters to the editor, flyers, action alerts, news letters, resource kits etc.
- 3) Maintain and develop two web sites (CTBT Action Site, Disarmament Site).
- 4) Inform, mobilize, and coordinate national, and regional events such as call-in days, strategy summits.
- 5) Maintain and build a database of over 500 activists, organizations, and policy maker contacts.
- 6) Coordinate Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now (CTBT) activities - includes maintaining lists of key contacts, maintaining a calendar of activities, maintaining the interactive e-mail list "CTBT-Organize" and assisting to

develop strategy for the field campaign.

- 7) Respond to daily requests for information and assistance.
- 8) Working with the Steering Committee to prepare funding proposals and progress reports for funders.
- 9) Conduct meetings of the Clearinghouse Steering Committee, including agendas and minutes.

Terms:

Full-time position. Salary in mid -\$20,000 range depending on experience, with health coverage, and annual leave.

Start date - Early May

Please send resume, cover letter and brief (no more than 1-4 pages) writing sample by March 26th

to:  
Disarmament Clearinghouse Search  
1101 14th Street NW #700 Washington DC 20005  
Via FAX: (202) 898 0172  
Via E-mail: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)  
NO phone calls please

An Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minorities are especially encouraged to apply.

--

DISARMAMENT CLEARINGHOUSE  
Nuclear Disarmament Information, Resources & Action Tools  
Kathy Crandall, Coordinator (Until March 8, 1999)  
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005  
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext. 232 FAX: 202 898 0172  
E-MAIL: [disarmament@igc.org](mailto:disarmament@igc.org)  
<http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>  
<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>

A project of: Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility  
and Women's Action for New Directions

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Mon, 08 Mar 1999 06:33:46 -0500  
From: Lachlan Forrow <lforrow@igc.org>  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Council for a Parliament of the World's Religions  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
X-Sender: lforrow@pop2.igc.org

Is anyone currently involved in this or planning to attend the meeting in Capetown, Dec 1-8, 1999?

See [www.cpwr.org](http://www.cpwr.org) for more details.

Lachlan Forrow, MD  
President, The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship  
Dedicated to supporting Reverence for Life in Action

"The world's greatest need is spirit, because if the world is not under the rule of spirit it will perish. Spirit is so powerful that if one could see the creation of a new spirit in the heart of humanity, all problems would be solved."

--Dr. Albert Schweitzer

To: Delongs <delong@nucleus.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: URGENT QUICK QUESTION!  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

At 12:40 PM 3/6/99 -0700, Delongs wrote:

>Dear Howard,  
>We are having a strategizing meeting in Ottawa one portion of which may  
>consider what we can do from Canada to support US abolitionists. We are  
>wondering, for example, if it would be possible for us to get a list  
>from someone of the appropriate contacts with all the major churches.  
>Would someone have a mailing list of perhaps 200 national and state  
>contacts? We could then get them onto a computer here and do a merge  
>and send out letters to encourage clergy and church members to look at  
>this issue more seriously. Is there anything else that might help?

Dear Bev,

You have an excellent idea. We in the U.S. could benefit from Canadians's knowledge and insight.

I don't know of any list of 200 or so national and state contacts readily available. I have a list of about 25 contacts who are part of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which I chair. These are Washington-based except for Pax Christi, the FOR, and the director of the Presbyterian Peacemaking Program at headquarters in Louisville. A more complete list should include persons at denominational headquarters and at the UN; it would take some digging to put together such a list. By and large the Black denominations do not have much headquarters staff and usually lack a sole contact on peace and justice issues.

The FOR deals with the unofficial religious peace fellowships. Clayton Ramey at FOR headquarters -- crramey@igc.org -- might be able to supply you with a list.

Most states have councils of churches or some other kind of ecumenical body. Some but not all have an interest in international issues. They are listed in the Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches.

It's conceivable that the National Council of Churches (USA) might have listings that I don't know about. I'm not sure who your best contact would be. Maybe Rev. Dr. Eileen W. Linder, editor of the Yearbook, or Derek J. Lander, assistant editor; phone, 212 870-2031; fax, 212 870-2817.

If you come with such a list, I would like to have a copy for my own use.

Let me know if I can help further.

