

---PUBLIC GATHERING TO CANCEL THE DEBT OF THE WORLD'S POOREST NATIONS---

A CALL TO WITNESS: WASHINGTON DC, SEPTEMBER 21, 1999

Join with persons of faith and conscience from the US and around the world in saying...

YES! to Life, NO! to Debt

On Sept 21, 1999 in Edward Murrow Park in Washington DC (across the street from the World Bank and IMF)

we will gather to mark The Countdown to the Jubilee Year: The Millennial Year of Activism to Cancel the Foreign Debt

WHO: People of Faith from the US and our partners from the South. (we are expecting "witnesses to the human face of the debt crisis" from about 15 countries in Latin America, Africa and Asia)

WHAT: A public gathering, liturgical service and commissioning for the Millennial Year of Activism.

WHEN: Tuesday, 12 noon - 2 pm, September 21, 1999 - 100 days to the year 2000 - and one week before the annual meeting of the World Bank and the IMF.

WHERE: Washington DC, Edward Murrow Park--across from the World Bank and the IMF - 19th Street, NW, between Pennsylvania Avenue and H Street NW.

ACTIVITIES: Sharing stories of struggle for life, exposing the human realities of the debt, recognizing our need for atonement for the debt's destructive consequences, proclaiming our solidarity with the poor, and commissioning our Southern and US partners to go out across the US and spread the Jubilee message: "YES! to Life, NO! to Debt."

SPONSORED BY: The Religious Working Group on the World Bank and the IMF.
Tel: (202) 832-1780, Email: mknolldc@igc.org.

=====
Jubilee 2000/USA Campaign
222 East Capitol St., NE
Washington, DC 20003-1036
Tel: 202-783-3566
Fax: 202-546-4468
email: coord@j2000usa.org
web site: www.j2000usa.org

==> to subscribe to a list serve for Jubilee 2000/USA action alerts, news and announcements (three brief messages per month delivered right to your email account) just send an empty email message to:
j2000usa-news-subscribe@egroups.com

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Sun, 16 May 1999 23:30:27 -0700 (PDT)
From: rej@acronym.org.uk (Rebecca Johnson)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT brf 4
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org (Unverified)

1999 NPT Briefing 4 from The Acronym Institute

Nuclear Disarmament (2) May 13 1999

This is the second part of the briefing on disarmament issues raised during the closed debates at the third NPT PrepCom for the 2000 Review Conference. Many statements emphasised the importance of fulfilling the obligations in the 1995 Principles and Objectives, especially the CTBT and fissile materials production ban. Many also underlined the importance of the US and Russia moving beyond the START impasse and undertaking accelerated reductions in their strategic arsenals. Several went further, detailing actions that would reduce the reliance on nuclear weapons, including those identified by the 1996 Canberra Commission, such as taking nuclear weapons off alert and restricting or withdrawing tactical nuclear weapons.

Algeria, Peru, Egypt and others recalled the various proposals from non-aligned states in the CD and argued that the ideas for substantial progress were available but that the political will appeared to be lacking among some parties. This was a theme echoed by many statements, with frequent calls for the NWS to reaffirm their unequivocal commitment to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and to speeding up the process for getting there. New Zealand, Canada and others rejected the view (heard from some of the NWS) that article VI makes nuclear disarmament contingent on general and complete disarmament, with Canada providing legal and political arguments in support of their case that nuclear and general disarmament are two distinct undertakings by all NPT parties.

The impasse in the Conference on Disarmament inevitably spilled into the debate. A large number of non-aligned delegations called for an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament to be established. As in past years, the statement from the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) called for a CD committee to commence negotiations on a phased programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons "with a specified framework of time, including a nuclear weapon convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, employment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination". Others, such as South Africa, Japan and Canada emphasised the need for the CD to set up a committee to discuss nuclear disarmament issues as a first step. Italy, on behalf of five NATO countries (including Belgium, Germany, Netherlands and Norway) spoke in favour of a working group at the CD to exchange information on nuclear disarmament. While dismissing the idea of multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament, France said it would be "prepared to join in a consensus" based on the NATO-5 proposal for the CD. South Africa, which has its own proposal for a CD committee on nuclear disarmament, said that in view of the importance of having some kind of mechanism to address the issue, it would

be willing to lend its support to the NATO-5 proposal.

Proposals for Action

The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) asserted that all NPT parties bear responsibility for nuclear disarmament, particularly the NWS with the largest arsenals. The NAM statement and interventions from several non-aligned delegations reiterated their long-held demand that the Geneva Conference on Disarmament should establish an ad hoc committee to commence negotiations on a phased programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons "with a specified framework of time, including a nuclear weapon convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, employment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination". The NAM also argued for a subsidiary deliberative body to be established at the 2000 Review Conference, quoting the commitment in 4c of the 1995 Principles and Objectives committing NPT parties to "practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons".

Brazil made a statement on behalf of 32 countries, based on the New Agenda Coalition, which originated in a statement on June 9 1998 by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa and Sweden. Following from their UN General Assembly resolution (53/77Y), which garnered 114 votes in December 1998, seven of the originators were joined by Bolivia, Botswana, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ghana, Iran, Indonesia, Lesotho, Malaysia, Malawi, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Switzerland, Thailand, Uruguay, Venezuela and Zimbabwe. After reviewing the situation, including the START process, CTBT, nuclear testing in South Asia, lack of a fissile materials ban and security assurances, the NAC statement concluded that "the pace of efforts to implement all the obligations of the NPT is faltering". Concerned that the NWS were reaffirming their nuclear doctrines and re-rationalising the continued possession of nuclear weapons, the Coalition said that the NWS had not been fulfilling their obligations with sufficient vigour, and emphasised that "we must not enter the next millennium with the prospect that the retention of these weapons will be considered legitimate for the indefinite future." NAC called for mutually reinforcing bilateral, plurilateral (among the NWS) and multilateral efforts to be pursued in concert, including greater progress on START reductions and steps to de-emphasise the role of nuclear weapons in security strategies, including de-alerting and de-mating warheads from delivery vehicles and reducing reliance on non-strategic nuclear weapons, as well as transparency and confidence-building measures. Critical of NATO's recent affirmation of the central role played by nuclear weapons in its alliance doctrine, NAC also called for "the early examination of measures to enhance strategic stability and to review strategic doctrines". A number of the co-sponsors gave their reasons for supporting the NAC initiative, with some elaborating more fully on the practical steps they would like to see.

Between the NAM and the NAC, it is clear that a large number of parties had strong views that more needed to be done. In addition to the NAM call for a nuclear weapons convention, several others reinforced this objective, including Egypt, Malaysia and Brazil. The NAC statement acknowledged that "the total and final elimination of nuclear weapons will require a multilateral agreement", without specifying further. Outlining actions on

START, no-first-use, CTBT and fissban, China repeated its position that on that basis, "a convention banning nuclear weapons should be negotiated". Australia took the view that "until nuclear disarmament nears the elimination phase, it will be premature for the international community to address the question of a single weapons convention".

Speaking for the first time, Brazil -- whose recent accession to the NPT was enthusiastically welcomed in many statements -- outlined a comprehensive and practical programme, recognising that "after the CTBT and the FMT, there is a logical step at the multilateral level, that is, a Nuclear Weapon Convention..." urging parties to begin at least considering this objective. Brazil also called for interim steps that would complement and reinforce the bilateral reductions underway, including: the de-alerting of nuclear weapons; the removal of nuclear warheads from their delivery vehicles; an agreement on the no-first-use of nuclear weapons; an agreement not to increase or modernise nuclear arsenals; the removal of non-strategic nuclear weapons from deployed sites; and greater transparency on fissile materials stocks. Peru specifically supported the de-alerting and de-activation of nuclear weapons and the withdrawal of non-strategic weapons. Supporting the NAC statement, as well as more support for the U.S. Cooperative Threat Reduction Programme, Nigeria also called for the other NWS not to "sit on the sideline", but to join in nuclear disarmament negotiations. China reiterated its long-standing demand for a legally binding instrument among the NWS on no-first-use of nuclear weapons.

Demands for more specific actions have increasingly been aired outside the non-aligned movement as well. Canada, for example, called for a new programme of action for 2000 to include the following additional elements: acceleration and full implementation of the START process, with the direct engagement of the other three NWS (Britain, China and France) "in the near future"; measures such as de-alerting, transparency and confidence-building, and negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons.

Warning that unless the tasks of nuclear disarmament were "thoroughly addressed, the NPT could lose its credibility", with grave consequences, Japan recalled its resolution to the UN GA (53/77 U). Like Canada, Japan emphasised the importance of the START process, CTBT and fissban, but also called for "further efforts" by all five NWS "to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally and through their negotiations". Together with a growing number of states, Japan also underscored the importance of practical measures such as de-alerting and de-targeting, as well as assistance in dismantling nuclear weapons, and managing and disposing of the resultant fissile materials. Both France and Britain said that their weapons were no longer targeted and that they had reduced the state of alert, though without characterising this as 'de-alerting' in the way that most states intended.

Written by Rebecca Johnson, with assistance from Nicola Butler

The Acronym Institute
24, Colvestone Crescent, London E8 2LH, England.
telephone (UK +44) (0) 171 503 8857
fax (0) 171 503 9153

website <http://www.acronym.org.uk>

negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile materials for weapons purposes and the cluster 2 and 3 sessions on safeguards, covering article III, and nuclear energy, as contained in article IV', which is still referred to as the 'peaceful uses of nuclear energy'. Security assurances, nuclear weapon free zones, and the special session on the Middle East will be covered in Briefing 6.

Fissban

More than half the statements to the general debate, as well as around 14 interventions in the special session on fissban attested to the importance of this issue. All expressed frustration about the stalemate at the Conference on Disarmament. In general, when referring to the proposed treaty prohibiting the production of plutonium and highly enriched uranium (HEU), western delegations and the NWS tend to speak of a cut-off treaty or FMCT, emphasising the halting of future production. Non-aligned countries more frequently refer to a fissile materials treaty or FMT, while others (including the Acronym Institute) prefer the abbreviation 'fissban', which does not prejudge the scope and approach. Though there appeared to be general acceptance that the responsibility for verification should be assigned to the IAEA, Russia and others preferred to speak of it as a 'controlling mechanism'. Some, like South Africa, supported the IAEA but considered that "certain proliferation and resource constraints" would have to be addressed.

Germany on behalf of the EU and 11 other European countries said that "an FMCT is not only a contribution to, but an integral and indispensable part of nuclear disarmament and an important step towards a world free of nuclear weapons". The EU called on NPT members to "demonstrate their commitment to nuclear non-proliferation and to nuclear disarmament by doing everything in their power to facilitate immediate commencement and early conclusion of negotiations...[and].. to send a strong and unambiguous signal" to the CD. Australia accused the CD of "possibly frittering away a short-lived opportunity" and underlined all the reasons why the fissban was important to international security, non-proliferation and was "an essential and unavoidable step" towards the elimination of nuclear weapons. The United States, Britain and especially France, which has irreversibly shut down its facilities for the military production of plutonium and HEU, also catalogued the ways in which a fissban would contribute to nuclear security, non-proliferation and disarmament. Russia clearly stated that it would not be appropriate to consider current stocks in the fissban's scope. China, which had earlier reiterated that negotiations should commence without further delay, appeared to question the point of negotiating new agreements when the settlement of important strategic issues like missile defence, the expansion of NATO and the "indiscriminate" bombing of a sovereign state (in Yugoslavia) were of "much higher priority". Many applauded the trilateral discussions between Russia, the United States and the IAEA, suggesting that the arrangements for placing surplus material under IAEA supervision could be built on further, including all the NWS.

The NAM statement called for negotiations on a treaty "banning the production and stockpiling of fissile material for nuclear weapons" or explosive purposes. The NAM regretted the "continuing lack of progress on items relevant to nuclear issues" in the CD. Commenting that the responsibility lay on all, Algeria noted that there remained differences in

perceptions regarding what the treaty should cover. Though not placing conditions on the negotiations, Algeria wanted the treaty to play its role in developing an international regime to address the weapons usable stocks held by all nuclear capable states.

Some entered into more concrete discussion of the key issues and the approaches they advocated. There were many similarities in the points made by Canada, Japan, Norway and South Africa, but also some differences. Japan called for the NWS to announce a moratorium on the production of fissile materials for weapons, which Britain, France, Russia and the United States say they have in de facto terms already done. Canada wanted an official moratorium to be declared by "all states concerned". Japan identified five principles for the fissban: universality, especially adherence by all states capable of producing nuclear weapons; non-discrimination, to ensure that the treaty did not create differential obligations between the NWS and others in terms of rights and obligations; cost-effectiveness; that the treaty should not affect the use of nuclear energy 'for peaceful purposes'; and "that the issue of existing stocks must be dealt with" in "parallel discussions" if it is not realistic to find a comprehensive solution in the fissban negotiations.

Saying that focussing exclusively on a cut-off of future production was not enough, Norway called for "the entire field of weapons usable fissile material" to be addressed "in a comprehensive manner". Praising the 'pathbreaking initiative' of the US-Russian Joint Statement of Principles for Management and Disposition of Plutonium, Norway identified four aspects that should be addressed multilaterally: future production as envisaged by the CD's negotiating mandate (contained in the Shannon report); stockpiles related to excess weapons material, including the development of norms covering irreversibility, safety, security and standards for national control, auditing and transparency; HEU for non-explosive purposes and naval propulsion; and military stocks, as outlined in Norway's 1997 four-step proposal for increased transparency and confidence-building through voluntary measures.

Building on its own experiences, South Africa substantially agreed with the foregoing suggestions for how the negotiations and verification system might address "non-proscribed" uses of "weapons-grade" materials, surplus stocks and irreversibility. South Africa further argued that verification arrangements should be worked out for facilities where production is closed down or redirected into non-military uses. Noting that an essential function of a fissban was to contribute to a "quantitative capping" of nuclear arsenals, South Africa suggested that it would be better to focus beyond fissile materials and include "certain other transuranic elements from which nuclear explosives can be made". Recognising the practical difficulties of providing fully accurate and complete declarations about past production and stocks, South Africa considered that declarations of historical production could be made as a "political gesture of goodwill".

Safeguards

During the closed debate on safeguards, many states emphasised their support for the IAEA Model Protocol, developed under the 93+2 programme to strengthen the safeguards regime. The EU statement announced that its member states would endeavour to conclude their ratification procedures in

time for the 2000 Review Conference, while the United States said it intended to submit its additional protocol to the Senate for advice and consent by the end of 1999. Although Russia and China reportedly contributed to the safeguards debate, no papers or English translations were made available to enable NGOs excluded from the session to assess what was said. There were several calls for all remaining states to conclude Additional Protocols with the IAEA without delay, with New Zealand proposing the goal of universal subscription to the Additional Protocol by the year 2000. In addition, there were calls for greater integration of traditional safeguards with Model Protocol safeguards, with the objectives of increased efficiency, cost effectiveness, and establishing both methods as the norm for safeguards and the full implementation of article III in the future.

In addition to references to non-compliance during the general debate, several states expressed concern about the lack of progress in implementing safeguards in the DPRK. A number also condemned Iraq's non-compliance with UN Security Council resolutions on the elimination of its weapons of mass destruction and supported efforts to re-establish an effective disarmament and monitoring regime.

Several states raised the problem of illicit trafficking of nuclear materials. The United States in particular proposed that the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material be extended to cover nuclear material in domestic use and storage, a point with which Canada and others concurred. The IAEA Director General will convene an experts meeting in Vienna in November to consider this further. France, however, expressed reservations about the sensitivity of verification in this area, arguing that "the best is liable to be the enemy of the good".

There was support for further efforts on the part of the NWS to put 'excess' fissile materials under IAEA safeguards, including the US-Russia-IAEA trilateral initiative. The UK also outlined the steps announced in its Strategic Defence Review to place more nuclear material under international safeguards and to increase transparency in relation to all its holdings of nuclear materials. France highlighted its plans, along with Germany, Italy and Russia, to reprocess excess weapons plutonium into mixed oxide (MOX) fuel.

Nuclear Energy

As in previous years, many statements supported the Article IV provision on nuclear energy and called for wider financial contributions to the Technical Cooperation Fund. Many of the nuclear supplier states emphasised the importance of the export control regime. In response to criticism from the NAM and others that these controls impeded access to technology and assistance for developing nuclear energy, Italy, as current chair of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), announced that a comprehensive report on transparency of NSG activities will be prepared in time for the 2000 Review Conference.

Several states supported the Convention on Nuclear Safety, which held its first review meeting in Vienna last month. Austria, one of the few states which refuses to back nuclear power, drew attention to its understanding that information provided at the meeting "clearly showed the existence of safety deficits" and that "implementation of measures for improvement can

and will be expected". More than ten years after the Chernobyl nuclear accident in Ukraine, it is clear that money is still required to assist in clean-up operations. In addition, a number of states raised concerns about safety hazards arising from the Year 2000 (Y2K) computer problems, also called the Millennium bug. Several supported IAEA efforts to deal with the problem, although some, including Australia and Austria, wanted better information.

Several, including Australia and New Zealand, who cited last year's meeting of the South Pacific Forum, and Peru, expressed concerns about the maritime transport of radioactive materials through their region. New Zealand reiterated its request for states to adopt "at least prior notification and ideally prior informed consent procedures" for transshipment of radioactive materials. However, France and Japan, which are responsible for transporting much of this material insisted that there must be no impediment to the "rights and freedoms of navigation".

Written by Rebecca Johnson and Nicola Butler

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

To: Fran Teplitz <fteplitz@peace-action.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Mtg. w/Mark Dooley
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 05:36 PM 5/14/99 -0400, you wrote:

>Greetings,

>

>Mark Dooley, an aide with Rep. Woolsey, would like to meet with NWWG
>members on one of the following dates to talk about nuclear abolition work.

>He wants to include plans for working with Helen Caldicott when she is in
>Washington, DC on June 22.

>

>Please let me know by Wednesday, 5/19 if you can make one or all of the
>following times if you wish to attend. Thanks.

>

>Thursday, June 3 at 9:30am

>Thursday, June 3 at 4:00pm

>Friday, June 4 at noon

Fran,

As far as I know, any of these dates is okay with me.

Howard

>

>

>Fran Teplitz

>Peace Action Education Fund

>

>

>

>

Return-Path: <joe@fctl.org>
From: Joe Volk <joe@fctl.org>
Reply-To: catherine <catherine@fctl.org>
To: adina rosenbaum <arosenbaum@uahc.org>,
American Bapt Churches OGR
<ograbc@aol.com>,
anna rich <arich@fas.org>, BASIC
<basicus@basicint.org>,
bill hartung <hartung@newschool.edu>, bob musil
<bmusil@psr.org>,
bob tiller <btiller@psr.org>, brad morse
<bmorse@igc.org>,
brian hughes <brian@taxpayer.net>,
"bridget @ work"
<moixb@newschool.edu>, bruce hall <panukes@igc.org>,
caleb rossiter
<pdd@clark.net>, catherine <catherine@fctl.org>,
cena swisher
<cena@taxpayer.net>,
charles mccollough <mccolloc@ucc.org>, chris davis
<cdavis@clw.org>,
chris paine <cpaine@nrhc.org>, chuck ferguson
<cferg@fas.org>,
chuck woolery <chuck@wfa.org>,
Church of the Brethren
<washofc@aol.com>,
Church Women United <cwu-dc@churchwomen.org>,
corey gay <cgay@isis-online.org>,
craig cerniello <craig@armscontrol.org>,
dan plesch <dplesch@basicint.org>,
danya greenfield <dgreenfield@clw.org>,
darryl fagin <fagin@ix.netcom.com>,
daryl byler
<J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org>,
daryl kimball <dkimball@clw.org>, david culp <dculp@igc.org>,
Disarmament Clearinghouse
<disarmament@igc.org>,
don kraus <cunr@aol.com>, edith villastrigo
<cedar@tfn.net>,
erik floden <efloden@clw.org>, fran teplitz
<paprog@igc.org>,
francyne harrigan <fharrigan@hotmail.com>,
gillian gilhool <ggilhool@ix.netcom.com>,
gordon clark <paexec@igc.org>, greg speeter <info@natprior.org>,
heather hamilton <hamiltoh@rtk.nett>, heather nolen <hnolen@igc.org>,
howard diamond <howard@armscontrol.org>, howard hallman <mupj@igc.org>,
james wyerman <jwyerman@2020vision.org>,
jay lintner <lintnerj@ucc.org>, jean sammon <jsammon@networklobby.org>,
jen washburn <washburj@newschool.edu>,
jenefer ellingston
<jellingston@erols.com>,
jenny smith <jsmith@clw.org>,
Jesuit Social Ministries - USA <jesuitusa@igc.org>,

jim matlack
<jmatlack@erols.com>, joan wade <fellow@2020vision.org>,
"joe @ fcnl"
<joe@fcnl.org>, john isaacs <jdi@clw.org>,
john pike <johnpike@fas.org>, kate joseph <kjoseph@basicint.org>,
"kathy @ fcnl" <kathy@fcnl.org>,
"kevin o'neill" <koneill@isis-online.org>,
kimberly roberts
<kroberts@psr.org>, kimberly robson <wand@wand.org>,
larry ekin
<info@paxworld.org>, laura kriv <laura@2020vision.org>,
lee vander laan
<vfp@igc.org>, liesl heeter <heeter@csbahome.com>,
lisa wright
<lwright@igc.org>, lynn fredriksson <etandc@igc.apc.org>,
mara kaufman
<pacampusnet@igc.org>, marcus corbin <defense@pogo.org>,
marie rietmann
<ctbt@2020vision.org>,
marijke haworth <haworthm@ucc.org>,
marissa vitagliano <marissa@vi.org>, martha honey <ipsps@igc.org>,
meg riley <uuawo@aol.com>, melissa becker <will@wand.org>,
michelle bazie
<bazie@cbpp.org>, mike fonte <mfonte@clw.org>,
"ned @ fcnl"
<ned@fcnl.org>, nisha baliga <nbaliga@psr.org>,
patrick lester
<lesterp@rtk.net>, peter davies <PJDAVIES@aol.com>,
piers wood
<pwood@cdi.org>, "rachel @ fcnl" <rachel@fcnl.org>,
ralph de gennaro
<ralph@taxpayer.net>,
robert courtnage <chapter@spusa.org>,
robert vandivier <bobvan@erols.com>, sandy ionno <sionno@spusa.org>,
scott nathanson <Pdd@clark.net>, spurgeon keeny <smk@armscontrol.org>,
stacey towles <towles@csbahome.com>,
steve kosiak <kosiak@csbahome.com>,
steve raikin <stevenraikin@delphi.com>, suzy kerr <skerr@clw.org>,
tamar gabelnick <tamarg@fas.org>, tim barner <TBarner@wfa.org>,
todd perry <tperry@ucsusa.org>, tom cardamone <cardamone@clw.org>,
tom clements <tom.clements@wdc.greenpeace.org>,
tom collina
<tcollina@ucsusa.org>, tom graham <tgraham@lawscns.org>,
tori holt
<tholt@clw.org>, wade boese <wade@armscontrol.org>,
walter owensby
<walter_owensby@pcusa.org>

Cc: Catherine Stratton <catherine@fcnl.org>

Subject: Sign on letter to Authorizers and Appropriators

Date: Mon, 17 May 1999 17:22:44 -0400

X-MS-TNEF-Correlator: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF6127750@SERVER1>

Dear Monday Lobby folks,

This is the final copy of the sign-on letter to DoD Authorizers and Appropriators which was passed out at Monday Lobby this afternoon. Please contact Catherine Stratton at FCNL by Wednesday morning at 10:00 am to sign on. The letter will be dropped Wednesday afternoon.

Thanks. (email: catherine@fcnl.org, ph: 202-547-6000, fax: 202-547-6019)

May 19, 1999

Dear (Representative or Senator):

We are very concerned about the current trend towards increasing military spending without looking critically at current and future defense spending. While we share a common concern for advancing human security at home and abroad, this means something far different than giving a blank check to the Pentagon and defense contractors.

The FY2000 defense budget robs billions from the social security surplus and places a tremendous burden on social programs at a time when there is tremendous need for adequate education, housing, and health care, especially among the children and the elderly.

There are many reasons to oppose increases in military spending.

- * In 1999 the Pentagon continues to be unable to account for billions of dollars in expenditures and inventory.
- * Currently there are plans to build not one, not two, but three new tactical aircraft despite the overwhelming superiority of the F-15. We do not need three new fighter aircraft.
- * The Pentagon wants to close unneeded bases around the country but Congress continues to resist.
- * Reducing the number of nuclear delivery systems, such as missiles and submarines, to within the overall limits of Start II would yield a ten-year savings of \$20.9 billion.
- * The Navy continues to build new submarines despite the fact that it is retiring some Los Angeles-class submarines before the end of their life span.
- * The Navy could also reduce the number of aircraft carriers and air wings to 10. Such a reduction would result in a ten-year savings of \$21.1 billion.

These are not radical ideas. These are but a few of the suggestions from the Congressional Budget Office on ways to reduce Pentagon spending.

Congress could easily save more than \$40 billion per year in military spending without endangering U.S. security. Your leadership is critical in order to make this happen. We urge you to save tax-payer dollars and redirect them to more productive purposes.

Sincerely,

Edith Villastrigo
Women Strike for Peace

Edward (Ned) W. Stowe
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Suzy S. Kerr
Council for a Livable World Education Fund

Paul Walker
Veterans for Peace

Marie Paprin (check the name)
Fund for New Priorities for America

Gordon S. Clark
Peace Action

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\Signonle

To: catherine@fcn1.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Sign-on letter on defense spending
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

I'll sign the letter to Congress on defense sending that Joe Volk circulated

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

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 17 May 1999 22:44:29 -0700 (PDT)
From: rej@acronym.org.uk (Rebecca Johnson)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT brf 6
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org (Unverified)

1999 NPT Briefing 6 from The Acronym Institute

May 17 1999 On Papers, Zones and the Middle East

When asked how the closed debates on the Chair's working papers were going, one diplomat (outside for a smoke) said it was like passing the 34th floor: "okay so far". New York is full of skyscrapers so such analogies come easy. After the confusion and deadlock at the Second PrepCom of the NPT in 1998, diplomats attending the Third PrepCom are nervous of failure. The 2000 Review Conference will be the first real test of the strengthened review process agreed in 1995. A lot therefore hinges on having a successful and constructive meeting now, to sort out as many practical issues as possible before 2000.

So far, the first week of the PrepCom seemed to have gone well. The Chair, Ambassador Camilio Reyes of Colombia, had prepared carefully and took the meeting briskly through a general debate and substantive sessions on nuclear disarmament, safeguards and nuclear energy, including special attention devoted to the Middle East, the fissile materials production ban (mired in CD politicking) and practical approaches for nuclear disarmament, as called for in the 1995 programme of action. The opening debate also enabled delegations to air views on the desired outcome and 'products' (documents containing negotiated agreements) for the 2000 Conference. Underneath the businesslike atmosphere, however, there is a sense of unhealed scars and grievances, contributing to lurking beartraps: would the United States and Egypt find a way to compromise on how to address the 1995 Middle East Resolution and Israel's nuclear programme? would states cooperate in finalising the preparations for the 2000 Conference or would some throw spanners into the works to advance their other political agendas? would the PrepCom succeed this time in making recommendations on substance to the 2000 Conference, and if so, what would they say about nuclear disarmament, the South Asian tests or the Middle East?

Monday 17 May was almost entirely taken up with discussions about the role and content of the two working papers tabled by Reyes last Friday. First, however, it was agreed to include the CTBT Organisation with the regional intergovernmental organisations, such as OPANAL or the South Pacific Forum. This paved the way for the rules of procedure to be adopted.

The Chair's first paper sought agreement for recommending two basic 'products' for 2000, a forward looking 'objectives' document and a review and assessment (backward-looking) document, leaving open the question of other possible agreements. It was supported by several delegations, including Brazil, Canada, South Africa, New Zealand and Britain, though some had suggestions for changes. For example several regarded the paragraph on

making "every effort" to adopt documents by consensus redundant, since the rules of procedure already encourage this, outlining the voting procedure under rule 28 if consensus is too elusive. France was especially adamant on the importance of consensus and again argued for a composite document based on the work of the three main committees. Mexico, Egypt and Iran, however, considered it premature to make a commitment to two principal documents. Like France (but for different reasons) they would prefer a single 'sink or swim' document, comprising both forward and backward looking elements. After many statements the delegations were no closer to agreement. The debate was therefore shelved, although Reyes may seek to resubmit a revised version later in the week.

Reyes' second Chair's paper comprised 31 paragraphs covering eight themes: universality, non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament, nuclear-weapon-free zones, security assurances, safeguards, the resolution on the Middle East and 'peaceful uses' of nuclear energy. It was intended to offer a starting point for developing recommendations on substance for the second PrepCom. Some delegations wanted to start immediate negotiations, seeking to insert their proposals into the text or delete paragraphs they did not like. Others thought it would be better to have an open discussion on the paper, but leaving it to the Chair and Secretariat to incorporate the views and revise the drafts. It is expected that negotiations on the themes will begin on Tuesday, but some delegations are still wondering where such work fits in. The recommendations from the PrepCom, even if adopted by consensus, are not binding on the Review Conference, although they could undoubtedly help to facilitate the planning and negotiations for 2000.... or not.

Nuclear Weapon Free Zones

Positive references were made to the concept of nuclear weapon free zones "freely arrived at" by the relevant states in a region, and especially to the full implementation of the NWFZ in Latin America and the Caribbean (Tlatelolco), the South Pacific (Rarotonga), Africa (Pelindaba) and South East Asia (Bangkok). Referring to problems over the protocols covering the zone of application of the security assurances expected from them, the United States said that it continued to "work intensively with the nations of Southeast Asia to fashion an approach that would permit the United States to sign the Protocol to the Treaty of Bangkok". Brazil raised its sponsorship of UNGA resolutions supporting a nuclear weapon free Southern Hemisphere and adjacent areas, noting that the initiative was receiving increasing support, with 154 votes in favour in the 1998 UN General Assembly.

More and more states, notably the United States and Britain, as well as the Non-Aligned Movement, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Switzerland and Mongolia, have welcomed progress on the initiative by five Central Asian countries to establish a NWFZ in their region. Noting that South Asian nuclear tests had "underlined the importance of regional approaches to disarmament and nonproliferation", the Kyrgyz Republic joined Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan in updating the NPT on their progress (together with Tajikistan and Turkmenistan) to establish a NWFZ in Central Asia. A working paper from the five Central Asian states welcomed the continued assistance from the UN and IAEA, as well as participants from the NWS, and hoped that a treaty establishing the Central Asian NWFZ would be completed and ready for signature at the earliest date possible.

Belarus reiterated its initiative on establishing a nuclear-weapon-free space in Central and Eastern Europe, prompting a furious response from 13 others. Croatia, on behalf also of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia, rejected Belarus' initiative on the grounds that there was no consensus in the region and that NWFZ "should not interfere with existing or evolving security arrangements". In a bitter exchange, Belarus queried the notion of collective security "based on a military alliance whose major strategic component is the concept of nuclear deterrence and refusal to undertake an obligation not to use nuclear weapons first" and remarked that of the 13 "three...have already become new members of the North Atlantic alliance and are bearing responsibility for barbaric bombing of sovereign Federal Republic of Yugoslavia without authorisation of the UN Security Council using, inter alia, prohibited types of weapons". Others, it noted, were seeking NATO membership.

Middle East

The NAM working paper, introduced by Indonesia, contained six paragraphs supporting the full implementation of the resolution on the Middle East, including establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction. It called on Israel to accede to the NPT without further delay. The NAM also pointedly emphasised article I's prohibition on transferring nuclear devices or technology to Israel and sought to prevent any assistance in the nuclear, scientific or technological fields to Israel "as long as it remains a non-party to the Treaty and has not placed all its nuclear facilities under full-scope IAEA safeguards". The NAM statement proposed that the 2000 Review Conference should establish a subsidiary body under Main Committee II "to consider and recommend proposals on the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East..."

On behalf of the Arab States, Algeria noted that since 1995 all the Arab states had become NPT parties, leaving Israel as the sole state in the region still refusing to accede to the Treaty. The Arab States submitted a working paper which reinforced the recommendations made by the NAM paper and called on all NPT parties, particularly the NWS to "shoulder their responsibilities, extend their cooperation and exert their utmost efforts" to achieve the full implementation of the resolution on the Middle East. Statements by several Arab countries supported the NAM and Arab League positions. Egypt also demanded that a "substantive part of the report of the PrepCom" should reflect the issue in a separate section, calling on Israel to accede to the Treaty and stressing the "special responsibility of the depositary states that have co-sponsored the 1995 resolution". Egypt submitted its own working paper, for the PrepCom to transmit to the Review Conference. It proposed language relating Israel's nuclear capabilities to articles I, II, III, IV, and VII.

Many others, including Germany, on behalf of the EU, Canada, Malaysia and South Africa, made clear their support for the implementation of the 1995 resolution, which France (in a separate statement) called "an integral part of the set of four documents agreed" at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. The EU urged "the earliest possible accession by all States in the region which have not yet done so to the NPT and to the Chemical and

Biological Weapons Conventions, as well as to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, in the pursuit of the goal of universal adherence to all these instruments..." Several others, including the United States and South Africa echoed this call. Emphasising the importance also of the Middle East Peace Process, South Africa underlined from its own experience that "with the destruction of our nuclear weapons capability came real security for ourselves and for the countries of our region". South Africa reiterated the paragraph from the New Agenda Coalition resolution to the UNGA, calling on "all three states that are nuclear weapons capable" and that have not yet acceded to the NPT to reverse their pursuit to develop and deploy nuclear weapons and "refrain from any actions which would undermine regional and international peace and security". Nigeria also reminded the Middle East states of the positive lessons learned from the successful experience of establishing the African NWFZ, including "the positive and catalytic political effect from Apartheid South Africa's successful peace process with the frontline and neighbouring African states".

Seeking to avoid the problems of 1998, the United States said that it shared the view that the goals and objectives of the 1995 Middle East resolution "remain valid until those goals are achieved", and that "Middle East issues are relevant to discussions of universality and NWFZ", as well as considering issues of universality, compliance and enhanced safeguards. The United States gave further details of its approach, declaring that "to promote further adherence [to the NPT] the United States, by law and policy, does not engage in nuclear cooperation with non-parties to the Treaty". Noting again problems of Iraqi non-compliance and the South Asian tests, the United States said that "we see that the challenges facing the NPT require the review process to look beyond a single region and focus on issues across the board". They must now be hoping that the election of Ehud Barak as Israel's new Prime Minister will herald a more positive approach to the peace process and regional security and non-proliferation issues.

Written by Rebecca Johnson with assistance from Nicola Butler.

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

Return-Path: <syoun@clw.org>
X-Sender: syoun@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 18 May 1999 10:31:57 -0400
To: syoun@clw.org
From: Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>
Subject: Sign-on Letter on Kerrey Amendment

To: Coalition members and friends
Fm: Stephen Young
Re: Kerrey Amendment sign-on letter

(Sorry for sending this again. But it needed a subject line.)

Below is a draft letter to go to US Senators on the upcoming Kerrey amendment to the Defense Authorization bill. For those of you who have not heard, the Senate Armed Services Committee renewed the restriction requiring the US to maintain START I levels until Russia ratifies START II. The Kerrey amendment will strike that restriction.

The Coalition will be sending out an Issue Brief on this topic this week.

Please send sign-ons to John Isaacs at the Council, at: jdi@clw.org

Thank you

+ + + + +

Draft letter for organizations and individuals 5/17/99 - John Isaacs - edits welcome

If you can sign this letter, please send via e-mail your name, title and organization, if appropriate, to "jdi@clw.org"

Deadline: The day the Defense Authorization bill is brought to the Senate floor, which could be by the end of this week, next week or after Memorial Day.

Dear Senator:

We urge you to support an amendment to be offered by Senator Robert Kerrey to the fiscal 2000 Defense Authorization bill to delete a provision barring retirement of additional nuclear weapons delivery systems until the Russian Duma ratifies START II.

For the past two years, the Senate Armed Services Committee has placed a clause in the Defense Authorization bill barring reductions of strategic nuclear delivery systems below the START I levels until START II enters into effect. This year the Committee approved the same provision, with one change at the behest of the Navy to permit a reduction from 18 to 14 Trident strategic nuclear submarines.

The Committee-approved provision locks the U.S. into a position that bases our security decisions on votes in the Communist-dominated Duma. The U.S. should determine the size and shape of our nuclear weapons deployment

based on our own national security needs; we should not be prisoners to the most reactionary elements of the Russian Duma.

Moreover, there is little doubt that the U.S. could reduce its nuclear weapons stockpile without fear of ceding any advantage to Russia. Regardless of whether its Duma ratifies START II, Russia cannot afford to maintain its currently large nuclear forces, and its arsenal will decline. Assistant Secretary of Defense, Strategy and Threat Reduction Edward Warner III recently told the Senate Armed Services Committee:

"We believe by 2005, in light of the very small modernization efforts they have underway, and the obsolescence of many major components of both their submarines and their strategic missile forces, they [Russia] will be hard-pressed to keep a force of more than about 3,500 weapons. And our intelligence analysts say in light of current developments — again we're projecting out over a decade -- by about the year 2010, they will be hard-pressed to even meet a level of about 1,500 weapons."

Aside from Russia, there is no other present or future nuclear adversary that will have nearly as many nuclear weapons as the U.S. The Chinese are estimated to have a mere 19 nuclear weapons capable of hitting the U.S. compared to our more than 6,000 long- range nuclear weapons.

In addition, there can be substantial savings from nuclear weapons cuts. The Congressional Budget Office recently estimated that reducing U.S. forces to START II levels by 2007 could produce a savings of \$570 million in fiscal 2000 and a \$12.7 billion savings over 10 years. The CBO further estimated that reductions in nuclear delivery systems within the overall limits of START II could produce savings of \$20.9 billion.

Almost a decade after the end of the Cold War, it is time for the U.S. to eliminate outdated laws and weapons deployments while saving billions of dollars. We urge you to vote for the Kerrey amendment.

Yours sincerely,

Tom Z. Collina, Director
Arms Control and International Security Program,
Union of Concerned Scientists

Maureen Eldredge, Program Director
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Daryl Fagan
Legislative Director
Americans for Democratic Action

John Isaacs, President
Council for a Livable World

James Matlack, Director, Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

Charles McCollough, Staff Associate
United Church of Christ, Office for Church in Society

Maurice Paprin, Co-Chairman
Fund for New Priorities in America

Paul Walker, President
Veterans for Peace

James K. Wyerman, Executive Director
20/20 Vision National Project

Stephen Young, Deputy Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Ave. NE #505
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795 ext. 102; fax: (202)546-7970
website: <<http://www.crnd.org>>

To: jdi@clw.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Letter on Kerrey Amendment
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

John,

I'll sign the letter on the Kerrey Amendment. Thanks for doing this.

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

Return-Path: <syoun@clw.org>
X-Sender: syoun@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 18 May 1999 12:44:36 -0400
To: syoun@clw.org
From: Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>
Subject: New Issue Brief on Congressional mandate to START I levels

To: Coalition members and friends
Fr: Stephen Young
Re: Issue Brief on Congressional mandate to START I levels

Below is the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers' new Issue Brief on the Congressional legislation requiring the US to maintain its nuclear forces at START I levels until Russia ratifies START II. Given the long delays expected before START II will enter into force, the Brief argues that the restriction should be lifted and alternative measures to the START process should be pursued to reduce the nuclear threat.

The Issue Brief is available, in a more aesthetically pleasing form, on the web at: <http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n1.htm>

The web version also includes a table from the Congressional Budget Office study on the savings produced by reducing to START II levels.

+ + + + +

Stuck at START:
U.S. Forced to Maintain its Nuclear Arsenal
while Russia's Declines Issue Brief

VOL. 3, NO. 1, May 17, 1999

RUSSIA'S NUCLEAR ARSENAL is shrinking. Its aging nuclear weapons are reaching the end of their service lifetime, and Russia cannot afford to repair or replace them. Meanwhile, in the United States, Congressional legislation mandates that the U.S. maintain its nuclear arsenal at levels set in START I until Russia ratifies START II. Unless this situation changes, the U.S. will be forced to spend billions of dollars to keep its START I arsenal of 6,000 strategic nuclear weapons, while Russia's forces decline, through attrition, to fewer than 1,000.

START I was signed in 1991 and entered into force in 1994. START II calls for reductions to 3,000-3,500 strategic nuclear warheads each and the elimination of land-based multi-warhead missiles. START II was signed in 1993 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in 1996, but Russia's Duma has repeatedly postponed a vote on the treaty.

The Congressional legislation was intended, at least in part, to pressure Russia to ratify START II. First added to the fiscal year 1998 Defense Authorization Bill by Sen. Robert Smith (R-NH), the legislation requires maintaining the U.S. arsenal at START I levels of 71 B-52H bombers, 18 Trident ballistic missile submarines, 500 Minuteman III inter-continental ballistic missiles, and 50 MX Peacekeeper missiles.

However, the effect of the legislation has been to give the recalcitrant Russian Duma the authority to determine the size - and cost - of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Moscow's anger over NATO's bombing of Yugoslavia brought U.S.-Russian relations to a low point. It is extremely unlikely that the Duma will ratify START II before Russian elections later this year. Despite the ongoing reductions in its nuclear arsenal, some observers believe Russia may never ratify START II. Thus, it makes little sense to require maintaining U.S. forces at START I levels, particularly given the high cost of doing so.

The High Cost of Cold War Relics

A new study by the Congressional Budget Office describes the dramatic savings that can be obtained by reducing U.S. nuclear forces to START II levels: \$570 million in fiscal 2000 and \$12.7 billion over ten years. Making additional reductions in nuclear systems, while keeping the same number of warheads as under START II, could lead to a total of \$20.9 billion in savings in the next decade.

The Senate Armed Services Committee renewed the restriction this year, with one alteration. With the support of the U.S. Navy, the requirement for Trident submarines was reduced from 18 to 14. It would cost \$5-\$7 billion over the next decade to keep those last four submarines in service, money the Navy would rather spend elsewhere. For its part, the Clinton Administration argues that, while it plans to remain at START I force levels for the foreseeable future (apart from the reduction to 14 Tridents), it prefers that Congress not mandate that position.

In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee this April, Assistant Secretary of Defense Edward Warner confirmed the U.S. government's expectation that, even without START II ratification, Russia "will be unable, by the middle of the next decade, to maintain strategic forces at even a START II level of 3,000-3,500 warheads." Russian Defense Minister Igor Sergeev has said that Russia is likely "to have no more than 500 deployed strategic warheads by 2012 for economic reasons."

Wanted: New Thinking

There are a number of reasons why removing the Congressional restriction makes sense - in terms of maintaining the U.S. arsenal, reducing the nuclear threat, and saving substantial taxpayer money.

Removing the Congressional restriction would allow the U.S. military and the Clinton Administration to explore alternate ways to reduce the nuclear threat. One difficulty with the ongoing decline in Russian forces is that it cannot be verified fully. The moribund START II was one option to verify those reductions, but given its status, other options must be pursued. One proposal is to pursue parallel, reciprocal, and verifiable reductions with Russia. For example, in exchange for U.S. reductions to START II - or even START III (2,000-2,500 strategic warheads) - levels, both sides could agree to use the verification provisions of START I to monitor deeper reductions.

In fact, some of the most dramatic reductions in nuclear arsenals took

place outside the formal treaty process. In September 1991, President George Bush announced dramatic unilateral U.S. reductions in tactical nuclear forces deployed in Europe and on ships. The number of deployed tactical forces dropped significantly; in Europe alone, they fell from over 7,000 to less than 1,000. Bush also ordered off alert a thousand U.S. warheads deployed on strategic bombers and ballistic missiles slated for dismantlement. In response, Russian President Mikhail Gorbachev withdrew all tactical weapons from outside Russian territory, removed most categories of tactical nuclear weapons from service and designated thousands of nuclear warheads to dismantlement.

Reductions in nuclear warheads to START II levels would help solve the tritium problem faced by U.S. forces. Tritium is an essential component of U.S. nuclear weapons, but it decays at a rapid rate and must be replaced. At present, the U.S. is recycling tritium from dismantled warheads, and is poised to spend billions of dollars on a new tritium production source. The plans for producing tritium face complications and delay; making available tritium from warheads above START II levels would ease the deadline for finding a new source. If the Congressional mandate barring reductions in U.S. forces is maintained, billions of dollars will be wasted on an oversized nuclear arsenal that does not serve America's national interests.

#

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce the dangers of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction.

*The views and analysis expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of every member of the Coalition. For more information, please contact Stephen Young on (202) 546-0795, ext. 102, or email syoung@clw.org

Stephen Young, Deputy Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Ave. NE #505
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795 ext. 102; fax: (202)546-7970
website: <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Wed, 19 May 1999 17:38:44 +0200
From: "Beatrice MERAHI" <bem@wcc-coe.org>
To: <pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Subject: pov-1: Call for action to support 2 national campaigns on small arms
reduction
Content-Disposition: inline
Sender: owner-pov-1@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: "Beatrice MERAHI" <bem@wcc-coe.org>

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

Dear friends,

Please find attached some information on two national campaigns to reduce the availability of small arms for your consideration and action:

WCC SUPPORTS MICRO DISARMAMENT INITIATIVES

The World Council of Churches (WCC) is supporting two national campaigns to reduce the availability of small arms, such as handguns and assault weapons, and surveying churches for information on their current anti-gun efforts. The WCC is calling on its ecumenical partners to support and join in these initiatives.

Signature Campaign in Brazil

A Brazilian anti-gun campaign has been launched by WCC's Peace to the City partner VIVA RIO on Tuesday, 11 May. The Peace to the City global campaign is part of the WCC Programme to Overcome Violence.

Last April Brazil's president Fernando Henrique Cardoso proposed legal steps to ban the commerce of small arms in Brazil. With its signature campaign VIVA RIO seeks to support this political initiative. According to VIVA RIO coordinator, Rubem César Fernandes, *Brazil accounts for more than 9 per cent of the world's fatal casualties from gun shot wounds, while Brazil's population amounts to 2,6 per cent of the world's population.* Fernandes is optimistic about the outcome of the campaign: *The political will of the president of the Republic as well as the existence of a strong social movement in the country create the possibility of a significant example, which can be boosted on a global scale.*

The International Action Network of Small Arms (IANSA) has called for an international signature campaign in support of VIVA RIO's national initiative, which seeks to end the trade of small arms Brazil. As a founding member of IANSA, the WCC endorses the international campaign.

The Bell Campaign in the United States of America

The WCC also supports a new campaign in the USA aimed at *reducing the numbers and availability of handguns and assault weapons*. The Bell Campaign, led by *victims of gun trauma* will be launched on Tuesday, 25 May in eight major cities in the USA, and national organizers have indicated that many churches will ring their church bells at the conclusion of the official launch at 11:00 am (local time).