Shalom,  
Howard



To: lintnerj@ucc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Ohio contact  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Jay,

The following person will serve as our Ohio contact:

Connie Hammond, 166 Acton Road, Columbus, OH 43214. Phone/fax: 614 268-2637. E-mail: Hammondc@aol.com.

She is active in a United Methodist Church and with the Columbus Campaign for Arms Control. Recently she was on one of the conference calls that Marie Rietmann organized. She will start line up appointments with the two Ohio senators.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
Date: Fri, 05 Mar 99 12:38:27 -0500  
From: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Re: Letter to Senator Sarbanes

Sure. Who attends the meeting? Am I asking Hobgood and Deckenback to attend or only to sign?

Reply Separator

---

Subject: Letter to Senator Sarbanes  
Author: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org> at internet-mail  
Date: 3/4/99 9:13 AM

Jay,

Mark Brown has persuaded me that signers of the letter to Senator Sarbanes should be basically top denominational officials in Maryland, such as bishops, conference ministers, etc., and not a broader list. Along those lines, would you be willing to ask Rev. Dr. Chris Hobgood, regional minister, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) to sign?

I'm trying to get this completed by Thursday or Friday of next week.

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>  
Date: Sun, 7 Mar 1999 13:50:55 -0500  
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@pgs.ca>  
Importance: Normal  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: FWB: Sen. Roche Home Page  
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.0810.800

Non-member submission from [Delongs <delong@nucleus.com>]  
Date: Tue, 02 Mar 1999 23:33:25 -0700  
From: Delongs <delong@nucleus.com>  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Sen. Roche Home Page

Friends,  
Good news! You may now access Senator Douglas Roche's home page at:  
<http://sen.parl.gc.ca/droche/>  
Best wishes to all!  
Bev Delong  
Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (CNANW)

Return-Path: <maureene@earthlink.net>  
X-Sender: maureene@earthlink.net  
Date: Mon, 08 Mar 1999 11:30:31 -0500  
To: maureene@avocet.prod.itd.earthlink.net  
From: maureen eldredge <maureene@earthlink.net>  
Subject: new email address

Hello,

I am back in the office after 6 months in Asia. We've switched email providers so I have a new email address at work: maureene@earthlink.net  
Please update your email files and reinstate me on weekly notices, list serves, etc.

Thanks,  
Maureen

To: lintnerj@ucc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Catholic contacts  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Jay,

I have learned from Jerry Powers that his department specified the CTBT and third world debt as the two international issues they encouraged their diocesan justice and peace people to take up with members of Congress during the February recess. Therefore, the CTBT is a topic fresh in their mind. The U.S. Catholic Conference position on this issue is stated on their web site: [www.nccbuscc.org/sdwp/international/arms.htm](http://www.nccbuscc.org/sdwp/international/arms.htm).

Another source told me that in New Mexico the strongest peace advocate is Bishop Recardo Ramirez in Las Cruces. Presumably the justice and peace officer in the Archdiocese of Santa Fe will also be informed about the CTBT. Therefore, our contact in New Mexico -- Wally Ford -- may want to get in touch with these persons and bring them into the effort to reach Senator Domenici.

Other state coordinators who want to bring in Catholics could also draw on this information that the CTBT is on the active agenda of the U.S. Catholic Conference.

Jerry has a Vatican representative in town at the moment, but he promised me that in a couple of days he will deal with my request to ask Cardinal Keeler of Baltimore to sign the letter to Senator Sarbanes.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: kathy@fcnl.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>  
Subject: Catholic contacts  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:

Dear Kathy,

As I posted the following message to Jay, it occurred to me that it contains information you could use.

Dear Jay,

I have learned from Jerry Powers that his department specified the CTBT and third world debt as the two international issues they encouraged their diocesan justice and peace people to take up with members of Congress during the February recess. Therefore, the CTBT is a topic fresh in their mind. The U.S. Catholic Conference position on this issue is stated on their web site: [www.nccbuscc.org/sdwp/international/arms.htm](http://www.nccbuscc.org/sdwp/international/arms.htm).

Another source told me that in New Mexico the strongest peace advocate is Bishop Recardo Ramirez in Las Cruces. Presumably the justice and peace officer in the Archdiocese of Santa Fe will also be informed about the CTBT. Therefore, our contact in New Mexico -- Wally Ford -- may want to get in touch with these persons and bring them into the effort to reach Senator Domenici.

Other state coordinators who want to bring in Catholics could also draw on this information that the CTBT is on the active agenda of the U.S. Catholic Conference.

Jerry has a Vatican representative in town at the moment, but he promised me that in a couple of days he will deal with my request to ask Cardinal Keeler of Baltimore to sign the letter to Senator Sarbanes.

Shalom,  
Howard

Return-Path: <rachel@fcnl.org>

From: Rachel Phillips <rachel@fcnl.org>

To: "'bmorse@earthlink.net'" <bmorse@earthlink.net>,  
"'maureene@earthlink.net'" <maureene@earthlink.net>,  
"'kcrandall@psr.org'" <kcrandall@psr.org>,  
"'ograbc@aol.com'"  
<ograbc@aol.com>,  
"'jmatlack@erols.com'" <jmatlack@erols.com>,  
"'fagin@ix.netcom.com'" <fagin@ix.netcom.com>,  
"'wade@armscontrol.org'"  
<wade@armscontrol.org>,  
"'craig@armscontrol.org'"  
<craig@armscontrol.org>,  
"'howard@armscontrol.org'"  
<howard@armscontrol.org>,  
"'smk@armscontrol.org'" <smk@armscontrol.org>,  
"'basicus@basicint.org'" <basicus@basicint.org>,  
"'cunr@aol.com'"  
<cunr@aol.com>,  
"'chellman@cdi.org'" <chellman@cdi.org>,  
"'pwood@cdi.org'" <pwood@cdi.org>,  
"'towles@csbahome.com'"  
<towles@csbahome.com>,  
"'heeter@csbahome.com'" <heeter@csbahome.com>,  
"'kosiak@csbahome.com'" <kosiak@csbahome.com>,  
"'bazie@cbpp.org'"  
<bazie@cbpp.org>,  
"'washofc@aol.com'" <washofc@aol.com>,  
"'cwu-dc@churchwomen.org'" <cwu-dc@churchwomen.org>,  
"'hnolen@igc.org'"  
<hnolen@igc.org>,  
"'lwright@igc.org'" <lwright@igc.org>,  
"'dkimball@clw.org'" <dkimball@clw.org>,  
"'jsmith@clw.org'"  
<jsmith@clw.org>, "'jdi@clw.org'" <jdi@clw.org>,  
"'skerr@clw.org'"  
<skerr@clw.org>,  
"'mfonte@clw.org'" <mfonte@clw.org>,  
"'cardamone@clw.org'" <cardamone@clw.org>,  
"'efloden@clw.org'"  
<efloden@clw.org>,  
"'cdavis@clw.org'" <cdavis@clw.org>,  
"'jellingston@erols.com'" <jellingston@erols.com>,  
"'pdd@clark.net'"  
<pdd@clark.net>,  
"'disarmament@igc.org'" <disarmament@igc.org>,  
"'etandc@igc.org'" <etandc@igc.org>, "'tholt@clw.org'" <tholt@clw.org>,  
"'dgreenfield@clw.org'" <dgreenfield@clw.org>,  
"'tamarg@fas.org'"  
<tamarg@fas.org>,  
"'arich@fas.org'" <arich@fas.org>,  
"'johnpike@fas.org'" <johnpike@fas.org>,  
"'cferg@fas.org'"