Rev. Jeffrey Brown, WCC Peace to the City partner in Boston, is calling for more churches to join in the campaign. "As an inner-city pastor who presides over funerals for victims and comforts families traumatized by gun violence, I applaud any action to mobilize a large scale effort to reduce gun violence. Events in places like Littleton, Colorado consistently prove that the spectre of violence is universal, and has spread like an epidemic from the cities to the suburban enclaves and rural hamlets of the US. At the root of this is a moral and spiritual malaise. If churches do not fully commit themselves to come out of their complacency and act as part of the solution, then our children's futures are gone." WCC survey on microdisarmament

The WCC has also launched a survey to compile a resource list of faith-based organizations which are specifically engaged in small arms and light weapons disarmament. It seeks information on problems faced by communities and the type as well as the impact of initiatives dealing with small arms disarmament.

>From the information gathered in response to the questionnaire, the WCC will create a database of existing micro disarmament initiatives for resource-sharing and networking. The database will also be a tool to encourage churches to act on this issue and to assess how, in the future, the WCC can support member churches and related organizations in their efforts to ban small arms. (The survey is available on the new WCC micro disarmament web site at <http://www.wcc-coe.org/what/international/index-e.html>)

For more information we suggest that you contact both campaigns DIRECTLY at:

1. Brazil signature campaign:
Viva Rio
Ladeira da Gloria, 98 - Gloria
CEP: 22211-120
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Contact: Andre Porto:
Direct Phone: +55-21-285 5271
FAX: +55-21-558-1381
Email: vivario@ax.apc.org
Web: <http://www.vivario.org.br>

2. The Bell Campaign (USA)
Midwest Bell Campaign Coordinator Stephen Young
c/o HELP for Survivors
217 N. Jefferson St, 4h Floor
Chicago, IL 60661-1111
United States of America
Tel: +1 312 879 7920
Fax: +1 312 669 1107
e-mail: youngs@uhlich.org
Website: www.bellcampaign.org
or National Bell Campaign Launch Coordinator Laurie Leiber at
Tel: + 1 415-821-8200.

We thank you for your support.

Salpy Eskidjian
Executive Secretary for Peace, Conflict Resolution and Disarmament
International Relations
World Council of Churches

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

Return-Path: <maureene@earthlink.net>

X-Sender: maureene@earthlink.net

Date: Wed, 19 May 1999 13:26:08 -0400

To: cdavis@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org, jsmith@clw.org, syoung@clw.org,
bamorse@earthlink.net, kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, ieer@ieer.org,
mupj@igc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org, fteplitz@peace-action.org,
epank@peacenet.org, kcrandall@psr.org, kroberts@psr.org,
btiller@psr.org, brian@taxpayer.net, ctbt@2020vision.org,
laura@2020vision.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, wand@wand.org,
cferg@fas.org

From: maureen eldredge <maureene@earthlink.net>

Subject: Kerrey Amendment on START II levels

I just spoke with Todd in Sen. Kerrey's office. He said that we can go ahead and speak freely about the Kerrey amendment at this time. He said his boss is very excited about the amendment and they will have a dear colleague letter out by the beginning of the week. Floor vote is still expected next week, barring any schedule changes. I've attached a fact sheet supporting the Kerrey amendment, feel free to use as you wish.

-Maureen

If you can't open the document, let me know and I can fax it to you.

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\STARTII-.doc

Maureen Eldredge
Program Director
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Return-Path: <syoun@clw.org>
X-Sender: syoun@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Wed, 19 May 1999 13:54:38 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org, cdavis@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org, jsmith@clw.org,
syoun@clw.org, bamorse@earthlink.net, kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org,
ieer@ieer.org, mupj@igc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org,
fteplitz@peace-action.org, epank@peacenet.org, kcrandall@psr.org,
kroberts@psr.org, btiller@psr.org, brian@taxpayer.net,
ctbt@2020vision.org, laura@2020vision.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org,
wand@wand.org, cferg@fas.org, maureene@earthlink.net
From: Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>
Subject: Savings under cuts to START II levels

Dear colleagues,

Just so we all are clear (I've gotten a question on this), the CBO's almost \$13 billion in savings by going to START II levels includes \$6 billion or so saved by not refitting four Trident submarines. However, the Administration never budgeted for those refittings, so the \$13 billion in savings could be challenged by some. The CBO's explanation, which makes some sense, is that the current law requires staying at 18 subs, thus that money would have to be spent, even if the Administration hadn't budgeted for it. However, now that the new legislation only requires 14 subs, the savings again become somewhat dubious.

This may have been clear to all of you before, but it wasn't completely clear to me.

Fortunately, Frank Gaffney and company have begun the campaign to preserve the 18-submarine force, so there is something to fight against. See: "S.O.S. -- Save Our Submarines: Latest Revelation About Chinese Espionage Underscores Need to Retain Full Trident Force" at <http://www.security-policy.org/papers/1999/99-D58.html>

Stephen

Stephen Young, Deputy Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Ave. NE #505
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795 ext. 102; fax: (202)546-7970
website: <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>
Date: Wed, 19 May 1999 14:57:48 +0100
Subject: CTBT update article
From: "Marie Rietmann" <ctbt@2020vision.org>
To: mupj@igc.org

Hi Howard,

Here is the article on CTBT that is on our web page right now. It is just a basic primer on the treaty and where we are in the process with it. If you think it would be helpful to the interfaith group, please feel free to distribute it.

Marie

Reduce Global Tensions:
Break the Senate Logjam on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

By Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Coordinator
May 19, 1999

One year ago, India and Pakistan tested nuclear weapons and ignited a regional arms race that is still going on today. Meanwhile, global tensions have risen to a boiling point over the crisis in Kosovo. Consequently, prospects for nuclear risk reduction among the U.S., Russia and China have dimmed. Russian Duma ratification of START II appears to have been postponed for the foreseeable future and both these countries have halted some of their ongoing non-proliferation efforts with the U.S.

The best way to stop the arms race and prevent the spread of nuclear weapons is for the U.S. to lead by example and ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

Over two thousand nuclear tests have been conducted worldwide. The U.S. stopped testing in 1992 after doing over a thousand tests with the adoption of the moratorium put in place by former Senator Mark Hatfield (R-OR). Our nuclear weapons laboratories say they can maintain our arsenal without testing. The CTBT would freeze all countries' nuclear testing programs in place, with the U.S. having far more experience than any other country.

The U.S. and 151 other nations have already signed the treaty. The number of countries that have ratified it now totals 34, with the following countries having ratified so far this year: Azerbaijan, Finland, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, and South Africa.

In order to become international law, the treaty must be ratified by the 44 nuclear-capable countries, including the U.S. Seventeen of those countries have ratified, including Great Britain and France, but by September, diplomats expect that number to rise to more than 30. Even after NATO bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade this month, China reiterated its pledge to ratify this year. Unfortunately, the CTBT is stalled in the U.S. Senate.

Now is a critical time for the U.S. to ratify the treaty. In October, there will be an important international conference for those nations that have ratified it by then. Its purpose is to determine ways to speed entry into force. The U.S. needs to be at that table as well; we would be conspicuous by our absence. Other reasons we need to ratify now include:

- €Ratification would set an example for India, Pakistan, and other countries considering acquiring nuclear weapons;
- €We desperately need to repair our damaged relationships with Russia and China. Ratification of the CTBT would be seen as a good faith measure;
- €Ratification chances are greater before the presidential election season commences next year.

The President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and nearly half the Senate all publicly support the CTBT as do four out of five voters in recent bipartisan public opinion polls. In order for the U.S. to ratify the treaty, it must be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee and then receive a two-thirds Senate majority vote.

Despite the treaty's substantial support, Committee Chairman Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) is blocking the CTBT almost single-handedly. Senators need to put pressure on Senator Helms and the Senate leadership to help break the logjam. In a speech to the Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee May 12 at the UN, the U.S. representative to it said, "Obtaining ratification in 1999 is one of the Administration's highest priorities." Unfortunately, beyond its enthusiastic rhetoric, it does not appear the Clinton Administration is doing what it needs to in pushing the treaty.

Senators, and the Administration, need to be encouraged to do all they can to achieve CTBT ratification this year. They need to work with other Senators to convince the Foreign Relations Committee to consider the treaty and then to get a floor vote. Failure to ratify the treaty soon would be a major blow to global efforts to stem the spread of nuclear weapons.

More information on the nuclear test ban treaty available on the 20/20 Vision web page: www.2020vision.org.

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<TITLE>CTBT update article</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY BGCOLOR="#FFFFFF">

Hi Howard,

Here is the article on CTBT that is on our web page right now. It is just a
 basic primer on the treaty and where we are in the process with it. If you
 think it would be helpful to the interfaith group, please feel free to
 distribute it.

Marie

Reduce Global Tensions:

Break the Senate Logjam on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

By Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Coordinator

May 19, 1999

One year ago, India and Pakistan tested nuclear weapons and ignited a regional arms race that is still going on today. Meanwhile, global tensions have risen to a boiling point over the crisis in Kosovo. Consequently, prospects for nuclear risk reduction among the U.S., Russia and China have dimmed. Russian Duma ratification of START II appears to have been postponed for the foreseeable future and both these countries have halted some of their ongoing non-proliferation efforts with the U.S.

The best way to stop the arms race and prevent the spread of nuclear weapons is for the U.S. to lead by example and ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

Over two thousand nuclear tests have been conducted worldwide. The U.S. stopped testing in 1992 after doing over a thousand tests with the adoption of the moratorium put in place by former Senator Mark Hatfield (R-OR). Our nuclear weapons laboratories say they can maintain our arsenal without testing. The CTBT would freeze all countries' nuclear testing programs in place, with the U.S. having far more experience than any other country.

The U.S. and 151 other nations have already signed the treaty. The number of countries that have ratified it now totals 34, with the following countries having ratified so far this year: Azerbaijan, Finland, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, New Zealand, Panama, and South Africa.

In order to become international law, the treaty must be ratified by the 44 nuclear-capable countries, including the U.S. Seventeen of those countries have ratified, including Great Britain and France, but by September, diplomats expect that number to rise to more than 30. Even after NATO bombing of the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade this month, China reiterated its pledge to ratify this year. Unfortunately, the CTBT is stalled in the U.S. Senate.

Now is a critical time for the U.S. to ratify the treaty. In October, there will be an important international conference for those nations that have ratified it by then. Its purpose is to determine ways to speed entry into force. The U.S. needs to be at that table as well; we would be conspicuous by our absence. Other reasons we need to ratify now include:

€Ratification would set an example for India, Pakistan, and other countries considering acquiring nuclear weapons;

€We desperately need to repair our damaged relationships with Russia and China. Ratification of the CTBT would be seen as a good faith measure;

€Ratification chances are greater before the presidential election season commences next year.

The President, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and nearly half the Senate all publicly support the CTBT as do four out of five voters in recent bipartisan public opinion polls. In order for the U.S. to ratify the treaty, it must be considered by the Foreign Relations Committee and then receive a two-thirds Senate majority vote.

Despite the treaty's substantial support, Committee Chairman Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) is blocking the CTBT almost single-handedly. Senators need to put pressure on Senator Helms and the Senate leadership to help break the logjam. In a speech to the Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee May 12 at the UN, the U.S. representative to it said, "Obtaining ratification in 1999 is one of the Administration's highest priorities." Unfortunately, beyond its enthusiastic rhetoric, it does not appear the Clinton Administration is doing what it needs to in pushing the treaty.

Senators, and the Administration, need to be encouraged to do all they can to achieve CTBT ratification this year. They need to work with other Senators to convince the Foreign Relations Committee to consider the treaty and

then to get a floor vote. Failure to ratify the treaty soon would be a major blow to global efforts to stem the spread of nuclear weapons.

More information on the nuclear test ban treaty available on the 20/20 Vision web page: www.2020vision.org.

</BODY>

</HTML>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 19 May 1999 21:39:47 -0700 (PDT)
From: rej@acronym.org.uk (Rebecca Johnson)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT brf 7
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org (Unverified)

1999 NPT Briefing 7 from The Acronym Institute

May 19 1999 Make or Break?

For the past two days, states parties to the NPT, attending the third PrepCom to the 2000 Review Conference, have been going through the working papers submitted by the Chair, Ambassador Camilo Reyes of Colombia. By the end of Thursday, he had provided a second draft of the paper recommending the 'products' (documented agreements) which the 2000 Conference should seek to achieve. Gone was the specific recommendation for two documents, one identifying actions and approaches for the next five years and the other to review and evaluate implementation in the past five years. The Chair's working paper affirmed that the objectives of the 2000 Conference must be to look forwards as well as back, but left open the question of how this should be done, and how many documents should be negotiated in 2000.

Leaving the question open seemed to satisfy the main concerns of Mexico. Egypt, however, still pushed for a single document encompassing both review and future programmes, and France tried to introduce amendments to narrow down the options and make one document the likely outcome. Egypt also wanted the paper to reflect proposals for subsidiary bodies on the Middle East and nuclear disarmament, but others consider that this debate and decision should be left to 2000. Although most of those who objected to the first draft are now signalling that they could accept the second, with a few minor clarifications, a number of non-aligned countries have warned that they would only agree a working paper with 'product' recommendations if it were accompanied by a working paper on substantive issues.

As parties went through the May 14 Chair's paper paragraph by paragraph, putting in their amendments or alternatives, a widening gulf of perceptions and intentions has become exposed, mainly between the non-aligned NNWS and the NWS and their allies, and also between incrementalists and fundamentalists. There are tensions within both the NAM and the Western group as one or two delegations continually hold out against views that most of their colleagues support or would at least be prepared to accept. Some of the proposals are the epitome of moderation; others reflect pet national positions. Some seek to delete entire paragraphs, such as para 7 relating to nuclear sharing and articles I and II. Others want to expand or narrow the scope of existing sections, such as para 8 on the South Asian tests or para 13 on the CTBT. Some parts of the Chair's paper have hardly drawn attention, indicating a wide measure of support and consensus. In others, however, especially relating to nuclear disarmament and the Middle East, the range of different proposals and perspectives would be hard to reconcile, except at a fairly bland level.

The key question now is whether agreement can be reached on making recommendations on substance to the 2000 Conference. One senior diplomat characterised the dilemma as a choice between a paper with agreed status but not much content and a paper dealing substantively with the issues, but without agreement (and therefore no status). Unfortunately, he concluded, the PrepCom looked as if it was heading for something with neither content nor status. Early in the week it had been feared that some of the NWS might insist on watering down the substance in the Chair's paper only to reject the paper in the end, a common ploy in consensus-based structures. There is also a concern that some individual states may be prepared to sacrifice the chances of agreement in order to pursue other agendas or interests.

Indonesia, on behalf of the NAM, today warned that they would not be satisfied this time with only procedural recommendations: if the PrepCom could not agree some recommendations on substance as well, then it would be regarded as a failure.

Although there are reports that the United States and Egypt may be nearing agreement on some of the outstanding issues regarding the Middle East resolution, including background documentation, no decisions have yet been forthcoming. There have been whispered speculations about a possible fourth PrepCom, which the majority would be keen to avoid, and talk of suspending the PrepCom if no agreement on substance is forthcoming by Friday, with a view to reconvening it some months later. These are drastic options, and may be coming up now in order to galvanise the political will to ensure a constructive outcome. With two days left, and a second draft of the Chair's working paper on substance promised for Thursday, a positive outcome is within reach but by no means certain.

Security Assurances

Member States, which through their accession to the NPT as non-nuclear-weapon states (NNWS) have forsworn the option of developing nuclear weapons of their own, have long demanded guarantees from the NWS against being threatened or attacked with nuclear weapons. Such 'negative security assurances' have so far been conditional and hedged with exceptions, offered only on an individual and voluntary basis by the NWS, reinforced through endorsement in two UN Security Council resolutions, 255 (1968) and 984 (1995).

As in past years, China has called for legally binding instruments by which the NWS would "undertake unconditionally...not to be the first to use nuclear weapons nor use or threaten to use nuclear weapons" against NNWS. Indonesia, in presenting the NAM paper, reiterated the long-standing position that pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons (the only genuine guarantee for NNWS against the threat or use of nuclear weapons), a legally binding regime on security assurances should be concluded. As in their 1998 working paper, the NAM called for the PrepComs to negotiate on a legal instrument to be adopted by the 2000 Review Conference. South Africa submitted a working paper containing a draft protocol to the NPT on security assurances, which it wants to be negotiated and attached to the Treaty. Iran argued for three kinds of multilateral agreements to be pursued within the NPT context: negative security assurances to NNWS, a treaty banning the first use of nuclear weapons, and a convention of prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons.

Australia also supported consideration by the NPT Parties of possible further measures on security assurances and wanted the NWS to reiterate the terms of their 1995 declarations and UN Security Council resolution 984 (April 1995). New Zealand, however, took the view that "a real test of the commitment to security assurances must be ratification by the nuclear weapon states of the Protocols to the nuclear weapon free zone treaties". Although New Zealand "remained interested in exploring the possibilities for more robust assurances", it regarded negotiation of a single internationally legally binding instrument "problematic", and was not sure of the right way forward.

In Algeria's view, the South Asian nuclear tests and NATO's strategic concept as confirmed in the April 1999 Washington Summit have particularly exposed the inadequacies of the present assurances contained in UNSC 984. Where the NAM statement merely noted that the CD had established an ad hoc committee in 1998 on negative security assurances, something which even the United States and Britain mentioned, Algeria called for this committee to be reconvened to negotiate and conclude some kind of treaty or multilateral instrument on security assurances. Nigeria, Brazil, Kazakhstan and Malaysia mentioned security assurances as important, but did not express any preference for how they should be dealt with. In a move which surprised some, Italy gave a statement on behalf also of Belgium, Germany, Netherlands and Norway (the 'Nato-5'), which acknowledged "we have to comply with the legitimate concern of the States party to the NPT with regard to their security needs, and work for an international framework that could assure those parties to the Treaty that are non-nuclear-weapon States against the use of such weapons". The NATO-5 recognised the importance of security assurances in the context of NWFZ and of building on UNSC 984. They called for further steps to be identified, which "could take the form of a legally binding treaty". Reflecting some differences among the New Agenda states, the NAC statement called only for a legally binding instrument on NSA, without specifying where the issue should best be addressed.

Nuclear Energy

As in previous years, many statements supported the Article IV provision on nuclear energy and called for wider financial contributions to the Technical Cooperation Fund. Many of the nuclear supplier states emphasised the importance of the export control regime. In response to criticism from the NAM and others that these controls impeded access to technology and assistance for developing nuclear energy, Italy, as current chair of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), announced that a comprehensive report on transparency of NSG activities will be prepared in time for the 2000 Review Conference.

Several states supported the Convention on Nuclear Safety, which held its first review meeting in Vienna last month. Austria, one of the few states which refuses to back nuclear power, drew attention to its understanding that information provided at the meeting "clearly showed the existence of safety deficits" and that "implementation of measures for improvement can and will be expected". More than ten years after the Chernobyl nuclear accident in Ukraine, it is clear that money is still required to assist in clean-up operations. The Kyrgyz Republic wanted stricter procedures for the safe handling, transport, storage, and disposal of sensitive nuclear

material to be observed. In a section specifying the production of nuclear weapons, but more widely applicable, both the Kyrgyz statement and a working paper from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, noted that "there have been exceptional instances in which serious environmental consequences have resulted from uranium mining and associate nuclear fuel-cycle activities". In addition, a number of states raised concerns about safety hazards arising from the Year 2000 (Y2K) computer problems, also called the Millennium bug. Several supported IAEA efforts to deal with the problem, although some, including Australia and Austria, wanted better information.

Several, including Australia and New Zealand, who cited last year's meeting of the South Pacific Forum, and Peru, Chile and Argentina, expressed concerns about the maritime transport of radioactive materials through their region. New Zealand reiterated its request for states to adopt "at least prior notification and ideally prior informed consent procedures" for transshipment of radioactive materials. However, France and Japan, which are responsible for transporting much of this material insisted that there must be no impediment to the "rights and freedoms of navigation".

Written by Rebecca Johnson and Nicola Butler

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

To: lwyolton@prodigy.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Contact in New Jersey
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Bill:

The Presbyterian minister in New Jersey who was mentioned at Tuesday's meeting is:

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

I hope that you can contact him about getting Bill Bradley to speak out on the CTBT.

The above information is 15 months old. I hope it is still valid.

Shalom,
Howard

To: mark.brown@ecunet.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Next steps for the CTBT campaign
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Mark:

At our meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT on Tuesday we agreed to step up our grassroots work to influence Senator Grams in Minnesota, Senator Abrahams in Michigan, and Senator Santorum in Pennsylvania. All of them face tough re-election campaigns next year and may be susceptible of moving toward the middle.

Because ELCA is the largest Protestant denomination in Minnesota and is strong in Pennsylvania I hope that you can get your networks in these two states in particular to be in touch with Senators Grams and Santorum. Would ELCA in Minnesota be able to take the lead in getting other denominations to join in?

On another matter some thought it would be useful for your web page on the interfaith petition to indicate that the petition can still be used in individual churches and other organizations and that coordinated efforts within states remains a useful activity.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <syoun@clw.org>

X-Sender: syoun@[209.8.25.194]

Date: Thu, 20 May 1999 16:28:04 -0400

To: Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>, jdi@clw.org, cdavis@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org, jsmith@clw.org, syoun@clw.org, bamorse@earthlink.net, kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, ieer@ieer.org, mupj@igc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org, fteplitz@peace-action.org, epank@peacenet.org, kcrandall@psr.org, kroberts@psr.org, btiller@psr.org, brian@taxpayer.net, ctbt@2020vision.org, laura@2020vision.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, wand@wand.org, cferg@fas.org, maureene@earthlink.net

From: Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>

Subject: Questions over Support of Kerrey Amdmnt

Dear colleagues,

There have been some questions raised about whether the Administration will support the Kerrey Amendment, and some people saying the Administration will actually OPPOSE it.

Having spoken today with Menda Fife in Kennedy's office (the source of the some of this information) as well as to people in the Administration, a few things are clear:

1. The Administration will NOT oppose the Kerrey Admendment.
2. The Administration OPPOSES the restriction, and would like to have it lifted.
3. There is a letter from the OMB opposing the restriction that is still being worked on. When it comes out, we will circulate it.
4. It is unclear if the Administration has any resources to spend to support the Kerrey amendment.

Let's get to work! (Or keep up the work!)

Stephen

Stephen Young, Deputy Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Ave. NE #505
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795 ext. 102; fax: (202)546-7970
website: <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Thu, 20 May 1999 18:37:35 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: New Issue Brief & Op-Ed on N-Espionage and CTBT

May 20, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: alleged nuclear weapons espionage and the role of the Test Ban Treaty

Below is text of the Coalition's latest Issue Brief, "The Test Ban Treaty: Last Line of Defense Against Nuclear Weapons Espionage," which points out that nuclear testing is needed to deploy and prepare advanced nuclear weapons. The Issue Brief is also attached as a Wordperfect file. Please feel free to use the arguments cited below in your efforts.

Also below is the text of Charles Ferguson's op-ed, "Ratify Test Ban Treaty to Help Protect Nuclear Secrets", on the same topic in this week's Defense News.

I would also recommend an excellent op-ed piece by Joe Cirincione, "Putting the Chinese Nuclear Threat in Perspective," which provides some useful insights on other aspects of the controversy. It is located at <<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/Cirincione051799.html>>

Look for further information and analysis on the Coalition's CTBT Site <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>> in the coming days as the Cox Commission report is prepared for general release.

DK

"The Test Ban Treaty:
Last Line of Defense Against Nuclear Weapons Espionage"

ISSUE BRIEF
VOL. 3, NO. 2, May 20, 1999

DISTURBING DISCLOSURES ABOUT the potential loss of highly sensitive nuclear weapons design and testing data from our nation's nuclear weapons laboratories further illustrate the risks of the proliferation of nuclear weapons know-how. In addition to a thorough review and tightening of nuclear weapons laboratory security, the incident should also compel American policy makers to take action on measures that will serve to mitigate the effect of the loss of these nuclear secrets to the Chinese or others, specifically ratification and entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

Any country that wishes to deploy and prepare to use advanced nuclear weapons needs more than blueprints and computer codes for them. Nuclear weapon test explosions are also required. In particular, Chinese military leaders cannot be confident that sophisticated, new nuclear warhead types, such as those carried on inter-continental ballistic missiles, will work effectively if China cannot conduct test explosions of those weapon types.

The spread of nuclear weapons — particularly new advances in weapons development — can be severely impeded by a verifiable, international ban on nuclear weapon test explosions. The CTBT will provide this last line of defense against these nuclear dangers to the United States if it enters into force. Negotiations on the CTBT were concluded in 1996. But the Senate has not been allowed the opportunity to consider the treaty because it has been held hostage in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC) for over one and a half years. Those in the Senate who are justifiably concerned about the damage caused by the years-long nuclear espionage scandal also should be concerned about the failure of the Senate to consider the Test Ban Treaty.

Implications of Espionage at the Labs:

The report of the select House committee chaired by Rep. Christopher Cox (R-CA) reportedly shows that China has gained access to classified information on as many as seven types of U.S. nuclear warheads, including several nuclear warheads still at the core of the U.S. arsenal: the W-87 deployed on the MX missile and warheads deployed on the U.S. Minuteman long-range missiles, and on submarine-based Trident nuclear missiles. The Cox report likely will provide important lessons about the challenges of advanced nuclear weapon design, their deployment, and the necessity for the CTBT.

Worst-case scenarios, as reported in the May 14 edition of The New York Times, suggest that China may have already used some U.S. nuclear bomb data to test and certify one warhead type. China required at least six explosive tests, including one known test failure, to develop its neutron bomb despite its access to American W-70 (a.k.a. "neutron bomb") data, according to the Cox report. Ironically, it was U.S. test monitoring intelligence gained from Chinese nuclear test explosions that indicated that China had access to design information on the United States' advanced W-88 warhead.

These facts confirm that China can not confidently incorporate advanced new designs into its arsenal without extensive explosive testing. It is also clear that the CTBT would, at the very least, help prevent China and other states from adding to its arsenal those advanced nuclear weapon types that have not already been tested thoroughly enough to achieve confidence in their performance. Given the United States' substantial quantitative and qualitative edge in nuclear weaponry, it is clear that renewed nuclear testing can only serve to improve the nuclear weapons capabilities of those nations with fewer and less advanced types of nuclear weapons. Even if, by 2010, China modernizes its nuclear arsenal, and the United States reduces to its arsenal to 3500 deployed strategic warheads, the U.S. will still have a strategic nuclear force 35 times the size of China's and one deployed on more modern missiles and bombers.

A ratified and fully implemented CTBT will not only help curtail China's nuclear ambitions, but also those of its Asian neighbors, India and Pakistan. Pakistan's Prime Minister has pledged to signed the CTBT by this September and India has said it would not stand in the way of the Test Ban Treaty's entry into force, which will be the subject of an international conference led by CTBT ratifiers to be held this October. China already has signed it and may ratify this year. But to bring the CTBT into force, the United States and other key countries must also provide leadership and ratify the treaty.

Time for Action:

The longer the Senate waits to ratify the CTBT, the greater the chance that some nation may challenge the de facto global norm against nuclear testing and set off a dangerous political and military chain reaction of nuclear testing that would decrease U.S. and world security. The President must also live up to his rhetoric on the test ban. The Clinton Administration has offered up numerous strong statements calling for Senate approval of the Test Ban Treaty this year. However, the President has thus far failed to seize upon the overwhelming public support, the endorsement of military leaders, and strong Senate backing for the treaty, which would win the two-thirds majority needed for ratification if a vote were allowed.

Skeptics express qualms about America's ability to detect test ban violators, despite the fact that the Test Ban Treaty would establish a far reaching global monitoring network and the option of on- site inspections, backed up by military and civilian intelligence gathering tools. The U.S. must detect and deter nuclear testing by other states with or without the test ban — a job that can be done much more effectively with the test ban than without. Critics also complain that a CTBT may harm the United States' ability to check the reliability of our own nuclear arsenal, a position that has been repeatedly refuted by directors of the three U.S. nuclear weapons labs, as well as independent weapons scientists, who all agree that the nuclear arsenal can be maintained reliably and safely through non-explosive tests and evaluations. With these and other objections largely discredited, it is regrettable that some Senators have chosen to delay a vote on the CTBT.

China must be discouraged from any further build-up of its nuclear arsenal. At the same time, it is in the national security interest of the United States to pursue measures, like the CTBT, that create technical barriers to further nuclear weapons development by China and other nations. By prohibiting the nuclear test explosions needed to confirm advanced nuclear weapons designs such as those in the U.S. arsenal and providing the means to confidently verify compliance, the CTBT will help prevent China from using U.S. nuclear design and test data to reliably field new and more deadly nuclear weapons. To deny the CTBT is to deny the United States its last line of defense against nuclear weapons espionage.

###

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce the dangers of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. For more information, contact: Charles Ferguson at FAS

(202-546-3300); Matthew MacKenzie at NRDC (202-289-6868); or Daryl Kimball (202) 546- 0795 x136 . *The views and analysis expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of every member of the Coalition.

"Ratify Test Ban Treaty to Help Protect Nuclear Secrets"

May 24, 1999, Defense News, p. 19

by Charles Ferguson

The Senate can best repair the alleged damage to US nuclear weapons security by ratifying the nuclear Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) this year.

Wen Ho Lee, a former Los Alamos National Laboratory scientist, is accused of transferring nuclear weapons codes and related data from classified to unclassified computers, which, in principle, could be accessed from outside the laboratory.

However, if any foreign nation, such as China, acquired these codes, it would not necessarily have the ability to make workable advanced nuclear weapons.

Some may argue that if given access to US nuclear weapons data, another nation could simply reproduce these weapons. On the contrary, after China reportedly stole neutron bomb information in the early 1980s from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, China's neutron bomb test failed in 1988.

This failure allegedly provoked China to steal additional neutron bomb information in 1995.

As long as China adheres to a nuclear testing moratorium, which began within a year after China's latest alleged theft, China will not be confident that its neutron bomb would work. Global enactment of the CTBT, which bans nuclear explosive testing, will turn this moratorium into international law.

Having confidence in any nuclear weapon ultimately requires nuclear explosive testing. Military leaders would not be willing to risk their nation's defense or their careers on untested weapons.

Even China, a nation with decades of nuclear weapons experience, felt obligated to test the stolen neutron bomb design. Nations less sophisticated in nuclear weapons technology, which includes the rest of the world except for acknowledged nuclear weapons nations, will feel even more compelled to test if they want to develop advanced nuclear weapons.

Assuming the worst-case -- that foreign nations acquired US nuclear weapons codes -- the most effective defense now would be for the US to ratify the CTBT, acting as a leader to press for global enactment of this treaty and thereby severely restraining the development of these weapons.

CTBT enactment will establish an extensive International Monitoring System to detect clandestine activity to very low explosive yields. Moreover,

violators would be subject to harsh international sanctions.

While many senators justly lament the national security breach of stolen nuclear secrets, the CTBT languishes for want of Senate ratification. Without Senate ratification by September, the United States will relinquish its world leadership role and be denied a seat this fall at the special international conference on the CTBT entry into force.

Senator Jesse Helms, R-NC, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., have erected road blocks against ratification. They have prevented their senatorial colleagues from considering the virtues of the CTBT through hearings, which would lead to a floor vote.

Senators are rightly concerned about our nuclear weapons security as exemplified by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence's recent unanimous vote to investigate Chinese espionage at U.S. nuclear weapons labs. And they can best act on that concern by encouraging Senator Helms to hold hearings and Senator Lott to schedule a floor vote on the CTBT.

By so doing, the United States will be sending a clear signal to the world that it is serious about preventing nuclear proliferation. India and Pakistan tested nuclear weapons one year ago and recently flight-tested nuclear capable ballistic missiles. If the United States wants these and other nations to show nuclear restraint, it must lead by example.

Ratifying the CTBT, however, does not imply unilateral disarmament as some critics contend. Instead, the CTBT will lock in the US advantage in nuclear weapons, while curtailing the deployment of new weapons.

The United States has the most advanced nuclear weapons in the world and can rely on its science-based stockpile stewardship program to ensure the safety and reliability of its nuclear arsenal without nuclear explosive testing.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the directors of the three nuclear weapons labs have given their unanimous endorsement to the CTBT and have fully certified the United States nuclear arsenal since nuclear explosive testing stopped in 1992.

Ever since President Dwight Eisenhower, three out of four Americans have consistently supported a nuclear test ban. This support is truly bipartisan. And Senate ratification will appeal strongly to voters, especially during this post-impeachment time when Democrats and Republicans need to rally behind bipartisan issues.

While the United States must protect its secrets and upgrade its security systems, it would provide even greater world security by ratifying the CTBT this year.

###

Charles D. Ferguson, a physicist and former United States naval officer, is a senior research analyst with the Federation of American Scientists, Washington.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <kcrandall@psr.org>
Date: Thu, 20 May 1999 19:05:49 -0400
From: Kathy Crandall <kcrandall@psr.org>
Organization: PSR - Physicians for Social Responsibility
X-Accept-Language: en
To: kcrandall@psr.org
Subject: URGENT - ACT NOW TO REDUCE NUCLEAR ARSENALS

To PSR Security Activists & Friends:

Thank you to all who did such a great job with call-in days to the President last week!
Now we need you to make calls to the Senate.

I sent a brief message out last week about this opportunity. The window is closing -The Senate is likely to vote on this early next week. Please call / fax your Senators right now. . . Let me know if you need further information or if I can help in any way, and let me know the response you're getting from Senate offices.
Kathy

URGENT * URGENT *URGENT
START II SAVE with KERREY AMENDMENT

CALL & FAX YOUR SENATORS TODAY
Capitol Switchboard: 202 224 3121

TELL THEM TO SUPPORT THE KERREY AMENDMENT
to THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL
ALLOWING THE US TO REDUCE
NUCLEAR ARSENALS TO START II LEVELS

BACKGROUND:

We agreed to pursue nuclear reductions when we signed and ratified a treaty years ago, and military experts agree that we can now save money and reduce US nuclear arsenals without harming our security interests.

Why is the US waiting for the Russian Duma, to get STARTed?

THE KERREY AMENDMENT:

Senator Bob Kerrey (D-NE) plans to offer an amendment to the FY2000 Defense Authorization Act allowing the US to reduce nuclear arsenals to START II (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) Levels. *(The vote on this Act & Amendment are expected soon - possibly as early as MONDAY)*

In a speech in November 1998 Kerrey stated:

"This deployed arsenal no longer serves our national security interests, and it is provoking Russia to maintain an arsenal that undermines our national security interests . . . the several thousand nuclear warheads on Russian soil are the gravest, most imminent threat to the security of the United States."

START I signed in 1991 and entered into force in 1993 sets the ceiling of deployed strategic nuclear arsenals of Russia and the US at 6,000 each.

START II signed in 1993 and ratified by the US in 1996 sets a ceiling of 3,500 strategic deployed nuclear weapons for each country. Russia has not ratified START II.

RUSSIAN REALITY: Russian nuclear forces are rapidly deteriorating and declining. Most agree that Russia will not be able to maintain START II levels. Russian Defense Minister Igor Sergeev has stated that Russia is likely "to have no more than 500 deployed strategic warheads by 2012."

The Russian Duma has repeatedly postponed START II ratification and in the current political climate it is unlikely that Russia will ratify START II any time soon.

THE CURRENT FY 2000 DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL (S. 1059): Like past years' bills, contains a "Limitation on Retirement or Dismantlement of Strategic Nuclear Delivery Systems" (Sec. 1041) This requires the U.S. to maintain START I Level Nuclear Arsenals.

WE'RE CUTTING TRIDENTS: This year the "limitation" in the FY2000 Act does allow a reduction in the level of Trident Nuclear Subs to START II levels (14 rather than 18), but requires that all other nuclear arsenals be maintained at START I levels. The Tridents are being reduced at the request of the Navy and the Pentagon. The cut of 4 Tridents will save \$5-\$7 billion for the next decade.

WE SHOULD LET THE PENTAGON AND MILITARY LEADERS REDUCE OTHER NUKES TOO.

Eugene Habiger, US Air Force (ret) former chief of US Stratcom, has stated "There is no need to stay at the START I level from a military perspective," and even Senator John Warner (R- VA), Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee has stated that "We have to reevaluate priorities" [on strategic weapons]. "We may be able to redirect money" [from nuclear weapons Programs] Jan. 5, 1999.

LETS START SAVING MONEY NOW:

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that reducing US forces to START II levels by 2007 could produce savings of \$570 million in FY2000 and save \$12.7 billion over 10 years. The CBO further estimated that reductions in nuclear delivery systems within the overall limits of START II could produce savings of \$20.9 billion.

TRITIUM "NEED":

Going to START II levels will also alleviate the "need" to produce tritium (a radioactive gas that boosts the yield of nuclear weapons) in commercial nuclear reactors or in an accelerator . Instead we can continue recycle tritium from dismantled weapons, saving money as well as preventing health, environment and proliferation costs.

We should seize this opportunity to reduce US nuclear arsenals to START II levels and put arms reductions back on track. Leadership on this issue will send a desperately needed message to other nations, especially Russia, about our nuclear intentions. Moreover these reductions, requested by the Pentagon, will save money.

WHAT YOU CAN DO:

A VOTE ON THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL IS EXPECTED BY MONDAY OR TUESDAY OF NEXT WEEK. (It is possible that this scheduling estimate will change - so stay tuned)

IT IS EXTREMELY URGENT THAT YOU CALL/ FAX YOUR SENATORS NOW:

Capitol Switchboard (202) 224-3121

Tell Them:

Support the Kerrey Amendment, allowing the U.S. Pentagon, not the Russian Duma, to set the nuclear force levels for the U.S. It's time now to seize the opportunity to go to START II levels.

PLEASE CONTACT PSR for further Information or Assistance.

Additional Resources, Talking Points etc. can be found on the PSR Web Site. <http://www.psr.org>
Also check the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers Site at <http://www.clw.org/coalition./briefv3nl.htm>

(Many thanks to the cadre of Nuclear Disarmament Professionals with great action alerts, issue briefs, talking points etc. I have "borrowed" - especially Maureen Eldredge, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability, Bruce Hall, Peace Action, John Isaacs, Council for a Livable World, and Stephen Young, CRND.)

--

Kathy Crandall
Associate Director, Security Programs
Physicians for Social Responsibility
1101 14th Street NW #700, Washington DC 20005
TEL: 202 898 0150 ext.222
FAX: 202 898 0172
E-MAIL: kcrandall@psr.org
WEB: <http://www.psr.org>

To: "Rev. Ron Foster" <BethesdaUM@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Recruiting a sax player
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Ron:

Sunday evening at Lon's Day, sponsored by the Community Ministry of Montgomery County, the Walt Whitman jazz band played. It was the big band sound of the '40s with the true golden oldies I grew up with. They had a good sax section, and some of the players took off with improvisations.

Afterwards I talked with the director, Chris Allen, about your desire to recruit a sax player for the Praise Band. He said if I (or you) called him in the fall, mentioning our conversation at Strathmore Hall, he would be willing to let players know of the opportunity to play with the Praise Band.

I share this information with you in case you would like to follow through on this lead.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 24 May 1999 19:19:46 -0700 (PDT)
From: rej@acronym.org.uk (Rebecca Johnson)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NPT final briefing 9
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org

1999 NPT Briefing 9 from The Acronym Institute

May 24 1999 Decisions Taken

Just after 10.00 p.m. on Friday 21 May, the States Parties attending the Third Preparatory Committee of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) adopted their report and applauded the Chair, Ambassador Camilo Reyes of Colombia, who had brought the PrepCom to a successful conclusion.

Earlier in the day, there were long faces and furrowed brows as many diplomats gave up hope of a positive outcome. The outstanding problems included: allocation of items to the Main Committees for 2000, where Egypt was still holding out for the PrepCom to recommend a subsidiary body on the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East; background documentation, particularly whether to cover the 1995 Resolution; whether and how to forward draft recommendations on the products of the 2000 Review Conference; and what to do with the Chair's working paper on substance.

After hours of waiting, during which the Chair met with various groupings which included some of the key non-aligned governments, Arab states, the nuclear weapon states, and 'problem solving' delegations with ideas, the following compromises were finally agreed.

1) Subsidiary bodies and allocation of treaty items to committee

Despite a growing concern about the inefficiency and inappropriateness of basing the treaty's review on debates in three committees, it was agreed to allocate the treaty articles and preambular paragraphs (but not the 1995 Principles and Objectives) to the three main committees along the lines followed since 1985, but without prejudice to proposals to change the structure, voiced by Canada and others. The PrepCom also noted that the Review Conference could consider and agree whether to establish subsidiary bodies within the main committees. In response to demands by Egypt and South Africa, there was written acknowledgement that some states parties had proposed subsidiary bodies on nuclear disarmament and the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East, leaving it up to the 2000 Review Conference to decide, in accordance with the 1995 decisions. Egypt had wanted a more definite recommendation, while the nuclear weapon states (especially Russia and the United States) had wanted to leave out the reference to subsidiary bodies. In view of the fact that rule 34 of the rules of procedure had been amended to reflect the reference to subsidiary bodies in paragraph 6 of Decision 1 on strengthening the review process, advocates of establishing subsidiary bodies in the end contented themselves with getting some mentions and leaving the decision to the 2000 Review Conference.

2) Background documentation

It was finally agreed that the U.N. Secretariat be asked to prepare documents on the various treaty articles, as well as the CTBT and implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East "reflecting developments since 1995 with a view to realising fully the objectives of the resolution". Documents were also requested from the IAEA and the various secretariats overseeing the NWFZ treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga, Pelindaba and Bangkok. By this means, Egypt was successful in reinforcing its view that the 1995 resolution on the Middle East was part of the package of decisions taken in 1995, while the United States was able to head off any special privileges for this resolution, including avoiding any additional responsibilities being undertaken by the depositary states (Britain, Russia and the United States), who had sponsored the resolution in 1995. While some expressed surprised that the United States had 'given in' on this issue, its more flexible approach from the beginning of the PrepCom had given hope that a compromise agreement would be found.

3) Recommendations on the outcome for 2000

Following a useful general debate during the first day of the PrepCom, in which some delegations outlined their views about what agreements, decisions and/or documents ("products") the 2000 Conference should aim for, Reyes circulated a paper on May 13 which reflected what appeared to be the majority view. France, Iran, Egypt and Mexico objected to putting forward recommendations for two documents, which they viewed as separating the review and forward-looking functions of the conference. After two further drafts, the PrepCom agreed a much less specific recommendation on "outcome" (rather than "products"). Without saying anything about expected reports or documented agreements, it outlined the Review Conference tasks of evaluating the results of the past five years and identifying future action, as well as examining the functioning of the review process and addressing what might be done to strengthen the implementation of the Treaty and achieve universality. Once again, Egypt achieved a mention of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, together with the decisions on principles and objectives and strengthening the review process, reinforcing their validity as a package. South Africa, which will chair the 2000 Conference, was understood to be disappointed that a more specific recommendation for two primary documents had not been made, as this could have assisted its planning and structuring in 2000.

4. Substance

Most of the final three days were taken up with considering first the Chair's May 14 working paper on substance and then its revision, issued on May 20. The May 20 revision expanded the original 31 paragraphs to 61. Reyes appears to have included those proposals made during the debate on Wednesday (May 19) which had substantial support with only one, two or a few delegations expressing opposition. Similarly, paragraphs which had substantial opposition, such as nuclear sharing, were omitted from the revised draft. During May 20, states parties had gone through the 61 paragraphs identifying whether there were any objections, but not attempting to draft changes or get agreement where objection was registered. By the end of Thursday, the question uppermost in delegations' minds was: what to do with the paper now that it has been the subject of discussions/negotiations? Could it be transmitted to the 2000 Conference and if so, how?

Attempts were made to establish the 'status' or 'standing' of the working paper through introductory paragraph(s) placing the paper in context (the 'chapeau'). Several alternative proposals for how this might be done were advanced, and for several hours it looked as if the PrepCom would become irrevocably deadlocked. Some, including France and the United States, wanted to differentiate between the paragraphs which had or had not been formally objected to and perhaps to recommend the 'agreed' sections; Russia wanted the paper to have only the same status as any of the national proposals made earlier in the week; since almost all the text on nuclear disarmament and the Middle East had been challenged by one or more of the NWS, the non-aligned and others argued against any preferential treatment for the more innocuous issues, hinting also that they would block agreement on the PrepCom report as a whole if there was no reflection of the substantive discussions and work.

Recognising that without consensus the paper could not go through as agreed recommendations, a growing number of delegations argued for it to be annexed to the report, whole, for consideration in 2000, while acknowledging that there was no agreement on the full text. In the end, the Chair manoeuvred through an Irish-New Zealand proposal, whereby both the May 14 and May 20 Chair's papers were annexed to the PrepCom report, together with the written proposals made by delegations. This compromise was hailed as a victory by those who wanted the text to be forwarded to the 2000 Review Conference as something the PrepCom had worked on, while others could claim victory in preventing the paper from having special authority or status.

Assessment

After the impasse at the second PrepCom it had been widely predicted that the third PrepCom would be difficult, and that proved to be the case. Nevertheless, all the essential decisions for preparing and planning for the 2000 Review Conference were successfully taken, although certain issues were fudged or remitted to the Review Conference for decision there. For example, the allocation of items was based on the post-1985 main committees structure, with Canada, New Zealand and others determined to discuss better ways for the future, including a possible article by article review. South Africa had wanted the PrepCom to recommend that there should be at least two final documents in 2000, covering review and future principles and objectives. Faced with strong initial opposition to this from France and Iran, joined later by Mexico, Egypt and a few other NAM states, saying they preferred a single document comprising both review and forward-looking elements, the 'recommendations' from the PrepCom on products merely reaffirmed the 1995 decisions and identified some obvious options. Nevertheless, that leaves the Chair-designate, Ambassador Jacob Selebi of South Africa, a reasonably free hand to undertake consultations over the next year.

As forecast, the Middle East and nuclear disarmament carried the major burdens of contention. Blamed for much of 1998's stalemate, and through bilateral meetings with Egypt over the past year, the United States came much more prepared to compromise on some issues. For example, the United States agreed to name Israel together with India, Pakistan and Cuba, in calls for universality, but not to name Israel on its own in relation to the Middle East. Intensive sessions between these two delegations and also among the Arab states, sometimes involving the Chair, enabled the final

compromises to be made. In the end the Middle East resolution was linked several times with the decisions taken in 1995, and it was agreed to request the UN secretariat to prepare a document on this, which (like the rest) was to "give balanced, objective and factual descriptions of the relevant developments, be as short as possible and be easily readable".

The way for agreement on subsidiary bodies in 2000 was paved by acceptance of the change to the rules of procedure, which went through remarkably smoothly at the beginning of the PrepCom. Like Canada, which reiterated its proposal for PrepComs to have an independent role in commenting on contemporaneous events, but did not insist on a recommendation on that from the PrepCom, South Africa set down markers regarding security assurances and its 1998 proposal for a subsidiary body to consider practical proposals on nuclear disarmament, but did not insist on recommendations from 2000. Egypt, however, insisting that "nothing was agreed until everything was agreed" tried nevertheless to push for a recommendation on establishing a subsidiary body on the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, before finally agreeing on a mention, with the understanding that the 2000 Conference would consider the proposal.