<cferg@fas.org>, Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>, Catherine Stratton <catherine@fcnl.org>, Ned Stowe <ned@fcnl.org>, Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>, "bobvan@erols.com" <bobvan@erols.com>, "tom.clements@wdc.greenpeace.org" <tom.clements@wdc.greenpeace.org>, "ipsps@igc.org" <ipsps@igc.org>, "koneill@isis-online.org" <koneill@isis-online.org>, "cgay@isis-online.org" <cgay@isis-online.org>, "jesuitusa@igc.org" <jesuitusa@igc.org>, "tgraham@lawscns.org" <tgraham@lawscns.org>, "mccwjdb@erols.com" <mccwjdb@erols.com>, "J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mcc.org" <J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mcc.org>, "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>, "stevenraikin@delphi.com" <stevenraikin@delphi.com>, "fharrigan@hotmail.com" <fharrigan@hotmail.com>, "cpaine@nrdc.org" <cpaine@nrdc.org>, "jsammon@networklobby.org" <jsammon@networklobby.org>, "hamiltoh@rtk.net" <hamiltoh@rtk.net>, "ombwatch@ombwatch.org" <ombwatch@ombwatch.org>, "paexec@igc.org" <paexec@igc.org>, "paprog@igc.org" <paprog@igc.org>, "pacampusnet@igc.org" <pacampusnet@igc.org>, "panukes@igc.org" <panukes@igc.org>, "bmusil@psr.org" <bmusil@psr.org>, "btiller@psr.org" <btiller@psr.org>, "kroberts@psr.org" <kroberts@psr.org>, "nbaliga@psr.org" <nbaliga@psr.org>, "dculp@igc.org" <dculp@igc.org>, "walter\_owensby@pcusa.org" <walter\_owensby@pcusa.org>, "defense@pogo.org" <defense@pogo.org>, "sionno@spusa.org" <sionno@spusa.org>, "chapter@spusa.org" <chapter@spusa.org>, "brian@taxpayer.net" <brian@taxpayer.net>, "ralph@taxpayer.net" <ralph@taxpayer.net>, "cena@taxpayer.net" <cena@taxpayer.net>, "jwyerman@2020vision.org" <jwyerman@2020vision.org>, "laura@2020vision.org" <laura@2020vision.org>, "ctbt@2020vision.org" <ctbt@2020vision.org>, "fellow@2020vision.org" <fellow@2020vision.org>, "rac@uahc.org" <rac@uahc.org>, "arosenbaum@uahc.org" <arosenbaum@uahc.org>, "tperry@ucsusa.org" <tperry@ucsusa.org>

"tcollina@ucsusa.org" <tcollina@ucsusa.org>,  
"uuawo@aol.com"  
<uuawo@aol.com>,  
"mccolloc@ucc.org" <mccolloc@ucc.org>,  
"lintnerj@ucc.org" <lintnerj@ucc.org>,  
"haworthm@ucc.org"  
<haworthm@ucc.org>,  
"info@paxworld.org" <info@paxworld.org>,  
"vfp@igc.org" <vfp@igc.org>, "marissa@vi.org" <marissa@vi.org>,  
"cedar@tfn.net" <cedar@tfn.net>, "wand@wand.org" <wand@wand.org>,  
"will@wand.org" <will@wand.org>,  
"ggilhool@ix.netcom.com"  
<ggilhool@ix.netcom.com>,  
"tbarner@wfa.org" <tbarner@wfa.org>,  
"chuck@wfa.org" <chuck@wfa.org>,  
"hartung@newschool.edu"  
<hartung@newschool.edu>,  
"moixb@newschool.edu" <moixb@newschool.edu>,  
"washburj@newschool.edu" <washburj@newschool.edu>,  
"pjdavies@aol.com"  
<pjdavies@aol.com>,  
"info@natprior.org" <info@natprior.org>

Subject: Code of Conduct

Date: Tue, 9 Mar 1999 12:38:08 -0500

To Monday Lobby group:

Following is a detailed memo about recent happenings on the Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers. Following the Memo is the text of the Code of Conduct portion of the bill (H.R. 973) approved last Thursday and the statement which Rep. McKinney submitted for the Record during that HIRC hearing.

\*\*\*\*\*

FCNL Memo to Monday Lobby re: Code of Conduct

On 3/4 in the House International Relations Committee markup of H.R. 973, the Security Assistance Act, a version of the Gejdenson International Arms Sales Code of Conduct which represents a compromise between Reps. McKinney and Gejdenson was approved as an amendment to the Act.

Only about 10 minutes were spent discussing the amendment on the floor in full committee: Chairman Gilman commended Rep. McKinney on her hard work on this amendment; Rep. Rohrabacher made brief remarks about being glad to have a good bipartisan relationship with McKinney and a bit about the importance of a Code ("the U.S. cannot be the arsenal to dictatorships"); McKinney said very little, merely calling the amendment "not a full step, but a very important step" and stating that she would submit a written statement for the record (Peter Hickey, Foreign Affairs LA to Rep. McKinney, gave Tamar a draft copy of that statement, and later told a group of us ATWG'ers that it is not a FINAL draft of the statement, as he wrote it and McKinney herself has not seen it yet. FCNL

will send out more information as the draft progresses; the final version will appear in the Congressional Record). Rep. Payne offered the day's most substantive remarks about the importance of a Code.