Ambassador Reyes was generally held to have chaired extremely well. Despite taking over late in the year, he had prepared well and consulted carefully. Although many delegations voiced serious doubts in the second week about his strategy with regard to the Chairs' papers, especially when he took delegations through the process of giving their views paragraph by paragraph on the revised substance paper, he retained the authority and calm to bring the edges together and make use of solution-building suggestions from different governmental and non-governmental sources. Reyes has been nominated to chair the most difficult committee, MC I on nuclear disarmament in 2000, where he will no doubt need all the skill, perseverance and humour that he displayed this fortnight in New York.

I will write a much fuller analysis over the next few weeks, but finish with a few brief comments. The continuing wide differences in intention and perceptions over the Middle East and nuclear disarmament are likely again to be major sources of conflict and disagreement in 2000.

The problem of proliferation in South Asia, precipitated by last year's nuclear tests by India and then Pakistan, was addressed more fully than in past years, but the states parties avoided the temptation merely to condemn, and sought instead to urge constructive solutions, including calling for full compliance with the measures stipulated in UNSC 1172.

The United States came across as more engaged and flexible this year, with Egypt, in contrast, looking somewhat divided and raising concerns even among NAM colleagues that its tactics could be counterproductively divisive. Following the US precedent set in 1998, four out of the five NWS (Britain, France, Russia and the United States) presented some form of factsheet summarising their actions, especially on article VI, but were not disposed to discuss present difficulties or future actions. Russia engaged more, but clearly wanted to keep the lid on any progress or implementation under the review process. Able to announce the decisions of the 1998 strategic defence review, Britain appeared much more comfortable than last year. Of the NWS, Britain appeared the most flexible on a number of issues, actively seeking

solutions to enable the PrepCom to lay positive foundations for 2000 and avoid a further PrepCom meeting, as had been threatened earlier in the week.

Questions rumbled below the surface (not least in the European Union) about the role taken by France, which challenged the unity that the German presidency of the EU sought to represent on several important issues, especially products and procedures. The bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade just days before the PrepCom started ensured that the Chinese would raise security questions about force and sovereignty. Despite its refusal to work within the 'P-5' context, China participated fully in the PrepCom. Amongst the familiar positions on no-first use etc, there were clear signals that any discussion of steps towards quantitative or qualitative nuclear disarmament would be met by linked concerns about missile defence, which should be expected to play a larger role in the coming year and through 2000.

Many considered this had been a "good conference" for the New Agenda Coalition, launched in June 1998, just after the second NPT PrepCom. Their first proposal was co-sponsored by 32 states and the working paper by 44. Several of the paragraphs in the May 20 Chair's working paper echoed NAC language and approaches. It will be interesting to see how the New Agenda Coalition builds in the run-up to 2000.

Finally, it was a mixed PrepCom for the non-governmental organisations. NGOs had contributed well to discussions in the run-up to the PrepCom. Following a fairly well attended informal plenary session in the first week, which heard 13 statements on a range of treaty-related issues, a roundtable discussion between NGOs and some delegations was held, the first ever to be put on the NPT agenda for voluntary participation. It was attended by several European ambassadors and representatives from some 10 other delegations. On the other hand, access to the actual proceedings has become worse than ever.

NGOs were excluded from everything except the opening debate and about five minutes on the last day, when the gavel came down on a PrepCom report that the public had had no opportunity to hear. As a consequence, obtaining information on the text of decisions this year has been particularly hard, and would not have been possible without the help of delegation members from all sides.

If the reason for excluding NGOs from hearing most of the session is to avoid having 'formal' sessions requiring summary records, then discretion could be employed to admit the handful of NGOs interested in following these issues to be present at 'informal' sessions, not requiring summary records. NGOs could be requested to leave if exchanges of views became sensitive negotiations. If, on the other hand, the problem is that some delegations are wary of saying what they have to say openly, this begs two questions: i) what are you afraid of? and ii) is it better for NGOs to receive reports of your words filtered through hearsay and the opinions of opposing delegations than to hear directly and judge for ourselves?

Written by Rebecca Johnson.

Grateful thanks to all the NGOs and friendly delegates who made these NPT

reports possible, and especially to Nicola Butler, who contributed greatly to getting these reports out. Not forgetting also the essentials of watermelon, ginger tea and Ben and Jerry.

Note re email address: Apparently using the reply function on messages with my new email address bounces messages back to you. I apologise for this. While I am trying to sort out the problem, please use the original address acronym@gn.apc.org to send me messages, as this still functions for the time being. Oh the wonders of modern technology!

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.acronym.org.uk>

To: acronym@pop.gn.apc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: NPT PrepCom reports
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Rebecca,

Thanks for the series of reports on the 1999 NPT PrepCom. They provide a valuable account.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 25 May 1999 11:46:07 -0700
From: "Bruce Hall" <bhall@peace-action.org>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NEW OPEN FORUM FOR NATIONAL SECURITY STUD
To: <abolition-caucus@igc.org>, <bananas@lists.speakeasy.org>
X-Mdaemon-Deliver-To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
X-Msmail-Priority: Normal
X-Return-Path: bhall@peace-action.org

To : Abolitionists Everywhere
From: Bruce Hall at Peace Action
Date: May 25, 1999
Re : Of interest for you

You all may want to comment on this.

Bruce
Subject: NEW OPEN FORUM FOR NATIONAL SECURITY STUDY GROUP

> = N E W S R E L E A S E

> =
> = OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
> = (PUBLIC AFFAIRS)
> = WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301
> =
> = PLEASE NOTE DATE

> =====

>
> No. 254-99
> (703)695-0192(media)
> IMMEDIATE RELEASE
> May 24, 1999
> (703)697-5737(public/industry)
> NEW OPEN FORUM FOR NATIONAL SECURITY STUDY GROUP
> The Department of Defense today launched "America's Future Forum," a new
debate forum posted on the National Security Study Group's Internet web site
at www.nssg.gov.
> The forum will provide the public an opportunity to contribute their ideas
on what the United States will look like in 2025. The America's Future
Forum solicits views on the range of factors that will shape the country's
future, including demographics, economics, civic culture, and issues of
national identity.
> "America's Future Forum" is the newest of the web site's interactive
features. Other discussion topics up for debate on the web site include the
nature of national security in the next century, the world in 2025, and the
future of technology.
> The study group is also known as the Hart-Rudman Commission after its
co-chairmen, former Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman. The group is
tasked with developing a national security strategy for the 21st Century.

> The NSSG web site is unique in that this is the first time a government-sponsored study has maintained a permanent direct connection with the American public during its drafting process.

> For more information, contact Lt. Cmdr. Anthony Cooper at (703) 697-3189.

> -END-

> page 1

>

> NOTE: This is a plain text version of a web page.

> If your mail program did not properly format this

> information, current News Releases are online at

> <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/#BLUETOPS>

> =====

> Listen to Pentagon Press Briefings LIVE

> <http://www.defenselink.mil/briefings/>

> =====

> Unsubscribe from or Subscribe to this mailing list:

> <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/subscribe.html>

> =====

Return-Path: <syoun@clw.org>
X-Sender: syoun@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 25 May 1999 10:55:59 -0400
To: syoun@clw.org
From: Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>
Subject: Coalition Issue Brief, documents on Kerrey amdmnt

May 25, 1999

To: Coalition members and friends
Fm: Stephen Young

Re: Coalition Issue Brief, documents on Kerrey amdmnt

The vote on the Kerrey Amendment is expected this afternoon in the Senate. As most of you know, the Kerrey Amendment would strike the restriction in the Defense Authorization bill that requires maintaining US strategic nuclear forces at START I levels until Russia ratifies START II. This year's version does allow a drop from 18 to 14 submarines, but otherwise provides no flexibility for the US military or Clinton Administration.

Below are three items of interest.

- 1) Coalition Issue Brief: "JCS to Congress: Do Not Mandate Excessive Nuclear Force Levels"
- 2) Clinton Administration's "Statement of Administration Policy on the Defense Authorization Bill", Section on Mandating Strategic Nuclear Force Levels.
- 3) Michael Krepon in today's Washington Post "Invitation to Nuclear Disaster"

+ + + + +

1) Issue Brief

JCS to Congress:
Do Not Mandate Excessive Nuclear Force Levels

Issue Brief
Vol 3, No. 3, May 24, 1999

TEN YEARS AFTER the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the U.S. and Russia continue to deploy over 13,000 strategic nuclear weapons, most of which remain on hair-trigger alert. Reductions by the United States and Russia would reduce the nuclear threat to both sides and save billions of dollars. In fact, because it cannot afford to maintain them at current levels, Russia is reducing its strategic nuclear forces. However, it has failed to ratify the 1993 START II agreement, which would cut U.S. and Russian arsenals to 3,000-3,500 weapons aside. For years, the U.S. Congress has mandated that the American military cannot make any reductions in its arsenal until Russia ratifies START II, which is less

likely today than ever before. As a result, U.S. nuclear force levels are oversized and increasingly expensive.

Nevertheless, the Senate is poised, against the advice of America's most senior military leaders, to extend their requirement that the U.S. maintain its nuclear arsenal at START I levels (6,000 strategic nuclear weapons) until Russia ratifies START II.

General Henry Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made clear his opposition to Congress mandating strategic nuclear force levels. In response to a question for the record from Sen. Carl Levin (D-MI), ranking minority member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Gen. Shelton said "I would definitely oppose inclusion of any language that mandates specific force levels. It is important for us to retain the ability to deploy the maximum number of warheads allowed by START I but the Services should also have the flexibility to do so with a militarily sufficient, yet cost effective, force structure."

In response to another question for the record, Gen. Shelton indicated that no military requirement exists for maintaining the current 50 Peacekeeper ballistic missiles or more than 14 Trident nuclear-armed submarines. According to Gen. Shelton, Admiral Richard Mies, Commander in Chief of US Strategic Command, conducted an "extensive analysis" and concluded that, with no Peacekeeper missiles and only 14 Tridents, the remaining US arsenal would "meet our current and emerging warfighting requirements."

Assistant Secretary of Defense Edward Warner, in testimony before the Senate in April, described the decline in Russia's nuclear forces. He indicated that, by 2010, Russia would be hard-pressed to maintain a strategic arsenal of even 1,500 weapons. When asked if Russia could rebuild its nuclear arsenal, he replied, "They are in such miserable condition that it is really not an option for them. Even the issue of being able to avoid the downward path does not seem to be a serious option."

###

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce the dangers of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. The views and analysis expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of every member of the Coalition. For more information, please contact Stephen Young on (202) 546-0795, ext. 102, or email syoung@clw.org

++++

2) Clinton Administration's Statement of Administration Policy on the Defense Authorization Bill, Section on Mandating Strategic Nuclear Force Levels.

Strategic Force Structure

The Administration appreciates the bill's endorsement of our plan to reduce the Trident submarine force from 18 to 14 boats, while maintaining a

survivable, effective START I-capable force. However, we prefer repealing the bill's general provision that maintains the prohibition, first enacted in the FY 1998 Defense Authorization Act, against obligating funds to retire or dismantle any other strategic nuclear delivery systems below specified levels unless START II enters into force. The Administration believes this position would unnecessarily restrict the President's national security authority and ability to structure the most capable, cost-effective force possible.

+ + + + +

3) Michael Krepon in today's Washington Post

Invitation to Nuclear Disaster

By Michael Krepon

Tuesday, May 25, 1999; Page A15

Unless concerted action is taken soon to reduce nuclear dangers, conditions will be coming into place for a dreadful accident, incident or even a nuclear detonation of Russian origin. The problems posed by Chinese nuclear espionage pale in comparison with the dangers inherent in Russia's domestic plight, its aging arsenal, stressed-out command and control and lax export controls. Moreover, the current U.S. nuclear posture exacerbates current dangers by requiring the deployment of 6,000 nuclear weapons, approximately half of which are on hair-trigger alert.

Russia, whose GNP is now the size of Belgium's (and falling), cannot match U.S. nuclear force levels. Over the next decade, deployed Russian nuclear weapons on strategic forces may well dip below 1,000 -- six times below the number allowed by the START II treaty, which has been held hostage by the Russian Duma since January 1993.

At present the Kremlin retains as many of its nuclear forces on hair-trigger alert as possible. This is done to compensate for weaknesses in Russia's conventional forces, for gaping holes in the old Soviet early warning network and for the vast launch readiness of U.S. nuclear forces. Independent estimates suggest that Russia maintains in excess of 3,000 nuclear warheads in very high states of launch readiness.

This is a recipe for disaster. The CIA's unclassified assessment of the "fail-safeness" of Russian command and control is not reassuring. Although the CIA says nuclear safety is not a concern as long as current security procedures and systems are in place, stresses in the Russian command and control system are growing, and are aggravated by the high launch readiness of U.S. nuclear forces.

In January 1995 Russian forces mistook a scientific rocket launched from Norway for a U.S. attack, thus activating President Boris Yeltsin's nuclear "suitcase." In September 1998 a deranged Russian sailor killed seven of his shipmates and barricaded himself inside the torpedo bay of his nuclear attack submarine. Security forces recaptured the boat, which may or may not have had nuclear weapons on board. In September 1998, a guard at a facility

holding 30 tons of plutonium shot other guards and then escaped, heavily armed. The list of incidents of this kind in Russia that we know about is chilling.

How does the U.S. maintenance of 6,000 deployed nuclear weapons, half on hair-trigger alert, help this country deal with such dangers? With Russian forces projected to decline dramatically over the next decade, what useful purpose is served by maintaining bloated nuclear arsenals at such high states of launch readiness?

While U.S. nuclear forces have been downsized with the end of the Cold War, U.S. nuclear doctrine and targeting requirements have changed relatively little. We still maintain massive attack options, with the potential for many hundreds of nuclear detonations. We still place Russia's crumbling industrial capacity "at risk," even though these factories have become liabilities rather than assets for the Kremlin. We still maintain forces at very high launch readiness, even though there is no longer a doctrinal requirement to launch quickly in the event of a Russian nuclear attack.

Capitol Hill has barely addressed the dangers inherent in interlocking U.S. and Russian nuclear postures. Extensive targeting lists and high Russian alert rates reinforce high U.S. alert rates. This vicious circle will be extremely dangerous as strains on Russian command and control continue to grow. As long as the U.S. strategic posture involves keeping our nuclear guns out of their holsters with the triggers cocked, there is no chance whatever of persuading Russia to take its dangerous and aging nuclear missiles off hair-trigger alert.

These nuclear dangers are badly compounded by congressional insistence that the United States maintain a force level of 6,000 deployed warheads -- the maximum allowed under START I -- until the 1993 START II accord finally enters into force. In this way, national decisions on the proper size of U.S. strategic forces are determined by the most retrograde delegates of the Russian Duma, who have blocked ratification of START II.

What could the United States conceivably do with 6,000 deployed nuclear warheads in the post-Cold War era? Why is it in the national security interest of the United States to wait for action by Russia's unpredictable and erratic legislature before taking new initiatives to reduce nuclear dangers? Doesn't it make more sense to accelerate the process of deep reductions now?

Sen. Bob Kerrey (D-Neb.) has a better idea than waiting for the Duma. He would strike the legislative requirement to remain at 6,000 deployed weapons and proceed instead with parallel, reciprocal, verifiable reductions.

Without accelerated reductions and new initiatives, such as a stand-down of alert nuclear forces, we invite tragedies on a massive scale.

The writer is president of the Henry L. Stimson Center.

© Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company

Stephen Young, Deputy Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Ave. NE #505
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795 ext. 102; fax: (202)546-7970
website: <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 25 May 1999 11:46:07 -0700
From: "Bruce Hall" <bhall@peace-action.org>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: NEW OPEN FORUM FOR NATIONAL SECURITY STUD
To: <abolition-caucus@igc.org>, <bananas@lists.speakeasy.org>
X-Mdaemon-Deliver-To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
X-Msmail-Priority: Normal
X-Return-Path: bhall@peace-action.org

To : Abolitionists Everywhere
From: Bruce Hall at Peace Action
Date: May 25, 1999
Re : Of interest for you

You all may want to comment on this.

Bruce
Subject: NEW OPEN FORUM FOR NATIONAL SECURITY STUDY GROUP

> = N E W S R E L E A S E

> =
> = OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
> = (PUBLIC AFFAIRS)
> = WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301
> =
> = PLEASE NOTE DATE

> =====

>
> No. 254-99
> (703)695-0192(media)
> IMMEDIATE RELEASE
> May 24, 1999
> (703)697-5737(public/industry)
> NEW OPEN FORUM FOR NATIONAL SECURITY STUDY GROUP
> The Department of Defense today launched "America's Future Forum," a new
debate forum posted on the National Security Study Group's Internet web site
at www.nssg.gov.
> The forum will provide the public an opportunity to contribute their ideas
on what the United States will look like in 2025. The America's Future
Forum solicits views on the range of factors that will shape the country's
future, including demographics, economics, civic culture, and issues of
national identity.
> "America's Future Forum" is the newest of the web site's interactive
features. Other discussion topics up for debate on the web site include the
nature of national security in the next century, the world in 2025, and the
future of technology.
> The study group is also known as the Hart-Rudman Commission after its
co-chairmen, former Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman. The group is
tasked with developing a national security strategy for the 21st Century.

> The NSSG web site is unique in that this is the first time a government-sponsored study has maintained a permanent direct connection with the American public during its drafting process.

> For more information, contact Lt. Cmdr. Anthony Cooper at (703) 697-3189.

> -END-

> page 1

>

> NOTE: This is a plain text version of a web page.

> If your mail program did not properly format this

> information, current News Releases are online at

> <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/#BLUETOPS>

> =====

> Listen to Pentagon Press Briefings LIVE

> <http://www.defenselink.mil/briefings/>

> =====

> Unsubscribe from or Subscribe to this mailing list:

> <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/subscribe.html>

> =====

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 25 May 1999 16:06:01 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news: Cox Committee Report & Coalition news release

May 25, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: Cox Committee report; Coalition news release

Today, the Rep. Cox's Select Committee released its report on nuclear and other technology transfers. The media are in full frenzy mode.

Attached below is the text version of the Coalition's press statement on the report. It is also available at
<<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/rel052599.htm>>

Also available from the Web are:

* The full text of the "REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY AND MILITARY/COMMERCIAL CONCERNS WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA" is available at <http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/congress/1999_r/cox/>

* Coalition Issue Brief "The Test Ban Treaty: Last Line of Defense Against Nuclear Espionage" <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/briefv3n2.htm>>

* June 1999 Scientific American article, "Explosive Reactions: A backlash from a nuclear espionage case might hurt science and do little to bolster national security" <<http://www.sciam.com/1999/0699issue/0699infocus.html>>

* and from the Global Beat Syndicate, 3 opinion editorials:

"The Ultimate Defense Against Nuclear Espionage" It is in the national security interest of the United States to pursue measures, like the CTBT, that create technical barriers to further nuclear weapons development by China and other nations. To deny the CTBT is to deny the United States its last line of defense against nuclear weapons espionage.
By Daryl Kimball, May 25, 1999
<<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/Kimball052599.html>>

* "Putting the Chinese Nuclear Threat in Perspective" China's nuclear arsenal is so small relative to that of the United States that, even in the worst case, the impact of its current deployment plans on U.S. national security is marginal. Overall, the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe that "China would not represent a serious military threat to the U.S. for at least 20 years." By Joseph CIRINCIONE, May 17, 1999 <<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/Cirincione051799.html>>

* "Protecting Nuclear Secrets Could Create New Nuclear Dangers" We may

never know the full damage to U.S. national security caused by the astonishing transfer of highly classified nuclear weapons data to unsecured computer systems at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. But a knee-jerk moratorium on international scientific collaboration contained in just-introduced legislation goes too far. By Todd PERRY, May 5, 1999
<<http://www.nyu.edu/globalbeat/syndicate/Perry050599.html>>

Please forward to me any organizational statements or particularly useful media reports that you think should be circulated to Coalition members and friends.

Thanks,

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

"Cox Nuclear Transfers Report Cites Role of Test Ban in Blocking Chinese Gains: Time for Senate to Ratify, Say Experts"

For Immediate Release: May 25, 1999

Contact: Adam Eidinger or Steve Rabinowitz 202-547-3577 or 986-6186; OR Daryl Kimball 202-546-0795 x136

(WASHINGTON, DC) The newly released report of the House Select Committee led by Rep. Chris Cox (R-CA) raises important questions about what steps the U.S. Senate is not taking to minimize damage to U.S. security from the loss of sensitive nuclear weapons secrets from our nation's laboratories, say leading nuclear weapons experts.

The U.S., like the People's Republic of China, has signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). But the U.S. and other key states have not yet ratified, preventing entry into force of the global agreement, which would create a verification system to monitor and deter nuclear testing world wide. Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC) has blocked action on the CTBT for over one and a half years. The Cox Committee report released today says, "If the PRC [People's Republic of China] violates the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by testing surreptitiously, it could further accelerate its nuclear development."

"In addition to a thorough review and tightening of nuclear weapon's know-how and laboratory security, Senate leaders should take immediate action on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) to mitigate the effect of the loss of these nuclear secrets," says Charles Ferguson of the Federation of American Scientists.

"China's nuclear arsenal is not, as the report claims, on par with the United States' and these data alone will not allow China to approximate America's at any time in the near future. Any country that wishes to deploy and prepare to use advanced nuclear weapons needs more than blueprints and computer codes for them. Those nations would need to conduct nuclear test

explosions before they could be confident a nuclear weapons would work as designed. The CTBT is our last line of defense against the use of the stolen technology, but the Senate is derelict in its duty to help stop China and others from conducting the nuclear test explosions that could help them perfect advanced types of warheads," added Ferguson, a former research scientist at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Worst-case scenarios, as outlined by the Cox Committee's report, suggest that China may have already used some U.S. nuclear bomb data to test and certify one warhead type. Ironically, it was U.S. test monitoring intelligence gained from Chinese nuclear test explosions that indicated that China had access to design information on America's advanced W-88 warhead.

"These facts confirm that China can not confidently incorporate advanced new designs into its arsenal without extensive explosive testing," said Matthew MacKenzie, Senior Scientist at the Natural Resources Defense Council "The CTBT would, at the very least, help prevent China and other states from adding advanced nuclear warhead types that have not already been tested thoroughly enough to achieve confidence in their performance," he added.

"America's ability to detect test ban violations will be greatly enhanced by the CTBT, which would establish a far reaching global monitoring network and the option of on-site inspections, backed up by military and civilian intelligence gathering tools. The U.S. must detect and deter nuclear testing by other states with or without the test ban — a job that can be done much more effectively with the test ban than without.," said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, an organization comprised of 17 of the nation's leading non-proliferation groups. "To deny ratification and global implementation of the Test Ban Treaty is to deny our nation a vital defense against nuclear proliferation."

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 25 May 1999 13:54:09 -0600
From: Delongs <delong@nucleus.com>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Sen. Roche - Analysis of NPT PrepComm III
To: Abolition Listserv <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>,
CNANW Listserv <cnanw@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>,
abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Corel-MessageType: EMail

Report/Analysis of NPT PrepComm III

By Senator Douglas Roche, O.C.

Chairman, Middle Powers Initiative

SUMMARY:

The third and final preparatory meeting for the 2000 Review of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) concluded at 10:30 p.m. May 21st with an agreement to disagree. In the arcane world of nuclear diplomacy, this was considered a step forward, since the 1998 Second PrepComm had concluded in disarray without an agreement that the parties disagreed. The 1999 action was but a thin cover over the deadlock persisting between the Western Nuclear Weapons States and the leading non-Nuclear Weapons States and, given the worsening international climate, signals a struggle of immense proportions to maintain the viability of the NPT after 2000.

China excoriated the United States for "wantonly bombing Yugoslavia for more than 40 days," bullying other countries, and pursuing an inflammatory missile defence system. The U.S. stated that its commitment to the NPT's Article VI "is broad and deep," but refused to allow a subsidiary body, which would examine the details of nuclear disarmament, to be established at the 2000 Review. The New Agenda Coalition tabled a working paper with 44 co-sponsors, criticizing the NWS for re-rationalizing their continued possession of nuclear weapons, and calling for "a clear and unequivocal commitment to the speedy pursuit of the total elimination" of nuclear weapons, which "will require a multilateral agreement." The Non-Aligned Movement went further, with its repeated call for the commencement of negotiations on a phased program of nuclear disarmament within "a specified framework of time, including a Nuclear-Weapons Convention... ." Canada, building on its new nuclear weapons policy statement, presented a draft of new Principles and Objectives for the 2000 Review, which called for acceleration of the START process, the engagement of the three other NWS "in the near future," and additional new measures such as de-alerting.

A lengthy list of States' proposals was blended into a 61-paragraph Chairman's Paper which, while not going as far as the NAM desires, went well beyond what the Western NWS would accept. The Chairman, Ambassador

Camilo Reyes of Colombia, included: a call for negotiations on the elimination of non-strategic nuclear weapons; de-alerting, de-targeting and de-activating all nuclear weapons and removing nuclear warheads from delivery vehicles; an expression of "deep concern that Israel continues to be the only State in the [Middle East] which has not yet acceded to the [NPT] and refuses to place all its nuclear facilities under the full-scope safeguards of the IAEA; a legally-binding negative security assurances regime; an ad-hoc committee at the Conference on Disarmament "with a negotiating mandate to address nuclear disarmament." Several hours of debate on the Chairman's Paper revealed once more the continuing wide split between the Western NWS and the gathering forces of the NNWS who are increasing their demands that the "systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally," promised in 1995, be lived up to.

Almost to the end of the PrepComm, it appeared that absolute deadlock would prevail, as occurred in 1998. But deft steering by the Chairman and a general feeling on all sides that a second total collapse of the PrepComm process could prove fatal for the 2000 Review led to an agreement to send to the 2000 Review the Chairman's Paper along with all the papers submitted by States with the notation: "The Preparatory Committee was unable to reach agreement on any substantive recommendations to the 2000 Review Conference."

This strategem allows the PrepComm material, containing many ideas for strengthening the NPT, to go forward. But Western NWS opposition to the ideas themselves persists.

1. During the three years of annual PrepComms leading up to the 2000 Review, the nuclear weapons situation has worsened. START II is blocked. The Conference on Disarmament is virtually paralyzed. Overt nuclear proliferation has spread to India and Pakistan. The Nuclear Weapons States continue to modernize their nuclear arsenals. NATO has reaffirmed that nuclear weapons are "essential." The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is nowhere near entering into force. A fourth U.N. Special Session on Disarmament has been blocked by India, which says that as long as the U.S. opposes nuclear disarmament as a chief item on the agenda, India doesn't want the Session at all.
2. The 1999 PrepComm opened under the cloud of the Kosovo war, which, among its other serious consequences for the international community, has severely strained relations between the U.S. and Russia and the U.S. and China. NATO's decisions to take in nine more nations (on top of the three new members), operate aggressively out-of-area, and bypass the U.N. Security Council in prosecuting the Kosovo war have angered Russia and China in the extreme. An additional \$300 billion will be pumped into the U.S. defence budget by 2003 which already is 18 times larger than the combined spending of the seven so-called "rogue" States identified by the Pentagon. The U.S. Congress has enshrined in national security policy the intention to field a national ballistic missile defence system; the Pentagon has budgeted \$10.5 billion over the next six years to create a workable system. Not only is the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty now under threat, the whole non-proliferation regime is under siege. A new nuclear arms race is

certain, unless Washington, Moscow and Beijing can quickly put collaborative efforts back on track.

3. China went up front at the PrepComm in castigating the U.S. Stung by the three NATO missiles that struck China's embassy in Belgrade, Ambassador Sha Zukang led off his opening speech with a condemnation of NATO's bombing campaign. "The Chinese Government and people express their utmost indignation and severe condemnation of the barbarian act and lodge the strongest protest. U.S-led NATO should bear all responsibilities arising therefrom." Sha then accused the U.S., through trying to build absolute security on the insecurity of others, of undermining international peace and security and impairing efforts towards nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. He singled out the proposed U.S. missile defence system as an unacceptable U.S. effort to achieve strategic superiority in the 21st century. "It will disrupt global and regional strategic balances and stability, and possibly trigger off a new round of arms races." He foresaw the collapse of existing international regimes on disarmament if the U.S. continues its present bullying methods, forcing other countries to resort to every possible means to protect themselves. "If that happens, the bombardment by the U.S. led NATO is the only thing to blame and it is U.S. and NATO which will provoke the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction." Calling for the negotiation of a Nuclear Weapons Convention, he promoted proposals already put forward, including the time-bound nuclear disarmament program advanced by the NAM, the work of the New Agenda Coalition, and the Canberra Commission Report.

4. The U.S. speech, given by Norman A. Wulf, reiterated U.S. strong commitment to the NPT and "continuing to meet its obligations under all aspects of the Treaty." He criticized the nuclear testing by India and Pakistan as "a grave disservice to our collective efforts because it occurred in the context of an historic achievement of a CTBT and a continuing deep reduction in the number of nuclear weapons worldwide." He called for a "balanced" review process. "We must approach our work with a healthy dose of realism and avoid the assumption that the NPT process can achieve what has not been achievable elsewhere."

5. The U.S. tabled two lengthy Fact Sheets detailing steps the U.S. has taken in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. The information package showed that the U.S. has brought its deployed strategic nuclear weapons down from 12,000 in 1989 to about 8,000 today, and that 80 percent of the tactical warhead stockpile has been eliminated. "The U.S., through the vigorous pursuit and conclusion of strategic and theater nuclear arms control and reduction agreements with the former Soviet Union, and by canceling new procurement and development programs, has helped to end the Superpower nuclear arms race. This Article VI obligation has been achieved." Mr. Wulf attempted to marginalize the New Agenda Coalition by stating: "There has been a lot of focus this past year on trying to identify a new agenda for the disarmament process. I would suggest that we have an existing agenda that remains to be completed."

6. The NGO community immediately issued a rebuttal to U.S. claims that it is advancing nuclear disarmament. The U.S. Fact Sheets had not

mentioned Presidential Decision Directive 60, in which the U.S. will continue to rely on nuclear arms as a cornerstone of its national security for the "indefinite future." In addition, recent planning documents of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff contemplate nuclear retaliation against the use of chemical and biological arms, an action that would violate negative security assurances.

The NGO statement said the 8,000 figure was misleading because it counted only operational weapons. By counting those in reserve, the total exceeds 10,000 warheads. The Stockpile Stewardship Program, encompassing sub-critical testing at weapons laboratories at Los Alamos and Livermore, violates the spirit, if not the letter, of the CTBT; and the U.S. plans to invest \$45 billion over the next decade for nuclear weapons research, development, testing, and production. Stocks of plutonium and highly-enriched uranium are maintained at excessive levels. "While the U.S. may have completely eliminated more than a dozen different types of nuclear warheads, during the same period it has initiated programs to develop several new warheads, or modifications of existing warheads." These include: the B-61/11, a new earth-penetrating warhead, a new warhead to be deployed on the Trident I and II missile, a refurbishment for the W87, currently used on MX missiles, and improvements for the B83.

7. Thirteen NGO papers were verbally presented to the PrepComm, covering many aspects of the NPT. Forums and literature were in abundance. At one forum, the new book, "Security and Survival: The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention," whose principal authors are Merav Datan and Alyn Ware, was presented. This thorough examination of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention, already a U.N. document, was distributed to delegates.

At the forum, Rebecca Johnson, who provided excellent daily reporting (with Nicola Butler) of the PrepComm on behalf of the Acronym Institute, made an interesting observation. A paradigm shift of thinking from the impossibility to the practicality of nuclear weapons abolition is needed. When the paradigm shift occurs, we will be surprised how fast nuclear abolition will take hold. She likened the work of NGOs today to loosening the earth around a big rock at the top of a mountain; after enough digging, the rock will start to roll down the mountain - unstoppable.

8. The NAM paper called once again for commencement of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on "a phased program of nuclear disarmament and for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention..." The NAM also called for negotiations for a legal instrument assuring non-nuclear States against the threat or use of nuclear weapons (negative security assurances) to be annexed as a protocol to the NPT. In fulfillment of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East, the NAM stressed the urgency of Israel acceding to the NPT without delay and recommended a subsidiary body at the 2000 Review to examine this question.

9. Following adoption of its Resolution 53/77Y at the 1998 UNGA, the New Agenda Coalition submitted a paper, which showed growth of support for

the NAC. Though Slovenia, a NATO aspirant, had dropped off the original membership of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden, the group was augmented by 37 more countries that co-sponsored the paper: Angola, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Indonesia, Iran, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Malaysia, Malawi, Morocco, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Swaziland, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

The NAC paper expressed "profound concern" at the lack of evidence that the NWS are living up to their commitments to Article VI. "On the contrary, the continued possession of nuclear weapons has been re-rationalized. Nuclear doctrines have been reaffirmed. ...The indefinite extension of the NPT does not sanction the indefinite retention of nuclear weapons. That must be absolutely clear. ...It is imperative to secure a clear and unequivocal commitment to the speedy pursuit of the total elimination of these weapons."

The NAC called for the pursuit of the START process, the "seamless integration" into the process by the other NWS, de-alerting, reduction of reliance on tactical nuclear weapons, and a legally-binding Negative Security Assurances.

10. Canada, building on its new policy statement on nuclear weapons, said that all members of the international community have "a binding obligation" to pursue nuclear disarmament under Article VI, even though for the foreseeable future the primary responsibility for the negotiation of nuclear reductions rests with the U.S. and Russia, with the engagement of the other three NWS "in the near future." Canada proposed a new set of Principles and Objectives, to be adopted at the 2000 Review, which would press for acceleration of the START process, de-alerting, entry-into-force of the CTBT, a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons, and discussion of nuclear disarmament issues at the Conference on Disarmament.

11. It was left to the Chairman to distill the 27 working papers and other documents submitted by delegations into a coherent presentation of ideas to strengthen the NPT. His final version, amounting to 61 paragraphs, was considered a progressive document, since it embodied an ad hoc committee at the Conference on Disarmament with a negotiating mandate to address nuclear disarmament, and a call to Israel to accede to the NPT and to place all its nuclear facilities under the full-scope IAEA safeguards "without further delay and without conditions." These two subjects - comprehensive negotiations for nuclear disarmament and Israeli compliance with the NPT - are the thorniest issues the 2000 Review will face. Therefore, the NAM, led by South Africa, pressed for subsidiary bodies to be attached to the regular main committees in 2000 for the purpose of giving detailed attention to nuclear disarmament and the Israeli situation. The United States vigorously objected - as it had in 1998 to the same proposal. For a few moments the PrepComm teetered on the point of subsidiary bodies, a surrogate issue representing the basic split between the NWS and the leading NNWS.

Then, because neither side wanted the PrepComm to fail outright, compromise language was crafted in which it was noted that some delegations proposed subsidiary bodies be established, and some delegations wanted to defer the decision, and thus the question would be resolved at the 2000 Review. A sigh of relief went around the room. And when the formal decision was taken to send the Chairman's Paper forward, with the specific notation that it was not an agreed text, delegates applauded.

12. Egypt immediately struck a realistic note, stating the PrepComm had not been a success and that no substantive recommendations had been sent to the 2000 Review. It hoped for better results on nuclear disarmament and the Middle East problem in 2000.

CONCLUSION

The NPT stalemate, crucial as it is to the hopes for a viable non-proliferation regime in the 21st century, is itself part of a larger world struggle today. Nuclear weapons, like the Kosovo war, are about the rule of law. How will international law be imposed in the years ahead: by the militarily powerful determining what the law will be, or by a collective world effort reposing the seat of law in the United Nations system?

Already, only a decade after the end of the Cold War, the hopes for a cooperative global security system have been dashed on the rocks of power. The trust, engendered during the early post-Cold War years, is now shattered. New arms races are underway.

It would be the height of folly to sweep under the rug this unpleasant turn of events. It would be equally folly to think that the rest of the world is powerless against the NWS. Gains are being made, however small compared to the immensity of the nuclear weapons problem. Reductions have occurred. Good documentation, even if not agreed, has been prepared for the 2000 Review. The New Agenda Coalition is developing strength. NATO has committed itself to review its nuclear weapons policy.

There is an interplay in these NPT-NAC-NATO developments. Singly, they may not amount to much; taken together and built upon by a new fusion of strength by like-minded governments and the advanced wave of civil society, they can create enormous world pressure that the NWS will not be able to ignore.

The world is staring into an abyss of nuclear weapons proliferation. The danger of the use of nuclear weapons is growing. The recognition of this should galvanize intelligent and committed people - in both governments and civil society - to action.

Return-Path: <maureene@earthlink.net>

X-Sender: maureene@earthlink.net

Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 17:13:09 -0400

To: bananas@lists.speakeasy.org, cdavis@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org,
jsmith@clw.org, syoung@clw.org, bamorse@earthlink.net, kathy@fcnl.org,
rachel@fcnl.org, ieer@ieer.org, mupj@igc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org,
fteplitz@peace-action.org, epank@peacenet.org, kcrandall@psr.org,
kroberts@psr.org, btiller@psr.org, brian@taxpayer.net,
ctbt@2020vision.org, laura@2020vision.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org,
wand@wand.org, cferg@fas.org

From: maureen eldredge <maureene@earthlink.net>

Subject: Kerrey Amendment, 44-56

We lost the vote on the Kerrey amendment (actually the vote to table the amendment). It split roughly along party lines, with the following exceptions. This was from me taking notes on the vote, so there may be some inaccuracies, a correct version will be available tomorrow.

Republicans who voted with us:

Chafee (R-RI)

Jefford (R-VT)

Gordon Smith (R-OR)

it appeared that the following Republicans voted with us and then changed their vote to be against:

McCain (R-AZ)

Gorton (R-WA)

The following Democrats voted against us:

Byrd (D-WV)

Graham (D-FL)

Lincoln (D-AR)

Bayh (D-IN)

It is particularly troubling to have lost Lincoln, she took Dale Bumpers' seat, who was a staunch friend of arms control.

Please send thanks to those who helped, and irate letters to those we lost, particularly the Dems.

Thanks for all your work on this.... at least now we have a vote count for the next election cycle.

-Maureen

Maureen Eldredge

Program Director

Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Return-Path: <syoun@clw.org>
X-Sender: syoun@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 17:28:33 -0400
To: syoun@clw.org
From: Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>
Subject: Kerrey amdnt voted down

May 26, 1999

To: Coalition members and friends
Fr: Stephen Young

Re: Kerrey Amdnt voted down

By a vote of 56-44, the Senate just voted to table (kill) the Kerrey amendment lifting the Congressional mandate to maintain START I levels. It was a mostly, but not solely, a party-line vote - Sens Byrd (D-VA), Graham (D-FI), Lincoln (D-Ark), and Bayh (D-Ind) voted to kill the amendment and Sens Jeffords (R-VT), Chafee (R-RI), and Smith (R-Or) voted for it. Thanks to Maureen Eldridge for helping me keep track of who's who.

Stephen Young, Deputy Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Ave. NE #505
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795 ext. 102; fax: (202)546-7970
website: <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 14:17:10 -0700
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Nuclear Abolition Calendar
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com

Below is an annual calendar of abolition related days that we developed at the Abolition 2000 Annual Meeting in The Hague. All Abolition 2000 groups are encouraged to be creative in developing abolition activities around these dates. Please note that we have specified March 1st to 8th as Global Action Days, a week in which to organize activities starting next year (in the year 2000).

We are currently in Proliferation Days (marked by the anniversaries of the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests). June 1st will be Sunflower Celebration Day, and in July we have World Court Opinion Day (July 8th) and Trinity Day (July 16th). Please keep this calendar for reference and planning.

David Krieger

NUCLEAR ABOLITION CALENDAR

Date	Event
March 1-8	Global Abolition Days (Week of public actions and lobbying for nuclear abolition, upholding articles 1, 2 and 6 of NPT)
March 1	Nuclear-Free and Independent Pacific Day (U.S. detonates 17 megaton hydrogen bomb on Bikini Atoll, 1954)
March 5	NPT Day (NPT enters into forces, 1970)
April 22	Earth Day
April 26	Chernobyl Day (Chernobyl nuclear reactor accident, 1986)
May 11 and 28	Proliferation Days (India and Pakistan conduct nuclear tests, 1998)
June 1	Sunflower Celebration Day (U.S. Russian and Ukrainian defense ministers plant sunflowers to celebrate Ukraine becoming nuclear weapons free)
July 8	World Court Opinion Day (World Court rules nuclear weapons generally illegal and there exists an obligation for complete nuclear disarmament)
July 16	Trinity Day (First nuclear weapon test, 1945)
August 6	Hiroshima Day
August 9	Nagasaki Day

- October 1 Nuremberg Day
(Leaders held to account for crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity, 1946)
- October 12 Indigenous Peoples' Day
(Indigenous peoples have suffered disproportionate effects of nuclear mining and testing)
- October 24 Disarmament Week
- October 24 United Nations Day
- December 1 Prisoners of Conscience Day
- December 10 Human Rights Day

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

International contact for Abolition 2000

a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 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: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Wed, 26 May 1999 22:11:45 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
X-Accept-Language: en
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: [Fwd: Draft statement on Helms and the CTBT]

Howard,

Did anything ever happen with this?

Shalom,
Bob T.

Return-Path: <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Received: from pppe-79.igc.org (mupj@pppe-79.igc.org)
by igce.igc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id LAA09395;
Fri, 12 Mar 1999 11:57:38 -0800 (PST)
Date: Fri, 12 Mar 1999 11:57:38 -0800 (PST)
Message-Id: <2.2.16.19990312145631.409f427a@pop.igc.org>
X-Sender: mupj@pop.igc.org (Unverified)
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: joe@fcnl.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Draft statement on Helms and the CTBT
Cc: btiller@psr.org, paprog@igc.org, kathy@fcnl.org

Dear Joe:

This morning I had conversations with Bob Tiller and Fran Teplitz about the possibility of issuing a statement that targets Senator Helm's refusal to schedule hearings on the CTBT and that urges Foreign Relations Committee members and all senators to counter this refusal.

They thought it was an idea worth exploring further. I tried to reach you before I went any further. Since we weren't able to talk this morning, I've gone ahead and drafted a statement. This can give our conversation more depth.

My thought is that we would get as many signers as we can from the faith community and Monday Lobby organizations, find ways to get it to the media, and send copies to all members of the Senate. We would also make copies available to state delegations that will be presenting the interfaith petition to their senators.

I would be interested in what you think of this approach and would like your comments on this draft.

Shalom,
Howard

###

First Draft

A Statement Calling for Senate Hearings on the CTBT

We the undersigned support Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). By banning all nuclear test explosions, the treaty helps prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Ratification is therefore decidedly in the national interest of the United States.

The CTBT was signed by President Clinton and representatives of other nations on September 24, 1996. A year later President Clinton submitted the treaty to the U.S. Senate for ratification. Eighteen months have elapsed since then, and the Senate has refused to exercise its constitutional responsibility to consider the treaty for concurrence.

Yet, ratification is essential. The United States is one of 44 states which must ratify the treaty before it can go into effect. Moreover, the U.S. will not be permitted to participate in an entry-into-force conference on the CTBT scheduled for the fall of 1999 unless the Senate has completed the ratification process.

The major obstacle to Senate ratification is the refusal of Senator Jesse Helms, chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, to schedule public hearings on the CTBT. Senator Helms is holding the treaty hostage for political purposes. As he publicly announced in January, he intends not to consider the CTBT until action occurs on two other treaties, which are not yet before the Senate. Through his refusal he is thwarting the will of the American people. Public opinion polls reveal that more than three-fourths of persons surveyed -- Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike -- favor ratification of the CTBT.

Therefore, we call upon members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to put an end to one-man rule and vote to schedule hearings on the CTBT. We ask them to apply the principle of majority rule to the workings of the Foreign Relations Committee.

We call upon all members of the Senate to cease their silent consent to the outmoded custom of allowing a committee chair to block consideration of measures vital to the national interest. We ask them to demand that Senator Helms release the CTBT from his clutch.

We have great respect for the Congress as a major institution of American democracy. We note with regret that Congress has fallen into disrepute with wide segments of the American public. Senators can help restore confidence in the Senate by insisting that the Committee on Foreign Relations promptly holds public hearings on the CTBT and that the treaty be scheduled for consideration by the whole Senate. It is not only the CTBT that is at stake, as important as this treaty is, but the very reputation of the United States Senate.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@iigc.org

March 12, 1999

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

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

To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Draft statement on Helms and the CTBT]
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 10:11 PM 5/26/99 -0400, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Howard,
>
>Did anything ever happen with this?
>

Bob,

At a meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT most participants felt it was inappropriate to be so outspoken, that it might backfire by increasing Helms' resistance. So I let it drop.

Our effort to get North Carolinians to send pictures of children to Helms has since emerged. I hope that PSR is or will be urging its North Carolina members to do so.

Also, I'm trying to get an appointment with Helms' and Lott's staff for an interfaith delegation to discuss the CTBT.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 27 May 1999 08:41:04 +0200
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: PB#5- Inspection at NATO today - pics & footage available
To: fme@motherearth.org, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org,
2000walk4abolition@motherearth.org, vredeslijst@ddh.nl,
tp2000.lst.grp@gn.apc.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id AAA09900
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be (Unverified)

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id AAB10157

+ International Citizens Inspection to Prevent Warcrimes +
+ announced at NATO headquarters +

PRESS CONTACT 0495-28 02 59 (Pol D'Huyvetter & Krista van Velzen)

-> 10:00 Start walk Atomium
-> 12:00 Arrival International Inspection team at NATO
Negotiations with Nick Fiorenza (NATO press Office)
-> 13:00 Lunch, speeches and music at NATO
-> ?? Report Inspection
-> 16:00 - 18:00 Reception at the European Parliament for the peacemarchers

Brussels, May 27th 1999 - This morning 10 a.m. at the Atomium in Brussels aprox. 500 peace marchers from over 30 countries will set their final steps to NATO headquarters in the For Mother Earth 220km peace walk. The peace marchers started their walk at the International Court of Justice in the Hague on May 16. They want NATO to take immediate action towards nuclear disarmament, while also asking an end to the NATO bombings in the Balkan. Although forbidden, today it seems that the Mr. De Donnea, Mayor of Brussels, might tolerate the non-violent marchers to reach the gates of NATO headquarters where a meeting is being set up for the inspectors. The marchers announce themselves as 'an international citizens inspection team to prevent warcrimes'. In a registered letter to Solana they ask for detailed information about NATO's nuclear stockpile, referring to numbers, locations, yield and targets (cfr. <<http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/tonato.htm>>).

The final march to NATO headquarters was declared illegal by the Mayor of Brussels. The walkers remain however determined to march to NATO, as they uphold international law, referring to the Nurmberg Principles and right to freedom of speech and assembly. According to For Mother Earth spokesperson Pol D'Huyvetter "Non-violent demonstrations against the war are being forbidden systematically in Belgrade and Brussels since the outbreak of the war. Todays inspection on NATO's illegal weapons of mass destruction might be the first demonstration being allowed at NATO since the war in Kosovo. This is a first step. We however demand to receive the controversial information from NATO which proves the Nuclear Planning Group is preparing crimes against humanity. NATO has to stop acting as the world's policemen, and respect the UN".

Marchers Azerbeidjan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Colombia, Denmark, England, Finland, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Israel, Iran, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Nepal, New-Zealand, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Russia, Scotland, Sweden, Ukraine, USA and Wales.

The walk has received the support of Abolition 2000, an international network of over 1300 NGO's working to eliminate all nuclear weapons.

The organisation of the international peace march is being co-ordinated from the international office of For Mother Earth in Gent, Belgium. Since 1991 For Mother Earth organized more than 12000km of peace marches across the US and Europe

++ Letter to Solana <http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/tonato.htm>

++ Audiovisual footage available from the walk ++

During the walk, the mobile media unit will be providing continuous coverage via video clips, stills and digital images. These are available upon request.

The audio-visual website will carry highlights of the footage, which is located at:

<http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/pics>

For updates and more information contact:

· For Mother Earth [<http://www.motherearth.org/>](http://www.motherearth.org/)

Press Briefings on Internet & on location:

Regular press briefings and photo images can be located at

[<http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/press.htm>](http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/press.htm)

Press contacts: Pol D'Huyvetter and Krista Van Velzen

Audio-visual media contact: Ville Aho

GSM 0495-28 02 59 (in Belgium)

E-mail: [<international@motherearth.org>](mailto:international@motherearth.org)

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: May consulting fee
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

Please pay me \$2,000 from the Ploughshares grant for ten days of work in May 1999 @ \$200/day.

After this payment what is the balance in the Ploughshares account?

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 27 May 1999 18:38:25 +0200
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: PB#6- 67 Inspectors arrested at NATO today - pics & footage
available
To: fme@motherearth.org, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org,
2000walk4abolition@motherearth.org, vredeslijst@ddh.nl,
tp2000.lst.grp@gn.apc.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id JAA13284
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be (Unverified)

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id JAB16674

-> Pictures, television footage and news through major news-wires

+ International Citizens Inspection Team to Prevent Warcrimes +
+ arrested at NATO headquarters +

PRESS CONTACT 0495-28 02 59 (Pol D'Huyvetter)

Brussels, May 27th 1999 - This late afternoon more than 100 Citizens Inspectors were arrested at NATO headquarters in Brussels. The arrests followed the refusal by NATO to hand over information about NATO's nuclear arsenal. This international team of Citizens Inspectors was the final action of a 500 people peace march from the International Court of Justice in The Hague which ended at NATO at midday. NATO press officer Nick Fiorenza and legal adviser Baldwin De Vidts refused to give any information about NATO's nuclear arsenal. The Citizens Inspectors demanded transparency about NATO nukes. They specifically asked for sites of deployment, numbers, types, yield and targets. They want to hand this information to the International Criminal Court which is being established in The Hague. The walkers also demanded an end to the bombings in the Balkan. "Only from the perspective of the developments in the Balkan, which hurt the progress in nuclear disarmament badly, we demand the end of the NATO bombings" declared For Mother Earth spokesperson Pol D'Huyvetter who referred to developments in Russia, China, Belarus and Ukraine.

A large delegation of the Citizen Inspectors is now being welcomed in the European Parliament, where they are guests of Magda Aelvoet, President of the Green Group in the EP.

This morning over 500 peace marchers from over 30 countries set their final steps to NATO headquarters in the For Mother Earth 220km peace walk. The peace marchers started their walk at the International Court of Justice in the Hague on May 16. They want NATO to take immediate action towards nuclear disarmament, while also asking an end to the NATO bombings in the Balkan. Although forbidden, today Mr. De Donnea, Mayor of Brussels, gave in to the non-violent marchers to reach the gates of NATO headquarters. At arrival the walkers found a strong police barrier. However they built a joyful festival with an open air lunch and a cultural event with a solar sound system. The marchers had announced themselves as 'an international citizens inspection team to prevent warcrimes'. In a registered letter to

Solana they had asked for detailed information about NATO's nuclear stockpile (cfr. <<http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/tonato.htm>>).

It is not clear

Marchers Azerbeidjan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Cameroon, Colombia, Denmark, England, Finland, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Israel, Iran, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Nepal, New-Zealand, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Romania, Russia, Scotland, Sweden, Ukraine, USA and Wales.

The walk has received the support of Abolition 2000, an international network of over 1300 NGO's working to eliminate all nuclear weapons.

The organisation of the international peace march is being co-ordinated from the international office of For Mother Earth in Gent, Belgium. Since 1991 For Mother Earth organized more than 12000km of peace marches across the US and Europe

++ Letter to Solana <http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/tonato.htm>

++ Audiovisual footage available from the walk ++

During the walk, the mobile media unit will be providing continuous coverage via video clips, stills and digital images. These are available upon request.

The audio-visual website will carry highlights of the footage, which is located at:

<http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/pics>

For updates and more information contact:

· For Mother Earth <<http://www.motherearth.org/>>

Press Briefings on Internet & on location:

Regular press briefings and photo images can be located at

<<http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/press.htm>>

Press contacts: Pol D'Huyvetter and Krista Van Velzen

Audio-visual media contact: Ville Aho

GSM 0495-28 02 59 (in Belgium)

E-mail: <international@motherearth.org>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 28 May 1999 14:48:51 +0200
From: "Pol D'Huyvetter" <pol@motherearth.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: PB#7- 190 Inspectors arrested at NATO yesterday/NATO Nuclear
Planning Group
To: fme@motherearth.org, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org,
2000walk4abolition@motherearth.org, vredeslijst@ddh.nl,
tp2000.lst.grp@gn.apc.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id FAA16868
X-Sender: pold@pop.xs4all.be (Unverified)

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id FAB17052

UPDATE UPDATE UPDATE UPDATE

-> Pictures, television footage and news through major news-wires

+ 190 Inspectors arrested at NATO headquarters +

PRESS CONTACT 0495-28 02 59 (Pol D'Huyvetter)

Brussels, May 28 1999 - Yesterday in the late afternoon a confirmed total of 190 Citizens Inspectors were arrested at NATO headquarters in Brussels. 60 of them were transported with police vans a short while later to the peace camp in the center of Brussels. A spokesperson for For Mother Earth who organised this inspection suspected the reason to be that the police didn't have enough room to keep everybody. 130 others were held in custody and released between 22:00 and 24:00.

The arrests followed the refusal by NATO to hand over information about NATO's Nuclear Planning Group. The inspectors demand the immediate release of data about NATO's nuclear force. They especially want to know the sites, numbers, types, yields and targets. The inspectors want to hand over this information to Members of Parliament, the International Court of Justice and the International Criminal Court which is being established in The Hague. The inspectors demand that NATO release the information immediately, preferably through their internet site.

Ronald De Vos, a Belgian inspector was succesful in entering one of the NATO buildings. "Immediately after passing through the entrance I was knocked down without any warning, and lost consciousness". NATO security however apologized afterwards. If NATO does not release tthe controversial data, citizens inspectors will continue to make new attempstps to enter the buildings to find the compromising information.

Further a diplomatic incident ocured when the Brussels police stopped another group of over 100 Citizens Inspectors from going to an official reception at the European Parliament which was hosted by Magda Aelvoet, President of the Green Group in the EP.

The citizens inspectors welcome the indictment of President Milosevic yesterday in The Hague. They however believe that also NATO has to be

brought to court for the preparation of crimes against humanity.

The inspectors have also an ongoing dialogue with Brussels security forces. "Brussels and Belgrade are the only two places in Europe where demonstrations against the war are being officially prohibited by authorities. We however invite the Brussels police-force to uphold international law. Referring to the 1946 Nuremberg Principles, we invite the security forces to cooperate and help us to get the information of the Nuclear Planning Group" declares For Mother Earth spokesperson Pol D'Huyvetter.

This international team of Citizen Inspectors is the final action of a 500 person peace march from the International Court of Justice in The Hague which ended at NATO at midday yesterday. NATO press officer Nick Fiorenza and legal adviser Baldwin De Vidts refused to release information regarding NATO's nuclear arsenal. The Citizen Inspectors demanded transparency about NATO nukes.

The peace camp stays until noon Sunday at the Katholieke Hogeschool in the Nieuwlandstraat 198, 1000 Brussels (near Brussels South railway station).

The action has received the support of Abolition 2000, an international network of over 1300 NGO's working to eliminate all nuclear weapons. For the inspection there is close cooperation with IALANA (International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms).

++ Letter to Solana <http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/tonato.htm>

++ Audiovisual footage available from the walk ++

During the walk, the mobile media unit will be providing continuous coverage via video clips, stills and digital images. These are available upon request.

The audio-visual website will carry highlights of the footage, which is located at:

<http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/pics>

For updates and more information contact:

· For Mother Earth [<http://www.motherearth.org/>](http://www.motherearth.org/)

Press Briefings on Internet & on location:

Regular press briefings and photo images can be located at

[<http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/press.htm>](http://www.motherearth.org/walk99/press.htm)

Press contacts: Pol D'Huyvetter and Krista Van Velzen

Audio-visual media contact: Ville Aho

GSM 0495-28 02 59 (in Belgium)

E-mail: <international@motherearth.org>

end

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Sun, 30 May 1999 23:30:28 +0100 (BST)
From: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org (Rob Green)
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: New UK Address
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Authentication-Warning: mail.gn.apc.org: Host user1102.uk.uudial.com [193.149.73.169] claimed to be [193.149.75.149]
X-Sender: robwcpuk@pop.gn.apc.org

Dear Abolitionists,

Please note that, from Wednesday 2 June, my UK address will be: Halldore Corner, High Road, Cookham Rise, Berkshire SL6 9JT; tel/fax (+44) 16285 22331.

Best wishes,
Rob Green
Chair, World Court Project UK

Commander Robert D Green, Royal Navy (Retired)
Chair, World Court Project UK

NZ: Disarmament & Security Centre	UK: Halldore Corner
PO Box 8390	High Road
Christchurch	Cookham Rise
Aotearoa/New Zealand	Berkshire SL6 9JT

Tel/Fax: (+64) 3 348 1353 Tel/Fax: (+44) 16285 22331

Email: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org

Return-Path: <GPowers@nccbuscc.org>
Date: Sat, 29 May 1999 17:40:30 -0500
From: Gerard Powers <GPowers@nccbuscc.org>
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
Subject: Using interfaith petition at regional gatherings -Reply
Content-Disposition: inline

No problem pestering me. We don't have such regional meetings, I'm afraid. We have a general meeting in June but it is a retreat, so I am not invited and no work is permitted -- theoretically.

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Fri, 28 May 1999 15:41:35 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: ISSUE BRIEF: Editorials for CTBT, Pt. 3

May 28, 1999

TO: Coalition Members and Friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Editorials for CTBT; Helms Has Held CTBT Hostage for 615 days

The following Coalition Issue Brief will be sent via fax blast on Monday. It summarizes editorials from Dallas, Austin, Atlanta, Miami and Omaha. Here is the e-mail version in advance. It is available on the web at <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n4.htm>>

Full versions of other the editorials and select CTBT-related op-eds is on the Coalition's CTBT Site at <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

DK

"America's Editors Back Test Ban Treaty, Pt. 3 --
Say That Senate Leaders Should End 615-Day Blockage of Consideration"

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF

VOL. 3, NO. 4, June 1, 1999

GLOBAL NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION problems persist, but the United States Senate has failed to take action to permanently ban nuclear testing worldwide — a step that would help prevent the buildup of advanced nuclear weapon arsenals by China or other states. The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) was transmitted to the Senate for approval over 20 months ago, but Foreign Relations Committee Chair Jesse Helms (R-NC) has held the treaty hostage. Helms says: "Not until the administration has submitted the ABM protocols and the Kyoto global-warming treaty ... will the Foreign Relations Committee turn its attention to other treaties on the president's agenda. ... I expect them [the ABM protocols] to arrive by June 1."

Senator Helms' views and his politics-before-substance tactics stand in stark contrast to the views of the American public and leading commentators who are strongly in favor of swift Senate approval of the CTBT, especially in light of new concerns about Chinese nuclear weapon capabilities. Since the CTBT was sent to the Senate in September 1997, over 76 newspaper editorials have expressed support for the CTBT and/or for prompt Senate action, while only 3 have opposed. This is the third in a series of excerpts from the editorials:

Austin American-Statesman, May 26, 1999: "Espionage Fallout"

"...China has only two dozen sophisticated nuclear weapons compared to thousands in the U.S. arsenal. It is hard to believe China's weapons development is on par with this nation's. But to negate the theft of U.S. nuclear secrets and prevent China from testing new weapons, the Senate should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. That already-signed treaty, held up for more than a year in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, establishes an international monitoring and verification procedure to deter nuclear testing. ... [R]atification [is] the most effective way to mitigate the loss of technology secrets and retard China's progress in testing nuclear weapons. The secrets are stolen, the technology transferred to China and there is blame aplenty to go around. Now halt testing."

The Dallas Morning News, May 24, 1999: "Test ban treaty: Helms should stop blocking Senate ratification"

"The Senate must ratify the treaty that would ban nuclear weapons tests. If it does not, a priceless opportunity to reduce the risk of nuclear catastrophe will have been lost. The biggest obstacle to ratification is one man: Jesse Helms, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Helms, a North Carolina Republican, objects to the treaty on its face. ... Mr. Helms' objections are faulty. The United States does not need to test more nuclear weapons. It has supercomputers that can judge the reliability of its nuclear weapons without testing. A global network of sensors will soon be in place that would make it virtually impossible for a nuclear device to be detonated secretly. China's theft of U.S. nuclear-weapons technology makes a test ban even more imperative. That's because China cannot build reliable weapons without testing. A test ban would reduce the likelihood that China could capitalize on the stolen U.S. technology.

"Seventeen nuclear-capable countries, including Britain and France, have ratified the treaty. Many countries are waiting to see what the United States will do. ... If the United States does not ratify it by September, then it is barred from participating in a key conference on speeding the treaty's entry into force. And, as has become usual in recent years, the United States is failing to lead by example. Mr. Helms should relent, and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott should stop supporting his indefensible obstructionism. If they do not, then Republican Sens. Phil Gramm and Kay Bailey Hutchison of Texas should help them to see the error of their ways. The U. S. must not miss this opportunity to make itself and the world more secure."

The Miami Herald, April 19, 1999: "India's Nuclear Punch: More Weapons, Tension"

"... In a world that already has far too many nuclear weapons, India's push for nuclear competence is disturbing. The early promise of the Cold War was for a more-sane world that retreated from the buildup of nuclear arms. With the United States leading by example, weapons stockpiles would

be reduced and non-nuclear countries discouraged from joining the ranks of the mutually assured destroyers. Under the Clinton administration, however, nuclear disarmament has been relegated to a back burner. U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty ... is stuck in Congress India's venture into the nuclear arena is a wake-up call for the United States, finally, to lead by its own good example."

Omaha World-Herald, March 4, 1999: "Test Ban Treaty Too Important To Be Used in Political Game"

"The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is still stuck on the desk of Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., kept there by his apparent presumption that he and he alone has the right to decide whether the Senate will consider a major international policy question of the era. ...Major issues should not be stacked like a house of cards, with the fate of each depending on the outcome of other matters. The Senate should consider each on its own merits. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the ABM amendments and the Kyoto treaty are not directly related. Helms is attempting to use the nuclear test ban treaty as a crowbar to force the White House to give the ABM amendments and the Kyoto treaty to the Senate.

"[Sen. Chuck] Hagel, whose knowledge of defense issues is widely recognized, has indicated through an aide that he accepts Helms' decision, though he would like to see the nuclear [test ban] treaty discussed on the Senate floor. The merits of the treaty are open for debate. [Questions about the treaty] ... should be addressed by the Senate, and sooner rather than later. Helms' gamesmanship stands in the way of a healthy and important debate. He should not be allowed to get away with it."

The Atlanta Constitution, January 25, 1999: "Nuclear Threat Lives On"

"With the Cold War a fading memory, it's natural to gloss over issues of nuclear security, but ... these problems persist and they really matter. One [Clinton] administration priority this year will be to win Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The sooner, the better. As long as Washington balks, it is in no position to persuade India or Pakistan to halt its testing, now that each has crossed the threshold into the nuclear club. Surprisingly, though, each has offered conditionally to sign the treaty; U.S. ratification could clinch the deal. But standing in the way of ratification are Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) and Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-N.C.). Helms even takes the loony view that the United States should resume nuclear tests.

The administration must overcome this opposition with solid national security arguments. For one thing, the treaty provides for on-scene inspections of suspected underground nuclear blasts, a far superior method than seismic monitoring from afar. For another, the treaty stops the nuclear race in its tracks with the United States very much ahead. Lott should be put on notice he will catch the blame if no vote is allowed on this treaty. Most Americans don't share his cohort Helms' yen for nuclear fireworks."

###

See the Coalition's CTBT Site <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>
for the full text of CTBT-related editorials. The Coalition is a
non-partisan alliance of 17 leading arms control and non-proliferation
organizations.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>,
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: ISSUE BRIEF: Editorials for CTBT, Pt. 3
Cc: tcollina@ucsusa.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 03:41 PM 5/28/99 -0400, Daryl Kimball wrote:

>
>May 28, 1999
>
>TO: Coalition Members and Friends
>FR: Daryl Kimball
>
>RE: Editorials for CTBT; Helms Has Held CTBT Hostage for 615 days
>
Dear Daryl:

That's a great idea to indicate that Senator Helms has held up the CTBT 615 days.

In 1980 Walter Cronkite ended every newscast with an indication that this is the xth day that Iran has held Americans hostage. This was an important factor in keeping the hostage crisis alive, and it was a factor in the defeat of President Carter in his quest for re-election.

What if every day in the opening moments of the Senate a senator arose and said, "Mr. President, this is the 625th day [updated daily] since President Clinton submitted the CTBT to the Senate for ratification. It is time for the Senate to act." A rotating group of senators could make this statement and add a few words of their own. Other senators could say a few words for the treaty each day. Our task would be to seek Republicans to join in.

Maybe this would be a way to resolve this hostage crisis.

Shalom,
Howard

To: "Jonathan Eig" <RockyNRudy@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Opening of "Super Wednesday"
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Jon,

If you haven't yet critiqued my re-write of the opening of SUPER WEDNESDAY that the class read, don't bother. I've re-worked it.

It now opens with a full moon setting in the west of Callahan's. When Larry gets to the store, a Callahan's security guard is already there. Larry is surprised when the police officer he met in the parking lot enters to pursue the case because he only called Callahan's security. The officer explains that the fax message represents a pattern of what has occurred the last three years on the night of the harvest moon, the details of which she isn't at liberty to disclose.

I hope this explains why the police would be concerned enough to appear and also add some mystery.

See you next Monday in class,

Howard

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 1 Jun 1999 17:27:06 -0400
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: Nuclear espionage & the CTBT
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org (Unverified)

June 1, 1999

Dear Friends,

Concerns over China's alleged theft of nuclear weapons secrets causes even greater urgency for Senate action on the CTBT. This development provides a timely opportunity for letters to the editor. A sample follows.

FYI, you'll be pleased to know that Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND) made a great speech to the Senate about the CTBT May 24 (full text available at <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/dorgan052499.htm>>). Here are a couple excerpts:

"I very much want our country to do the right thing: Ratify [the CTBT] before September of 1999...I intend to work with a number of my colleagues to see if we are able, in the coming weeks, to speak with some aggressiveness on this issue here on the floor of the Senate..." He went on to say that the treaty needs to be on the Senate's agenda before the July 4 recess.

This has good potential to lead to significant action on the treaty! For more information on these developments, check the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers website (<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/>>), as well as its links to Disarmament Clearinghouse member organizations.

Marie Rietmann, CTBT Coordinator
20/20 Vision

Sample Letter to the Editor

Dear Editor:

Recent disclosures about the potential loss of U.S. nuclear weapons secrets demonstrate the urgent need for U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), which seeks to ban nuclear weapons test explosions. Unfortunately, the CTBT is stalled in the Senate, thanks to the monolithic power of Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC).

China or any country wanting to use nuclear weapons needs more than computer codes; it must also test the weapons, which the CTBT prevents. Those in the Senate who are justifiably concerned about this scandal should also be concerned about the Senate's failure to consider the treaty.

The U.S. Senate needs to follow the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and

ratify the CTBT. I encourage our Senators, _____, to do all they can to get the treaty ratified this year. To deny the CTBT is to deny the U.S. its last line of defense against nuclear weapons espionage.

Your name

Your address

Your day and evening phone numbers

Tips on writing letters to the editor:

* 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, although it may publish your hometown along with your name.

* 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.

* Letters to the editor mentioning a Senator by name will probably be clipped by Senate staff and likely even gain the personal attention of the Senator.

Please send printed letters to the editor to:

Disarmament Clearinghouse

1101 14th Street NW, #700

Washington, DC 20005

Telephone 202/898-0150 Fax 202/898-0172

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: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 07:49:16 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news: AP on Senate's delay on CTBT

June 2, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Associated Press article on CTBT; ABM; Deep Cuts Conundrum in Senate

The following article provides a good summary of the continuing impasse over key nuclear risk reduction measures on the occasion of Senator Helms' "deadline" (June 1) for Clinton Administration transmittal of the ABM Treaty Protocols. No one said U.S. ratification of the CTBT would be easy.

For more information on the CTBT, see the Coalition's CTBT Site
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

DK

June 2, 1999

"Nuke Treaty Remains in Senate Limbo"

Filed at 2:22 a.m. EDT

By The Associated Press

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Arms-control advocates suggest a nuclear test ban treaty languishing in the Senate could, if ratified, make it harder for China to take its acquired nuclear-weapons technology to the next level.

Yet some of the same Senate conservatives who have been the loudest in condemning Chinese espionage and lax Clinton administration security policies have been blocking a ratification vote.

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was signed by the United States in 1996 and submitted to the Senate the following year. Its ratification has long been a major foreign policy objective for the administration.

It remains on hold before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where Chairman Jesse Helms refuses to bring it up.

Helms first wants the administration to send the Senate modifications to an older treaty -- the 27-year old Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with Moscow.

The North Carolina Republican gave the administration until June 1 to submit the modifications or face a freeze on all treaties.

Helms reiterated the threat last week: "I will do everything within my power to ensure that the ABM treaty is never resurrected or reconstituted."

As of today, the administration still had not sent the Senate the ABM modifications agreed to by President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin. Nor did the White House appear ready to act any time soon.

A senior White House official, speaking on condition of anonymity, said late Tuesday that Clinton "clearly intends to fulfill his commitment to the Senate. But it's strictly the president's prerogative as to the timing of that submission."

"The situation has been thrown off course by the Kosovo operation," the official said. "We intend to try to put the arms control track back in gear with the Russians."

The administration is afraid the GOP-led Senate will vote to scuttle the whole ABM treaty if it is revisited. Helms admits as much, saying it belongs in the "dustbin of history" since it was negotiated with a country that no longer exists, the Soviet Union.

But the biggest reason most conservatives dislike the ABM treaty is that it restricts deployment of a national defense against ballistic missiles, long a GOP goal and more recently embraced by Democrats as well.

Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, an arms-control organization, said the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty "is one of the few tools that is available to the United States to prevent China from conducting nuclear tests on its warhead designs."

"How helpful is it to national security to delay consideration of a treaty that's been in the Senate for 20 months now?" Kimball asked.

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty has been signed by 152 countries, including Russia and China. Only [correction 38] have ratified it. And of those, only two are nuclear powers: Britain and France.

China held its last underground nuclear test in 1996, then declared a moratorium on nuclear testing.

Many treaty advocates claim the Senate delay is keeping other nations from ratifying the treaty, which obligates its signatories not to carry out any nuclear weapons test explosions.

"These are not salad days for arms control," said Chris Madison, a spokesman for Sen. Joseph Biden of Delaware. Biden, the senior Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, is leading the charge for the treaty but has been frustrated by Helms.

The attention may now be on China in light of last week's congressional report on espionage, but China has fewer than 20 ballistic missiles capable of reaching the United States. Russia has thousands.

"I suggest we may be losing touch with reality. We are keeping more weapons in our arsenal than we need, and forcing the Russians to keep more in theirs than they can control," said Sen. Bob Kerrey, D-Neb.

Kerrey has sought unsuccessfully Senate approval for allowing the United States to reduce unilaterally its nuclear arsenal below the 6,000-warhead level permitted for both nations under existing arms-control agreements.

Yet, in this game of musical treaty chairs, the Clinton administration is insisting that it will hold off on the ABM modifications until Russia ratifies yet another arms-control agreement, the so called START II pact.

But with US-Russian relations strained by NATO's bombing in Yugoslavia, the Russian Duma does not seem inclined to act any time soon.

Underscoring the danger, Viktor Chernomyrdin, Russia's special envoy for Kosovo, wrote last week in an essay in The Washington Post that "the world has never in this decade been so close as now to the brink of nuclear war."

Sen. Byron Dorgan, D-S.D., said he and other ban supporters will work in the coming days "to speak with some aggressiveness on this issue on the floor of the Senate" in hopes of prompting a vote.

But with Helms in control, no one is giving Dorgan very good odds.

EDITOR'S NOTE -- Tom Raum covers national and international affairs for The Associated Press.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <tcollina@ucsusa.org>
From: tcollina@ucsusa.org
Date: Wed, 02 Jun 1999 10:31:23 -0500
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>, <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Re[2]: ISSUE BRIEF: Editorials for CTBT, Pt. 3
Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

great idea Howard. Go for it! tom

Reply Separator

Subject: Re: ISSUE BRIEF: Editorials for CTBT, Pt. 3
Author: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Date: 6/1/99 11:13 AM

At 03:41 PM 5/28/99 -0400, Daryl Kimball wrote:

>
>May 28, 1999
>
>TO: Coalition Members and Friends
>FR: Daryl Kimball
>
>RE: Editorials for CTBT; Helms Has Held CTBT Hostage for 615 days

>
Dear Daryl:

That's a great idea to indicate that Senator Helms has held up the CTBT 615 days.

In 1980 Walter Cronkite ended every newscast with an indication that this is the xth day that Iran has held Americans hostage. This was an important factor in keeping the hostage crisis alive, and it was a factor in the defeat of President Carter in his quest for re-election.

What if every day in the opening moments of the Senate a senator arose and said, "Mr. President, this is the 625th day [updated daily] since President Clinton submitted the CTBT to the Senate for ratification. It is time for the Senate to act." A rotating group of senators could make this statement and add a few words of their own. Other senators could say a few words for the treaty each day. Our task would be to seek Republicans to join in.

Maybe this would be a way to resolve this hostage crisis.

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: <ctbt@2020vision.org>

X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org (Unverified)

To: cdavis@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org, jsmith@clw.org, syoung@clw.org, maureene@earthlink.net, bamorse@earthlink.net, kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, ieer@ieer.org, mupj@igc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org, fteplitz@peace-action.org, epank@peacenet.org, kcrandall@psr.org, kroberts@psr.org, btiller@psr.org, brian@taxpayer.net, ctbt@2020vision.org, laura@2020vision.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, wand@wand.org

From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)

Subject: RESPONSE REQUESTED re your CTBT activities

Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 15:08:30 -0400

Dear Friends,

This is for presentation at 6/4 CTBT Working Group meeting. Please provide additions or changes to me by COB Thursday, 6/3.

Thanks for your help.

Marie Rietmann
20/20 Vision

Upcoming CTBT Public Advocacy Activities
For June 4, 1999 meeting of CTBT Working Group

JUNE

SENATE MEMORIAL DAY RECESS May 28-June 6

ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S SPEECH AT AMERICAN UNIVERSITY CALLING FOR A LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY June 10

- * Home state lobby visits during Memorial Day recess, issues to include CTBT - Peace Action and Physicians for Social Responsibility
- * Distribution of Center for Defense Information video to grassroots groups by Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
- * 20/20 Vision's monthly action alert postcard to members on CTBT for June
- * Letter to Senators signed by members of Green Group (presidents of environmental organizations) - delivery date to be determined (12 signers so far)
- * Interfaith petition deliveries to Senators in field offices continuing
- * Opeds signed by 20/20 Vision members being placed in IN, KS, MS, NE, OR, TN
- * Sign-on letter to Senators from women's groups pending

* Conference call for New Mexico with 20/20 Vision Core Groups and Catholics - tentative

JULY

SENATE 4TH OF JULY RECESS July 3-11

ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST NUCLEAR TEST July 16

National call-in day to Senator offices around test anniversary - being organized by Disarmament Clearinghouse

"Roots on the Radio" in key states around test anniversary (organize listeners to call in to locally hosted radio talk shows and place guest experts) - tentative

AUGUST

SENATE AUGUST RECESS August 7-September 7

HIROSHIMA AND NAGASAKI DAYS August 6 and 9

* Peace Action Congress Los Alamos Demonstration August 6-9

SEPTEMBER

ANNIVERSARY OF CTBT SIGNING September 24

WAND/WILL National Conference, including lobby day, September 26-28

OCTOBER

SPECIAL CONFERENCE (or late September)

SENATE TARGET ADJOURNMENT November 1

RESOURCES FOR GRASSROOTS ADVOCACY

* Brochures and comprehensive website- Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers (www.crnd.org)

* Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now! buttons - Disarmament Clearinghouse

* Coalition action alert postcards - 20/20 Vision

* Info re individual Senators, field office phone numbers, sample letter to the editor, etc. - 20/20 Vision website (www.2020vision.org)

* Library of editorials - National Security News Service

* "Center for Defense Information America's Defense Monitor: "Test Anxiety, Should the United States Sign the Test Ban Treaty?" video - copies

available for grassroots groups from Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

* Interfaith petition - available at Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs website (www.loga.org)

* Resolution on abolition, including CTBT - Women's Action for New Directions

Compiled by Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision

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-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com>
From: owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
Bcc:
Date: Wed, 2 Jun 1999 13:31:47 -0600

=====
THE SUNFLOWER
=====

Sender: owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
Precedence: bulk
Reply-To: sunflower-napf

ISSUE NO. 25, June 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/sf/index.html>

=====
CONTENTS
=====

HAGUE APPEAL FOR PEACE
Thousands Attend Hague Appeal for Peace

KOSOVO
More Voices Call for Bombing Halt
Conflict in Yugoslavia Endangering Nuclear Arms Reductions
Milosevic Indicted as War Criminal

PROLIFERATION
House Report Alleges Extensive Chinese Nuclear Espionage
U.S. Overreaction to Chinese Spying Seen
U.S. Moves Closer to Missile Defense System
Pakistan Takes Hard Line on Nuclear Deterrence

NON-PROLIFERATION
NPT PrepComm III Ends With Little Progress

RESOURCES

EVENTS

=====
HAGUE APPEAL FOR PEACE
=====

Thousands Attend Hague Appeal for Peace

Some 8,000 people attended the four-day Hague Appeal for Peace Conference

that began on May 12. More than 100 nationalities were represented, and over 400 debates, working groups and other activities took place. Addresses were presented by world leaders including Archbishop Desmond Tutu and UN Secretary General Kofi Annan. Also present were Nobel laureates Jody Williams, Joseph Rotblat, Jose Ramos Horta, and Rigoberta Menchu Tum. Other guests included Queen Noor of Jordan, Netherlands Prime Minister Wim Kok, and Bangladesh Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina. Characterizing the conference as a "huge success," Hague Appeal president Cora Weiss noted that "we are overwhelmed by the outpouring of commitments demanding a war-free future."

"[Preventing war] requires a deep change in civil society - the development of a culture in which statesmen and diplomats alike know what is expected of them. They have to know that, in the eyes of their fellow citizens, the ultimate crime is not to give away some real or imaginary national interest. The ultimate crime is to miss the chance for peace, and to condemn your people to the unutterable misery of war."

UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan
Hague Appeal for Peace, May 15, 1999

Following the conference, several hundred persons participated in a march for nuclear disarmament from the Hague Peace Palace to NAYO headquarters in Belgium. The demands of the marchers included that NATO declare a No First Use policy for nuclear weapons, promote a European Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone, and allow NGO representation in policymaking.

=====
KOSOVO
=====

More Voices Call for Bombing Halt

A variety of international leaders are calling for a cessation of NATO strikes against Yugoslavia. Calling for an end to widescale bombing that hurts the people of Serbia, former President Jimmy Carter criticized leaders for giving up prematurely on negotiations and stated that use of ground forces is a better option than continuing to destroy the lives of civilians. Former Soviet leader and Nobel Peace Laureate Mikhail Gorbachev condemned U.S. actions as arbitrary and without regard to international public opinion. (ABC May 23, 1999; Associated Press, May 27, 1999).

Condemning the NATO air strikes, Russian envoy Viktor Chernomyrdin stated that "The world has never in this decade been so close as now to the brink of nuclear war." Chernomyrdin has called for "the introduction of U.N. forces into Kosovo with Yugoslavia's sovereignty and territorial integrity intact." (Washington Post, May 27, 1999)

Conflict in Yugoslavia Endangering Nuclear Arms Reductions

Progress in nuclear arms reductions is one of the casualties of the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia. Strained U.S.-Russian relations have put the outcome of Start II and other efforts to control nuclear weapons in doubt, including the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and joint efforts to avoid an accidental missile attack by cooperation on early warning systems. Sergei Rogov, Director of the USA/Canada Institute in Moscow warned, "What will happen in the next two years is the total collapse of arms control unless significant improvements are made in U.S.-Russian relations." (David Hoffman, Washington Post Foreign Service, May 23, 1999.)

Milosovic Indicted as War Criminal

The UN War Crimes Tribunal in The Hague has charged Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic and four other Yugoslav officials as war criminals for crimes against humanity committed during the Kosovo conflict. Milosevic became the first sitting head of state ever to be charged with war crimes. A Yugoslav government statement dismissed the tribunal as a tool of the United States to "obliterate enemies." (CNN, May 27, 1999; Reuters, May 27, 1999)

PROLIFERATION

"The problems posed by Chinese nuclear espionage pale in comparison with the dangers inherent in Russia's domestic plight, its aging arsenal, stressed-out command and control and lax export controls. Moreover, the current nuclear export posture exacerbates current dangers by requiring the deployment of 6,000 nuclear weapons, approximately half of which are on hair-trigger alert."

Michael Krepon, President, Henry L. Stimson Center, Washington Post, May 25, 1999

House Report Alleges Extensive Chinese Nuclear Espionage

A report of the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China released May 25 concluded that since the 1970's China has obtained a wide range of U.S. nuclear secrets. Among the alleged acquisitions are plans for every weapon in the current U.S. nuclear arsenal. According to the report, "With the stolen U.S. technology, (China) has leaped, in a handful of years, from 1950s-era strategic nuclear capabilities to the more modern thermonuclear weapons design."

However, DOE Secretary Richardson, who has stated that security problems at U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories have been corrected, said that "It does not appear based on the CIA assessment that the Chinese have used this information to modernize their deployable strategic force as well as their deployment of their nuclear weapons." China has denied all charges related to nuclear spying. (Reuters, May 24, 1999; CNN May 25, 1999; Los Angeles Times May 25, 1999)

U.S. Overreaction to Chinese Spying Seen

In the context of the balance of nuclear arms, in which the U.S. possesses some 6,000 strategic nuclear weapons and China fewer than two dozen, some defense experts believe that many U.S. politicians have overreacted to Chinese nuclear espionage. Robert Norris, a nuclear weapons expert with the Natural Resources Defense Council, recently stated that "the depiction of China as an impending nuclear nemesis just does not accord with the facts." Warning against an overreaction that could impair U.S.-China relations, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger told senators that even with the stolen nuclear secrets, China would take 15 years to develop the capacity to produce weapons based on U.S. nuclear weapons plans. (Associated Press, May 26, 1999)

U.S. House Moves Closer to Missile Defense System

On May 20 the U.S. House voted overwhelmingly to commit the government to building a missile defense system whenever "technologically feasible." President Clinton is expected to sign the bill into law. The measure does not actually commit funds for construction of a missile defense system. (New York Times, May 21, 1999. For a daily update on missile defense, consult the BMD Newswire, <http://www.clw.org/ef/bmdnews/index.html>.)

Pakistan Takes Hard Line on Nuclear Deterrence

Pakistan's Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif has reaffirmed the importance of nuclear deterrence to Pakistan's national policy. "Now nuclear deterrence is indispensable to our security doctrine," he stated on May 18. "We will preserve this deterrence under all circumstances." (Reuters, May 19, 1999)

=====
=====
"...cities and towns were decorated with banners and giant posters carrying pictures of Pakistan's nuclear weapons and scientists and Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif against a backdrop of mushroom clouds ... Replicas of Pakistan's recently tested nuclear missiles and a giant scale model of the nuclear test site at Chaghi in Baluchistan were constructed ... There has probably never been an occasion like this before. It is nothing less than glorying in having achieved the capacity to commit mass murder..."

Zia Mian on the celebration of the first anniversary of Pakistan's nuclear testing, from his article "Nuclear Nationalism"

For a full copy of the article, visit www.napf.org/articles/pakaniv.html.
A related article by Pervez Hoodbhoy, "Pokhran-Chaghi Audit - Winners and Losers," is available at www.mnet.fr/aiindex/perver28May99.html.

=====

=====

NON=PROLIFERATION

=====

====

"The world is staring into an abyss of nuclear weapons proliferation. The danger of the use of nuclear weapons is growing. The recognition of this should galvanize intelligent and committed people - in both governments and civil society - to action."

Senator Douglas Roche, May 25, 1999 (Senator Roche's analysis of PrepComm III appears at www.napf.org/articles/prepcomm3.html)

PrepComm III Ends With Little Progress

Another Preparatory Committee (PrepComm) meeting for 2000 Review of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is over, and once again the nuclear weapons states have blocked any dramatic progress toward the elimination of nuclear weapons. According to Rebecca Johnson of the Acronym Institute, "as predicted, it was a difficult conference, all the essential decisions for preparing and planning for the 2000 Review Conference were successfully taken, although certain issues were fudged or remitted to the Review Conference for decision there." For more information and analysis, see www.acronym.org.uk/nptdesc.htm

=====

EVENTS

=====

More events are listed at http://www.napf.org/calendar/events_current.html

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 5: Emergency Mobilization to Stop the War, National March on the Pentagon. Details: <http://home.earthlink.net/~npcboston/jun5end.htm>

June 5: Interfaith Common Ground Conference, 8:30 am-4 p.m., San Juan Capistrano Mission, California. Practical and non-violent solutions to violence for the third millennium. Contact Tom Whaling, 949-472-1010.

June 18-20: Nuclear Policy and Security on the Eve of the 21st Century, St.

Petersburg, contact Xanthe Hall, IPPNW Germany, 49-30-693-0244,
ippnw@oln.comlink.apc.org

July 4-7, 1999: Nourishing the Peacemaker: Living in Harmony & Becoming a
Peacebuilder, 18th Annual Peace Retreat, sponsored by the Nuclear Age Peace
Foundation and La Casa de Maria, Santa Barbara, CA, (805) 969-5031.

August 3-9: World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, contact
antiatom@twics.com.

August 6: Sadako Peace Day. Ceremony at the Sadako Peace Garden at La Casa
de Maria in Santa Barbara. Sponsored by the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.
For more information, call 965-3443.

August 6-8: Beyond the Bomb: A New Agenda for Peace and Justice,
Albuquerque, NM, contact Bruce Hall, Peace Action, panukes@igc.apc.org. See
<http://www.peace-action.org/beyond.html>

=====
RESOURCES

The Middle Powers Initiative (MPI) has a new website at
www.middlepowers.org. It offers "Fast Track to Zero Nuclear Weapons"
downloadable in PDF form. This is one of the finest current summaries of
the major issues involved with nuclear weapons proliferation and abolition.

A new book "Security and Survival, The Case for a Nuclear Weapons
Convention" is available IPPNW, 727 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA
02139, 617-868-5050, fax 617-868-2560; ippnwbos@ippnw.org. \$10 U.S., plus
postage and handling (\$2 in the US/Canada/Mexico. \$6 elsewhere.)

Security and Survival: The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention, \$10 in
the U.S.; e-mail ippnwbos@ippnw.org for shipping charges outside the U.S.
Order from IPPNW Publications Department, 727 Massachusetts Ave.,
Cambridge, MA 02139.

"Russia's Nuclear Crisis" is the latest video from America's Defense
Monitor. Details: www.cdi.org/adm/1228.

"Aotearoa/New Zealand at the World Court" by Kate Dewes and Robert Green is
an excellent account of Aotearoa/New Zealand's anti-nuclear history and use
of the World Court. Available from Disarmament and Security Center, P.O.
Box 8390, Christchurch, Aotearoa/New Zealand, kate@chch.planet.org.nz.

<http://www.peacewire.org/campaigns/index.html> features excellent audio
links to speeches by General Lee Butler and other key documents in the
campaign to abolition nuclear weapons.

Protecting Human Rights Defenders, Analysis of the newly adopted
Declaration on Human Rights Defenders, is available through the Lawyers
Committee for Human Rights, <http://www.lchr.org/media/chr/defdecanalysis.htm>

http://hiroshima.tomato.nu/English/index_e.html is a website designed to

convey the spirit of Hiroshima and advocate nuclear weapons abolition and world peace. It features survivors' stories, a Peace Park Tour, letters from the world, and more. The site was prepared by Hiroshima survivor Miyoko Matsubara.

<http://www.globalactionpw.org/> is the website for Global Action to Prevent War, a coalition-building effort to stop war, genocide, and other forms of deadly conflict.

=====
EDITOR
=====

David Krieger

=====
SPONSOR
=====

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" with "unsubscribe sunflower-napf" in the body of the message.
For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send "help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

To: dihallman@erols.com
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Scribble magazine
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Diana:

At the Maryland Writers' Association Annual Conference, I spoke to the Sherry Morrow, Editor of SCRIBBLE, who said that she had hoped to have SCRIBBLE ready for the Conference, but would have it out soon. I have been surprised that it has not yet come. Has something happened? Did everyone collapse after the Conference?

Also, the Maryland Writers' Association was not represented at the small press fair at the Writer's Center in Bethesda in May. Just want to know what's up?
Carlee Hallman

Return-Path: <RockyNRudy@aol.com>
From: RockyNRudy@aol.com
Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1999 22:53:57 EDT
Subject: Re: Opening of "Super Wednesday"
To: mupj@igc.apc.org

Howard

I think your solutions make a lot of sense. I have read your new pages (I think 40-50), but I haven't looked at the rewrite of the beginning you did yet. Now I will wait to see the newer stuff you mentioned.

See you Monday.

Jon

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 01:00:00 +0000
From: IPPNW@vlberlin.comlink.de (IPPNW)
Lines: 82
Organization: IPPNW Germany
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Coordinating Committee and Global Council
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Gateway: ZCONNECT Uluru.IPN.De [UNIX/Connect v0.74b4MB06#mw1]
X-ZC-PGP-Key-Avail:
X-ZC-Post: Koertestrasse 10

DEUTSCHE SEKTION DER INTERNATIONALEN AERZTE FUER DIE VERHUETUNG DES ATOMKRIEGES
AERZTE IN SOZIALER VERANTWORTUNG
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)

Koertestrasse 10, Tel: +49 (0)30 693 0244
D-10967 Berlin 61, Fax: +49 (0)30 693 8166

IPPNW@VLBerlin.comlink.de IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org
<http://www.ippnw.de>

04.06.99

Dear All,

Zia Mian sent a message containing a number of questions about the make-up and relationship of the newly constituted bodies in Abolition 2000: the Coordinating Committee and the Global Council. I do not know if his message or any of the responses were posted to the caucus but I would encourage this discussion to be open to everyone, otherwise it becomes hierarchical.

The main question was of participation from the Global South and how the Committee intends on facilitating that, given that there is so little representation of the South on the Committee. Apparently, the Committee was chosen on the grounds of "availability" which could be interpreted as meaning resources to make international telephone calls or take part in meetings.

The crucial question is: what are the tasks of the Committee? If the main task is to see that the "administrator", based at the office where the list of Abolition 2000 Statement endorsers is held (currently Lori Beckwith at the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation in California), is paid and administers the list, then I have no objections to the present make-up of the committee. If the committee is meant to have a coordinating role, then it is a problem, since coordination requires prioritisation, and that involves politics. In my opinion the Council might be in a better position to do this, since its representation will be more equal.

What will the Council do? In my opinion the Council should be the forum to discuss ways of extending into the South and making Abolition

2000 attractive and relevant to NGOs there, so that their participation is motivated. A particular problem is Africa and South America, where we have very few groups.

It would be helpful to have less questions and more suggestions, especially from the South. I am not in a position to know what it takes for someone in Bangladesh or Ghana to participate more fully in this Network. Is it just money? Or is it also a question of motivation and issue? It could be both. Maybe we need to develop more materials on the cross-over between nuclear weapons and other issues, and they should be written from a Southern perspective. I remember the statement to the UN Ecosoc meeting I think it was, that Zia drafted, or the Moorea Declaration. Are these materials useful for motivating participation?

My vision for Abolition 2000 is that the regions will develop independently, identifying their own issues, but that the whole Network will feel its "globalness" through the demand for a Convention and through the number of endorsing groups (2000 by the year 2000). These are the two focal points for the Global Council:

1. How to promote the Convention
 2. How to increase the number of groups and their participation.
- Any more than this is too much work on top of all the issues we have to deal with daily.

The discussion about this should be open to all, but the responsibility for action on these points should be with the Global Council. So let's get transparent!

Love to you all (and let's hope the war in the Balkans will soon be over...)

Xanthe Hall
(Co-Director)

IPPNW is a member of Abolition 2000
- a Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons -

CrossPoint v3.11 R

To: IPPNW@vlberlin.comlink.de (IPPNW), abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Coordinating Committee and Global Council
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 01:00 AM 6/4/99 +0000, IPPNW wrote:

> 04.06.99
>Dear All,
>
>Zia Mian sent a message containing a number of questions about the
>make-up and relationship of the newly constituted bodies in Abolition
>2000: the Coordinating Committee and the Global Council. I do not know
>if his message or any of the responses were posted to the caucus but I
>would encourage this discussion to be open to everyone, otherwise it
>becomes hierarchical.

Dear Friends:

I don't know what Xanthe Hall is talking about in this message. It sounds as if Abolition 2000 at the Hague meeting set up a new Coordinating Committee and a new Global Council. However, as a signer of the Abolition 2000 statement and therefore a member of the network, we have heard nothing of these new bodies. Can anyone inform us? Full participation requires complete and timely information.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Fri, 04 Jun 1999 12:48:43 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
X-Accept-Language: en
To: tcollina@ucsusa.org, dkimball@clw.org, jdi@clw.org, wand@wand.org,
cferg@fas.org, mupj@igc.org, joe@fcl.org, ctbt@2020vision.org,
smk@armscontrol.org, pwood@cdi.org, tgraham@lawscens.org
Subject: Proposed sign-on letter
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id JAA04557

Here is an electronic copy of the proposed sign-on letter I distributed this morning.

PROPOSED SIGN-ON LETTER

Here is a proposed sign-on letter to Congress. Final version to be circulated next week.

Comments on this draft to Bob Tiller by 10:30 a.m. on Monday, June 7, 1999.

Phone (202) 898-0150, ext. 220
fax (202) 898-0172
e-mail <btiller@psr.org>

Dear Representative/Senator:

The report of the Cox Committee about Chinese spying at U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories raises many issues which you will wrestle with in the coming months, including export controls, trade relations with China and counterintelligence at the labs.