On Wednesday afternoon and Thursday morning, word had it that the McKinney-Gejdenson deal had broken down, but it was revived shortly before the hearing.

In brief, the new Gejdenson amendment DOES contains ATWG's "famous four" definitions (excerpted from H.R. 4545 of 1998). They were added to the requirement for multilateral negotiations and to the State Department annual human rights report. The section on "REPORTS TO CONGRESS" is much more vague than we would have liked, requiring a description of how the states measure up to the Code criteria, but not a LIST of states which do and do not. It reads:

"(b)(1) In the report required in sections 116(d) and 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 [THE ANNUAL STATE HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT], the Secretary of State shall describe the extent to which the practices of each country evaluated meet the criteria in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a) [McKinney's DEFINITIONS]."

McKinney's aide told us that Gejdenson simply wouldn't accept any language about a specific Human Rights Report LIST of eligible countries. This was as far as they would go.

The committee vote on H.R. 973 was a unanimous Aye, so the bill will go to the House floor on a suspension of the rules. Under a suspension of the rules, a bill is considered "non-controversial," no amendments are permitted, and the vote is up or down. H.R. 973 seems virtually certain to pass. If this happens, then we get the four criteria assessments for each country in future annual reports on human rights from the Department of State.

On one hand, these are two important advances. We should celebrate the advance. FCNL will help to report this action as a good step, an advance for the Code. Rep. MCKinney and her aide, Peter Hickey, deserve thanks for their work.

On the other hand, we're not satisfied and want more. For example, this morning's HIRC action does not result in a requirement that the President or State make determinations, i.e. create a list of which countries comply or don't comply. Also, countries are not made ineligible for weapons, thus no need of a Presidential waiver either. So, we have more work to do.

In conversations this noon, Joe Volk and Caleb Rossiter felt that our next steps will be crucial. They foresee action on the Code moving now from HIRC to the Foreign Ops Appropriations Subcommittee. FCNL and Demilitarization for Democracy anticipate the need to identify and work with congressional champions who are well placed to move the full Code through the Foreign Ops Appropriations process. Joe said he will also be interested whether our human rights colleagues will see ways to use

the new Gejdenson provisions.

\*\*\*\*\*

H.R.973

Security Assistance Act of 1999 (Introduced in the House)

TITLE IV--INTERNATIONAL ARMS SALES CODE OF CONDUCT ACT OF 1999

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the 'International Arms Sales Code of Conduct Act of 1999'.

SEC. 402. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

- (1) The proliferation of conventional arms and conflicts around the globe are multilateral problems. The only way to effectively prevent rogue nations from acquiring conventional weapons is through a multinational 'arms sales code of conduct'.
- (2) Approximately 40,000,000 people, over 75 percent of whom were civilians, died as a result of civil and international wars fought with conventional weapons during the 45 years of the cold war, demonstrating that conventional weapons can in fact be weapons of mass destruction.
- (3) Conflict has actually increased in the post cold war era.
- (4) It is in the national security and economic interests of the United States to reduce dramatically the \$840,000,000,000 that all countries spend on armed forces every year, \$191,000,000,000 of which is spent by developing countries, an amount equivalent to 4 times the total bilateral and multilateral foreign assistance such countries receive every year.
- (5) The Congress has the constitutional responsibility to participate with the executive branch in decisions to provide military assistance and arms transfers to a foreign government, and in the formulation of a policy designed to reduce dramatically the level of international militarization.
- (6) A decision to provide military assistance and arms transfers to a government that is undemocratic, does not adequately protect human rights, or is currently engaged in acts of armed aggression should require a higher level of scrutiny than does a decision to provide such assistance and arms transfers to a government to which these conditions do not apply.

SEC. 403. INTERNATIONAL ARMS SALES CODE OF CONDUCT.