One proposed response to the espionage revelations is a large ramp-up in funding and programs at the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons labs. We believe that this is the wrong reaction, because:

- China's nuclear program does not constitute a threat to the United States. China has only about two dozen strategic weapons deployed, it does not keep them on high alert status, and it has not conducted an explosive nuclear test for several years. Rushing to expand our weapons program is not an appropriate response to the present situation.
- Expensive new weapons programs and facilities at the labs will not contribute to our national security, but they will increase the potential for worldwide nuclear proliferation. Espionage is a reality of our modern world, which can not be completely extinguished, so new developments at U.S. labs will eventually find their way to other countries. Pouring more money into new nuclear weapons research will just lead to a new arms race.
- The issue at the labs is accountability, not more money. The labs already have more than 20,000 employees and annual budgets exceeding \$4 billion, even though the U.S. has not conducted a nuclear test for seven years.

If we want to prevent China from becoming a nuclear threat, the best thing to do is assure that China will not resume explosive nuclear testing, and the way to accomplish that is to get the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) ratified and in force. The treaty has been languishing in the Senate for nearly two years, with no ratification vote in sight.

In light of the above we have two policy recommendations:

1. Congress should not increase the funding and programs at the weapons labs.
2. The Senate should promptly ratify the CTBT.

Thank you for considering our views on this important matter.

Sincerely,
Physicians for Social Responsibility
others

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1999 22:44:57 +0100
From: "Janet Bloomfield" <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Coordinating Committee and Global Council
To: "Steven D. Staples" <sstaples@canadians.org>,
"IPPNW" <IPPNW@vlberlin.comlink.de>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Dear Abolition Friends,
greetings from England. Thank you for your enquiries about the minutes of the Abolition Annual Meeting at the Hague in May. The Minutes are currently in draft form and should be sent out for final confirmation to the list serv at the end of next week. Frances Connolly of A2000 UK took the notes and is currently on holiday.

Rather than give a partial report I suggest that people wait until the minutes are fully circulated and then we can have a full and open discussion of what happens next with everybody participating with the same information.

Yours in peace,
Janet Bloomfield.

Janet Bloomfield
25 Farmadine
Saffron Walden
Essex
CB11 3HR
England
Tel/Fax: +44 (0)1799 516189
e-mail: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Sat, 5 Jun 1999 16:07:17 -0400
From: "Renny Drielsma" <drielsma@c gocable.net>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: OPERATION DE-ALERT
To: <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

URGENT+ACE-

This project needs input and support. Please comment, Thanks, Renny Drielsma.

Dear Member of Parliament, June 1st,1999.

During the week commencing May 11, 1999, over 6000 citizens gathered from around the world to meet in The Hague, Holland, to plan peace-making strategies for the new millennium.

Realizing the potential devastation of an accidental Y2K Nuclear Launch, there emerged out of The Hague Appeal for Peace Conference a global movement determined to minimize the risks of a Nuclear Launch as we advance into the third millennium.

The stakes are high, humanity is at risk.

We, The Members of Non-Governmental Organizations from around the world, request your active support in requesting that all Nuclear Nations participate in +ACI-Operation De-Alert+ACI-.

We believe that with the heightened risk associated with the millennium changeover, not only would it be in the best interest of all Humanity for the Nuclear Nations to stand down their Nuclear Weapons, but it would also be perceived as a gesture of good faith and mutual trust between nations as we progress into a hopefully more peaceful third millennium.

+ACI-Operation De-Alert+ACI- was born in The Hague, The Netherlands on May 15th, 1999.

+ACI-OPERATION DE-ALERT+ACI-

+ACI-MILLENNIUM SECURITY INITIATIVE+ACI-

+ACI-Building Global Confidence for The Third Millennium.+ACI-

The Hague, The Netherlands, May 15, 1999.

Operation De-Alert consists simply of a two month time-frame, December 1999, and January 2000, during which all nuclear nations will have their nuclear missiles on a De-Alert Status.

On January 5th, 2000, all Foreign Ministers are invited to attend a Toronto Summit to negotiate an agreement to continue the de-alert posture further into the new century.

On February 1st, 2000, if no extension is negotiated, The Nuclear Nations revert back to Alert Status.

As a Member of Parliament, you have the ability to bring this initiative to the attention of The Government of Canada, and to advance it to the world stage for consideration.

We ask that you+ADs-

1. Endorse +ACI-Operation De-Alert+ACI-, recommending it+IBk-s implementation.
2. Bring this Initiative to the attention of your colleagues, The Defence Minister, The Standing Committee on Defence, The Foreign Minister, The Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Canada+IBk-s Ambassador to The U.N. , Canada+IBk-s representative to The U.N. Security Council, Canada+IBk-s representative to The Committee for Disarmament, non-aligned nations, and, Canada+IBk-s Ambassador to NATO.

We, the members of the International N.G.O+IBk-s, under the direction of Abolition 2000,

will in the meantime be garnering the support of+ADs-

The Middle Powers Nations.

The New Agenda Coalition.

Non-Governmental Organizations from around the world.

I am sure you share our hope of being able to celebrate this significant moment in history, without at the same time having to worry about our very survival. Attached please find the document:

+ACI-YEAR 2000 COMPUTER PROBLEMS AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS CONTROL SYSTEMS+ACI-

Please contact me with your endorsement of +ACI-Operation De-Alert+ACI-

Sincerely,

Mr. Renny Drielsma 422 Patrick Place Burlington Ontario Canada L7L 5Z3

phone 905 632 8687 fax 905 632 8627 email drielsma+AEA-cgocable.net

member: Abolition 2000

+ADwAIQ-DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC +ACI-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN+ACIAPg-
+ADw-HTML+AD4-
+ADw-HEAD+AD4-

+ADw-META content+AD0AIg-text/html+ADs- charset+AD0-utf-7+ACI- http-equiv+AD0-Content-Type+AD4-
+ADw-META content+AD0-'+ACI-MSHTML 4.72.3110.7+ACI-' name+AD0-GENERATOR+AD4-
+ADw-/HEAD+AD4-

+ADw-BODY bgColor+AD0AIw-ffffff+AD4-
+ADw-DIV+AD4APA-FONT size+AD0-2+AD4-
+ADw-P+AD4-URGENT+ACEAPA-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4-This project needs input and support. Please comment, Thanks, Renny
Drielsma.+ADw-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4-Dear Member of Parliament, June 1st,1999.+ADw-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4-During the week commencing May 11, 1999, over 6000 citizens gathered from
around the world to meet in The Hague, Holland, to plan peace-making strategies
for the new millennium.+ADw-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4-Realizing the potential devastation of an accidental Y2K Nuclear Launch,
there emerged out of The Hague Appeal for Peace Conference a global movement
determined to minimize the risks of a Nuclear Launch as we advance into the
third millennium.+ADw-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4-The stakes are high, humanity is at risk.+ADw-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4-We, The Members of Non-Governmental Organizations from around the world,
request your active support in requesting that all Nuclear Nations participate
in +ACY-quot+ADs-Operation De-Alert+ACY-quot+ADs-.+ADw-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4-We believe that with the heightened risk associated with the millennium
changeover, not only would it be in the best interest of all Humanity for the
Nuclear Nations to stand down their Nuclear Weapons, but it would also be
perceived as a gesture of good faith and mutual trust between nations as we
progress into a hopefully more peaceful third millennium.+ADw-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4AJg-quot+ADs-Operation De-Alert+ACY-quot+ADs- was born in The Hague, The Netherlands on May
15+ADw-SUP+AD4-th+ADw-/SUP+AD4-, 1999.+ADw-/P+AD4APA-B+AD4-

+ADw-P align+AD0-center+AD4AJg-quot+ADs-OPERATION DE-ALERT+ACY-quot+ADsAPA-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P align+AD0-center+AD4APA-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P align+AD0-center+AD4AJg-quot+ADs-MILLENNIUM SECURITY INITIATIVE+ACY-quot+ADsAPA-
/P+AD4-

+ADw-P align+AD0-center+AD4APA-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P align+AD0-center+AD4AJg-quot+ADs-Building Global Confidence for The Third
Millennium.+ACY-quot+ADsAPA-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P align+AD0-center+AD4APA-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P align+AD0-center+AD4-The Hague, The Netherlands, May 15, 1999.+ADw-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P align+AD0-center+AD4APA-/P+AD4APA-/B+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4-Operation De-Alert consists simply of a two month time-frame, December 1999,
and January 2000, during which all nuclear nations will have their nuclear
missiles on a De-Alert Status.+ADw-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4-On January 5+ADw-SUP+AD4-th+ADw-/SUP+AD4-, 2000, all Foreign Ministers are invited to attend
a Toronto Summit to negotiate an agreement to continue the de-alert posture
further into the new century.+ADw-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4-On February 1+ADw-SUP+AD4-st+ADw-/SUP+AD4-, 2000, if no extension is negotiated, The
Nuclear

Nations revert back to Alert Status. +ADw-/P+AD4-

+ADw-P+AD4-As a Member of Parliament, you have the ability to bring this initiative to
the attention of The Government of Canada, and to advance it to the world stage
for consideration. +ADw-/P+AD4-

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: June 11 meeting; report on meeting with Lott's staff
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

First, I want to remind you that the next meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT will take place from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, June 15 in the FCNL Conference Room, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC.

Second, on Thursday, June 3 a delegation from the Interfaith Group for the CTBT met with Chris Williams, Senator Lott's advisor on foreign policy and intelligence. Participants included Jack Cullinan (U. S. Catholic Conference), Kathy Guthrie (Friends Committee on National Legislation), Jay Lintner (National Council of Churches), Adina Rosenbaum (Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism), and myself.

We told Mr. Williams about the widespread support for the CTBT within the faith community, both nationally and throughout the country. We asked him to convey to Senator Lott that we would like him to set a date for a Senate vote on the CTBT.

Mr. Williams indicated that Senator Lott is now "taking the temperature" among Republicans regarding the CTBT. A decision may be made within the next three weeks on the CTBT and several other arms control issues (ABM Treaty, START II protocol). The CTBT may be part of a broader bargaining package between the Clinton Administration and Senate leadership.

In response to a question on objections to the CTBT, he mentioned (1) concern about verifiability, (2) doubts that the treaty could stop all nuclear proliferation, and (3) a conviction by some that nuclear weapons remain vital for U.S. security and that therefore U.S. ability to develop new models shouldn't be undermined.

It's hard to judge the outcome of such a meeting, but I hope that Mr. Williams will be able to convey to Senator Lott that the faith community is solidly behind the CTBT, that we have a strong grassroots network supporting ratification.

I believe that our strategy of dealing with key Republican senators (such as Domenici, Warner, members of the Foreign Relations Committee, senators up for re-election next year) remains valid. Particularly important is continued grassroots contacts.

We'll talk more about this on June 15.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 07:54:14 -0700 (PDT)
From: ICPJ <icpj@igc.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Y2K DE-ALERTING STRATEGIC NUKES SIGN-ON LETTER TO
YELTSIN/CLINTON
To: FoE Sydney - Nuclear Campaign <nonukes@foesyd.org.au>,
Abolition-caucus@igc.org, leftlink@vicnet.net.au, nirsnet@nirs.org,
nirsnet@igc.org, nuaware@web.net
X-Sender: icpj@pop2.igc.org

Dear Friends:

Please include the International Center for Peace and Justice as a signer of
the letter

I think it is important to get this out to members of the U.S.

Congress--Senators and Representatives and UN missions. Has that been done?

Thank you for your important work.

Karen Talbot, Director,
International Center for Peace and Justice
550 Pacheco Street,
San Francisco, CA 94116
phone/fax: 415:759-9774
iicpj@igc.org

At 06:12 PM 6/7/1999 +1000, FoE Sydney - Nuclear Campaign wrote:

>John Hallam

>Friends of the Earth Sydney,

>Suite 15,

>1st Floor, 104 Bathurst Street,

>Sydney, NSW, 2000.

>

>Fax(61)(2)9283-2005 ph(61)(2)9283-2006.

>

>nonukes@foesyd.org.au <http://homepages.tig.com.au/~foesyd>

>

>(MY APOLOGIES IF YOU GET THIS MANY TIMES. IT HAS BEEN SENT TO A NUMBER OF
>OVERLAPPING LISTS. BUT HOWEVER MANY TIMES YOU GET IT PLEASE DO SIGN IT!)

>

>RE: SIGN - ON LETTER TO DE-ALERT STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS OVER THE Y2K
>ROLLOVER PERIOD.

>4/6/1999

>

>

>Dear NGOs, Parliamentarians, Concerned Persons,

>

>Enclosed is a letter which is to be sent to Bill Clinton, Boris Yeltsin,

>and their respective defence secretaries and other relevant agencies,

>asking that strategic nuclear weapons be taken off 'hair trigger alert'

>status, and placed in a status in which it will require at least hours and

>preferably days to launch them, over the November/December/January/February
>period.

>
>I am hoping you will be able to sign it.

>
>This is because the possibility of computer-related Y2K failures in the
>vast number of computerised systems that form the command and control
>infrastructure of both US and Russian strategic nuclear systems in
>conjunction with the current state of tension in US/Russian relationships,
>makes for an unacceptable risk of accidental nuclear war over the Y2K
>rollover period.

>
>A strategic nuclear weapons stand-down is thus a potentially planet -
>saving precaution. It is commonsense.

>
>The de-Alerting of nuclear weapons systems was a crucial recommendation of
>the report of the Canberra Commission.

>
>Your signature on this letter will help make the world a safer place.

>
>John Hallam,
>Nuclear Campaigner, Friends of the Earth Sydney.

>
>
>FROM:
>FRIENDS OF THE EARTH AUSTRALIA,
>AUSTRALIAN PEACE COMMITTEE,
>CAMPAIGN FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND DISARMAMENT (CICD) AUSTRALIA,
>AUSTRALIAN ANTI-BASES CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,
>ENVIRONMENT CENTRE OF THE NORTHERN TERRITORY,
>SENATOR DEE MARGETTS,
>ANTHONY ALBANESE, FEDERAL MP FOR GRAYNDLER,
>
>WORLD COURT PROJECT UK,
>DISARMAMENT AND SECURITY CENTRE, NZ,
>ECODEFENSE KOENIGSBERG/MOSCOW,
>WOMENS INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM (Geneva/NY)
>WOMENS INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM (FRANCE)
>GLOBAL RESOURCE ACTION CENTRE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (NY)
>TRI-VALLEY CARES, U.S.,
>METRO-BOSTON COMMITTEE TO DE-ALERT NUCLEAR WEAPONS
>NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION, CALIFORNIA, US.

>
>
>
>PRESIDENT BORIS YELTSIN,
>OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
>KRASNOPRESENSKAYA-2,
>MOSCOW, RUSSIA,
>+7-095-205-4219, +7-095-206-5173

>
>PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON,
>WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, US,
>+1-202-456-2461, +1-202-456-2883.

>
>WILLIAM COHEN, US SECRETARY OF DEFENCE,
>+1-703-695-1149,
>
>BILL RICHARDSON, US SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
>+1-202-586-9987.
>
>IGOR SERGEYEV,
>DEFENCE MINISTER OF RUSSIA,
>Znamenka-19, 103160, Moscow, Russia,
>+7-095-293-33-13
>CC
>ALL HEADS OF STATE (BY EMAIL)
>ALL UN MISSIONS (BY EMAIL)
>
>Dear Presidents Yeltsin and Clinton, Defence Ministers and Defence
>Secretaries, Heads of State and UN Missions,
>
>The organisations above, representing millions of people worldwide, are
>writing to convey their extreme concern over the possibility that Year
>2000 (Y2K)-related computer failures in nuclear weapons systems may lead to
>an unacceptable risk of nuclear war by accident or miscalculation.
>
>In the current political situation this is most especially the case.
>According to Alexandr Arbatov, of the Defence Committee of the Russian
>State Duma, US-Russian relations are at 'the worst, most acute, most
>dangerous juncture since the US-Soviet Berlin and Cuban missile crises.'
>
>The danger during the Y2K rollover lies primarily in the possibility that
>spurious data may induce commanders, even at the highest levels, to
>mistakenly authorise the launches of nuclear weapons.
>
>Events similar to this have already occurred. For example:
>
>In the US in 1980, a malfunctioning computer chip sent spurious alert
>signals;
>
>In 1983 in Russia, satellites mistook glare off the tops of clouds for a US
>missile launch, (and disaster was averted by the refusal of the local
>commander to believe the warnings were real);
>
>In 1995, a Norwegian research rocket prompted a full-scale Russian alert.
>
>If Y2K breakdowns produce inaccurate early warning data, or if
>communications and command channels are compromised, the combination of
>hair-trigger force postures and Y2K failures could be disastrous. There
>should therefore be a 'safety first' approach to Y2K and nuclear
>arsenals.
>
>Because none of the nuclear weapons states can guarantee that their
>nuclear- related computer systems are Y2K compliant, the only responsible
>solution is for them all to stand down nuclear operations. This approach
>should include taking nuclear weapons off alert status and decoupling
>nuclear warheads from delivery vehicles.

>
>The stakes involved in any nuclear exchange between Russia and the US are
>such that they dwarf any other considerations. The future of life itself on
>earth could be in doubt.

>
>In light of this, we strongly urge that you remove all strategic and
>tactical nuclear weapons from 'hair trigger' alert, and place them in a
>status in which at least hours and preferably days would be required to
>launch them.

>
>The Canberra Commission in August 1996, noted that terminating nuclear
>alert status would:

- >--Reduce dramatically the chances of accidental or unauthorised nuclear
>missile launch.
- >--Help set the stage for intensified cooperation on a more far- reaching
>disarmament agenda
- >--Have a very positive influence on the political climate between nuclear
>weapon states.

>
>This last is especially relevant in the current tension between Russia and
>NATO, which has prompted Russia to withdraw from cooperation with the US on
>Y2K problems.

>
>According to the Canberra Commission,
>"Taking nuclear forces off alert could be verified by national technical
>means and nuclear weapon state inspection arrangements. in the first
>instance, reduction in alert status could be adopted by the nuclear weapon
>states unilaterally"

>
>If both sides are verifiably de-alerted, it will not be possible for either
>to launch a disarming first strike.

>
>The immediate stakes are so high, and the potential for global catastrophe
>so clear, that mutually verified de-alerting in the face of the Y2K
>computer problem must take precedence over all other considerations of
>politics and national security.

>
>Signed

>
>John Hallam, Nuclear Campaigner, Friends of the Earth Australia,
>Denis Doherty, Secretary, Pax Christi NSW,
>Julie Marlow, Australian Anti-Bases Campaign Committee,
>Irene Gale, Australian Peace Committee, SA Branch,
>Babs Fuller-Quinn, Australian Peace Committee, National Committee,
>Pauline Mitchell, Campaign for International Cooperation and Disarmament,
>Mark Wakeham, Environment Centre of the Northern Territory,
>Senator Dee Margetts, Green Senator for W.A.,
>Anthony Albanese. MP, Federal member for Grayndler.

>
>Commander Robert Green RN (Ret'd), Chair, World Court Project UK,
>Dr Kate Dewes, Disarmament and Security Centre, Aotearoa/NZ Peace Foundation,
>Vladimir Sliviak, Ecodefense, Russia,
>Felicity Hill, Womens International League for Peace and Freedom, Geneva/NY
>Solange Fernex, Womens International League for Peace and Freedom, France.

- >Alice Slater, Global Resource Action Centre for the Environment, NY.
- >Marylia Kelley, Tri-Valley CARES, Livermore, California, US.
- >William F. Santelmann, Metro-Boston Committee to De-Alert Nuclear Weapons
- >David Kreiger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, Santa Barbara, Calif, US.

>
>
>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 14:51:16 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news: Dorgan (again) on CTBT; more CTBT editorials

June 7, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Sen. Dorgan speaks on Senate floor for CTBT; new CTBT editorials

This afternoon, Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND) spoke for a second time in as many weeks calling on his colleagues to help bring the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to a vote the "next 2-3 months." He said that he is organizing a letter with others to the appropriate committee members to request a debate; he urges his colleagues to join him in demanding treaty ratification, and said he will speak again soon in the coming days with his other colleagues on the issue.

Sen. Harry Reid (D-NV) followed by briefly saying that he agrees with Dorgan and that "everything that can be done should be done to ratify the CTBT."

Also, two new pro-CTBT editorials -- one in The Tennessean and one in the News and Observer (text attached) -- have appeared.

In addition, one new pro-CTBT op-ed in the Minneapolis Star Tribune also ran last week(see attached text).

For further information on CTBT statements and editorials, see the Coalition's CTBT Site at <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

DK

Editorial/Opinion
Defusing nuclear threats

05/31/1999
The News & Observer Raleigh, NC
Final
Page A18
(Copyright 1999)

Along with disclosures about Chinese spying at U.S. weapons labs, a newly raging conflict between India and Pakistan throws into stark relief the dangers posed by nuclear weapons. Having failed to exert real leadership to

discourage nuclear proliferation, the United States bears much responsibility for those risks. It's time Congress acted to reduce them, by ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Last week's report on security lapses at U.S. labs threw a spotlight on China's resolve to build an arsenal capable of challenging the most militarily advanced nations. Its implications are frightening, but the escalation of hostilities between India and Pakistan presents a more immediate danger.

A year ago, India and Pakistan proudly trumpeted their nuclear coming of age with high-profile weapons tests. World leaders rightly scrambled for assurances about the South Asian countries' intents. Indian and Pakistani leaders readily complied, going so far as to say they would likely sign a global treaty banning nuclear testing.

But this spring things heated up again, with more tests and a renewal of the old conflict over Kashmir. Approach-ing national elections in India heighten the risk that the conflict could escalate into one involving nuclear weapons: India's ruling party is under pressure to show that it's willing to use military force.

The United States could have helped defuse India's, Pakistan's and China's nuclear aspirations long ago, by ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty . If it were in force, the tests with which India and Pakistan have egged each other on would, by global agreement, be prohibited.

The longer we wait to ratify this important treaty, the greater the possibility of regional or global disaster. Senator Helms, who has long blocked hearings on it, would perform a service by stepping out of the way.

"Test ban treaty is last line of defense against nuclear espionage"
by Charles Ferguson and Daryl Kimball

06/04/1999

Star-Tribune Newspaper of the Twin Cities Mpls.-St. Paul

Page 19A

(Copyright 1999)

Unless the United States soon ratifies the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and presses for global enactment, China, or any other nation that may have stolen U.S. nuclear weapons information, could resume nuclear explosive testing that is necessary to confirm new bomb designs.

Advanced nuclear weapons are complex devices and the laws of physics are universal. Any country that wishes to build or improve a nuclear weapon needs more than blueprints and computer codes. Only a series of nuclear explosive tests provides the assurance that new types of advanced nuclear weapons work as designed. No Chinese general or political leader can confidently deploy an advanced nuclear bomb design - whether it is developed independently by China, or possibly with the help of stolen

nuclear codes - if it cannot be field tested.

The report of the select House committee chaired by Rep. Christopher Cox, which says that China has acquired classified information on most nuclear weapons in the current U.S. arsenal, may prompt some to call for renewed U.S nuclear weapons development and testing. On the contrary, the Cox report teaches us important lessons about nuclear proliferation and the national security value of the Test Ban Treaty.

China had to conduct at least six explosive tests, including one known test failure, to develop its neutron bomb despite its access to American neutron bomb data, according to the Cox report. In fact, the literal smoking guns that tipped off U.S. intelligence that China stole W-88 warhead design information from Los Alamos were its explosive tests of a similar weapon. From these facts, the United States should realize that nuclear espionage can and will occur but will not give a thief the confidence to deploy weapons without extensive explosive testing.

Renewed nuclear explosive testing would only benefit those nations with fewer numbers and types of nuclear weapons. Even if, by 2010, China modernizes its nuclear arsenal, and the United States reduces to 3,500 deployed strategic warheads, the United States will still have a strategic nuclear force 35 times the size of China's and one deployed on more modern missiles and bombers.

Global enactment of the Test Ban Treaty, which bans all nuclear test explosions, can provide a last line of defense against new advances in weapons development. The United States, China and 150 other states have signed the treaty, which now must be ratified by key states to enter into force. But the Test Ban Treaty has languished in the Senate for more than 18 months because of opposition from Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms and Majority Leader Trent Lott, who have not allowed a hearing, let alone a floor vote. Ironically, many in the Senate who are rightly concerned about the espionage damage are the same senators who have failed to consider ratification of the Test Ban Treaty.

A ratified Test Ban Treaty today will help curtail the nuclear weapons programs not only of China, but also of its neighbors, thus lessening the chances of a dangerous arms race in Asia.

India, citing its fear of China, conducted its own sharply criticized tests last year. Pakistan, citing its fear of India, quickly followed with its own tests. Pakistan's prime minister has pledged to sign the Test Ban Treaty by September, and India has said it would not stand in the way of the treaty's entry-into-force. China already has signed and is expected to ratify this year. Without leadership by the United States through ratification, those nations may not abide by their stated intentions.

That leadership must not only come from the Senate, but also the president and his cabinet. The Clinton administration has delivered numerous strong statements calling for Senate approval of the Test Ban Treaty this year.

However, the president thus far has failed to act on his promise to make

the treaty a priority and to capitalize on the overwhelming public support, the endorsement of military leaders, and strong Senate backing for the Test Ban Treaty, which would win the two-thirds majority needed for ratification if a vote were allowed. The Clinton administration must bolster its anemic efforts to press for Senate approval if the United States is to ratify this year.

A fully implemented Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, while not undoing the national security damage caused by China's theft from our nuclear weapons laboratories, would help prevent China from applying valuable nuclear secrets toward an improved nuclear arsenal.

- Charles Ferguson, a former Los Alamos National Laboratory research scientist, is a senior research analyst with the Federation of American Scientists. Daryl Kimball is the executive director of the Washington, D.C.-based Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: mayumioda@aol.com
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 15:53:04 -0400
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: OPERATION DE-ALERT
To: drielsma@cgocable.net (drielsma@cgocable.net), abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3

Dear Renny,

Thanks for beginning a draft proposal for the Abolition 2000 Y2k Working Group.

Below are my comments:

1. One urgent request: Please note in the text that the proposal is from the Abolition 2000 Y2k Working Group and not from Abolition 2000. There is no way for 1400 organizations to agree to any one proposal--the only thing we all agreed to was the Abolition Statement which was signed and endorsed by each organization. In order to work in the context of the Network, we always attribute projects to the Working Groups of Abolition 2000, not to Abolition 2000 by itself.

2. I'm not clear on the meaning of +ACE- Could you please explain. Also, if I can't figure it out, I guess there are others as well.

3. I think the two month timeframe is cutting ourselves too short. If we want de-alerting with verification, we'll need more than one month. If we want negotiations after December 31st to keep weapons off alert, we'd need more than one month at that end as well. I like the concept but I wonder if others have more informed advice on what exactly we should be asking for--what's the ideal timeframe that can work for us?

Once again, thanks for getting started. Warmest regards,

At 04:07 PM 6/5/99 -0400, drielsma@cgocable.net wrote:

>
> URGENT+ACE-
>
> This project needs input and support. Please comment, Thanks, Renny
> Drielsma.
>
> Dear Member of Parliament, June 1st, 1999.
>
> During the week commencing May 11, 1999, over 6000 citizens gathered from
> around the world to meet in The Hague, Holland, to plan peace-making
> strategies for the new millennium.
>
> Realizing the potential devastation of an accidental Y2K Nuclear Launch,
> there emerged out of The Hague Appeal for Peace Conference a global
> movement determined to minimize the risks of a Nuclear Launch as we
> advance into the third millennium.
>

> The stakes are high, humanity is at risk.
>
> We, The Members of Non-Governmental Organizations from around the world,
> request your active support in requesting that all Nuclear Nations
> participate in +ACI-Operation De-Alert+ACI-.
>
> We believe that with the heightened risk associated with the millennium
> changeover, not only would it be in the best interest of all Humanity for
> the Nuclear Nations to stand down their Nuclear Weapons, but it would also
> be perceived as a gesture of good faith and mutual trust between nations
> as we progress into a hopefully more peaceful third millennium.
>
> +ACI-Operation De-Alert+ACI- was born in The Hague, The Netherlands on May
> 15th, 1999.
>
> +ACI-OPERATION DE-ALERT+ACI-
>
>
> +ACI-MILLENNIUM SECURITY INITIATIVE+ACI-
>
>
> +ACI-Building Global Confidence for The Third Millennium.+ACI-
>
>
> The Hague, The Netherlands, May 15, 1999.
>
>
> Operation De-Alert consists simply of a two month time-frame, December
> 1999, and January 2000, during which all nuclear nations will have their
> nuclear missiles on a De-Alert Status.
>
> On January 5th, 2000, all Foreign Ministers are invited to attend a
> Toronto Summit to negotiate an agreement to continue the de-alert posture
> further into the new century.
>
> On February 1st, 2000, if no extension is negotiated, The Nuclear Nations
> revert back to Alert Status.
>
> As a Member of Parliament, you have the ability to bring this initiative
> to the attention of The Government of Canada, and to advance it to the
> world stage for consideration.
>
> We ask that you+ADs-
>
> 1. Endorse +ACI-Operation De-Alert+ACI-, recommending it+IBk-s
> implementation.
>
> 2. Bring this Initiative to the attention of your colleagues, The Defence
> Minister, The Standing Committee on Defence, The Foreign Minister, The
> Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Canada+IBk-s Ambassador to The U.N.
> , Canada+IBk-s representative to The U.N. Security Council, Canada+IBk-s
> representative to The Committee for Disarmament, non-aligned nations, and,
> Canada+IBk-s Ambassador to NATO.
>

email: aslater@gracelinks.org

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

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 16:18:44 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
X-Accept-Language: en
To: maureene@earthlink.net, dkimball@clw.org, syoung@clw.org,
bamorse@earthlink.net, kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org,
kcrandall@psr.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, wand@wand.org,
epank@peacenet.org, fteplitz@peace-action.org, mupj@igc.org
Subject: Sign-on letter
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id NAA09604

At the NWWG meeting of 5-27-99 I volunteered to draft a sign-on letter in response to the Cox Committee report. I circulated my draft to many of you last week by e-mail, and I also circulated it to the CTBT WG of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

I did not receive any feedback from NWWG members, and I am not sure what that means. Is this the letter that you want, or did I go off-track?

I got two inquiries from CTBT WG members along the lines of "Why are you doing this?"

Also one member of NWWG thought that we were supposed to be doing two letters, and asked which letter I was writing. I don't recall that we discussed two letters, but then my memory is not always perfect. I thought we only wanted one letter. So, do you recall that we decided on one or two?

The final version of the letter is slightly revised from the one I posted last week. I announced a sign-on deadline of 5:00 p.m. Wednesday. Let me know if you can sign on.

Maybe we can discuss this sign-on letter at the NWWG meeting this Thursday, to make sure we are on the same page.

Shalom,
Bob T.

PROPOSED SIGN-ON LETTER

Sign-ons due to Bob Tiller by 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, June 9, 1999.
phone (202) 898-0150, ext. 220
fax (202) 898-0172
e-mail <btiller@psr.org>

Dear Representative/Senator:

The report of the Cox Committee about Chinese spying at U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories raises many issues which you will wrestle with in the coming months, including export controls, trade relations with China and counterintelligence at the labs.

One proposed response to the espionage revelations is a large ramp-up in funding and programs at the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons labs. We believe that this is the wrong reaction, because:

- China's nuclear program does not constitute a threat to the United States. China has only about two dozen strategic weapons deployed, it does not keep them on high alert status, and it has not conducted an explosive nuclear test for three years. Rushing to expand our weapons program is not an appropriate response to the present situation.

- Expensive new weapons programs and facilities at the labs will not contribute to our national security, but they will increase the potential for worldwide nuclear proliferation. Espionage is a reality of our modern world, which can not be completely extinguished, so new developments at U.S. labs will eventually find their way to other countries. Pouring more money into new nuclear weapons research will just lead to a new arms race. The labs already have more than 20,000 employees and annual budgets exceeding \$4 billion, even though the U.S. has not conducted a nuclear test for seven years.

If we want to prevent China from becoming a nuclear threat, the best thing to do is assure that China will not resume explosive nuclear testing, and the way to accomplish that is to get the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) ratified and in force. The treaty has been languishing in the Senate for nearly two years, with no ratification vote in sight. Ratification of the CTBT by the U.S. in 1999 would be a major step toward containing the risks arising from the espionage reported by the Cox Committee.

In light of the above we have two policy recommendations:

1. Congress should not increase the funding for nuclear programs at the weapons labs.
2. The Senate should promptly ratify the CTBT.

Thank you for considering our views on this important matter.

Sincerely,
Physicians for Social Responsibility
others

Return-Path: <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 07:37:45 -0700 (PDT)
X-Sender: mupj@pop.igc.org
To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, maureene@earthlink.net, dkimball@clw.org,
syoung@clw.org, bamorse@earthlink.net, kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org,
kcrandall@psr.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, wand@wand.org,
epank@peacenet.org, fteplitz@peace-action.org, mupj@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter

At 04:18 PM 6/7/99 -0400, Bob Tiller wrote:

>At the NWWG meeting of 5-27-99 I volunteered to draft a sign-on letter
>in response to the Cox Committee report. I circulated my draft to
>many of you last week by e-mail, and I also circulated it to the CTBT WG
>of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.....

Bob,

With my feeble memory, I don't recall precisely what kind of letter we decided upon at NWWG.

When I read your draft after the CTBT WG, I perceived it as part of the PSR dual approach to stockpile stewardship and the CTBT. I wondered about the advisability of linking them in this instance, but I didn't say anything. I'm sort of passive these days in commenting on other people's letters.

If the issue is still open (and it may not be), I would now raise the question of linkage in connection with the Cox report aftermath. The CTBT is very much on the table this month because Democratic senators are trying to get key Republicans (including Domenici) to join them in a statement on the need for action on the CTBT. Also, Lott is trying to determine what to do. Domenici may support the CTBT, but he's not going to favor curtailing stockpile stewardship. As far as I know, additional funding for stockpile stewardship has not been raised in the aftermath of the Cox report, though it may come up.

Therefore, perhaps we would be better off to have a strong, positive letter stating why the CTBT is so important in view of the findings of the Cox report. CRND has a lot of ready-made language on that. If the issue of additional funding for stockpile stewardship comes up, we can deal with that separately.

Sorry for raising this issue on Tuesday rather than on Friday during the first draft stage. Take or leave my comments as you choose.

Shalom,
Howard

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

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

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>

X-Sender: wslf@mail.earthlink.net (Unverified)

Date: Mon, 07 Jun 1999 16:36:00 -0700

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, LCNP@aol.com,
johnburrroughs@earthlink.net, wslf@earthlink.net,
gclark@peace-action.org, forum@worldforum.org, tad@worldforum.org,
Jgerson@afsc.org, kentcom@highlands.com, napf@wagingpeace.org,
sallight@earthlink.net, mmebane@fourthfreedom.org, fff@tln.net,
pmeidell@igc.org, bmusil@psr.org, btiller@psr.org, disarm@forusa.org,
dave@paxchristiusa.org, schellj@hotmail.com, shaer@wand.org,
aslater@gracelinks.org, shundahai@shundahai.org, aav1@ctaz.com,
od4life@aol.com, Will.Hathaway@emich.edu, jahn@cruzio.com,
claudiap@sginet.com, geln38a@prodigy.com, J0LandP@aol.com,
JGG786@aol.com, mccarolyn@pon.net, abolishnukes@igc.org,
epank@peacenet.org, salvador@hawaii.edu, pilulaw@jps.net

From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@earthlink.net>

Subject: (abolition-usa) SANTA BARBARA ABOLITION CAMPAIGN UPDATE

Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Deal all -- The Facilitator's Group established at the February US
abolition meeting in Santa Barbara
is meeting regularly via frequent conference calls, to carry out its
assigned tasks: 1) Formulate a longer-term
structure; 2) Bring forward strategic activities; 3) Suggest a name for the
campaign; 4) Plan the next meeting.

The notes of our calls are being posted to the US abolition-caucus list
serve. We are currently discussing
possibilities for our next face-to-face meetings. Watch this space.... In
the meantime, here's a brief update and
announcement. Please consider contacting one or more of the working groups!

FIRST, The Facilitators' Group is pleased to announce that we have reached
agreement on a name!

We are now the US CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS. This name was agreed
upon

after several rounds of consultation with meeting participants and lots of
discussion. While we recognize
that the name is not perfect, it is clear and it conveys our primary
purpose. While it's not intended to be
a temporary name, we remain open to changing or modifying it in the future,
if there's a compelling reason.

Thanks to all of you for your patience.

SECOND, at the Santa Barbara meeting we identified potential working groups
and conveners. FOLLOWING

IS A LIST OF THE INITIAL US ABOLITION CAMPAIGN WORKING GROUPS. PLEASE
CONTACT THE LISTED

CONVENERS IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN WORKING WITH A GROUP OR OBTAINING MORE
INFORMATION ABOUT IT. FOR THOSE GROUPS WITHOUT IDENTIFIED CONVENORS, PLEASE
RESPOND TO THE LIST IF YOU'RE INTERESTED IN VOLUNTEERING FOR THE JOB.

-- STAR WARS/ABM WORKING GROUP

This group was formed initially to respond quickly to the legislation pending at the time of the Santa Barbara meeting authorizing further research and limited deployment of an anti-ballistic missile system by the United States. Although there is currently no convener for this group, those on the conference call agreed that ballistic missile defense continues to be a key issue of concern for advocates of nuclear weapons abolition, due to continuing development of the system, its potential to revive a multilateral nuclear arms race, and the controversy over its possible extension in the Western Pacific.

Conveners: To be determined.

--CIVIL SOCIETY CAMPAIGN TO ENROLL ORGANIZATIONS IN A BRIEF ABOLITION STATEMENT AND CITY DIALOGUES ON NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT WITH PROMINENT MOVERS AND SHAKERS WORKING GROUP

This working group covers several related efforts aimed at mobilizing opinion via existing groups in civil society and campaigns aimed at elected officials in municipalities. It includes various efforts to get mayors and city and town governing bodies to endorse abolition statements, as well as similar efforts aimed at non-governmental civic groups. Campaigns represented within this working group include A campaign aimed at creating discussion forums among "opinion leaders" in major cities on nuclear weapons and their abolition; a campaign aimed at convincing a wide range of civic groups to endorse an abolition statement; and the campaign to obtain endorsement of the Abolition 2000 statement by municipalities.

Conveners: Pamela Meidell (The Atomic Mirror) pmeidell@igc.org; (805)985-5073; Ed Aguilar (Lawyers Alliance for World Security, Philadelphia)(610)668-5470

--CONGRESSIONAL FOCUS (Originally Congress and Administration, now split in two)

This working group will focus on initiatives relevant to nuclear weapons abolition in the U.S. Congress. Examples include the pending Markey and Woolsey resolutions, aimed respectively at scaling back U.S. nuclear weapons research and production programs and at encouraging the Administration to engage in meaningful negotiations to achieve abolition. Its work encompasses grassroots efforts to mobilize widespread attention to particular measures and issues pending in Congress.

Conveners: to be determined.

--ADMINISTRATION FOCUS

This group will work to focus attention on the nuclear weapons policies and activities of the Executive branch, trying in particular to create forums for discussion and criticism of nuclear weapons policies. Its current initiative is a teach-in at the University of Michigan on nuclear weapons issues, with the organizers hoping to get administration officials to participate and to publicly debate critics of existing nuclear weapons policies. If the teach-in model works the hope is to extend it to other

campuses.

Convener: Alan Haber (Michigan Coalition of Peace and Environmental Organizations) od4life@aol.com; (734)761-7967

--YOUTH/CAMPUSES

This working group aims to raise the level of awareness among young people about nuclear weapons and efforts to abolish them. It will work on the teach-ins discussed in the Administration focus working group above. It will also attempt to gather and broaden the distribution of existing nuclear weapons abolition materials aimed at a youth and campus audience.

Convener: Odile Haber (Michigan Coalition of Peace and Environmental Organizations) od4life@aol.com; (734)761-7967

--DIRECT ACTION

Nonviolent direct action long has been a central part of the movement to abolish nuclear weapons. Despite a lack of media coverage, direct action continues at weapons and government facilities around the country, from the Nevada Test Site, to the weapons laboratories in Livermore, California and Los Alamos, New Mexico, to Washington D.C. and the newly opened Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, also in New Mexico. This working group will be a place for people involved in particular direct action campaigns to raise national awareness of their activities and to exchange ideas and information. It also will try to provide resources which will be broadly useful, for example nonviolence training materials and lists of nonviolence trainers.

Convener Matteo Ferreira (Shundahai Network) shundahai@shundahai.org; (702)647-3095

--INDIGENOUS PEOPLE ORGANIZING AND CONCERNS

The cycle of nuclear materials mining and nuclear weapons testing and production always has had a disproportionate impact on indigenous people world-wide. Nuclear weapons testing has occurred for the most part on the lands of indigenous peoples, without regard for their sovereign rights, and with devastating effects on people and their lands. Indigenous people have taken the lead in many parts of the globe both in making the connections between nuclear weapons and the effects of the entire cycle of nuclear materials, nuclear power, and nuclear weapons production, and in advocating for nuclear weapons abolition. This working group will provide a focus for making these voices heard both inside and outside the movement.

Conveners: Michele Xenos (Shundahai Network), shundahai@shundahai.org; (702)647-3095; Pilulaw Khus (Coastal Band, Chumash Nation), pilulaw@jps.net; (805)771-8922; Richard Salvador (Pacific Islands Association of NGOs) salvador@hawaii.edu; (818)956-8537

--NATO AND NATO 50TH ANNIVERSARY MEETING, APRIL 23

This working group initially focused on the upcoming NATO 50th

anniversary meeting in Washington, D.C. and the likelihood that NATO nuclear weapons policies would be debated there. There has been interest in continuing this as a working group, since the controversy over NATO nuclear weapons policies, including a refusal to renounce first use, a potential counter-proliferation role for nuclear weapons, and the expansion of NATO's military scope to include broad out-of-area combat roles is likely to continue for a long time.

Convener: Mark Mebane (Fourth Freedom Forum) mmebane@fourthfreedom.org; (219)543-3402

--INTERNATIONAL CONNECTIONS AND ISSUES

This working group aims at coordinating the abolition campaign in the United States with efforts world-wide, including Abolition 2000 and other efforts in particular nations and regions to eliminate nuclear weapons. With the emergence of a new nuclear weapons and ballistic missile race in South Asia, growing controversy over possible theatre and domestic ballistic missile deployments, and the stagnation of arms control negotiations, this working group will help the abolition campaign in the U.S. remain aware of the effects U.S. nuclear weapons and military policies have on efforts to achieve abolition in other nuclear weapons states and globally.

Conveners: Alice Slater (Global Resource Action Center for the Environment) aslater@gracelinks.org; (212)726-9161; Richard Salvador (Pacific Islands Association of NGOs) salvador@hawaii.edu; (818)956-8537 or 3691; David Krieger (Nuclear Age Peace Foundation) wagingpeace@napf.org; (805)965-3443

--AFFECTED COMMUNITIES

Communities across the country have been affected by half a century nuclear weapons research, testing, and production. They range from workers at DOE facilities to people who live downwind from those facilities to armed services veterans exposed to nuclear tests. Many of these groups already have organized to put pressure on the Federal government to clean up the environmental damage, to perform meaningful health and environmental studies, and to provide compensation. These groups share many of our concerns, and often already are committed to abolition of nuclear weapons. This working group will focus attention on the destructive legacy of nuclear weapons, and will work to integrate these communities and their concerns into the broader campaign.

Convener: Joseph Gerson Jgerson@afsc.org; (617) 661-6130

--RESEARCH FUTURE DIRECTIONS OF THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS COMPLEX

This group will focus on the activities of the nuclear weapons and production complex, and will explore the impacts of continuing nuclear weapons research on the global test ban and nonproliferation regime and on efforts to achieve abolition. It will also examine the overlap between nuclear weapons research technologies and other emerging arms races which affect chances for

abolition, including anti-ballistic missile technologies, space weaponry, and possible next-generation nuclear weapons. The group will be both a means to coordinate research efforts and to distribute relevant information within the campaign and to a wider public.

Conveners: Jackie Cabasso (Western States Legal Foundation),
wslf@earthlink.net,
(510)839-5877; Sally Light (Tri-Valley CAREs), sallight@earthlink.net,
(925)443-7148

--MEDIA/CAMPAIGN LAUNCH

This working group will be a place to develop and share media strategies. An initial focus will be efforts to coordinate a campaign launch that is cohesive and nationally visible.

Convener: Steve Kent (Kent Communications)kentcom@highlands.com; ((914)424-8382

--BOTTOM UP ORGANIZING (local movement building and making the connection to other issues)

Through discussing and organizing around the way nuclear weapons are connected to other social ills and injustices, from local ecological devastation, distorted government spending priorities, and a culture of violence which stretches from the state to the street to global inequality, we can deepen our own understanding of what must be done to achieve abolition of nuclear weapons, as well as the understanding of those we hope to persuade. We then open up the possibility that we will become part of a larger movement which can make the changes which could make abolition possible. This working group will explore ways to make connections on the local level with other organizing efforts which share some of our concerns, and by doing so to help create the social movement needed to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons.

Convener: Andrew Lichterman (Western States Legal Foundation),
alichterman@worldnet.att.net 510-839-5877

--DEMOCRACY, POWER AND NUCLEAR WEAPONRY DRAFTING COMMITTEE

This working group has taken responsibility for following through on the commitment made in Santa Barbara to develop a carefully thought out statement on the relationships between democracy, power and nuclear weapons. A draft statement is currently being prepared, to be circulated for comment in the near future.

Convener: David Krieger (Nuclear Age Peace Foundation), wagingpeace@napf.org;
(805)965-3443.

Jacqueline Cabasso, Executive Director

WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION

1440 Broadway, Suite 500
Oakland, California USA 94612
Tel: +(510)839-5877
Fax: +(510)839-5397
E-mail: wslf@earthlink.net

Western States Legal Foundation is part of ABOLITION 2000
A 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.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 00:03:34 -0700
From: Andrew Lichterman <alichterman@worldnet.att.net>
X-Accept-Language: en
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
CC: LCNP@aol.com, johnburroughs@earthlink.net, wslf@earthlink.net,
gclark@peace-action.org, forum@worldforum.org, tad@worldforum.org,
Jgerson@afsc.org, kentcom@highlands.com, napf@wagingpeace.org,
sallight@earthlink.net, mmebane@fourthfreedom.org, fff@tln.net,
pmeidell@igc.org, bmusil@psr.org, btiller@psr.org, disarm@forusa.org,
dave@paxchristiusa.org, schellj@hotmail.com, shaer@wand.org,
aslater@gracelinks.org, shundahai@shundahai.org, aav1@ctaz.com,
od4life@aol.com, Will.Hathaway@emich.edu, jahn@cruzio.com,
claudiap@sginet.com, geln38a@prodigy.com, JOLandP@aol.com,
JGG786@aol.com, mccarolyn@pon.net, abolishnukes@igc.org,
epank@peacenet.org, salvador@hawaii.edu, pilulaw@jps.net
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) SANTA BARBARA ABOLITION CAMPAIGN UPDATE
References: <4.1.19990607153327.009a69a0@mail.earthlink.net>
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Greetings abolition 2000 and US abolition campaign folks.

I am the convener of the "bottom up organizing" working group of the fledgling US campaign. In order to encourage discussion on themes relevant to this working group, I have written a strategy working paper which addresses some of the issues raised in the two organizing meetings which resulted in the current US campaign structure. If you would like a copy, drop me a note specifying the format you would like to receive it in (I can do MS word, all wordperfect formats, the various generic word processing formats --ascii, rtf, etc.-- and paper).

Andrew Lichterman
Western States Legal Foundation
1440 Broadway Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94612 (510) 839 5877

-

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: <alichterman@worldnet.att.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Bottom up organizing strategy paper
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Andy,

I would like to see your strategy paper for bottom up organization. I can receive it in Microsoft Word format.

Thanks,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 16:49:28 +1000
From: FoE Sydney - Nuclear Campaign <nonukes@foesyd.org.au>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Y2K DE-ALERTING STRATEGIC NUKES SIGN-ON LETTER TO
YELTSIN/CLINTON
To: ICPJ <icpj@igc.apc.org>, Abolition-caucus@igc.org, leftlink@vicnet.net.au,
nirsnet@nirs.org, nirsnet@igc.org, nuaware@web.net
X-Sender: foesyd4@pop.ihug.com.au

At 12:54 AM +1000 8/6/99, ICPJ wrote:

Dear ICPJ,
Yess, it has ben done - twice so far!

Many taks for the signature!

John hallam.

>Dear Friends:

>
>Please include the International Center for Peace and Justice as a signer of
>the letter
>I think it is important to get this out to members of the U.S.
>Congress--Senators and Representatives and UN missions. Has that been done?

>
>Thank you for your important work.

>
>Karen Talbot, Director,
>International Center for Peace and Justice
>550 Pacheco Street,
>San Francisco, CA 94116
>phone/fax: 415:759-9774
>iicpj@igc.org

>-----

>
>At 06:12 PM 6/7/1999 +1000, FoE Sydney - Nuclear Campaign wrote:

>>John Hallam
>>Friends of the Earth Sydney,
>>Suite 15,
>>1st Floor, 104 Bathurst Street,
>>Sydney, NSW, 2000.

>>
>>Fax(61)(2)9283-2005 ph(61)(2)9283-2006.

>>
>>nonukes@foesyd.org.au <http://homepages.tig.com.au/~foesyd>

>>
>>(MY APOLOGIES IF YOU GET THIS MANY TIMES. IT HAS BEEN SENT TO A NUMBER OF
>>OVERLAPPING LISTS. BUT HOWEVER MANY TIMES YOU GET IT PLEASE DO SIGN IT!)

>>
>>RE: SIGN - ON LETTER TO DE-ALERT STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS OVER THE Y2K
>>ROLLOVER PERIOD.
>>4/6/1999

>>
>>
>>Dear NGOs, Parliamentarians, Concerned Persons,
>>
>>Enclosed is a letter which is to be sent to Bill Clinton, Boris Yeltsin,
>>and their respective defence secretaries and other relevant agencies,
>>asking that strategic nuclear weapons be taken off 'hair trigger alert'
>>status, and placed in a status in which it will require at least hours and
>>preferably days to launch them, over the November/December/January/February
>>period.

>>
>>I am hoping you will be able to sign it.

>>
>>This is because the possibility of computer-related Y2K failures in the
>>vast number of computerised systems that form the command and control
>>infrastructure of both US and Russian strategic nuclear systems in
>>conjunction with the current state of tension in US/Russian relationships,
>>makes for an unacceptable risk of accidental nuclear war over the Y2K
>>rollover period.

>>
>>A strategic nuclear weapons stand-down is thus a potentially planet -
>>saving precaution. It is commonsense.

>>
>>The de-Alerting of nuclear weapons systems was a crucial recommendation of
>>the report of the Canberra Commission.

>>
>>Your signature on this letter will help make the world a safer place.

>>
>>John Hallam,
>>Nuclear Campaigner, Friends of the Earth Sydney.

>>
>>
>>FROM:
>>FRIENDS OF THE EARTH AUSTRALIA,
>>AUSTRALIAN PEACE COMMITTEE,
>>CAMPAIGN FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND DISARMAMENT (CICD) AUSTRALIA,
>>AUSTRALIAN ANTI-BASES CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,
>>ENVIRONMENT CENTRE OF THE NORTHERN TERRITORY,
>>SENATOR DEE MARGETTS,
>>ANTHONY ALBANESE, FEDERAL MP FOR GRAYNDLER,

>>
>>WORLD COURT PROJECT UK,
>>DISARMAMENT AND SECURITY CENTRE, NZ,
>>ECODEFENSE KOENIGSBERG/MOSCOW,
>>WOMENS INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM (Geneva/NY)
>>WOMENS INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM (FRANCE)
>>GLOBAL RESOURCE ACTION CENTRE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (NY)
>>TRI-VALLEY CARES, U.S.,
>>METRO-BOSTON COMMITTEE TO DE-ALERT NUCLEAR WEAPONS
>>NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION, CALIFORNIA, US.

>>
>>
>>
>>PRESIDENT BORIS YELTSIN,

>>OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
>>KRASNOPRESENSKAYA-2,
>>MOSCOW, RUSSIA,
>>+7-095-205-4219, +7-095-206-5173

>>
>>PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON,
>>WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, US,
>>+1-202-456-2461, +1-202-456-2883.

>>
>>WILLIAM COHEN, US SECRETARY OF DEFENCE,
>>+1-703-695-1149,

>>
>>BILL RICHARDSON, US SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
>>+1-202-586-9987.

>>
>>IGOR SERGEYEV,
>>DEFENCE MINISTER OF RUSSIA,
>>Znamenka-19, 103160, Moscow, Russia,
>>+7-095-293-33-13

>>CC
>>ALL HEADS OF STATE (BY EMAIL)
>>ALL UN MISSIONS (BY EMAIL)

>>
>>Dear Presidents Yeltsin and Clinton, Defence Ministers and Defence
>>Secretaries, Heads of State and UN Missions,

>>
>>The organisations above, representing millions of people worldwide, are
>>writing to convey their extreme concern over the possibility that Year
>>2000 (Y2K)-related computer failures in nuclear weapons systems may lead to
>>an unacceptable risk of nuclear war by accident or miscalculation.

>>
>>In the current political situation this is most especially the case.
>>According to Alexandr Arbatov, of the Defence Committee of the Russian
>>State Duma, US-Russian relations are at 'the worst, most acute, most
>>dangerous juncture since the US-Soviet Berlin and Cuban missile crises.'

>>
>>The danger during the Y2K rollover lies primarily in the possibility that
>>spurious data may induce commanders, even at the highest levels, to
>>mistakenly authorise the launches of nuclear weapons.

>>
>>Events similar to this have already occurred. For example:

>>
>>In the US in 1980, a malfunctioning computer chip sent spurious alert
>>signals;

>>
>>In 1983 in Russia, satellites mistook glare off the tops of clouds for a US
>>missile launch, (and disaster was averted by the refusal of the local
>>commander to believe the warnings were real);

>>
>>In 1995, a Norwegian research rocket prompted a full-scale Russian alert.

>>
>>If Y2K breakdowns produce inaccurate early warning data, or if
>>communications and command channels are compromised, the combination of
>>hair-trigger force postures and Y2K failures could be disastrous. There

>>should therefore be a 'safety first ' approach to Y2K and nuclear
>>arsenals.

>>
>>Because none of the nuclear weapons states can guarantee that their
>>nuclear- related computer systems are Y2K compliant, the only responsible
>>solution is for them all to stand down nuclear operations. This approach
>>should include taking nuclear weapons off alert status and decoupling
>>nuclear warheads from delivery vehicles.

>>
>>The stakes involved in any nuclear exchange between Russia and the US are
>>such that they dwarf any other considerations. The future of life itself on
>>earth could be in doubt.

>>
>>In light of this, we strongly urge that you remove all strategic and
>>tactical nuclear weapons from 'hair trigger' alert, and place them in a
>>status in which at least hours and preferably days would be required to
>>launch them.

>>
>>The Canberra Commission in August 1996, noted that terminating nuclear
>>alert status would:

>>--Reduce dramatically the chances of accidental or unauthorised nuclear
>>missile launch.

>>--Help set the stage for intensified cooperation on a more far- reaching
>>disarmament agenda

>>--Have a very positive influence on the political climate between nuclear
>>weapon states.

>>
>>This last is especially relevant in the current tension between Russia and
>>NATO, which has prompted Russia to withdraw from cooperation with the US on
>>Y2K problems.

>>
>>According to the Canberra Commission,
>>"Taking nuclear forces off alert could be verified by national technical
>>means and nuclear weapon state inspection arrangements. in the first
>>instance, reduction in alert status could be adopted by the nuclear weapon
>>states unilaterally"

>>
>>If both sides are verifiably de-alerted, it will not be possible for either
>>to launch a disarming first strike.

>>
>>The immediate stakes are so high, and the potential for global catastrophe
>>so clear, that mutually verified de-alerting in the face of the Y2K
>>computer problem must take precedence over all other considerations of
>>politics and national security.

>>
>>Signed

>>
>>John Hallam, Nuclear Campaigner, Friends of the Earth Australia,
>>Denis Doherty, Secretary, Pax Christi NSW,
>>Julie Marlow, Australian Anti-Bases Campaign Committee,
>>Irene Gale, Australian Peace Committee, SA Branch,
>>Babs Fuller-Quinn, Australian Peace Committee, National Committee,
>>Pauline Mitchell, Campaign for International Cooperation and Disarmament,
>>Mark Wakeham, Environment Centre of the Northern Territory,

>>Senator Dee Margetts, Green Senator for W.A.,
>>Anthony Albanese. MP, Federal member for Grayndler.
>>
>>Commander Robert Green RN (Ret'd), Chair, World Court Project UK,
>>Dr Kate Dewes, Disarmament and Security Centre, Aotearoa/NZ Peace Foundation,
>>Vladimir Sliviak, Ecodefense, Russia,
>>Felicity Hill, Womens International League for Peace and Freedom, Geneva/NY
>>Solange Fernex, Womens International League for Peace and Freedom, France.
>>Alice Slater, Global Resource Action Centre for the Environment, NY.
>>Marylia Kelley, Tri-Valley CARES, Livermore, California, US.
>>William F. Santelmann, Metro-Boston Committee to De-Alert Nuclear Weapons
>>David Kreiger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, Santa Barbara, Calif, US.
>>
>>
>>

To: FoE Sydney - Nuclear Campaign <nonukes@foesydney.org.au>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Y2K DE-ALERTING STRATEGIC NUKES SIGN-ON LETTER TO YELTSIN/CLINTON
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

To: John Hallam

Yes, I'll sign your letter on Y2K and De-alerting.

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

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

Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1999 14:11:21 +0200

From: alynw@ibm.net

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: Abolition 2000 Hague Declaration. Please circulate

To: "Jaap van Leeuwen" <dto.vanleeuwen@dataweb.nl>, <peace-caucus@igc.apc.org>, <disarmament@igc.org>, "abolition caucus" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>, "atota" <atota@walrus.com>, "John Berman" <jsb8580@is2.nyu.edu>, "Phon van den Biesen" <phon@bpb.nl>, "Rob Boogert" <RAHSP@bsd.denhaag.nl>, "Myrla Bran" <basecln@skyinet.net>, "Diana Cohn" <solidago@igc.org>, "Jeanette Karlsson (Sweden)" <Jeanette69@hotmail.com>, "Angela del Franco (NY)" <Novaangel@earthlink.net>, "Debbie Mackie (Canada)" <Danmackie@sympatico.com>, "Joshua Jacobs (San Fran)" <333@tabiji.com>, "Chris Decker (UK, USA)" <Chris@earthdance.demon.co.uk>, "Yoel Kuliasko (Gent, Belgium)" <jk@cage.rug.ac.be>, "Nya Gregor Fleron" <nya@mobilixnet.dk>, "Dan Kinch" <danmk@interport.net>, "Saul Mendlovitz" <womp@igc.org>, "Roger Clark" <rsclark@crab.rutgers.edu>, "Richard Falk" <rfalk@wvs.princeton.edu>, "Peter Weiss" <petweiss@igc.org>, "Merav Datan" <mddatan@ippnw.org>, "lcnp" <lcnp@aol.com>, "Jonathan Granoff" <JGG786@aol.com>, "John Burroughs" <johnburroughs@earthlink.net>, "Jim Wurst" <Jhwurst@aol.com>, "Glenn Alcalay" <galcalay@aol.com>, "Elizabeth Shafer" <Elspeth212@aol.com>, "David Krieger" <wagingpeace@napf.org>, "Anne Marie Corominas" <amlcorominas@hotmail.com>, "Anabel Dwyer" <dwyer@pilot.msu.edu>, "Alice Slater" <aslater@gracelinks.org>, "Olu Arowolo" <arinola76@hotmail.com>, "Mee" <mee_music@hotmail.com>, "Anna Parker" <annasthetic@hotmail.com>, "Wim Westerbaan" <icpbi.nl@antenna.nl>, "Alyn Ware" <alynw@ibm.net>, "Brenda Yanni" <byanni@iee.org>, "ExTeam" <pamela.sexton@mailcity.com>, "Jill Sternberg" <jillberg@igc.org>, "Kim and Nickhyl" <kimiasia@yahoo.com>, "Lucia (PBI)" <owl_light@hotmail.com>, "Marcus Berglund" <marcusibloms@berg.mail.telia.com>, "Max Surjadinata" <max@igc.apc.org>, "Michael Beer" <mbeer@CapAccess.org>, "Pam Sexton" <cake@exploratorium.edu>, "peter watson" <pwatson@clear.net.nz>, "Winnie Romeril" <Wromeril@aol.com>, "yeshua moser-puangsuwan" <yeshua@alpha.tu.ac.th>, "Emily Severance" <eseverance@hotmail.com>, "Yvonne Timmermans" <onkruid@hotmail.com>, "Susan Vancil" <bhujanga@earthlink.net>, "Pete Waack" <pwaack@pa.org>, "jaime weiss" <jaimeweiss@usa.net>, "Rhonda Zabinsky" <rhonda.zabinsky@royalroads.ca>

X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Abolition 2000

Call for the New Millennium
The Hague May 1999

For the past half century humanity has been under the threat of annihilation from nuclear weapons. The environment and people's lives and health have been destroyed or adversely affected by the development, testing and use of nuclear weapons. Peace movements around the world have struggled to rid the world of this danger. Under this pressure from informed and mobilised citizens, the nuclear weapons states have promised repeatedly that they will eventually eliminate nuclear weapons and even signed treaties to this effect.

Yet the nuclear weapon states have made no moves towards relinquishing their nuclear weapons. Instead they are continuing with deployment of nuclear weapons and their deterrence policies including an option of first-use of these weapons. They also continue to spend billions of dollars for research, testing, and development of new nuclear weapons. The threat from these programs diminished at the end of the cold war, but has again increased dramatically as a result of deterioration of the Russian command and control system, the expansion of NATO, war in the Balkans and nuclear proliferation in Asia. It may increase further as the millennium bug affects nuclear weapons systems into the 21st Century.

Confronted by the failure of international diplomacy to rid the world of nuclear weapons, citizens' organizations at the Non Proliferation Treaty Review and Extension Conference in 1995 released a statement calling on countries to implement their disarmament obligations under this treaty by commencing negotiations which would lead to the conclusion of a nuclear weapons abolition convention by the year 2000. Over 1400 organizations have so far endorsed this statement, and comprise the Abolition 2000 network.

This international movement has gained strength from the ruling by the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in 1996 that the threat or use of nuclear weapons is generally illegal and that there is an obligation to conclude negotiations on complete nuclear disarmament. The United Nations General Assembly and the European Parliament have both adopted resolutions calling for the implementation of the ICJ's decision through negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. Public opinion polls show over 80% support for a nuclear weapons convention in most NATO countries and nuclear weapon states, including the United States and United Kingdom. A Model Nuclear Weapons Convention, demonstrating the feasibility of nuclear abolition, has now been circulated by the United Nations.

In May 1999, 8000 people joined together in the Hague to launch the Hague Appeal for Peace (HAP), a new agenda for peace and justice for the new century. Abolition 2000, which held its annual meeting at the 1999 HAP Conference, makes an urgent call for all people to act to reduce and eliminate the nuclear threat by:

- a.. Calling on your government to support the United Nations resolution calling for a nuclear weapons convention
- b.. Urging the nuclear weapons states to immediately take all nuclear forces off alert and initiate negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention
- c.. Participating in Global Abolition Days Mar 1-8, 2000, an international week of actions, education and lobbying for nuclear disarmament
- d.. Participating in other disarmament days (a full list is available from Abolition 2000)
- e.. Calling on states members of the Non Proliferation Treaty to implement their disarmament obligations by agreeing at the 2000 NPT Review Conference to commence negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention
- f.. Urging civic authorities to adopt resolutions supporting a nuclear weapons convention
- g.. Urging other organizations to sign the Abolition 2000 statement building our network to number 2000 endorsers by the turn of the century.

The dawn of the new millennium should be the time to take bold steps toward achieving a nuclear weapons free world. We urge everyone to help us do this.

For more information contact

Abolition 2000, 1187 Coast Village Road, #121, Santa Barbara, CA 93108.

Tel: 805-965-3443. Fax: 805-568-0466. Website: www.abolition2000.org

disarmament. The United Nations General Assembly and the European Parliament have both adopted resolutions calling for the implementation of the ICJ's decision through negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. Public opinion polls show over 80% support for a nuclear weapons convention in most NATO countries and nuclear weapon states, including the United States and United Kingdom. A Model Nuclear Weapons Convention, demonstrating the feasibility of nuclear abolition, has now been circulated by the United Nations. </P>

<P>In May 1999, 8000 people joined together in the Hague to launch the Hague Appeal for Peace (HAP), a new agenda for peace and justice for the new century. Abolition 2000, which held its annual meeting at the 1999 HAP Conference, makes an urgent call for all people to act to reduce and eliminate the nuclear threat by:

Calling on your government to support the United Nations resolution calling for a nuclear weapons convention

Urging the nuclear weapons states to immediately take all nuclear forces off alert and initiate negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention

Participating in Global Abolition Days Mar 1-8, 2000, an international week of actions, education and lobbying for nuclear disarmament

Participating in other disarmament days (a full list is available from Abolition 2000)

Calling on states members of the Non Proliferation Treaty to implement their disarmament obligations by agreeing at the 2000 NPT Review Conference to commence negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention

Urging civic authorities to adopt resolutions supporting a nuclear weapons convention

Urging other organizations to sign the Abolition 2000 statement building
our network to number 2000 endorsers by the turn of the century.<FONT

size=+0>The dawn of the new millennium should be the time to take bold steps toward achieving a nuclear weapons free world. We urge everyone to help us do this.

<P>For more information contact

<P>Abolition 2000, 1187 Coast Village Road, #121, Santa Barbara, CA 93108.

<P>Tel: 805-965-3443. Fax: 805-568-0466.

Website: www.abolition2000.org</P>

</DIV></BODY></HTML>

Return-Path: <fteplitz@peace-action.org>
From: "Fran" <fteplitz@peace-action.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>, "Bob Tiller" <btiller@psr.org>, <maureene@earthlink.net>, <dkimball@clw.org>, <syounge@clw.org>, <bamorse@earthlink.net>, <kathy@fcnl.org>, <rachel@fcnl.org>, <kcrandall@psr.org>, <ctbt@2020vision.org>, <>wand@wand.org>, <epank@peacenet.org>, <fteplitz@peace-action.org>, <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Sign-on letter
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 12:43:24 -0400
X-Msmail-Priority: Normal
Importance: Normal
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
X-Mdaemon-Deliver-To: mupj@igc.org
X-Return-Path: fteplitz@peace-action.org

Greetings,

I would support the original dual approach to the letter; new SS facilities are in the wings (such as the Advanced Hydro-test Facility) and as ANA's budget reports indicate, SS funding is on the rise. The proliferation, testing, and weapons development issues raised by the Cox report are of course intertwined and Peace Action/PAEF support the comprehensive approach of the current letter.

Thanks,
Fran Teplitz

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org]
> Sent: Tuesday, June 08, 1999 10:38 AM
> To: Bob Tiller; maureene@earthlink.net; dkimball@clw.org;
> syounge@clw.org; bamorse@earthlink.net; kathy@fcnl.org; rachel@fcnl.org;
> kcrandall@psr.org; ctbt@2020vision.org; wand@wand.org;
> epank@peacenet.org; fteplitz@peace-action.org; mupj@igc.org
> Subject: Re: Sign-on letter

>
>
> At 04:18 PM 6/7/99 -0400, Bob Tiller wrote:
>>At the NWWG meeting of 5-27-99 I volunteered to draft a sign-on letter
>>in response to the Cox Committee report. I circulated my draft to
>>many of you last week by e-mail, and I also circulated it to the CTBT WG
>>of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.....

>
> Bob,
>
> With my feeble memory, I don't recall precisely what kind of letter we
> decided upon at NWWG.

>
> When I read your draft after the CTBT WG, I perceived it as part
> of the PSR
> dual approach to stockpile stewardship and the CTBT. I wondered about the
> advisability of linking them in this instance, but I didn't say anything.
> I'm sort of passive these days in commenting on other people's letters.
>
> If the issue is still open (and it may not be), I would now raise the

> question of linkage in connection with the Cox report aftermath. The CTBT
> is very much on the table this month because Democratic senators
> are trying
> to get key Republicans (including Domenici) to join them in a statement on
> the need for action on the CTBT. Also, Lott is trying to
> determine what to
> do. Domenici may support the CTBT, but he's not going to favor curtailing
> stockpile stewardship. As far as I know, additional funding for stockpile
> stewardship has not been raised in the aftermath of the Cox report, though
> it may come up.
>
> Therefore, perhaps we would be better off to have a strong,
> positive letter
> stating why the CTBT is so important in view of the findings of the Cox
> report. CRND has a lot of ready-made language on that. If the issue of
> additional funding for stockpile stewardship comes up, we can
> deal with that
> separately.
>
> Sorry for raising this issue on Tuesday rather than on Friday during the
> first draft stage. Take or leave my comments as you choose.
>
> 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: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 12:58:56 -0400
To: "Fran" <fteplitz@peace-action.org>, "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>, "Bob Tiller" <btiller@psr.org>, <maureene@earthlink.net>, <syounge@clw.org>, <bamorse@earthlink.net>, <kathy@fcnl.org>, <rachel@fcnl.org>, <kcrandall@psr.org>, <ctbt@2020vision.org>, <>wand@wand.org>, <epank@peacenet.org>, <fteplitz@peace-action.org>, <mupj@igc.org>, gclark@peace-action.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: RE: Sign-on letter

Fran and Co:

In reply to your email ... the question is not necessarily whether the CTBT and SSM are intertwined, but rather whether it is effective to make points about them both in the context of a letter about the Cox Committee report. I would ask you and others to clarify whether anyone is proposing that SSM funding be increased specifically because of the Cox Committee report findings. I have not found any evidence and believe that Howard is correct in raising the issue. In fact Reps. Cox and Dicks' editorial today in the WSJ makes no mention of anything like that. If SSM funding is being raised, then perhaps a letter and other actions specifically focused on this matter are in order.

I would also like to ask if anyone has a reply to my email from last Friday about the Domenici/Kyl and Spence bills that would remove the labs from control of DOE, which I believe could be far more damaging than any single year budget increase. Does not the ANA, PSR, Peace Action have an opinion on this matter?

DK

At 12:43 PM 6/8/99 -0400, Fran wrote:

>Greetings,
>I would support the original dual approach to the letter; new SS facilities >are in the wings (such as the Advanced Hydro-test Facility) and as ANA's >budget reports indicate, SS funding is on the rise. The proliferation, >testing, and weapons development issues raised by the Cox report are of >course intertwined and Peace Action/PAEF support the comprehensive approach >of the current letter.
>Thanks,
>Fran Teplitz

>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org]

>> Sent: Tuesday, June 08, 1999 10:38 AM

>> To: Bob Tiller; maureene@earthlink.net; dkimball@clw.org;

>> syounge@clw.org; bamorse@earthlink.net; kathy@fcnl.org; rachel@fcnl.org;

>> kcrandall@psr.org; ctbt@2020vision.org; wand@wand.org;

>> epank@peacenet.org; fteplitz@peace-action.org; mupj@igc.org

>> Subject: Re: Sign-on letter

>>

>>

>> At 04:18 PM 6/7/99 -0400, Bob Tiller wrote:

>> >At the NWWG meeting of 5-27-99 I volunteered to draft a sign-on letter

>> >in response to the Cox Committee report. I circulated my draft to

>> >many of you last week by e-mail, and I also circulated it to the CTBT WG

>> >of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.....

>>

>> Bob,

>>

>> With my feeble memory, I don't recall precisely what kind of letter we

>> decided upon at NWWG.

>>

>> When I read your draft after the CTBT WG, I perceived it as part

>> of the PSR

>> dual approach to stockpile stewardship and the CTBT. I wondered about the

>> advisability of linking them in this instance, but I didn't say anything.

>> I'm sort of passive these days in commenting on other people's letters.

>>

>> If the issue is still open (and it may not be), I would now raise the

>> question of linkage in connection with the Cox report aftermath. The CTBT

>> is very much on the table this month because Democratic senators

>> are trying

>> to get key Republicans (including Domenici) to join them in a statement on

>> the need for action on the CTBT. Also, Lott is trying to

>> determine what to

>> do. Domenici may support the CTBT, but he's not going to favor curtailing

>> stockpile stewardship. As far as I know, additional funding for stockpile

>> stewardship has not been raised in the aftermath of the Cox report, though

>> it may come up.

>>

>> Therefore, perhaps we would be better off to have a strong,

>> positive letter

>> stating why the CTBT is so important in view of the findings of the Cox

>> report. CRND has a lot of ready-made language on that. If the issue of

>> additional funding for stockpile stewardship comes up, we can

>> deal with that

>> separately.

>>

>> Sorry for raising this issue on Tuesday rather than on Friday during the

>> first draft stage. Take or leave my comments as you choose.

>>

>> 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.

>>

>

>

>

>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <bamorse@earthlink.net>

X-Sender: bamorse@earthlink.net

Date: Tue, 08 Jun 1999 13:06:21 -0700

To: "Fran" <fteplitz@peace-action.org>, "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>, "Bob Tiller" <btiller@psr.org>, <dkimball@clw.org>, <syounge@clw.org>, <kathy@fcnl.org>, <rachel@fcnl.org>, <kcrandall@psr.org>, <ctbt@2020vision.org>, <>wand@wand.org>, <epank@peacenet.org>, <fteplitz@peace-action.org>, <mupj@igc.org>

From: Brad Morse <bamorse@earthlink.net>

Subject: RE: Sign-on letter

References: <2.2.16.19990608103739.2967fe14@pop.igc.org>

I would also support this type of letter. The letter doesn't even mention stockpile stewardship, only references spending at labs, which is on the rise. I think the message is clear:

ratify the CTBT

don't increase spending at the labs

Thanks,

Brad

At 12:43 PM 6/8/99 -0400, Fran wrote:

>Greetings,

>I would support the original dual approach to the letter; new SS facilities >are in the wings (such as the Advanced Hydro-test Facility) and as ANA's >budget reports indicate, SS funding is on the rise. The proliferation, >testing, and weapons development issues raised by the Cox report are of >course intertwined and Peace Action/PAEF support the comprehensive approach >of the current letter.

>Thanks,

>Fran Teplitz

>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org]

>> Sent: Tuesday, June 08, 1999 10:38 AM

>> To: Bob Tiller; maureene@earthlink.net; dkimball@clw.org;

>> syounge@clw.org; bamorse@earthlink.net; kathy@fcnl.org; rachel@fcnl.org;

>> kcrandall@psr.org; ctbt@2020vision.org; wand@wand.org;

>> epank@peacenet.org; fteplitz@peace-action.org; mupj@igc.org

>> Subject: Re: Sign-on letter

>>

>>

>> At 04:18 PM 6/7/99 -0400, Bob Tiller wrote:

>> >At the NWWG meeting of 5-27-99 I volunteered to draft a sign-on letter

>> >in response to the Cox Committee report. I circulated my draft to

>> >many of you last week by e-mail, and I also circulated it to the CTBT WG

>> >of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.....

>>

>> Bob,

>>

>> With my feeble memory, I don't recall precisely what kind of letter we

>> decided upon at NWWG.

>>
>> When I read your draft after the CTBT WG, I perceived it as part
>> of the PSR
>> dual approach to stockpile stewardship and the CTBT. I wondered about the
>> advisability of linking them in this instance, but I didn't say anything.
>> I'm sort of passive these days in commenting on other people's letters.
>>
>> If the issue is still open (and it may not be), I would now raise the
>> question of linkage in connection with the Cox report aftermath. The CTBT
>> is very much on the table this month because Democratic senators
>> are trying
>> to get key Republicans (including Domenici) to join them in a statement on
>> the need for action on the CTBT. Also, Lott is trying to
>> determine what to
>> do. Domenici may support the CTBT, but he's not going to favor curtailing
>> stockpile stewardship. As far as I know, additional funding for stockpile
>> stewardship has not been raised in the aftermath of the Cox report, though
>> it may come up.
>>
>> Therefore, perhaps we would be better off to have a strong,
>> positive letter
>> stating why the CTBT is so important in view of the findings of the Cox
>> report. CRND has a lot of ready-made language on that. If the issue of
>> additional funding for stockpile stewardship comes up, we can
>> deal with that
>> separately.

>>
>> Sorry for raising this issue on Tuesday rather than on Friday during the
>> first draft stage. Take or leave my comments as you choose.

>>
>> 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.

>>
>
>
>
>
>
>

Brad Morse
Program Assistant
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability
Phone: 202-833-4668
Fax: 202-234-9536
bamorse@earthlink.net

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org
To: btiller@psr.org, mupj@igc.apc.org
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)
Subject: Re: Sign-on letter
Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 12:16:55 -0400

Thank you, Howard for mentioning this. Now that you've raised it, I think you have a good point. Bob, I'm sorry like Howard, that I hadn't thought this through earlier.

I plan to put this letter on the NWWG agenda for Thursday, FYI (I'm chairing).

Marie

>Date: Tue, 8 Jun 1999 07:37:45 -0700 (PDT)
>X-Sender: mupj@pop.igc.org
>X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 2.2 (16)
>Mime-Version: 1.0
>To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, maureene@earthlink.net, dkimball@clw.org,
> syoung@clw.org, bamorse@earthlink.net, kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org,
> kcrandall@psr.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, wand@wand.org,
> epank@peacenet.org, fteplitz@peace-action.org, mupj@igc.org
>From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
>Subject: Re: Sign-on letter
>
>At 04:18 PM 6/7/99 -0400, Bob Tiller wrote:
>>At the NWWG meeting of 5-27-99 I volunteered to draft a sign-on letter
>>in response to the Cox Committee report. I circulated my draft to
>>many of you last week by e-mail, and I also circulated it to the CTBT WG
>>of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.....
>
>Bob,
>
>With my feeble memory, I don't recall precisely what kind of letter we
>decided upon at NWWG.
>
>When I read your draft after the CTBT WG, I perceived it as part of the PSR
>dual approach to stockpile stewardship and the CTBT. I wondered about the
>advisability of linking them in this instance, but I didn't say anything.
>I'm sort of passive these days in commenting on other people's letters.
>
>If the issue is still open (and it may not be), I would now raise the
>question of linkage in connection with the Cox report aftermath. The CTBT
>is very much on the table this month because Democratic senators are trying
>to get key Republicans (including Domenici) to join them in a statement on
>the need for action on the CTBT. Also, Lott is trying to determine what to
>do. Domenici may support the CTBT, but he's not going to favor curtailing
>stockpile stewardship. As far as I know, additional funding for stockpile
>stewardship has not been raised in the aftermath of the Cox report, though
>it may come up.
>
>Therefore, perhaps we would be better off to have a strong, positive letter

>stating why the CTBT is so important in view of the findings of the Cox
>report. CRND has a lot of ready-made language on that. If the issue of
>additional funding for stockpile stewardship comes up, we can deal with that
>separately.

>
>Sorry for raising this issue on Tuesday rather than on Friday during the
>first draft stage. Take or leave my comments as you choose.

>
>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.

>
>

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: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Thu, 10 Jun 1999 08:57:31 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: CTBT sign-on letter - PLZ REPLY ASAP

June 10, 1999

TO: Coalition members and other CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: renewing our call for Presidential action on the Treaty; sign-on letter

PLZ REPLY NO LATER THAN MONDAY, JUNE 14 AT NOON

With the Kosovo peace plan signed and in the early stages of implementation, several Coalition members have suggested that we should renew our effort to prompt the Clinton administration to finally move ahead with the serious "cabinet-wide" effort to bring the CTBT to a successful vote in the Senate. While there is renewed activity among Senate CTBT supporters to move the treaty to a vote, the White House and key cabinet agencies must initiate their public campaign on behalf of the CTBT within the next few weeks in order to make it possible to get the treaty on the Senate's calendar and to win over key undecideds needed for Senate approval.

To communicate our message to the administration, we will need to rapidly arrange meetings with a number of high-level policy makers. If you are willing to make some calls to set up some of those meetings, please contact John Isaacs of Council for a Livable World (543-4100 or <jdi@clw.org>).

In addition, the following draft sign-on letter is intended to help reinforce the effort to move the administration into action. The letter, you will notice, is more of less an update of our January 1999 letter to the President on the CTBT. It is designed to be a Coalition letter signed by directors of Coalition groups and directors (or program directors) of any other organizations which support the test ban treaty.

The deadline for replies is MONDAY, JUNE 14 at NOON. It will be sent by close of business that day. Please contact me by e-mail or phone if you can sign-on or if you have any questions.

An update on the status of our broader CTBT campaign effort (media work, editorials and op-ed, grassroots communications, etc) will be posted later today.

Thank you,

DK

DRAFT

June XX, 1999

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

Dear Mr. President,

With the conflict in Kosovo moving to a peaceful conclusion, your Administration has a window of opportunity to achieve much needed progress on nuclear arms control and non-proliferation, especially moving the Senate to a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). With only 18 months left in your Administration and with only two months before the Congressional summer recess, now is the time to press for a Senate commitment on a date certain for a CTBT vote.

Despite your pivotal role in helping to bring the CTBT negotiations to a successful conclusion, Senate approval and entry into force of the Treaty are in serious jeopardy. Without a new and substantial presidential campaign on behalf of the CTBT, the Senate will not take up or approve the Treaty. Without U.S. leadership and approval of 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.

In order to overcome the Senate leadership's opposition to CTBT consideration, there needs to be an immediate and substantial commitment of energy and resources to this effort. We urge you to:

- * take your case for CTBT ratification directly to the public and invite bipartisan support for its consideration and approval on a frequent and consistent basis;
- * 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 and;
- * direct key cabinet members and high-profile CTBT supporters to pursue a sustained, public campaign to increase support and win Senate approval for the treaty.

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. Concerns about espionage at the laboratories and Chinese nuclear weapons modernization further underscore the national security value and urgency of CTBT ratification and entry into force. Although the drive for the treaty in the Senate will be difficult, we firmly believe that if it is brought to the Senate floor for a vote in 1999, the CTBT will win final approval.

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 block a vote on this popular treaty, which is so vital to the nation's nuclear non-proliferation efforts and to world security.

Thank you for your consideration of our views. We would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you and/or your senior political advisors on this matter.

Sincerely,

[heads of organizations]

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>, .
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: CTBT sign-on letter - PLZ REPLY ASAP
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 08:57 AM 6/10/99 -0400, Daryl Kimball wrote:

>June 10, 1999

>

>TO: Coalition members and other CTBT supporters

>FR: Daryl Kimball

>

>RE: renewing our call for Presidential action on the Treaty; sign-on letter

>

>PLZ REPLY NO LATER THAN MONDAY, JUNE 14 AT NOON

Daryl,

I'll sign the letter to President Clinton on the CTBT.

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

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

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1999 11:33:25 -0700 (PDT)

From: rej@acronym.org.uk (Rebecca Johnson)

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: latest on CD

To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id LAA11974

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

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id LAB13258

To Acro receivers

CD Update, 11 June 1999

NOTE: The latest Disarmament Diplomacy (37) has now been published and will be up on our website shortly. It contains the latest on the CTBT and Article XIV entry into force Conference from Daryl Kimball, Rebecca Johnson's summary and analysis of the 1999 NPT PrepCom and implications for 2000, and also CD update (but the one below is slightly more up to date).

Continuing Stalemate at the CD: Russia and China call for work on Outer Space weaponisation

With fewer than 12 session-weeks before the end of its 1999 session on 8 September, the Conference on Disarmament is still mired in political wrangles over its programme of work. As a consequence, the much heralded decision to start negotiations on a ban on the production of fissile materials for weapons (fissban), taken on August 11 last year, has been thwarted, since the CD has been unable to reconvene the ad hoc committee charged with negotiating the treaty. Other important issues languishing in the impasse are nuclear disarmament, preventing the weaponisation of space, and security assurances, though unlike the fissban, none of these are presently the subject of any negotiating mandates. In particular, Russia and China have become increasingly vociferous in their objections to US plans for missile defence, increasing demands for the CD to address such developments in an ad hoc committee on 'prevention of an arms race in outer space' -- PAROS. The CD President is now seeking a compromise including fissban and NSA committees and working groups on nuclear disarmament (based on the NATO-5 proposal) and PAROS (deliberative). The G-21 group of non-aligned states have indicated that they would accept working groups on nuclear disarmament and PAROS, although they would have preferred committees. China and Russia would accept a working group on PAROS although they too want a committee; Russia, China and France have accepted the concept of a working group on nuclear disarmament, based on the NATO-5 proposal, if this ensures that the fissban committee can start negotiations. Although they have said nothing publicly Britain and the United States are reportedly also willing to accept a nuclear disarmament working group on NATO-5 lines, but the United States is still adamantly opposed to anything beyond a special coordinator on PAROS.

1. US-UK-French proposal fails to persuade

Shortly after the CD re-opened in May, the United States, Britain and France proposed establishing a work programme based on last year's, with ad hoc committees to negotiate the fissban and to discuss security assurances and special coordinators on 'prevention of an arms race in outer space' (PAROS), landmines and transparency in armaments, as well as to consult on procedural questions for the CD, including expansion of membership, review of its agenda, and improved functioning, which it clearly needs. To avoid disrupting the negotiations and having to fight about re-establishing the fissban negotiations every year, the three-power proposal provided for the fissban committee to "meet in successive sessions of the Conference until its work is completed, without the need for annual reauthorisation". To address nuclear disarmament, which has been demanded by non-nuclear-weapon states from all political groupings, the P-3 proposed continuing 'troika consultations' under the President, with the assistance of the outgoing and incoming CD presidents "as its first priority and substantially to intensify its vigorous efforts", including holding open-ended consultations at least once per Presidency (normally 4 working weeks) and presenting interim reports at the end of each Presidency.

There was opposition from various delegations of the G-21 group of non-aligned states, including India and Pakistan. They wanted more on nuclear disarmament and objected to the proposal that negotiations on the fissban should automatically reconvene each year, arguing that this might undermine the CD and require a rule change. It is generally thought that India and Pakistan would like to string the fissban negotiations out long enough to produce as much plutonium and highly enriched uranium as they deem necessary for their projected nuclear weapon requirements. The delays and supposed leverage of an annual tug of war in the CD are therefore practically and politically convenient for some.

2. China and Russia raise stakes re outer space issues

China rejected the P-3 proposal because it offered only a special coordinator on PAROS. Earlier this year China proposed a mandate for a deliberative ad hoc committee on PAROS, which the United States rejected. Observing that "the significant divergence on the position of CD members on the two agenda items... Nuclear Disarmament and PAROS reflects the different stands of various countries on the objectives and purposes of disarmament" China countered the P-3 proposal by calling for "necessary working mechanisms" -- either ad hoc committees or working groups -- with appropriate mandates to address these issues. In some very pointed exchanges between the ambassadors for China and the United States, Li Changhe noted that "Many delegations, including the Chinese delegation, believe that the importance of nuclear disarmament and PAROS is no less than that of FMCT". Robert Grey responded by castigating linkages "which suggest that all the items we are considering have equal support in the CD". He said that "This is not conducive either to the Conference's work or to its reputation as an effective multilateral negotiating body". The United States is the sole opponent of an ad hoc committee to discuss the weaponisation of space. Russian ambassador Vasily Siderov also accused the bill passed by the US House of Representatives on anti-missile defence of "undermining the 1972 ABM Treaty" and said that "there is an intrinsic interrelationship between the START and strategic defensive armaments... [which] provides that deep reduction of strategic offensive weapons are only feasible under the

conditions of a limited ABM system". On outer space, Siderov said that the "progressive development of space equipment and state-of-the-art high technology weapon systems can provide a positive incentive for some states" to use a legal loophole in the 1967 Treaty on Outer Space "for purposes inconsistent with the peaceful activities in the space around the world". Therefore Russia argued that "a legal regime prohibiting the deployment of offensive weapons in outer space should become one of the principal tasks of the international community" since "it is better to consider today the means of preventing an arms race in outer space, rather than waste tomorrow huge amounts of resources to disarm it".

3. Presidential proposal: includes working groups for PAROS and nuclear disarmament as well as fissban negotiations

At time of writing, it is understood that the CD President, Ambassador Mohamed-Salah Dembri, is attempting to get acceptance for a formula which would re-establish the fissban committee for this year, but would also provide working groups -- not committees -- to address nuclear disarmament and PAROS. With France on the one hand and the G-21 on the other prepared to accept a working group along the lines proposed by Belgium and the NATO-5, at least as a first step, the search is on for acceptable deliberative mandates for each of the suggested working groups. Ireland, for example, had pointed out that the draft NATO-5 mandate appeared to imply "'talks about talks' rather than a dialogue on substantive endeavours". Ireland suggested removing the procedural aspect of the discussion and going straight to substance. The main opposition on both nuclear disarmament talks and a working group on PAROS is still the United States, which is researching and developing missile defence systems. Arguing that there is no arms race in outer space to worry about, the US delegation does not want to go beyond a special coordinator on this issue.

4. Ireland castigates delay on expansion

Concluding her thoughtful analysis of the CD's work prospects, Ambassador Anne Anderson of Ireland again called for implementation of the decision to admit five new members to the Conference: Ecuador, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Malaysia and Tunisia. This mini-expansion nearly went through in September 1998, but was blocked by Iran for extraneous reasons. Early this year, after Iran gave its agreement, Pakistan impeded the decision in order to 'punish' some of the applicants for the role they had played in votes on the UN First Committee and General Assembly resolutions condemning the South Asian tests. Commenting that "we are all aware that the views of all of the five on all issues are not congenial to everyone", Anderson quoted a former Ambassador of Pakistan to the CD, Ahmed Kamal from March 1995: "...It does not matter if there are differences of opinion here; difference of opinion is the essence of democracy. We all learn from the opinions of others, and it is in adjusting to the opinions of others that we do not weaken ourselves individually but strengthen ourselves collectively."

5. Sharp exchanges on NATO/Yugoslavia and Kashmir

During the plenary sessions in the last few weeks there have been bitter exchanges between the United States and China and Russia over NATO action and bombing in Yugoslavia and missile defence. Ambassador Vasily Siderov

drew attention to the Joint Russian-Chinese Press Communiqué on Consultations on Issues pertaining to the 1972 ABM Treaty. In an angry response to Chinese accusations over missile defence Ambassador Robert Grey denied that the United States had breached the ABM Treaty and said that the US would not make a decision on deployment "until the year 2000 or thereafter". He affirmed that the "ABM Treaty remains a cornerstone of strategic stability for the US, and we are committed to continued efforts to strengthen the treaty and to enhance its viability and effectiveness". Pakistan's Ambassador Munir Akram supported China's position on PAROS and the threats to the ABM Treaty and raised questions about NATO's actions and new strategic concept of "new and unprecedented missions which can be conducted without recourse to the provisions of the UN Charter". As fighting increased in Kashmir, those tensions were mirrored on the floor of the CD in heated arguments between India and Pakistan.

Conclusion

Even if the President is successful in finding a compromise work programme, it is too late for any substantive work to be done on the fission. Because of US plans on missile defence, the issue of preventing the weaponisation of space has increased in importance, and seems to be regarded as of equal or greater importance than a fission for some delegations, including China. As most of the weapon states seem willing now to accept the concept of discussing nuclear disarmament in the CD, the US' refusal to discuss PAROS is now the major obstacle to agreement on a work programme. A face-saver this year without any firm commitment and collective intention to proceed along the same lines in 2000 will accomplish little. Even if fission negotiations get underway, the prospects are for a long, slow and difficult few years.

CD Dates for 1999

18 January to 26 March; 10 May to 25 June; 26 July to 8 September.

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.acronym.org.uk>

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: June 15 Meeting of Interfaith Group for CTBT
Cc: ctbt
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

This a reminder of the meeting of Interfaith Group for the CTBT from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, June 15, 1999 at the FCNL conference room, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC. The proposed agenda is as follows:

1. Introductions
2. Status of CTBT
 - a. Congress
 - b. Administration
3. Grassroots advocacy
4. Call-in day: July 16
5. Proposal for lobby day in September
6. Other

I hope to see you then.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3
Date: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 15:42:00 -0400
To: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org (jbloomfield@gn.apc.org),
abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca,
abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Re: Minutes of the Abolition 2000 Annual Meeting 1999.
Cc: ippnw@vlberlin.comlink.de, koen.moens@mailandnews.com,
psoake@healthnet.org, peacedepot@y.email.ne.jp,
nei.til.atomvapen@online.no, r.braun@ping.de, fredpax@online.no,
hititau@mail.pf, akmalten@corunet.nl, johnburroughs@earthlink.net,
ippnwbos@igc.apc.org, acc@internetegypt.com, a2000uk@gn.apc.org,
pacific@talent.com.au, zia@yuma.princeton.edu, rwilcock@web.apc.org,
salvador@hawaii.edu, pol@motherearth.org, pmeidell@igc.apc.org,
scheffran@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de, jovall@perth.dialix.oz.au,
jbloomfield@gn.apc.org, wslf@earthlink.net, cxj15621@niftyserve.or.jp,
flick@igc.apc.org, wagingpeace@napf.org, ddurand@mail.asi.fr,
mailbox@ipb.org, dwyer@pilot.msu.edu, alynw@ibm.net,
mvtpaix@globenet.org
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

>
> Dear Friends,

Here are some addition, corrections to minutes:

>
> *Praful Bidwai (India) [pbidwai@pb.unv.ernet.in]
>
> 2) Religious Organizations:
> Howard Hallman, (Methodists United For Peace with Justice), 1500 16th St.
> NW, Washington D.C., 20036, USA, Tel: +1-301-896-0013, Fax:
> +1-301-896-0013, E-Mail: mupj@igc.apc.org,
> Clayton Ramey, (Fellowship of Reconciliation), 521 North Broadway, Nyack,
> New York, 10960, USA, Tel: 1-914-358-4601, Fax: 1-914-358-4924, E-Mail:
> cramey@igc.apc.org.
> Dave Robinson, Pax Christi, 532 West 8th Street. E-mail:
> Dave@paxchristiusa.org
> [Howard informed the caucus that he closed this list down: To subscribe to
> the working group's E-Mail list server, contact Howard Hallman.]
>
> 5) NATO Working Group:
> [Karina Wood informed the group that she would not be on this working group
> when she began her work with the HAP. She had a co-convenor:

>
> Karina Wood, (Peace Action), 1819 H Street, NW, Suite 420, Washington,

> D.C. 20006, USA, Tel: +1-202-862-9740 ext. 3044, Fax: +1-202-862-9762,
> E-Mail: kwood@igc.org.