(a) NEGOTIATIONS- The President shall attempt to achieve the foreign

policy goal of an international arms sales code of conduct with all Wassenaar Arrangement countries. The President shall take the necessary steps to begin negotiations with all Wassenaar Arrangement countries within 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The purpose of these negotiations shall be to conclude an agreement on restricting or prohibiting arms transfers to countries that do not meet the following criteria:

(1) PROMOTES DEMOCRACY- The government of the country--

(A) was chosen by and permits free and fair elections;

(B) promotes civilian control of the military and security forces and has civilian institutions controlling the policy, operation, and spending of all law enforcement and security institutions, as well as the armed forces;

(C) promotes the rule of law, equality before the law, and respect for individual and minority rights, including freedom to speak, publish, associate, and organize; and

(D) promotes the strengthening of political, legislative, and civil institutions of democracy, as well as autonomous institutions to monitor the conduct of public officials and to combat corruption.

(2) RESPECTS HUMAN RIGHTS- The government of the country--

(A) does not engage in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, including--

(i) extra judicial or arbitrary executions;

(ii) disappearances;

(iii) torture or severe mistreatment;

(iv) prolonged arbitrary imprisonment;

(v) systematic official discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, gender, national origin, or political affiliation; and (vi) grave breaches of international laws of war or equivalent violations of the laws of war in internal conflicts;

(B) vigorously investigates, disciplines, and prosecutes those responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights;

(C) permits access on a regular basis to political prisoners by international humanitarian organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross;

(D) promotes the independence of the judiciary and other official bodies that oversee the

protection of human rights;

(E) does not impede the free functioning of domestic and international human rights organizations; and

(F) provides access on a regular basis to humanitarian organizations in situations of conflict or famine.

(3) NOT ENGAGED IN CERTAIN ACTS OF ARMED AGGRESSION- The government of the country is not currently engaged in acts of armed aggression in violation of international law.

(4) FULL PARTICIPATION IN U.N. REGISTER OF CONVENTIONAL ARMS- The government of the country is fully participating in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS- (1) In the report required in sections 116(d) and 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Secretary of State shall describe the extent to which the practices of each country evaluated meet the criteria in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a).

(2) Not later than 6 months after the commencement of the negotiations under subsection (a), and not later than the end of every 6-month period thereafter until an agreement described in subsection (a) is concluded, the President shall report to the appropriate committees of the Congress on the progress made during these negotiations.

(c) DEFINITION- The term `Wassenaar Arrangement countries' means Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, and the United Kingdom.

\*\*\*\*\*

STATEMENT BY Rep. CYNTHIA MCKINNEY

Mr. Speaker,

First, I like to applaud the Minority Leader for his efforts to harmonize the arms export policies of different countries to guarantee respect for human rights, democracy, norms of non-aggression, and transparency in arms transfers.

As many of you know, the issue before us is very important to me. Two years ago Representative Rohrabacher and I introduced the Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers Legislation to stop U.S. arms sales to countries that are not democratic or fail to adhere to international standard for human rights. We plan to reintroduce that legislation later this year.

While the bill before us is less ambitious in its scope than our Code of Conduct, it represents an important step forward in the international effort to rein in weapons transfers to rogue nations, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

WITH IT, we will enshrine into law clear, unambiguous standards for weapons transfers and put us on an equal footing with the 15 nations of the European Union that passed a similar Code of Conduct last year.

WITH IT, we can join the efforts led by Oscar Arias and 16 of his fellow Nobel Peace laureates to promote an International Code of Conduct in an uncompromised position. Indeed, this legislation will establish the United States in its rightful role as a leader in this international effort.

WITH IT, we will take an important step forward in passing what Defense News described as an "a useful tool to shine light on some nations' darkest human rights and other unsavory secrets."

Still, this bill represents a step forward, not an end unto itself. Thus I am extremely pleased by the commitment made to me yesterday by my colleague, Mr. Gejdenson, to work with me in supporting separate legislation that will identify countries that do not meet the criteria defined in this bill so the Congress can take appropriate action.

And I am hopeful that we will work together to present to this Committee language that will alter U.S. foreign policy with respect to military assistance and weapons transfers. As the sole remaining superpower and leading arms merchant in the world, the United States must first to lead by example, and then reach out to other arms-exporting nations.