>
> [Stephen Staples volunteered to organize a Corporate Working Group to
address
> the corporation-driven nuclear arms race and focus on the WTO meeting in
> Seattle this fall.]

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: Mon, 14 Jun 1999 18:58:35 -0400
To: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org (jbloomfield@gn.apc.org),
abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca,
abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Re: Minutes of the Abolition 2000 Annual Meeting 1999.
Cc: ippnw@vlberlin.comlink.de, koen.moens@mailandnews.com,
psoake@healthnet.org, peacedepot@y.email.ne.jp,
nei.til.atomvapen@online.no, r.braun@ping.de, fredpax@online.no,
hititau@mail.pf, akmalten@corunet.nl, johnburroughs@earthlink.net,
ippnwbos@igc.apc.org, acc@internetegypt.com, a2000uk@gn.apc.org,
pacific@talent.com.au, zia@yuma.princeton.edu, rwilcock@web.apc.org,
salvador@hawaii.edu, pol@motherearth.org, pmeidell@igc.apc.org,
scheffran@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.de, jovall@perth.dialix.oz.au,
jbloomfield@gn.apc.org, wslf@earthlink.net, cxj15621@niftyserve.or.jp,
flick@igc.apc.org, wagingpeace@napf.org, ddurand@mail.asi.fr,
mailbox@ipb.org, dwyer@pilot.msu.edu, alynw@ibm.net,
mvtpaix@globenet.org
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear Friends,

In my amendments to the minutes, I mistakenly edited out the name of Ben Cramer

as the co-convenor of the NATO working group. His email is <appel100@worldnet.fr> Regards,

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.

To: FoE Sydney - Nuclear Campaign <nonukes@foesydney.org.au>,
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: PLEASE SIGN ON Y2K DE-ALERTING SIGN ON LETTER TO CLINTON/YELTSIN
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 03:03 PM 6/15/99 +1000, FoE Sydney - Nuclear Campaign wrote:

>Dear people,
>My apologies if it's the umpteenth time you've got this letter.

Dear Friends:

A week or so ago I sent a message that I would sign, but I don't see my name on the list. Please include me.

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

To: Dringler@umc-gbcs.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Peace with Justice projects
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Robin,

Our church is observing Peace with Justice Sunday on June 27, and I've been invited to speak for three to five minutes. I want to mention some of the Maryland and national projects that are funded by the Peace with Justice offering. Can you provide me a list or summary of what the GBCS funds?

You can bring the list to the Interfaith Group for the CTBT meeting or mail it to me at home, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817.

Thanks,
Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 12:31:19 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org, mpage@macfdn.org, nbolus@igc.apc.org,
ksuokko@wajones.org, gperkovich@wajones.org, jaquith@mindspring.com,
c.wing@fordfound.org, rwboone@silcom.com,
(Renee de Nevers) rdnever@macfdn.org, magraw@tidalwave.net
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: draft CTBT poll ques.- reply req. ASAP

CONFIDENTIAL -- DO NOT CIRCULATE WITHOUT PERMISSION

June 15, 1999

TO: select CTBT colleagues
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: your feedback on our draft national, bipartisan CTBT poll

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers has commissioned The Mellman Group and Wirthlin Worldwide to conduct a national survey on the subject of the CTBT in order to provide us with more up to date information on public attitudes and to help us understand how our specific CTBT messages resonate with the public.

The questions are below (and a Wordperfect file vesion is also attached). They have been formulated by the pollsters with input from a small group of Coalition members. I am sending you this draft to solicit your comments and suggestions about the survey.

The analyzed results will be available by the last week in June. I would also appreciate any suggestions you might have about how the results might be disseminated. In addition to the results on the CTBT survey questions, we will have information on respondents regarding: Most important problem facing the nation;
Right track/wrong track for the country; Party ID; Ideology; Gender; Age; Education; Religious affiliation; Race/Ethnicity; Marital status; Children at home; Employment; and Income.

Because we are on deadline to begin fieldwork at the end of this week, I would ask that you reply BEFORE WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16 AT 5pm. Sorry for the short deadline.

If you are interested in seeing our previous CTBT polling results, visit <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/polling.htm>>

Thanks for your help.

DK

NATIONAL SURVEY - NUCLEAR TESTING

1. What should be the goal of the United States' nuclear weapons policy: Eliminating nuclear weapons worldwide, reducing the number of nuclear weapons in the world to lower levels, maintaining the current number of nuclear weapons, or designing new and better nuclear weapons for the United States?

Eliminate 1
Reduce 2
Maintain 3
Design new and better 4
Don't know 5

TRADITIONAL QUESTION

2. The United States and 152 other countries have signed a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty which would prohibit nuclear weapons test explosions worldwide. Do you think the United States Senate should approve or disapprove of this treaty?

[IF APPROVE/DISAPPROVE:] Do you feel that way strongly or not so strongly?

Approve strongly 1
Approve not strongly 2
Disapprove not strongly 3
Disapprove strongly 4
Don't know 5

OR NEW ALTERNATE:

There is a treaty which would prohibit nuclear weapons test explosions worldwide. Do you think the United States should ratify, that is agree to this treaty, or do you think the United States should not ratify this treaty? [IF RATIFY/NOT RATIFY, ASK:] Do you feel that way strongly or not so strongly?

Ratify strongly 1
ratify not strongly 2
NOT ratify not strongly 3
NOT ratify strongly 4
don't know/no opinion 5

SPLIT SAMPLE A

3. Which of the following do you think is a better way for the United States to protect itself against nuclear threats from other countries?

READ AND ROTATE STATEMENTS

__ Having the option for the U.S. to resume conducting nuclear weapons test explosions 1

__ Having an international treaty that prohibits all nuclear weapons test explosions 2

[VOLUNTEER] not sure about this 3

SPLIT SAMPLE B

4. Which of the following do you think is a better way for the United States to protect itself against nuclear threats from other countries?

READ AND ROTATE STATEMENTS

__ Having the option for the U.S. to resume conducting nuclear weapons test explosions, which are needed to maintain and improve our nuclear arsenal, and allow other countries to conduct their own nuclear weapons tests 1

__ Having an international treaty that prohibits all nuclear weapons test explosions, which helps prevent other countries from developing new nuclear weapons, while allowing us to maintain our weapons without further testing 2

[VOLUNTEER] not sure about this 3

5. Recent reports indicate that China has obtained secret information about how the US builds nuclear weapons. Which statement comes closer to your point of view:

READ AND ROTATE STATEMENTS:

__ The most important way to prevent China from improving its nuclear arsenal is for the US to ratify and encourage global implementation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty which China has also signed. If the US ratifies the treaty it will prevent China from testing the new bomb designs so they won't know if their weapons work 1

__ It is irrelevant for the U.S. to ratify and encourage global implementation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty because this Treaty will not stop China from improving their nuclear technology and developing new weapons 2

OR don't you have an opinion on this? 3

6. Now I am going to read you two statements about two candidates and ask for whom you would vote if this was all you knew about the two candidates:

READ AND ROTATE STATEMENTS:

__ Candidate A says that the U.S. Senate should not ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty because the Treaty does not stop other countries from acquiring nuclear weapons and because we cannot be sure other countries are living up to the Treaty. Candidate A says that if the United States ratifies this treaty, we will be obligated to commit millions of dollars to implement it when it cannot be effectively verified. Candidate A says that countries like China and Iran can always conduct nuclear tests in secret, meanwhile we will no longer be able to test our own nuclear arsenal to make sure our existing weapons work and will continue serve as an effective deterrent to other nations. Finally, Candidate A says that dealing with other issues like cutting taxes on working families is a much higher priority for the Senate than dealing with this Treaty.

SPLIT SAMPLE A - STOP NUKE PROLIFERATION

__Candidate B says that the U.S. Senate should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, because the Treaty is a critical step to stopping the spread of nuclear weapons, and freezing the nuclear advances being made by China, Iran, India and Pakistan. Because the Treaty prevents nuclear weapons tests, these countries will never be sure that their nuclear weapons actually work and therefore won't risk using them. Candidate B also says ratifying the Test Ban Treaty will strengthen United States' ability to monitor other countries' nuclear activities by establishing over 300 technological monitoring stations all over the world and allowing on-site inspection to make sure countries are not cheating. Finally Candidate B says the United States has the most advanced weapons in the world and US nuclear laboratory directors and independent scientists have said that tests are not necessary to maintain the US nuclear arsenal. They say we should ratify this Treaty, to help stop other countries from developing sophisticated nuclear weapons like ours.

SPLIT SAMPLE B - HONORING OUR PROMISE/FUTURE GENERATIONS

__Candidate B says that the U.S. Senate should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, because the United States signed this Treaty almost three years ago and we should honor our promise to the other 150 countries that have signed. Candidate B says that because the United States is a world leader, many other countries will not implement this treaty unless we do. And unless we ratify and help implement the treaty, countries without nuclear weapons will continue their efforts to develop them. Candidate B says that US Presidents beginning with Eisenhower, have supported ending nuclear testing but this is the best chance in history to finalize a global, verifiable Test Ban Treaty. Candidate B also says we have a responsibility to future generations to make the world safer and to end the environmental damage caused by nuclear testing by ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

7. For whom would you vote if an election for U.S. Senate in your state were being held between these two candidates, Candidate A or Candidate B?

- Candidate A 1
- Candidate B 2
- (Neither) 3
- (Both) 4
- (Don't know) 5

8. Which of the following do you think is the most convincing reason to support US ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty?

READ AND ROTATE LIST:

- __The Treaty will help stop the spread of nuclear weapons 1
- __The Treaty will freeze the nuclear advances being made by China by preventing them from testing their new weapons designs 2
- __The Treaty will strengthen the United States' ability to detect whether other nations have conducted nuclear tests 3
- _ The Treaty will establishing over 300 monitoring stations

all over the world and allow for on-site inspection to make sure countries
are not cheating 4

__US nuclear laboratory directors and independent scientists have said that
tests

are not necessary to maintain the US nuclear arsenal. 5

__The United States signed this Treaty almost three years ago and we should
honor

our promise to the other 150 countries that have signed. 6

__Many other countries will not adhere to this treaty unless we do 7

__The United States' ability to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons will
be greatly

diminished if we do not ratify the treaty 8

__We have a responsibility to future generations to make the
world safer and stop environmental damage caused by nuclear testing 9

__The Treaty will help the United States' maintain its technological edge in
nuclear weapons 10

[DNR] not sure about this/don't know 11

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

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Two grassroots activity on the CTBT
Cc: ctbt@2020vision.org, disarmament@igc.org
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

At today's meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, we decided to pursue two grassroots activities in the weeks ahead.

1. Home-state meetings, July 3-11

The Senate will be in recess from July 3 to 11. This is good opportunity to encourage grassroots CTBT advocates to attend public meetings at which their senator is appearing and to ask questions about his/her support for treaty ratification. We will focus particularly on 12 states with members on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and with other influential senators. Five of us will ask our key contact in these states to obtain information on scheduled public meetings. We will share this information with you so that you can provide it to your contacts in these states. Marie Rietmann and I are developing a process statement for this mini-project, which we'll send to you.

2. Call-in July 16

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is organizing a Senate Call-in Day on the CTBT on July 16 (the 54th anniversary of the first nuclear weapons test). The Disarmament Clearinghouse has postcards to publicize the event and funds for mailing. They can mail directly to names and addresses you provide, or they will provide you free postcards and assistance with postage if you want to handle the mailing yourself. You can use your discretion on who should receive such postcards, such as key activists, and which states (your whole network or our 13 key states or top 30). To order cards or otherwise participate, contact Joan Wade at Disarmament Clearinghouse: 202 898-0150 or disarmament@igc.org.

Stay tuned for other aspects of the CTBT ratification campaign.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 15 Jun 1999 17:08:44 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org, jsmith@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: CTBT WG meeting 6/18, 9:30am

June 15, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball and Tom Collina

RE: CTBT Working Group meeting this Friday, June 18, 9:30am-11:00am

The Coalition's CTBT working group will meet this Friday at 1616 P Street NW in the UCS 7th floor conference room to plan our "post-Kosovo" efforts to get the Clinton administration's CTBT efforts on track.

Please bring information about what your organization is doing or is prepared to do in connection with this effort and the overall public education campaign on the CTBT.

Look for a CTBT campaign e-mail update later this week.

Attached below is a draft agenda. See you there.

DK and TC

CTBT Working Meeting, June 18, 1999

Introductions

1. "Post-Kosovo" Plan of Action on CTBT

Coalition letter to the President (Daryl Kimball)
Meetings with Administration officials (John Isaacs)

Scientists letter (Tom Collina)
Enviros letter (Bob Tiller)

CTBT polling and dissemination (Daryl Kimball)

Grassroots CTBT Call-In Day, July 16 (Joan Wade & Kim Robson)

2. Generating News Coverage

op-eds
editorials
expert letters
press briefing

3. Report on Hill Developments

4. Other

possible Cox Report briefing session for NGOs

*An Ad Hoc Lobbying Meeting Will Follow

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

To: lintnerj@ucc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Seeking appointments re CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Jay,

At yesterday's meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT we agreed to once again pursue appointments with top officials of the Clinton Administration. Would you be able and willing to try again for an appointment with Secretary Ahlbright and/or Undersecretary Talbot? If you can't, please let me know, and I'll get somebody else to take on the assignment.

Shalom,
Howard

To: jsammon@networklobby.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Possible appointment with Secretary Richardson
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Jean,

At yesterday's meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT we agreed to once again pursue appointments with top officials of the Clinton Administration. Would you be able and willing to try again for an appointment with Secretary Richardson? If you can't, please let me know, and I'll get somebody else to take on the assignment.

Shalom,
Howard

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Ploughshares grant
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil,

This month I will be requesting \$1,500 from the Ploughshares grant. Am I right that this will leave less than \$100 in the grant fund? This can be used up on phone bill, photocopy, or IGC e-mail account. The balance for such a bill can be taken from the General Fund.

If this doesn't make sense, please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 11:26:19 -0600
From: Delongs <delong@nucleus.com>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Kosovo: Senator Roche's Speech in the Senate June 15, 1999
To: Abolition Listserv <abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>,
CNANW Listserv <cnanw@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>,
"Int'l. Abolition List" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-Corel-MessageType: EMail

Honourable Senators,

Lessons that NATO, the United Nations and Canada should learn from the Kosovo war concerning the future of international law are the theme of this address. The Kosovo war was fundamentally about the rule of law. How will international law be imposed in the years ahead: by the militarily powerful determining what the law will be, or by a collective world effort reposing the seat of law in the United Nations system?

It is in no light vein that I stand to oppose Senator Grafstein whose high respect in the Senate has been eminently earned. Senator Grafstein has argued that not only was NATO's bombing of Serbia and Kosovo legal but also that it was necessary because of the failure of the United Nations to act against the brutal aggression against the Kosovars committed by the forces of Slobodan Milosevic. Senator Grafstein is in accord with the Government of Canada's position, as articulated by the Government Leader in the Senate, who said that NATO had to intervene because: "The alternative would have been to watch passively as an entire population was terrorized and expelled from its ancestral land."

I am in profound disagreement with this viewpoint. I hold that NATO did not have the right to take the law into its own hands. Moreover, NATO's continued bombing for 78 days caused immense suffering and damage, worsened the situation for the Kosovars, undermined the United Nations, and destabilized international relations.

I do not feel alone in opposing the weight of government thinking on this matter. Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter criticized the NATO campaign, stating:

"The decision to attack the entire nation has been counterproductive, and our destruction of civilian life has ... become senseless and excessively brutal."

Former Soviet Leader Mikhail Gorbachev said the possibilities for a political solution were not used, and NATO's disregarding the views of countries like Russia, China, and India has placed the world "in a very, very difficult situation." Pope John Paul II deplored the human suffering caused by the bombing. Here in Canada, James Bissett, former Canadian Ambassador to Yugoslavia, said:

"NATO's unprovoked attack is a blatant violation of every precept of international law."

The historian Michael Bliss said NATO's action was "ill-considered and reckless."

Let us consider for a moment what actually happened. Using 700 aircraft and 20 ships, NATO flew nearly 35,000 sorties, dropping 20,000 bombs on 600 cities, towns and villages. There were 13,000 civilian casualties, including 2,500 dead. Utilities, roads, bridges, hospitals, clinics and schools were destroyed along with military targets. There has been no spring planting and, thus, there will be no autumn harvest. Countless wells, which are the principal water source, have been poisoned with human bodies, dead animals, and toxic substances like paint and gasoline. The NATO bombardment, which cost NATO countries about \$100 million a day, has set much of Yugoslavia back into a pre-industrial state and the cost of rebuilding the demolished infrastructure will be between \$50 billion and \$150 billion.

Western media have downplayed the fact that the negotiations between U.S. envoys and Milosevic were on the verge of an agreement. The Serb Parliament was ready to accept the withdrawal of the bulk of Serb forces from Kosovo, and permit the entry into Kosovo of 1,800 unarmed international inspectors, and would allow overflights by NATO planes. NATO threatened air strikes to force a peace agreement to be monitored exclusively by NATO's ground troops. The negotiations foundered on NATO's threat to bomb. Once NATO had issued this threat, it felt compelled to follow through. Thus, when Milosevic rebelled, NATO - without a legal mandate - started bombing. NATO persisted in the bombing because the credibility of NATO had become the issue.

Why was the Secretary General of the U.N. not immediately dispatched to personally conduct negotiations on behalf of the entire Security Council? The answer to that question, which historians will surely probe, is that the U.S., which proudly proclaims itself as the "indispensable nation" decided that it, and its NATO partners, would force a solution.

The consequences of the imposition of force by the nuclear-armed Western military alliance have been startling. The military action has virtually halted Russian-American consultations on nuclear disarmament, buried the START II Treaty, and has bred a dangerous trend pushing some countries out of the non-proliferation regime. China, whose Belgrade embassy was bombed, has excoriated the U.S. and NATO for bullying tactics. NATO should learn that humiliating the Russians and the Chinese is no way to build world peace.

Only a decade after the end of the Cold War, the hopes for a cooperative, global security system have been dashed on the rocks of power. The trust, engendered during the early post-Cold War years, is now shattered. New arms races are under way.

It has been said that the NATO action was a "just war," and Senator Grafstein cited Hugo Grotius, the father of international law, to advance this idea. However, two of the requirements for a "just war" are limitation and proportionality. The damage must be limited to combatants and no greater than the securing of a military objective. Such rules were formulated before the technological development of modern warfare. Killing and damage, as Kosovo showed, are now

indiscriminate. The phrase "collateral damage" is military doublespeak, covering up the killing of innocent people.

It was said that the bombing was to stop the ethnic cleansing of the Kosovars. When the bombing started, there were 45,000 Kosovar refugees who had fled. After the strikes began, the number of refugees swelled to 855,000. Bombing worsened their situation.

To say that the Kosovo war was not just, nor justifiable in the political circumstances, does not mean that I am closing my eyes to the horrors for which Milosevic now stands indicted before the special Yugoslav tribunal. Of course, something had to be done. But it is the U.N. Security Council, not NATO, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

When nations signed the U.N. Charter, they accepted the obligation, as set out in Article 2.4, to refrain from the threat or use of force; and, under Article 42, to use force to stop acts of aggression only under a mandate of the Security Council.

The U.N. Charter is the modern embodiment of the international law that had been building up through previous centuries. To downgrade the U.N. Charter is to close one's eyes to the structural role the U.N. has played in the development of international law, which has at last produced an agreement on an International Criminal Court. Even NATO's own Charter says that NATO's actions must follow the U.N. Charter.

The Security Council did, in fact, adopt three resolutions on Kosovo, on March 31, 1998, September 23, 1998, and October 24, 1998. It is a myth for the proponents of the war to keep saying that the U.N. was "paralyzed." The Russians and Chinese were certainly opposed to NATO troops being the exclusive intervenors in Kosovo and would likely have vetoed a resolution authorizing NATO alone to intervene. But where is the evidence they would have vetoed an international force? In fact, the latest resolution, Number 1244 of June 10, 1999, specifies that the deployment of a force in Kosovo now will be "under United Nations auspices"; moreover, the interim administration for Kosovo is "to be decided by the Security Council."

NATO troops are a leading element of the international force, to be sure, but the overall responsibility for keeping the peace in Kosovo as well as coordinating humanitarian relief operations, has been handed back to the U.N. Thank God for the United Nations. It is a tragic irony that, after all the NATO blundering, we are back to where we were before the bombing - with the U.N. Security Council now determining how to maintain international peace and security. Moreover, the potential sovereignty for Kosovo, the stumbling block of the Rambouillet agreement, has now been removed.

It is only through the United Nations that the whole international community can jointly pursue such basic Charter values as democracy, pluralism, human rights and the rule of law. As Secretary General Kofi Annan has stated:

"Unless the Security Council is restored to its preeminent position as

the sole source of legitimacy on the use of force, we are on a dangerous path to anarchy."

Honorable Senators, the Security Council must unite around the aim of confronting massive human rights violations and crimes against humanity. In a world where globalization has limited the ability of states to control their economies, regulate their financial policies, and isolate themselves from environmental damage and human migration, the last right of states cannot and must not be the right to enslave, persecute or torture their own citizens. States must find common ground in upholding the principles of the U.N. Charter, and also find unity in defence of our common humanity - a double challenge.

Since the end of the Cold War, the world has witnessed important instances in which the Security Council rose to the challenge and legitimized both peacekeeping operations and the use of force where they were just and necessary. Central America and the reversal of the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait are prime examples of the Security Council playing the role envisioned for it by its founders. The failures of the Security Council should be measured against its successes to dispel the spurious charges that it cannot keep the peace.

Finally, the Kosovo crisis of 1999 exposed the contradictions in Canadian foreign policy. For a long time, Canada has tried to balance its adherence to the United Nations system and its allegiance to NATO. When the United Nations was trying to rid the world of nuclear weapons and NATO said they were essential, Canada tried to accommodate both viewpoints. When NATO expanded into Eastern Europe at the expense of the development of the pan-European security body, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Canada went along.

When the United States and the U.K. began, in 1998, protracted bombing of Iraq without any mandate from the U.N. Security Council, Canada acceded. The war opened up by NATO's bombing of Serbia and Kosovo in direct violation of the U.N. Charter, as well as NATO's own Charter, has brought the fissures between Western military might and the global strategies of the United Nations into the open.

Canada is still trying to balance its adherence to both the U.N. and NATO. Increasingly, this is becoming an impossible task as the differences between each become irreconcilable. The U.N. wants peace through peace-making techniques. NATO wants peace through military dominance.

Canada is caught in a dilemma. Its fundamental values lie with the United Nations as the guarantor of international peace and security. Its own protection during the Cold War lay with a Western military alliance that would come to Canada's defence if attacked. As long as there was a reasonable compatibility between the two, Canada could absorb the clashing of the two systems.

In choosing to not only support but participate in NATO's bombing of Serbia and Kosovo, Canada -- for the moment -- put NATO above the U.N. Of course the other NATO members did the same thing; they all subverted

international law by war.

The pragmatics of attempting to stop the ethnic cleansing and atrocities suffered by the Kosovars at the hands of the Serbs won out over the principle that only the U.N. Security Council has the right to take military action against an aggressor. The planes that Canada sent to bomb Serbia and Kosovo illustrate the skewing of Canada's priorities. Canada sent the planes to show that it was an active participant in the NATO action; but their need, relative to the overwhelming U.S. strength, was marginal. Canada's effort to resolve the Kosovo crisis would have been better served by using resources to strengthen political and diplomatic endeavours, then contribute forces to a U.N. approved international force.

[Senator Roche was unable to conclude his comments due to enforcement of time restrictions in the Senate. The balance of his prepared text follows.]

This would have underscored Canada's commitment to international law, but it would have meant stepping outside of NATO's action.

Canada is not ready to leave NATO. Yet Canada wants U.N. solutions. So the country continues to try to balance both sets of obligations. It is becoming clearer that remaining in a nuclear-armed Western military alliance is undermining Canada's ability and desires to express our yearning for peace through the United Nations system. If, by remaining in NATO, Canada can successfully work with allies to eliminate NATO's reliance on nuclear weapons and ensure that NATO works under, not above, the U.N., the allegiance will be worthwhile. But it will take far more determination than yet seen by Canadian government action to achieve these goals. As long as NATO remains imperious, the demand of thinking Canadians, concerned about the requirements for a truly global security system, for Canada to leave NATO will grow.

Hon. Douglas Roche, O.C.
June 15, 1999

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 21:35:30 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: CTBT campaign update, 6/99
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id SAA01655

June 16, 1999

TO: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers members and CTBT Wkg. Grp.
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: Update on CTBT campaign activities

With the Kosovo peace agreement signed and now being implemented, we now have a crucial opportunity to re-assert our message to the Clinton Administration that it must begin a high-level effort to secure a vote on and approval of the CTBT in the Senate. The administration and the Senate leadership are now assessing what can and should be on their policy agendas for the remainder of the year and into the 2000 election season. During the next few weeks before the summer Congressional recesses, it is important that we redouble our efforts to get our message through the President and his advisors, get favorable CTBT media coverage, and publicize the broad public support for the test ban.

A number of NGO projects aimed at increasing awareness and support for action on the test ban are underway. More are being planned. What follows is:

- 1) a summary of CTBT-related public education activities;
- 2) a short list of CTBT-related resources;
- 3) an update on Coalition public opinion survey plans; and
- 4) an updated CTBT calendar of events and anniversaries.

If your organization is engaged in or is planning any CTBT-related work that you feel others should be aware of, please inform me. If you are interested in information on Hill-related CTBT efforts, contact Tom Collina <tcollina@ucsusa.org> or me <dkimball@clw.org>

Also, please be sure to attend the next CTBT Working Group meeting of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers on Friday, June 18 from 9:30am to 11:00am at the UCS 7th floor conference room, 1616 P Street NW.

DK

1. PLANNED PUBLIC EDUCATION, MEDIA AND OUTREACH ACTIVITIES ON CTBT

MAY (Underway or Ongoing)

* Interfaith CTBT petition drive from March-May. Petitions signed by 8000

people from 23 states and delivered to Senators in field offices and sign-on letter from various denominational leaders is delivered to Senate offices in DC. For more information on the petition, see <<http://www.loga.org/CTBTalt.htm>>

* 20/20 Vision CTBT action alert postcard to members on CTBT. A total of 26,000 CTBT "Action-Alert" post-cards have been distributed since March, 99 by 25 organizations to their memberships and by individual activists. Several of these groups (including PSR and others) are also sending additional action alert mailings to their memberships.

* Individual meetings with Senate CTBT aides to deliver collections of letters written by leaders of 20 national organization with grassroots members.

* CDI documentary on CTBT aired on PBS stations; distributed to 100 grassroots leaders for presentations to member and outreach to new groups by Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers has been pitching defense and political reporters on the CTBT-COX Committee-Senate inaction story resulting in coverage by Associated Press and Albuquerque Journal.

* Special campaign to deliver letters to Jesse Helms urging action on CTBT, asking constituents to include photos of their children with plea for hearings organized by Interfaith CTBT Working Group.

JUNE-JULY (Underway or Planned)

* Representatives of 5 major religious denominations (representing 60 million) met with Sen. Lott's foreign affairs aide in early June.

* June 15 Coalition letter sent to the President urging immediate action on the CTBT.

* Meetings with key Clinton Administration officials, being coordinated by John Isaacs and other NGOS. Contact John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org> for more information.

* Op-ed placement effort by 20/20 Vision in IN, KS, MS, NE, OR, TN underway.

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers op-ed placement effort underway. Has produced only 2 placements as of June 16.

* Editorial board advisory on CTBT and follow-up calls by National Security News Service underway.

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers-commissioned bipartisan national polling on public attitudes on the CTBT. Results will be available by the week of June 21; dissemination schedule not yet determined.

* CTBT Conference Call Training for New Mexico 20/20 Vision members and

Catholic Church activists and leaders, organized by 20/20 Vision on June 29. Previous CTBT conference call trainings have reached nearly 200 activists in 25 key states. Contact Marie Rietmann for more information <ctbt@2020vision.org>

* Senate lobbying by grassroots activists in state and DC offices over July 3-11 recess. Contact Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org> or Marie Rietmann <ctbt@2020vision.org> for more information.

* CTBT "Call-In Day" to the Senate on July 16, organized by the Disarmament Clearinghouse (and allied groups Peace Action, PSR, 20/20 Vision, WAND, FCNL). Flyers and postcards to publicize the activity are available. Contact Joan Wade at <disarmament@igc.org> or 898-0150.

* Green Group (presidents of 12 major environmental organizations) letter of support for the CTBT to Senators, to be delivered in late-June. Contact Marie Rietmann <ctbt@2020vision.org> or Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

* Nobel-laureates letter of support for the CTBT/public event being organized by Francis Slakey of the American Physical Society. Release date not yet set.

* New letter of support for the CTBT from nuclear weapon scientists (to follow up on similar effort in 1998, see <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ucsltr.htm>>) being organized by Tom Collina of the Union of Concerned Scientists. Release date not yet set.

* Letter of support for the CTBT from women's organizations being organized by PeaceLinks. Release date not set.

* Letter of support for the CTBT from several dozen historians, including Stephen Ambrose and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., being organized by Daryl Kimball of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. Release date not yet set.

NOTE: a list of NGOs and prominent individuals who support the CTBT is available from the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers through a hidden link on the Coalition Web Site at <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbtlist.htm>>

AUGUST

* Peace Action National Congress & Demonstration, Los Alamos, NM, August 6-9

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER

* Womens Action for New Directions/Womens Legislators Lobby National Conference & Lobby Day, September 26-28

2. CTBT OUTREACH AND PUBLIC EDUCATION RESOURCES:

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers' CTBT Site <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbindex.htm>> and related CTBT Web

Sites <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctlinks.htm>>

* 20/20 Vision-produced action alert postcards (See <<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbt.html>> for more information.)

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers CTBT brochure (See <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbkform.htm>> for more information.)

* "Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now!" buttons from the Disarmament Clearinghouse(See <<http://www.psr.org/buttons.htm>> or contact 898-0150 for more information.)

* Information on Senators and staff in connection with the CTBT <<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbtSenate.html>> and their state contact information <<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbtfield.html>>

* Library of CTBT-related editorials on Coalition's CTBT site <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctedit.htm#editorials>>

* Center for Defense Information America's Defense Monitor: "Test Anxiety, Should the United States Sign the Test Ban Treaty?" video, see <<http://www.cdi.org/adm/1235/>>. (Contact <msugg@cdi.org> or Jenny Smith <jsmith@clw.org> for ordering information.)

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers Report, "Accelerating the Entry Into Force of the CTBT: The Article XIV Special Conference." Available online at: <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/SpecConfRep0599.htm>>

4. CTBT CALENDAR: 1999

January 19 Senate reconvenes; State of the Union address

February 5 CTBT Working Group Mtg., UCS 7th floor conference room, 1616 P St. NW

March 5 CTBT Working Group Mtg., UCS 7th floor conference room, 1616 P St. NW

April 2 45th anniversary of P.M. Jawaharlal Nehru's speech to the Indian Parliament for a "standstill agreement" regarding nuclear test explosions

April 9 CTBT Working Group Mtg., UCS 7th floor conference room, 1616 P St. NW

April 20-23 Eighth Preparatory Session of the CTBTTO, Vienna, Austria

March 26-

April 12 Senate spring recess

May 7 CTBT Working Group Mtg., UCS 7th floor conference room, 1616 P St. NW

May 10-21 Preparatory Committee Meeting of the NPT Review Conference, United Nations, New York

May 11 & 13 First anniversary of 1998 Indian nuclear tests at Pokhran

May 28 & 30 First anniversary of 1998 Pakistani nuclear tests

May 28-June 6 Senate Memorial Day recess

June 4 CTBT Working Group Mtg., UCS 7th floor conference room, 1616 P St. NW

June 18 CTBT Working Group Mtg., UCS 7th floor conference room, 1616 P St. NW

July 3-11 Senate Independence Day recess

July 16 CTBT Working Group Mtg (location tba)

July 16 54th anniversary of the first nuclear test; Natl. CTBT "Call-In" Day

July 30 CTBT Working Group Mtg., UCS 7th floor conference room, 1616 P St. NW

August 6 & 9 Hiroshima and Nagasaki Days

Aug.6-Sept.6 Senate summer recess

Aug. 23-27 Ninth Preparatory Session of the CTBTO, Vienna, Austria

August 29 50th anniv. of the first Soviet nuclear test, Semipalatinsk Test Site

September 24 Third anniversary of the signing of the CTBT

October 6-8 First Special Conference on CTBT Entry Into Force, Vienna

October 9-12 Senate Columbus Day recess (estimate)

October 16 35th anniversary of the first Chinese nuclear test, Lop Nur, China

October 21 U.S. temporary waiver of sanctions against India and Pakistan related to their nuclear testing expires

October 29 target date for adjournment of Congress

Nov. 16-19 Tenth Preparatory Session of the CTBTO, Vienna, Austria

NOTE: All deadlines and due dates for Congress and the Administration should be considered flexible; both branches of government frequently act later than scheduled. Dates of additional CTBT Working Group Meetings of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers will be announced as they are scheduled.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505

Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Wed, 16 Jun 1999 21:35:51 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Coalition ltr. to Prez. on CTBT

June 16, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: Final (June 15) letter to President urging immediate action on CTBT

Please find below the e-mail text version of the letter on the CTBT sent to Mr. Clinton and copied to key administration officials. Attached is a WordPerfect file version.

The letter was signed by 35 heads of organizations and prominent individuals, including former Sen. Jim Exon and former Congressmen Mike Kopetski and Tom Downey.

Thanks to those of you who contributed suggestions to the letter and who signed. A hard copy will be sent to you by mail shortly.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS

June 15, 1999

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

Dear Mr. President,

With the Kosovo peace agreement now signed, your Administration has a window of opportunity to achieve much needed progress on nuclear arms control and non-proliferation, especially moving the Senate to a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). With only 18 months left in your Administration and less than two months before the Congressional summer recess, now is the time to press for a Senate commitment on a date certain for a CTBT vote.

Despite your pivotal role in helping to bring the CTBT negotiations to a successful conclusion, Senate approval and entry into force of the Treaty are in serious jeopardy. Without a new and substantial presidential campaign on behalf of the CTBT, the Senate will not take up or approve the Treaty. In order to overcome the Senate leadership's opposition to CTBT consideration, there needs to be to an immediate and substantial commitment of energy and resources. We ask you to:

- * present your case for CTBT ratification directly to the public and invite bipartisan support for its consideration and approval on a frequent and consistent basis;
- * 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, and;
- * direct key cabinet members and high-profile CTBT supporters to pursue a sustained, public campaign to increase support and win Senate approval for the treaty.

Although the drive for the treaty in the Senate will be difficult, we firmly believe that if it is brought to the Senate floor for a vote in 1999, the CTBT will win final approval. Recent concerns about espionage at the U.S. nuclear laboratories and Chinese nuclear weapons modernization further underscore the national security value and the urgency of CTBT ratification and entry into force.

Without your leadership, we may lose the historic opportunity to secure prompt U.S. ratification of the CTBT, which is critical to entry into force of the Treaty, and risk that some nation may again challenge the de facto global norm against nuclear testing. This would erase the enormous progress toward the CTBT achieved during your presidency and constitute a major setback to the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

If the U.S. does not promptly ratify the CTBT, the next review conference of the nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in April 2000 may produce further challenges to that treaty's credibility and authority. The commitment by the nuclear-weapons states to achieve a comprehensive test ban was a major reason why the non-nuclear-weapon states agreed to the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995.

Thank you for your consideration of our views. We would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you and your senior advisors on this matter.

Sincerely,

Eugene J. Carroll, Jr., Tom Downey,
Rear Admiral, USN (ret.) former United States Congressman

James J. Exon, Michael J. Kopetski,
United States Senator (ret.) former United States Congressman

Amy Isaacs, James Matlack,
National Director, Director, Washington Office,
Americans for Democratic Action American Friends Service Committee

Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr., Martin Butcher,
President, Senior Visiting Fellow,
Arms Control Association* British American Security Information
Council*

John Isaacs, Mary H. Miller
President, Executive Secretary

Council for a Livable World* Episcopal Peace Fellowship

Rev. Russell O. Siler, Director,
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs,
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Scientists*
Jeremy J. Stone,
President,
Federation of American

Frank von Hippel, Professor,
Princeton University and Chair,
Federation of American Scientists Fund
David Cortright,
President,
Fourth Freedom Forum

Joe Volk
Executive Secretary,
Friends Committee on National Legislation
America
Maurice Paprin
Co-Chair
Fund for New Priorities in

Michael Krepon,
President,
Henry L. Stimson Center*
Jack Mendelsohn,
Vice President and Executive Director,
Lawyers Alliance for World Security*
Lindsay Mattison,
Director,
The International
Center*
J. Daryl Byler,
Director, Washington Office,
Mennonite Central Committee

Howard Hallman,
Chair,
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Washington
Studies
The Honorable Lawrence Scheinman,
former Assistant Director of ACDA,
currently Director of the
Office, Monterrey Institute for
International

Rev. Jay Lintner,
Wade Green Chair for Nuclear Policy,
National Council of Churches
Thomas B. Cochran, Director, Washington Office,
Natural Resources Defense Council*

Nancy Small,
National Coordinator,
Pax Christi USA
Gordon S. Clark,
Executive Director,
Peace Action*

Robert K. Musil,
Executive Director,
Physicians for Social Responsibility*
David Culp,
Legislative Coordinator,
Plutonium Challenge*

Elenora Giddings Ivory,
Director, Washington Office,
Presbyterian Church USA
Steven G. Raikin,
President,
Public Education Center*

James K. Wyerman,
Executive Director,
Project*
Mark Pelavin, Associate
Religious Action Center for 20/20 Vision National
Reform Judaism,
Union of American Hebrew
Director,
Congregations

Tom Zamora Collina, Director,
Arms Control and International Security Prgrm.,
Union of Concerned Scientists*
Charles McCollough,
Assoc. for Policy Advocacy,
Washington Office,
United Church of Christ

Lee Vander Laan,
Executive Director,
Susan Shaer,
Executive Director,

*Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers member organizations

cc: Albert Gore, Jr., Vice President
Samuel R. Berger, National Security Advisor
Madeleine K. Albright, Secretary of State
John Holum, Undersecretary of State
William Cohen, Secretary of Defense
Bill Richardson, Secretary of Energy

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is an alliance of 17 leading disarmament and non-proliferation non- governmental organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers. Please address correspondence to Daryl G. Kimball, Executive Director.

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\Ltr0699.wpd

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

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

At 10:52 AM 6/17/99 -0400, Phillip H. Miller wrote:

>I'm showing a balance of \$1,658 and some cents. A payment to you of \$1500
>would leave \$158. I did not assign the last Jahn's bill to Ploughshares.

>

>I did notice that your initial payment under the grant seems to have been
>made before we actually deposited the grant. Does that seem right to you?

>

>P.

>

Phil,

I have correspondence from you on March 1 saying that you were depositing the Ploughshares grant that day. On March 4 you sent me a first payment of \$2,000. I doubt you would have made out that check if you hadn't already made the deposit.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org (Unverified)
To: mupj@igc.org
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)
Subject: Senators' public meetings
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 13:04:56 -0400

Hi Howard,

Hope this will be helpful for our in-state information-gatherers. I told Daryl about what we are doing; there may be a moment in tomorrow's CTBT Working Group agenda to mention it. I told him you're familiar with it. I'll send hard copies of this document with Laura just in case. She's attending in my place--you'll recall I'll be at my cousin's wedding in Idaho.

Marie

Ask your Senators' views on the nuclear test ban treaty at their public meetings!

The Senate will be in recess July 3-11 and many Senators will be in their home states. The most effective means of getting your message to your Senator is to deliver it in person and this upcoming recess could provide an excellent opportunity for that. Many Senators make public appearances, such as town hall meetings, receptions, events, or cable TV and radio call-in shows where constituents can raise the issue of the nuclear test ban treaty.

Constituents can call the individuals listed here to get the information about these public appearances--these are the staff persons responsible for scheduling their Senators' time while they are in their home states. You'll note that some are in the Senators' Washington, DC offices and some are in their state offices. Tell the scheduler you are a constituent and you want to hear the Senator's views. If asked what your interests are, be as broad as possible. For the nuclear test ban treaty, say you are interested in international issues.

Another possible means of getting this information is to call your Senators' nearest state offices (many have them in several locations throughout your state). A list of those offices for each Senator can be found at www.2020vision.org.

Schedulers for in-state activities for 12 key states:

ALASKA

Senator Stevens: DeLynn Henry, Washington, DC (202/224-3004)
Senator Murkowski: Pat Heller, Anchorage (907/271-3735)

INDIANA

Senator Lugar: Jeff Hilliker, Washington, DC (202/224-4814)

KANSAS

Senator Brownback: Denise Coatney, Topeka (785/233-2503)

Senator Roberts: Maggie Ward, Washington, DC (202/224-4774)

NEBRASKA

Senator Hagel: Christy Kennedy, Omaha (402/758-8981)

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Senator Gregg: Carol Carpenter, Concord (603/225-7115)

NEW MEXICO

Senator Domenici: Lyndon Armstrong, Washington, DC (202/224-6621)

OREGON

Senator Smith: Kerry Tymchuk, Portland (503/326-3386)

TENNESSE

Senator Frist: Donna Randolph, Nashville (615/352-9411)

Senator Thompson: Bobby Murphy, Nashville (615/736-5129)

UTAH

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

Senator Bennett: Tiffany Harrison, Salt Lake City (801/363-8920)

VIRGINIA

Senator Warner: Eileen Mandel or Anna Reilly, Washington, DC (202/224-2023)

WASHINGTON

Senator Gorton: Joann Poysky, Bellevue (425/451-0103)

WYOMING

Senator Thomas: Kathy Wise, Washington, DC (202/224-6441)

Senator Enzi: Dee Rodekohl or Debbie McCann, Cheyenne (307/772-2477)

Suggested language to choose from in raising this issue with your Senators at public meetings:

Senator _____, as you know, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is an international treaty to ban nuclear weapons testing and it has been stalled in the U.S. Senate for nearly two years now. We need to set the right example to prevent new arms races in places like India and Pakistan. The directors of our nuclear weapons laboratories say that we can maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile without underground testing. Current and former Joint Chiefs of Staff chairmen say the Senate needs to ratify the CTBT for our national security, to prevent other nations from testing nuclear weapons. In recent bi-partisan polls, four out of five American voters support the CTBT.

Questions for Senator:

Do you support the nuclear test ban treaty? Will you work to help get it ratified this year?

Prepared by Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision

June 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>

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org (Unverified)
To: mupj@igc.org
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)
Subject: P.S.
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 13:07:06 -0400

Please feel free to edit in any way you see fit document on Senators' public meetings I just sent. Also, you can put your name on the bottom, too for further credibility with the church constituencies.

Marie

Marie Rietmann
CTBT Coordinator
20/20 Vision and 20/20 Vision Education Fund
'20 Minutes a Month to Help Save the Earth.'
1828 Jefferson Place, NW * Washington, D.C. 20036
202.833.2020 * fx 202.833.5307
<http://www.2020vision.org>

To: sarglawson@aol.com
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: comments on story
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Stephanie,

Your story is intriguing, am waiting for the next installment.

Some little things: Page 8, 4th line from bottom "not invite her" rather than "Kelly"
page 11 "wonderful" maybe another word more natural
Did they ever wipe up the chocolate mess?

Chapt. 4

page 1, 6th line from bottom-- not "who" probably "Why"

bottom page 7 I felt a lot of conversation with no action

page 31 middle of page "I wish there were" not "was" seems better to me

page35 paragraph at top of page -- an awful lot of history , is this necessary for the story?

Chapt. 7 page 8 word missing 10 lines from bottom "be"

page 21 I don't think you need the "bye, byes"

Do you need to name all the kids that play minor roles?

I'm impressed with all the complications. I'll be waiting to hear more.

Carlee L. Hallman

To: kathy@fcn.org, mccwjdb@erols.com, arosenbaum@uahc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Finding senators' home-state meetings
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Kathy, Daryl, Adina:

At Tuesday's meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT you agreed to reach a key contact in one or more states (a) to ask them to find out their senators' home-state meetings during the July 3-11 recess, (b) to share that information with you, and (c) to encourage citizens in the state to attend meetings and ask their about his/her support for the CTBT.

Marie Rietmann has developed the enclosed guidance for our outreach, including the names of schedulers for the senators we want to reach. You can use this information in getting in touch with the key contacts in the states you are working on.

Call me if you have any questions.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Ask your Senators' views on the nuclear test ban treaty at their public meetings!

The Senate will be in recess July 3-11 and many Senators will be in their home states. The most effective means of getting your message to your Senator is to deliver it in person and this upcoming recess could provide an excellent opportunity for that. Many Senators make public appearances, such as town hall meetings, receptions, events, or cable TV and radio call-in shows where constituents can raise the issue of the nuclear test ban treaty.

Constituents can call the individuals listed here to get the information about these public appearances--these are the staff persons responsible for scheduling their Senators' time while they are in their home states. You'll note that some are in the Senators' Washington, DC offices and some are in their state offices. Tell the scheduler you are a constituent and you want to hear the Senator's views. If asked what your interests are, be as broad as possible. For the nuclear test ban treaty, say you are interested in international issues.

Another possible means of getting this information is to call your Senators' nearest state offices (many have them in several locations throughout your state). A list of those offices for each Senator can be found at www.2020vision.org.

Schedulers for in-state activities for 12 key states:

ALASKA

Senator Stevens: DeLynn Henry, Washington, DC (202/224-3004)
Senator Murkowski: Pat Heller, Anchorage (907/271-3735)

INDIANA

Senator Lugar: Jeff Hilliker, Washington, DC (202/224-4814)

KANSAS

Senator Brownback: Denise Coatney, Topeka (785/233-2503)
Senator Roberts: Maggie Ward, Washington, DC (202/224-4774)

NEBRASKA

Senator Hagel: Christy Kennedy, Omaha (402/758-8981)

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Senator Gregg: Carol Carpenter, Concord (603/225-7115)

NEW MEXICO

Senator Domenici: Lyndon Armstrong, Washington, DC (202/224-6621)

OREGON

Senator Smith: Kerry Tymchuk, Portland (503/326-3386)

TENNESSE

Senator Frist: Donna Randolph, Nashville (615/352-9411)
Senator Thompson: Bobby Murphy, Nashville (615/736-5129)

UTAH

Senator Hatch: Linda Gibbons, Salt Lake City (801/524-4380)
Senator Bennett: Tiffany Harrison, Salt Lake City (801/363-8920)

VIRGINIA

Senator Warner: Eileen Mandel or Anna Reilly, Washington, DC (202/224-2023)

WASHINGTON

Senator Gorton: Joann Poysky, Bellevue (425/451-0103)

WYOMING

Senator Thomas: Kathy Wise, Washington, DC (202/224-6441)
Senator Enzi: Dee Rodekohr or Debbie McCann, Cheyenne (307/772-2477)

Suggested language to choose from in raising this issue with your Senators at public meetings:

Senator _____, as you know, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is an international treaty to ban nuclear weapons testing and it has been stalled in the U.S. Senate for nearly two years now. We need to set the right example to prevent new arms races in places like India and Pakistan. The directors of our nuclear weapons laboratories say that we can maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile without underground testing. Current and former Joint Chiefs of Staff chairmen say the Senate needs to ratify the CTBT for our national security, to prevent other nations from testing nuclear weapons. In recent bi-partisan polls, four out of five American voters support the CTBT.