We also have a responsibility to our troops. We know that weapons sold to the Shah or Iran became the arsenal of the Ayatollah Khomeini, and we know that in recent mobilizations of U.S. forces -- in Panama, Iraq, Somalia, and in Haiti -- U.S. soldiers were killed and wounded by weapons and/or weapons technology exported from the United States.

Finally, we have a moral responsibility to deny our direct, or indirect support to those who do not share our values of democracy and respect for human rights. As parents, I have no doubt that we have all told our children at one time or another; that it does not matter what the other kids are doing -- or what the parents of other kids let them do. We simply do not allow our children to embark on dangerous or morally dubious adventures simply because so-and-so down the street can. We must insist on the same common-sense approach to arms transfer policies.

Again, I commend the leadership of my colleague Mr. Gejdenson on this issue and look forward to working with him as we establish the same moral values for our country that we insist upon from our children.



Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>  
Date: Tue, 9 Mar 1999 18:56:11 -0800 (PST)  
From: flick@igc.org (Felicity Hill)  
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org  
Subject: Annual General Meeting  
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org  
X-Sender: flick@pop2.igc.org

\*\*\*\*\* ANNOUNCEMENT \*\*\*\*\*

Part one of the Abolition 2000 Annual General Meeting will be held immediately after the closing plenary of the HAGUE APPEAL FOR PEACE. (you do not have to be registered for the entire to the HAP to come on that day - one day registration is an option)

WHEN : SATURDAY, 15 MAY, 1.30 pm - 11pm,

WHERE: The Netherlands Conference Center, The Hague

WHO: The meeting is open to individuals and members of organisations that have signed the Abolition 2000 Statement and all those interested in joining the campaign to bring about the abolition of nuclear weapons.

WHAT: A draft agenda will soon be circulated so that discussion can begin early on such matters as: Sharing successes, proposals for joint unified actions/events/visual images and the best structure to facilitate our global network.

\*\*\*\*\* BUT THAT'S NOT ALL \*\*\*\*\*LETS HAVE SOME FUN!!\*\*\*\*\*

The Annual General Meeting will continue on the Abolition 2000 Walk organised by For Mother Earth. ALL MEMBERS OF Abolition 2000 are STRONGLY URGED to join the Abolition 2000 Walk from The Hague to NATO Headquarters in Brussels (NOT VERY FAR AT ALL).

After speeches on the steps of the International Court of Justice, the walk will meander along in the European springime to DELFT (a 15 minute train ride from the Hague).

WHEN: MONDAY 16 MAY, 7-9 & TUESDAY 17 May 10-2pm

WHERE: DELFT

WHO: All those interested in continuing the discussion and the refinement of Abolition 2000's strategies to Educate, Activate, Organise for Nuclear Abolition.

(Thanks to John Burrowes, Alyn Ware, Jackie Cabasso and Pol D'Huyvetter for their planning and thinking.)



Return-Path: <delong@nucleus.com>  
Date: Sat, 06 Mar 1999 12:40:23 -0700  
From: Delongs <delong@nucleus.com>  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
Subject: URGENT QUICK QUESTION!  
X-Corel-MessageType: EMail

Dear Howard,

We are having a strategizing meeting in Ottawa one portion of which may consider what we can do from Canada to support US abolitionists. We are wondering, for example, if it would be possible for us to get a list from someone of the appropriate contacts with all the major churches. Would someone have a mailing list of perhaps 200 national and state contacts? We could then get them onto a computer here and do a merge and send out letters to encourage clergy and church members to look at this issue more seriously. Is there anything else that might help?

There is certainly increasing alarm outside the US with the frequency at which the US is breaching international law through their policy decisions and at the role of the US in footdragging on the ICC, the CTBT, the landmines convention, etc. American negotiators, instead of leading, are always last to get on board. It is very sad - but I suspect only occurring because the public is unawares of what is going on. We are anxious to help out in this education process.

Let me know your thoughts! Sorry to make this "Urgent" but my computer is going in for a health check while I'm in Ottawa so I'm offline after about Monday at 3 PM.

cheers!

Bev DeLong

Co-Chairperson, Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons  
(and a member of the United Church of Canada!)

PS If you miss my deadline, kindly send this to pgs@web.net and mark it FOR BEV DELONG and I'll get it in Ottawa. Thanks!