Questions for Senator:

Do you support the nuclear test ban treaty? Will you work to help get it ratified this year?

Prepared by Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision

June 17, 1999

Ask your Senators' views on the nuclear test ban treaty at their public meetings!

The Senate will be in recess July 3-11 and many Senators will be in their home states. The most effective means of getting your message to your Senator is to deliver it in person and this upcoming recess could provide an excellent opportunity for that. Many Senators make public appearances, such as town hall meetings, receptions, events, or cable TV and radio call-in shows where constituents can raise the issue of the nuclear test ban treaty.

Constituents can call the individuals listed here to get the information about these public appearances--these are the staff persons responsible for scheduling their Senators' time while they are in their home states. You'll note that some are in the Senators' Washington, DC offices and some are in their state offices. Tell the scheduler you are a constituent and you want to hear the Senator's views. If asked what your interests are, be as broad as possible. For the nuclear test ban treaty, say you are interested in international issues.

Another possible means of getting this information is to call your Senators' nearest state offices (many have them in several locations throughout your state). A list of those offices for each Senator can be found at www.2020vision.org.

Schedulers for in-state activities for 12 key states:

ALASKA

Senator Stevens: DeLynn Henry, Washington, DC (202/224-3004)

Senator Murkowski: Pat Heller, Anchorage (907/271-3735)

INDIANA

Senator Lugar: Jeff Hilliker, Washington, DC (202/224-4814)

KANSAS

Senator Brownback: Denise Coatney, Topeka (785/233-2503)

Senator Roberts: Maggie Ward, Washington, DC (202/224-4774)

NEBRASKA

Senator Hagel: Christy Kennedy, Omaha (402/758-8981)

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Senator Gregg: Carol Carpenter, Concord (603/225-7115)

NEW MEXICO

Senator Domenici: Lyndon Armstrong, Washington, DC (202/224-6621)

OREGON

Senator Smith: Kerry Tymchuk, Portland (503/326-3386)

TENNESSE

Senator Frist: Donna Randolph, Nashville (615/352-9411)

Senator Thompson: Bobby Murphy, Nashville (615/736-5129)

UTAH

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

Senator Bennett: Tiffany Harrison, Salt Lake City (801/363-8920)

VIRGINIA

Senator Warner: Eileen Mandel or Anna Reilly, Washington, DC (202/224-2023)

WASHINGTON

Senator Gorton: Joann Poysky, Bellevue (425/451-0103)

WYOMING

Senator Thomas: Kathy Wise, Washington, DC (202/224-6441)

Senator Enzi: Dee Rodekohr or Debbie McCann, Cheyenne (307/772-2477)

Suggested language to choose from in raising this issue with your Senators at public meetings:

Senator _____, as you know, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is an international treaty to ban nuclear weapons testing and it has been stalled in the U.S. Senate for nearly two years now. We need to set the right example to prevent new arms races in places like India and Pakistan. The directors of our nuclear weapons laboratories say that we can maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile without underground testing. Current and former Joint Chiefs of Staff chairmen say the Senate needs to ratify the CTBT for our national security, to prevent other nations from testing nuclear weapons. In recent bi-partisan polls, four out of five American voters support the CTBT.

Questions for Senator:

Do you support the nuclear test ban treaty? Will you work to help get it ratified this year?

Prepared by Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision

June 17, 1999

Return-Path: <jsammon@networklobby.org>
X-Sender: jsammon@mail.networklobby.org
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1999 15:07:10 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org> (by way of Jean Sammon <jsammon@networklobby.org>)
From: Jean Sammon <jsammon@networklobby.org>
Subject: Re: Possible appointment with Secretary Richardson

Hi Howard - I don't think I can commit to this -- NETWORK has decided to focus our efforts on "anti-poverty". We're still following some military issues but mainly from the standpoint of budget priorities & military vs. domestic spending. We struck out twice with Richardson -- maybe Jack Cullinan with USCC would have better luck. I'd still like to follow progress on the issue & will do that through Monday Lobby.

At 11:28 AM 6/17/99 , you wrote:

>Dear Jean,
>
>At yesterday's meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT we agreed to
>once again pursue appointments with top officials of the Clinton
>Administration. Would you be able and willing to try again for an
>appointment with Secretary Richardson? If you can't, please let me know,
>and I'll get somebody else to take on the assignment.
>
>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.
>

~~~~~  
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: <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1999 09:10:24 -0400
From: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
Subject: Oops!
Sender: "Phillip H. Miller" <PhillipMiller@compuserve.com>
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Content-Disposition: inline

I reexamined the Ploughshares account and found that I had entered a wrong date on Check No. 1201. The computer had it written in January when it was in fact it was written in May.

The exact balance in the Ploughshares grant is \$1,658.30.

Did you intend your message to be a request for \$1500?

P.

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

At 09:10 AM 6/18/99 -0400, Phillip H. Miller wrote:

>
>Did you intend your message to be a request for \$1500?
>
>P.
>
Phil,

Not particularly. I usually wait until the end of the month, but if you want to put me in your next check writing cycle, that's okay.

Howard

To: "Rev. James McDonald" <vcc.net@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: CTBT ratification campaign
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Rev. McDonald:

In our continuing campaign for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, we see the Senate's July 3-11 recess as opportunity for citizens to reach their senators during public appearances in their home state.

Would you or one of your associates be willing to find when and where Senator Warner will be appearing in Virginia during this recess period? Suggestions on how to do this and the senator's scheduler are indicated in the attachment. When you have this information, please try to enlist Virginians to attend such events and ask Senator Warner about his support for the CTBT. Also, please let us know the schedule so that national interfaith organizations can share this information with their key contacts in Virginia.

To report this information, you can reach me at phone/fax 301 896-0013 or by e-mail at mupj@igc.org.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Ask your Senators' views on the nuclear test ban treaty at their public meetings!

The Senate will be in recess July 3-11 and many Senators will be in their home states. The most effective means of getting your message to your Senator is to deliver it in person and this upcoming recess could provide an excellent opportunity for that. Many Senators make public appearances, such as town hall meetings, receptions, events, or cable TV and radio call-in shows where constituents can raise the issue of the nuclear test ban treaty.

Constituents can call the individuals listed here to get the information about these public appearances--these are the staff persons responsible for scheduling their Senators' time while they are in their home states. You'll note that some are in the Senators' Washington, DC offices and some are in their state offices. Tell the scheduler you are a constituent and you want to hear the Senator's views. If asked what your interests are, be as broad as possible. For the nuclear test ban treaty, say you are interested in international issues.

Another possible means of getting this information is to call your Senators' nearest state offices (many have them in several locations throughout your state). A list of those offices for each Senator can be found at www.2020vision.org.

Schedulers for in-state activities:

VIRGINIA

Senator Warner: Eileen Mandel or Anna Reilly, Washington, DC (202/224-2023)

Suggested language to choose from in raising this issue with your Senators at public meetings:

Senator _____, as you know, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is an international treaty to ban nuclear weapons testing and it has been stalled in the U.S. Senate for nearly two years now. We need to set the right example to prevent new arms races in places like India and Pakistan. The directors of our nuclear weapons laboratories say that we can maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile without underground testing. Current and former Joint Chiefs of Staff chairmen say the Senate needs to ratify the CTBT for our national security, to prevent other nations from testing nuclear weapons. In recent bi-partisan polls, four out of five American voters support the CTBT.

Questions for Senator:

Do you support the nuclear test ban treaty? Will you work to help get it ratified this year?

Prepared by Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision
June 17, 1999

To: wford@ecunet.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: CTBT ratification campaign
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Dr. Ford:

In our continuing campaign for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, we see the Senate's July 3-11 recess as opportunity for citizens to reach their senators during public appearances in their home state.

Would you or one of your associates be willing to find when and where Senator Domenici will be appearing in New Mexico during this recess period? Suggestions on how to do this and the senator's scheduler are indicated in the attachment. When you have this information, please try to enlist New Mexicans to attend such events and ask Senator Domenici about his support for the CTBT. Also, please let us know the schedule so that national interfaith organizations can share this information with their key contacts in New Mexico.

To report this information, you can reach me at phone/fax 301 896-0013 or by e-mail at mupj@igc.org.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Ask your Senators' views on the nuclear test ban treaty at their public meetings!

The Senate will be in recess July 3-11 and many Senators will be in their home states. The most effective means of getting your message to your Senator is to deliver it in person and this upcoming recess could provide an excellent opportunity for that. Many Senators make public appearances, such as town hall meetings, receptions, events, or cable TV and radio call-in shows where constituents can raise the issue of the nuclear test ban treaty.

Constituents can call the individuals listed here to get the information about these public appearances--these are the staff persons responsible for scheduling their Senators' time while they are in their home states. You'll note that some are in the Senators' Washington, DC offices and some are in their state offices. Tell the scheduler you are a constituent and you want to hear the Senator's views. If asked what your interests are, be as broad as possible. For the nuclear test ban treaty, say you are interested in international issues.

Another possible means of getting this information is to call your Senators' nearest state offices (many have them in several locations throughout your state). A list of those offices for each Senator can be found at www.2020vision.org.

Scheduler for in-state activities:

NEW MEXICO

Senator Domenici: Lyndon Armstrong, Washington, DC (202/224-6621)

Suggested language to choose from in raising this issue with your Senators at public meetings:

Senator _____, as you know, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is an international treaty to ban nuclear weapons testing and it has been stalled in the U.S. Senate for nearly two years now. We need to set the right example to prevent new arms races in places like India and Pakistan. The directors of our nuclear weapons laboratories say that we can maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile without underground testing. Current and former Joint Chiefs of Staff chairmen say the Senate needs to ratify the CTBT for our national security, to prevent other nations from testing nuclear weapons. In recent bi-partisan polls, four out of five American voters support the CTBT.

Questions for Senator:

Do you support the nuclear test ban treaty? Will you work to help get it ratified this year?

Prepared by Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision

June 17, 1999

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 21 Jun 1999 09:22:52 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: A modest proposal
To: abolition-caucus@igc.org
X-Accept-Language: en

Friends,

I offer a modest proposal: Let's preserve the abolition caucus list-serve as a place for posting e-mails related to efforts to abolish nuclear weapons.

There are other list-serves and bulletin boards where postings can be made on other topics.

Shalom,
Bob Tiller

To: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>, abolition-caucus@igc.org
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: A modest proposal
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 09:22 AM 6/21/99 -0400, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Friends,
>
>I offer a modest proposal: Let's preserve the abolition caucus
>list-serve as a place for posting e-mails related to efforts to abolish
>nuclear weapons.
>
>There are other list-serves and bulletin boards where postings can be
>made on other topics.
>
>
Friends,

I agree with Bob. That will save me from dropping off the abolition-caucus list serve because it has too many extraneous messages that outnumber nuclear weapons related messages.

Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <lintnerj@ucc.org>
Date: Fri, 18 Jun 99 09:38:07 -0500
From: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Seeking appointments re CTBT

Sorry, I'm going to have to pass. I cleared several months for this,
but have to keep future involvement more limited.

Reply Separator

Subject: Seeking appointments re CTBT
Author: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org> at internet-mail
Date: 6/16/99 4:29 AM

Dear Jay,

At yesterday's meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT we agreed to
once again pursue appointments with top officials of the Clinton
Administration. Would you be able and willing to try again for an
appointment with Secretary Ahlbright and/or Undersecretary Talbot? If you
can't, please let me know, and I'll get somebody else to take on the assignment.

Shalom,
Howard

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

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

Return-Path: <owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 09:24:32 +0200
From: "Beatrice MERAHI" <bem@wcc-coe.org>
To: <pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org>
Subject: pov-l: Ecumenical Decade to Overcome Violence: ENI news 21 June
Content-Disposition: inline
Sender: owner-pov-l@wccx.wcc-coe.org
Reply-To: "Beatrice MERAHI" <bem@wcc-coe.org>

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

Ecumenical News International
ENI News Service
21 June 1999

Churches urged to join Decade to Overcome Violence
ENI-99-0244

By Stephen Brown
Stuttgart, 21 June (ENI)--Churches have been challenged to participate actively in an "Ecumenical Decade to Overcome Violence", beginning in 2001 and ending in 2010.

The campaign is intended to promote church initiatives for reconciliation and peace.

The appeal was made at the German Protestant Kirchentag in Stuttgart by Catholicos Aram I of the Armenian Apostolic Church, from Lebanon, who is moderator of the central committee of the World Council of Churches (WCC), and by Manfred Kock, chair of the council of the Evangelical Church in Germany (EKD), the country's main Protestant church body. The Kirchentag is one of the main dates in the calendar of the Protestant church in Germany, gathering together tens of thousands of participants every two years.

The decision to organise an Ecumenical Decade to Overcome Violence was agreed last December at the WCC's eighth assembly in Harare. According to the Harare assembly, the decade should promote the WCC's work with churches on issues of human rights and reconciliation.

Speaking on 18 June, at the end of a day of debate at the Kirchentag on initiatives to overcome violence, Catholicos Aram suggested that the conflict over Kosovo made the initiative even more important.

He pointed out that delegates at the WCC's founding assembly at Amsterdam in 1948 had declared: "We as churches say 'War is against the Will of God'." However, the Kosovo crisis had shown that churches "remain divided in their response to war", with some considering it to be "a negation of the Gospel" while others

believed that it could be a "means of last resort".

But Catholicos Aram also stressed that non-violence was not a "fixed objective" or an "end in itself", but rather a means "to overcome injustice, to create peace with justice".

Catholicos Aram listed a number of reasons for, and examples of, violence, including the debt crisis and ethnic conflict, as well as drugs, unemployment, violence against women and racism. But he also warned that violence had "various forms and expressions in our churches that we cannot ignore".

He said: "The churches cannot be indifferent to issues that question the integrity and credibility of the church of Christ and its specific vocation in the world today."

He also stressed that the decade needed to go "beyond the WCC to include all churches, non-member churches, non-governmental organisations, religions of the world who are committed to work together with non-violent means for peace, justice and reconciliation". Calling on the churches in Germany to take part in the decade, Manfred Kock said that human beings "have to learn how conflicts can be overcome without violence".

Churches had to become places where Christians showed the "strength of non-violence", he said.

"All life on our earth is threatened by violence - the life of human beings, of animals, plants, indeed the very existence of our planet. The war in Kosovo again demonstrated the destructive power of violence. Almost a million people were driven out of their homes, people were raped and killed. Towns were destroyed, villages razed to the ground. Kosovo is the most recent example of violence with limits, following Afghanistan, Rwanda, Angola."

Earlier on 18 June, Salpy Eskidjian, a WCC executive secretary for international relations who has played a leading role in coordinating the WCC's Programme to Overcome Violence - which was launched in the mid-1990s - described the Ecumenical Decade as "a growing and dynamic grass-roots movement to build a culture of peace for the new millennium". [585 words]

All articles (c) Ecumenical News International
Reproduction permitted only by media subscribers and
provided ENI is acknowledged as the source.

Ecumenical News International
Tel: (41-22) 791 6087/6515 Fax: (41-22) 798 1346
E-Mail: eni@eni.ch

PO Box 2100 150 route de Ferney CH-1211 Geneva 2
Switzerland

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

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org
To: mupj@igc.org
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)
Subject: Gordon Smith mtg
Date: Tue, 22 Jun 1999 18:08:06 -0400

Hi Howard,

Gordon only has one public meeting 7/3-11 at least at this point. It's 7/6 at the Redmond Expo Center 9-10:30 am for he and Rep. Walden to hear from Eastern Oregon public officials. It seems to be open to the public, however.

Marie

Marie Rietmann
CTBT Coordinator
20/20 Vision and 20/20 Vision Education Fund
'20 Minutes a Month to Help Save the Earth.'
1828 Jefferson Place, NW * Washington, D.C. 20036
202.833.2020 * fx 202.833.5307
<http://www.2020vision.org>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
From: Dealert99@aol.com
Date: Wed, 23 Jun 1999 18:04:29 EDT
Subject: (abolition-usa) IN 191 DAYS RUSSIAN MISSILES ENTER Y2K; ANYONE WORRIED?
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, JGerson@afsc.org
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

IN 191 DAYS RUSSIAN MISSILES ENTER Y2K; ANYONE WORRIED?

Well, I am! As reported in Scientific American, November, 1997, "the two nuclear superpowers remain ready to fire a total of more than 5,000 nuclear weapons at each other within half an hour" under the current hair-trigger, launch-on-warning alert maintained by both sides. One "accidental" weapon launch would most likely cause a larger response and the use of all 5,000 weapons. This insane policy has outlived the "cold war" into our present era of "peace" between our two nations.

On January 25, 1995, it brought us within 8 minutes of nuclear war through human error rather than computer malfunction! In 191 days, as we enter Y2K, the year 2000, some missile command and control computers will malfunction. There are serious concerns about the Russian ability to control their nuclear missiles in Y2K, as their command and control systems are in terrible condition with little attention given to the Y2K problem. It is possible, if not probable, that an accidental launch will occur! This is not to say that our own nuclear arsenal is safe from accidental launches, but it is probably in better condition.

There is an easy solution to this crisis! It is called "de-alerting", and is merely a process of making it impossible to launch each missile within minutes, as at present, by modifications that require a day or more of preparation to restore. Warheads could be separated from their launch vehicles, guidance computers could be removed, or huge piles of earth could be placed over the silos. This would give political leaders and military commanders a day or more, not mere minutes, to learn the facts of any incident and respond accordingly.

President Clinton can initiate this process by an Executive Order!! It does not require action by Congress or the Senate. President Bush set a precedent in 1991 during the attempted coup in Moscow by de-alerting a portion of our missiles, to which Gorbachev responded by de-alerting a number of Russian missiles. No de-alerting has ever been ordered by President Clinton! However, the British have fully de-alerted their nuclear missiles!

Here in Lexington, MA, a group of us at church have formed the Metro-Boston Committee to De-Alert Nuclear Weapons. We have prepared an information brochure and a petition to President Clinton asking him "to initiate by means of an Executive Order a phased "de-alerting" with all nuclear powers of all nuclear missiles, to be completed before the end of 1999." The signed petitions will be sent to him, and copied to all our senators and congressional representatives on July 4.

We began our campaign on May 18 with high hopes, but at this point we have

only about 300 signatures. We find that we can only obtain about 20 signatures per hour at a supermarket. A street fair was productive with about 110 signatures in 6 hours. Many regard us as "Chicken Littles" who are warning that the sky is falling, perhaps because they have not heard of the dangers of the missile alert through the media. We have contacted our politicians, the clergy, the press, and influential citizens with essentially no response, save from our own church.

I am not aware of more than two or three other efforts to bring the Y2K de-alerting crisis to the people in the USA! Our politicians and military leaders have had ample time to ponder the situation and respond intelligently, but nothing has been done! We need millions of ordinary, real people making their voices heard at the White House in support of de-alerting!! Our Lexington petitions won't be enough, I'm afraid.

And WHERE IS THE MEDIA ON THIS CRISIS? Why isn't the public being made aware through television, radio, newspapers, and magazines of the nuclear risks ahead at Y2K? In my humble opinion, these risks are more important and serious than all that we presently see, hear, and read. SO WHY THE SILENCE?

William F. Santelmann, Jr.
Metro-Boston Committee to De-Alert Nuclear Weapons
dealert99@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: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Request for information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

In our efforts to get the Clinton Administration to be more assertive in its advocacy of the CTBT, I have requested appointments for an interfaith delegation to meet with John Podesta (Chief of Staff for the President), Vice President Gore, and First Lady Hillary Clinton. So far I have had some encouragement that Mr. Podesta might be willing to do so, but no firm appointment. I'll keep you informed.

One of the purposes of such visits would be to demonstrate to top Administration officials that the faith community is solidly behind the CTBT and that we are prepared to go all out to mobilize grassroots support when the treaty goes before the Senate. Our commitment may bolster their confidence that there will be sufficient votes for ratification.

To make our case it would be useful to have brief "testimonials" of commitment from denominational offices and other religious associations with an indication of scope of outreach. Would you please provide me such information by the end of the month, Wednesday June 30. This compilation can be used if we get our appointments or provided to these officials by mail or fax.

You might indicate the name of denomination or association, your basic policy toward the CTBT, name of central unit that is working on the CTBT, number of members in U.S., number of churches/meetings/synagogues, number of geographical bodies (diocese, conference, synod, etc.), titles of prelates or other officers who head these bodies and will be active in the ratification campaign, geographical officer or units that mobilize local churches on peace and justice issues, etc. You might indicate special ways you reach out to your constituency, such as through alerts and other communications to X number of persons or local units. You might indicate who you will be mobilizing to get in touch with their senators when the CTBT is before the Senate.

What I am seeking is a paragraph or so that shows what you will be doing when the CTBT is up for consideration. If the Administration sees the depth of commitment of the faith community, maybe they will have greater courage to do their essential part to get the CTBT ratified.

You can reply by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax at 301 896-0013.

Thanks,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Fri, 25 Jun 1999 12:42:54 -0400
From: Joan Wade <disarmament@igc.org>
Organization: Disarmament Clearinghouse
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: CTBT Call-In Day Action Alert!
To: ctbt-organize@igc.org
X-Accept-Language: en

To: CTBT-organize
From: disarmament
RE: CTBT Call-In Day
Date: 6/25/99

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is organizing a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Call-In Day to the Senate on July 16th, the anniversary of the first nuclear test in New Mexico. Postcards will be mailed to activists around the country urging them to ask their Senators to do everything in their power to ratify the CTBT this year. If you have any questions, are planning around the call, or would like more information on having postcards mailed to activists in your area, please contact Joan Wade (contact information posted at the bottom of this message) as soon as possible. An action alert follows:

*CTBT CALL-IN

DAY JULY 16, 1999*

The world's first nuclear test shattered the desert dawn on July 16, 1945 in New Mexico. This July 16, we urge you to call you Senators and ask them to do everything in their power to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) this year.

The CTBT, an international treaty that seeks to ban nuclear weapons test explosions, has been stalled in the U.S. Senate for nearly two years. While the delay continues, ratification has grown more urgent than ever. On July 16, tell your Senators that CTBT must be ratified this year because:

- * The U.S. must set the right example if India and Pakistan are expected to sign the treaty.
- * The U.S. needs to take part in the fall conference for countries that have ratified.
- * It is imperative that a vote take place on ratification before the presidential election year.
- * Momentum in the Senate has grown due to leadership by Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND) who is actively seeking a floor vote by September.

> Be sure to leave your name and address. Speak directly with your Senators' aides who handle the nuclear test ban treaty, if they are available. Aides' names are listed at www.psr.org/ctbt.action.htm

> The Senate Switchboard Phone Number is (202) 224-3121.

For more information, contact:

Joan L. Wade

Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator

1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700

Washington, DC 20005

Phone: (202)898-0150

Fax: (202)898-0172

E-mail: disarmament@igc.org

The Disarmament Clearinghouse is a project of Friends Committee on National Legislation, Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, 20/20 Vision, and Women's Action For New Directions.

--

Joan L. Wade

Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator

1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700

Washington, DC 20005

Phone: (202)898-0150

Fax: (202)898-0172

E-mail: disarmament@igc.org

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: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 08:43:28 -0400
Subject: Fwd: Re: CTBT
Content-Disposition: inline

To: Howard Hallman
From: J. Daryl Byler
Date: 6/28/99 8:43:03 AM
Subj: Fwd: Re: CTBT

Hi Howard:

Here's the response I received from Robert Epp, a member of Nebraskans for Peace.

Warm regards,
Daryl

----- Forwarded by J. Daryl Byler on 06/28/99 08:42 AM -----
Originally Sent by "Robert O. and Amelia Epp" <robelia@mail.telcoweb.net> on
06/25/99 03:01:05 PM
Originally Sent/Copied to J. Daryl Byler/MCC@MCC

J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org wrote:

>
> To: robelia@telcoweb.net
> From: J. Daryl Byler
> Date: 6/21/99 2:40:44 PM
> Subj: CTBT
>
> Hi Bob:
>
> At our CTBT working group last week, I agreed to contact someone from Nebraska
> to see if they could get a list of Senator Hagel's public appearances during
his
> 4th of July recess (July 3-11). We want to then encourage folks to show up to
> public meetings, call in to radio talk shows, etc. to ask about the CTBT.
>
> As you probably know, Senate offices tend to be quite protective of this kind
of
> information, but usually will give it to a constituent.
>
> Would you be willing to call Christy Kennedy, Senator Hegal's scheduler, at
his
> Omaha office (402-758-8981)? Marie Reitmann, from 20/20 Vision suggests:

"Tell
> the scheduler you are a constituent and you want to hear the Senator's views.
> If asked what your interests are, be as broad as possible. For the nuclear
test
> ban treaty, say you are interested in international issues."
>
> If you, or someone else from Nebraskans for Peace, could get me this schedule
by
> the end of the week, it would be of great help. Many thanks.
>
> Warm regards,
> Daryl

Daryl: Just got back from the protest camp at La Framboise Island and
going through the accumulated e-mail messages found yours and just now
called Senator Hagel's office , Christy Kennedy tells me that Senatoer
Hagel will be in the state only one day for the July 4 holiday and has
no public appearances scheduled. Hope this is helpful. Bob
[End of Original Text]

To: ctbt@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Senator Hagel
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Marie,

Daryl Byler learned from a Nebraska contact that Senator Hagel will be in the state only one day during the recess and has no events scheduled.

Howard

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)
Subject: Re: Senator Hagel
Date: Mon, 28 Jun 1999 13:11:10 -0400

Hi Howard,

FYI, I called Domenici's Albuquerque office and his scheduler in DC and both said he has no public meetings scheduled, either. And his two radio "appearances" will not include call-ins. I assume they'll tell Wally Ford the same thing. Seems like trying to get this info sounded like a good idea in principle, but in actuality, more contact was enabled via the interfaith petition deliveries. We need to urge activists (not necessarily the church ones--they've done a great deal already) to try to schedule August meetings, as you and I discussed.

Marie

>Marie,

>

>Daryl Byler learned from a Nebraska contact that Senator Hagel will be in
>the state only one day during the recess and has no events scheduled.

>

>Howard

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: <rachel@fcnl.org>
From: Rachel Phillips <rachel@fcnl.org>
To: "'mupj@igc.apc.org'" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Cc: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>
Subject: FW: Request for information
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 15:47:18 -0400

Howard,

Here is the text of FCNL's paragraph on the CTBT for use on lobbying the administration. I'm also faxing you a copy on our letterhead.

Rachel

The Friends Committee on National Legislation is a Quaker lobby in the public interest, which endeavors to bring spiritual values to bear on public policy decisions. We are a membership-based organization with approximately 8,000 - 10,000 grassroots contacts nationwide. The strength of our grassroots is scattered across the country, with particular concentrations in the Midwest, the Northeast, and the Southeast. We mobilize our grassroots activists through weekly action messages, special action alerts, research documents, a newsletter, and other means.

As we work to build national and global human security, we rely on the premise that human security depends on meeting basic human needs such as education, safety, and health, and building a culture of peace rather than perpetuating our culture of militarism. Violence is an unacceptable response to conflict at any level -- peace and security must be achieved through peaceful means. We believe that as the most influential nation on earth, the United States has a responsibility to take a lead role in building a global culture of peace.

Ratification of the Comprehensive (nuclear) Test Ban Treaty should be high on the U.S.'s agenda, as a first step toward negotiating, signing, and ratifying treaties that would abolish all weapons of mass destruction in our world. The treaty would stem the spread of nuclear weapons, prevent the renewal of regional and global nuclear arms races, establish a strict verification and monitoring system, and protect public health and the environment. More and more nations are ratifying the treaty each month: by summer, over 30 of the world's 44 nuclear-capable nations, as defined in the text of the treaty itself, are expected to have ratified. The U.S. will lag behind, setting a poor example for other nations. The treaty is scheduled to enter into force this September, but only if all 44 nuclear-capable states have ratified.

President Clinton signed the treaty in September 1996 and urged the Senate to ratify it. Nearly two years have passed, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has not held hearings on the issue. We request that you urge members of the Foreign Relations Committee to schedule prompt and fair public hearings on the treaty. We also ask you to request Senate leadership to set a date certain during this session of Congress when the treaty will be voted on by the entire Senate.

A world without nuclear test explosions is a safer world. Please do your part to promote national and global human security through the instrument of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org]

Sent: Thursday, June 24, 1999 2:28 PM

To: ograbc@aol.com; Jim Matlack; washofc@aol.com;
ann_d.parti@ecunet.org; tom.hart@ecunet.org; jmskipper@aol.com;
epf@igc.org; disarm@forusa.org; joe@fcnl.org; kathy@fcnl.org;
rachel@fcnl.org; sara@fcnl.org; mark.brown@ecunet.org;
J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org; 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; jpmdc@ucc.org; Dringler@umc-gbcs.org;
gpowers@nccbuscc.org; hnoles@igc.org
Subject: Request for information

Dear Colleagues:

In our efforts to get the Clinton Administration to be more assertive in its advocacy of the CTBT, I have requested appointments for an interfaith delegation to meet with John Podesta (Chief of Staff for the President), Vice President Gore, and First Lady Hillary Clinton. So far I have had some encouragement that Mr. Podesta might be willing to do so, but no firm appointment. I'll keep you informed.

One of the purposes of such visits would be to demonstrate to top Administration officials that the faith community is solidly behind the CTBT and that we are prepared to go all out to mobilize grassroots support when the treaty goes before the Senate. Our commitment may bolster their confidence that there will be sufficient votes for ratification.

To make our case it would be useful to have brief "testimonials" of commitment from denominational offices and other religious associations with an indication of scope of outreach. Would you please provide me such information by the end of the month, Wednesday June 30. This compilation can be used if we get our appointments or provided to these officials by mail or fax.

You might indicate the name of denomination or association, your basic policy toward the CTBT, name of central unit that is working on the CTBT, number of members in U.S., number of churches/meetings/synagogues, number of geographical bodies (diocese, conference, synod, etc.), titles of prelates or other officers who head these bodies and will be active in the ratification campaign, geographical officer or units that mobilize local churches on peace and justice issues, etc. You might indicate special ways you reach out to your constituency, such as through alerts and other communications to X number of persons or local units. You might indicate who you will be mobilizing to get in touch with their senators when the CTBT is before the Senate.

What I am seeking is a paragraph or so that shows what you will be doing when the CTBT is up for consideration. If the Administration sees the depth of commitment of the faith community, maybe they will have greater courage to do their essential part to get the CTBT ratified.

You can reply by e-mail at mupj@igc.org or by fax at 301 896-0013.

Thanks,
Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 16:27:40 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: enviros call for CTBT; CRND Issue Brief

June 30, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: 1) Enviro. Grps. Urge Ratification of CTBT; 2) Issue Brief - 641 Days
and Counting

Two CTBT items for your information:

1. At the initiative of 20/20 Vision and Physicians for Social
Responsibility, a letter from the heads of twelve national environmental
organization urging Senate approval of the CTBT was sent to the Senate
today. The e-mail text version of the letter is below and I have also
attached Word file of the final letter as sent.

PSR and the Coalition's media firm, Rabinowitz Communications, have sent
out an advisory to reporters about the letter. For more information,
contact Marie Rietmann at 20/20 Vision (202-833-2020 or
<ctbt@2020vision.org>) or Bob Tiller at PSR (202-898-0150 or
<btiller@psr.org>).

For a complete list of key individuals and organizations who support the
CTBT, see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbtlist.htm>>.

2. Please find below in e-mail text format the latest (June 25) Issue Brief
from the Coalition, which is titled "Nitze, Drell to Senate: 'This Treaty
Must Be Ratified' -- But Lott and Helms' 641-Day Blockage of Test Ban
Treaty Continues."

The Issue Brief is also available on the Coalition's CTBT site at the
following address <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n5.htm>>

DK

1828 Jefferson Place NW, Second Floor, Washington, DC 20036

June 30, 1999

The Honorable Senator XX
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Re: Major national environmental organizations' support of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Dear Senator:

We urge the Senate to give its consent to ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty this year. The timing is critical so that the United States can participate in this fall's special international conference of Treaty ratifiers.

We support the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) because it is a valuable instrument in stemming the proliferation of nuclear weapons and reducing the environmental and security threats posed by nuclear arms races. Under the CTBT, non-nuclear weapons states will be barred from carrying out the nuclear explosions needed to develop compact, high-yield nuclear warheads for ballistic missiles and confidently certify nuclear explosive performance. The Treaty is therefore vital to preventing the spread of nuclear missile capability to additional states. In addition, the Treaty will limit the ability of the existing nuclear weapons states to build new and destabilizing types of nuclear weapons.

Since 1945, seven nations have conducted over 2,050 nuclear test explosions--an average of one test every 10 days. Atmospheric tests spread dangerous levels of radioactive fallout downwind and into the global atmosphere. Underground nuclear blasts spread highly radioactive material into the earth and each one creates a permanent nuclear waste site. This contamination presents long-term hazards to nearby water sources and surrounding communities. Also, many underground tests have vented radioactive gases into the atmosphere, including some of those conducted by the United States. Of course, the ultimate threat to the environment posed by nuclear testing is the continuing and possibly increasing risk of nuclear war posed by proliferating nuclear arsenals.

In addition to protecting the environment, the CTBT will enhance U.S. security with its extensive monitoring system and short-notice, on-site inspections. These will improve our ability to discourage all states from engaging in the testing of nuclear weapons.

Ending nuclear testing has been a goal of governments, scientists, and ordinary citizens from all walks of life for over forty years. The CTBT has already been ratified by many other nations, including France, the United Kingdom, and Japan. The vast majority of Americans support approval of the CTBT. The effort in this country to stop nuclear testing that began with public outrage about nuclear fallout and has been pursued by American Presidents since Dwight Eisenhower can now be achieved. With U.S. leadership on the CTBT, entry into force is within reach. It is vital that the U.S. set the example on this important environmental and security issue; with your leadership and support, the CTBT can finally be realized.

Yours sincerely,

Rodger Schlickeisen
President
Defenders of Wildlife

Mike Casey
Vice-President for Public Affairs
Environmental Working Group

Matt Petersen
Executive Director
Global Green USA

John Adams
Executive Director
Natural Resources Defense Council

Amy Coen
President
Population Action International

James K. Wyerman
Executive Director
20/20 Vision

Brian Dixon
Director of Government Relations
Zero Population Growth

Fred D. Krupp
Executive Director
Environmental Defense Fund

Brent Blackwelder
President
Friends of the Earth

Phil Clapp
President
National Environmental Trust

Robert K. Musil
Executive Director
Physicians for Social Responsibility

Carl Pope
Executive Director
Sierra Club

Bud Ris
Executive Director
Union of Concerned Scientists

Please direct correspondence to: CTBT c/o 1828 Jefferson Place, NW, Second Floor Washington, D.C. 20036

"Nitze, Drell to Senate: 'This Treaty Must Be Ratified'
But Lott and Helms' 641-Day Blockage of Test Ban Treaty Continues"

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF

VOL. 3, NO. 5, June 25, 1999

FOR 641 DAYS and counting, the Foreign Relations Committee has refused to consider the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), failing to fulfill its responsibility to consider treaties before the United States Senate. Backed by Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS), Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC) has held the CTBT hostage until the White House transmits the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty protocols, which the Clinton administration has said will be sent when Russia ratifies START II.

Senator Helms' tactics create treaty gridlock that damages America's national security. According to President Reagan's former arms control negotiator and ambassador-at-large, Paul H. Nitze, and one of America's foremost nuclear weapon scientists, Sidney Drell, failure by the Senate to act on the CTBT immediately will undermine America's already beleaguered efforts to stem nuclear weapons proliferation. In their June 21 Washington Postopinion-editorial, "This Treaty Must Be Ratified," Nitze and Drell argue:

"This year, America has an opportunity to lead a global effort to strengthen nuclear non-proliferation by ratifying the ... CTBT. Approval of the CTBT by the Senate is essential in order for the United States to be in the strongest possible position to press for the early enforcement of this vital agreement. Failure to act will undercut our diplomatic efforts to combat the threat from the proliferation of nuclear weapons."

Senators Helms and Lott continue to ignore such advice. According to a June 21 report in The Washington Post, Helms is threatening to take more hostages. The Postreports that: "His staff has drafted legislative language [which] would prohibit the White House from putting any new treaty into effect until the ABM amendments go to the Senate." Such tactics would only reinforce the Committee's reputation for inaction. It has been described by National Journal as "a Senate underachiever."

The fact that Helms is widely blamed for inaction on the CTBT is cold comfort for other Senators who have not yet made their views known. So long as Chairman Helms' is allowed to shut-down the Committee and dictate to the Senate what will happen on matters affecting the national interest, the Senate itself moves further and further out of step with the American electorate, which overwhelmingly favors Senate approval of the CTBT.

The CTBT will improve our nation's ability to detect, inspect, and deter nuclear test explosions, thereby helping to block the development of new

bomb types by countries like China and prevent nations seeking nuclear arms, like Iran and Iraq, from making advanced nuclear warheads. By failing to consider and approve the CTBT — let alone hold hearings — the Senate leaves the door open to nuclear proliferation and renewed nuclear arms races.

###

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading non-proliferation organizations. For the full text of the Nitze-Drell op-ed, see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/nitzedrell062199>>
*The views and analysis in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of every member of the Coalition.

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\envirolt.doc

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <joseph@ceip.org>
Reply-To: "Joseph Cirincione" <joseph@ceip.org>
From: "Joseph Cirincione" <joseph@ceip.org>
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Message for Howard
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 17:23:46 -0400
Organization: Carnegie Endowment
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2014.211
X-MIMETrack: Itemize by SMTP Server on ceip3/Ceip(Release 5.0a |May 4, 1999) at 06/30/99 05:25:17 PM,
Serialize by Router on ceip3/Ceip(Release 5.0a |May 4, 1999) at 06/30/99 05:25:21 PM,
Serialize complete at 06/30/99 05:25:21 PM

Dear Howard,

Thank you for your letter of June 21. I was out of town and just read it upon my return today.

I completely agree with you, in fact, I have told numerous reporters that the CTBT will be ratified by the Senate if it can just get to the floor.

In the story, I was speaking about the ABM protocols, not the CTBT. I think the protocols would be defeated if the Senate brought them to a vote today. This may change by September or October, but under current circumstances, they would go down.

I hope that changes your opinion of the consequences of my quote and view. I am very aware, by the way, of the grassroots efforts to rally support for the treaty. I appreciate your efforts and those of all the activists who are keeping the faith even as the Administration itself appears to lose it.

JOE

Joseph Cirincione
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
(202) 939-2297 (phone)
(202) 483-1840 (fax)
www.ceip.org/npp

Joseph Cirincione
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
(202) 939-2297 (phone)
(202) 483-1840 (fax)
www.ceip.org/npp

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1" http-equiv=Content-Type><BASE

href="file://C:\Program Files\Common Files\Microsoft Shared\Stationery\">
<STYLE></STYLE>

<META content="MSHTML 5.00.2614.3401" name=GENERATOR></HEAD>

<BODY background="">

<DIV>Dear Howard,

Thank you for your letter of June 21. I was out of town and just read it
upon my return today.

I completely agree with you, in fact, I have told numerous reporters that
the CTBT will be ratified by the Senate if it can just get to the floor.

In the story, I was speaking about the ABM protocols, not the CTBT. I
think the protocols would be defeated if the Senate brought them to a vote
today. This may change by September or October, but under current
circumstances, they would go down.

I hope that changes your opinion of the consequences of my quote and view.
I am very aware, by the way, of the grassroots efforts to rally support
for the treaty. I appreciate your efforts and those of all the activists
who are keeping the faith even as the Administration itself appears to
lose it.

JOE

Joseph Cirincione
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
(202) 939-2297 (phone)
(202) 483-1840 (fax)
www.ceip.org/npp
</DIV>

<DIV>
Joseph Cirincione
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
(202) 939-2297 (phone)
(202) 483-1840 (fax)
www.ceip.org/npp</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV> </DIV></BODY></HTML>

To: "Joseph Cirincione" <joseph@ceip.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Message for Howard
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 05:23 PM 6/30/99 -0400, Joseph Cirincione wrote:

>Dear Howard,

>

>Thank you for your letter of June 21. I was out of town and just read it
>upon my return today.

>

>I completely agree with you, in fact, I have told numerous reporters that
>the CTBT will be ratified by the Senate if it can just get to the floor.

>

>In the story, I was speaking about the ABM protocols, not the CTBT. I
>think the protocols would be defeated if the Senate brought them to a vote
>today. This may change by September or October, but under current
>circumstances, they would go down....

Joe,

I apologize if I misinterpreted what you were speaking of the ABM protocols not the CTBT. My enthusiasm is for the CTBT, and I want to be certain that the White House and Senate supporters don't adopt an attitude of "it can't be ratified anyway."

Howard

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Request for payment
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

Now that June is over, I request payment of \$1,500 from the Ploughshares grant for 7 1/2 days of work in June on the CTBT.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 19:14:21 -0400
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@pgs.ca>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Report from St.Petersburg by Jackie Cabasso
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id QAB10409

This important message bounced from being too long with attachments. It was originally sent by Jackie Cabasso - well done Jackie - and thank you, Ross Wilcock.

The St. Petersburg Declaration is also available as html at
<http://www.pgs.ca/pages/a2/stpdec99.htm>

Dear Abolition 2000 partners and friends,

Below is a preliminary report about recent Abolition 2000 activities in St. Petersburg, Russia, including an Abolition 2000 conference. This is by no means a complete report (corrections and revisions from other participants are welcome!) -- hopefully more will be forthcoming. Following the report you will find the text of the Abolition 2000 "St. Petersburg Declaration" (also known as the "White Nights" Declaration) and a list of host organizations and conference participants. At the very end you will find organizational contact information. PLEASE DISTRIBUTE THE ST. PETERSBURG DECLARATION WIDELY!

First, some brief background information: From 18 - 20 June, 1999, the St. Petersburg Peace Council, Russian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, the Finnish Peace Committee, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) Germany, Swedish Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, and the International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility hosted an international Abolition 2000 conference at the House of Friendship and Peace in St. Petersburg, Russia. More than 75 activists from Russia, Finland, Sweden, Denmark, UK, the Netherlands, Germany, Romania, Switzerland, France, Ukraine, USA, and Lithuania participated in the conference, entitled "Nuclear Policy and Security on the Eve of the 21st Century." Abolition 2000 original founding member Xanthe Hall of IPPNW Germany, Vera Brokvina of the St. Petersburg Peace Council, Boris Bonderenko of Russian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, and Teemu Matinpuro of the Finnish Peace Committee did an outstanding job as core conference organizers.

Notable speakers included Russian nuclear safety whistleblower Aleksandr Nikitin and former leading Russian nuclear weapons designer Lev Feoktistov, who now supports the abolition of nuclear weapons.

Plenary sessions and workshops were held on: International Humanitarian Law and Nuclear Weapons (presenters: Rob Green, World Court Project, UK; John Burroughs, Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, USA; Nikita Lomgin, University of St. Petersburg and United Nations Association, Russia); European Security (presenters: Rae Street, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament,

UK; Allistair Millar, Fourth Freedom Forum, USA; Solange Fernex, International Peace Bureau and WILPF, France; Sharon Riggle, Centre for European Security and Disarmament, Belgium; Youri Egorov, St. Petersburg Pedagogic University, Russia; Otfried Nassauer, Berlin Information Centre for Transatlantic Security, Germany); Present Nuclear Situation in the Russian Federation (presenters: Vice Admiral Yvgeny Chernov, voluntary head of Nikitin support committee, Russia; Lydia Popova, Socio-Ecological Union, Russia; Tatiana Tkachenko, Women for the Future, Ukraine; Vladimir Iakimets, Russian Academy of Sciences and Center for Russia Environmental Science, Russia); Russian Nuclear Policy and Global Security (presenters: Alla Yaroshinskaya, International Network of Engineers and Scientists, Russia; Ivan Safrantchouk, PIR Center, Russia; Rebecca Johnson, Acronym Institute, UK; Vladimir Barishnikov, St. Petersburg University, Russia; Aleksandr Nikitin, Bellona Foundation, Russia); and Security in the Baltic Region (presenters: Tomas Giedraitis, Lithuanian Peace Forum; Nikolai Barishnikov, historian, Russia; Juri Martin, Estonian Foundation for Support of Radiation Victims; Tatyana Zhdanok, Latvian Movement for Neutrality; Pekka Koskinen, Finnish Peace Committee); and a presentation of a joint book publication project by the Russian and Swedish Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, "The Weapon That is No Longer Relevant," authored by Lev Feostikov (presenters: Alexander Yemelyanenko, Russian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War; Lev Feostikov). At present, written presentations (in English) by John Burroughs, Allistair Millar, Sharon Riggle, Vladimir Iakimets, and Juri Martin, as well as an advance order form for the book "The Weapon That is No Longer Relevant," are available from Xanthe Hall (see contact information at end of list of participants). A more complete conference report is in the works.

A drafting committee (Vera Brokvina, St. Petersburg Peace Council, Russia; Roman Dolgov, Russian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War; Rob Green, World Court Project, UK; Rae Street, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, UK; Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation, USA; John Burroughs, Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, USA; Bernice Boermans, International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, Netherlands) prepared a "forward looking" statement reflecting the discussions held during the conference, which was adopted in the final plenary session by consensus of the participants. The Abolition 2000 "St. Petersburg Declaration" was drafted in anticipation of the International (Governmental) Conference "Centennial of the Russian Initiative: From the First Peace Conference, 1899 to the Third, 1999," which took place in St. Petersburg 22 - 25 June, 1999, at the Smolny Institute. The "Centennial" conference, hosted by the governments of the Russian Federation and The Netherlands, was held in commemoration of the first Hague Peace Conference in 1899. Lending some weight to the conference, United Nations Secretary Kofi Annan gave the keynote speech. Some of the Abolition 2000 conference participants went on to the Centennial Conference as part of a 15-member Hague Appeal for Peace (HAP) delegation, which included activists from Russia, Pakistan, USA, Germany, and Denmark. At the government conference, Vera Brokvina read out the St. Petersburg declaration (in Russian -- from the same podium where Lenin announced the revolution in 1917!) to the plenary session on disarmament. Some of our findings were reflected in the report from the Chair during the final plenary, and it is expected that these findings will be included in the final conference report (see below.)

A few additional notes: St. Petersburg is a fabulous city and both the Russian NGOs and the Russian government were fabulous hosts! We were treated to bus and boat tours of the city, the ballet and opera, and numerous elegant receptions. The conferences took place during the period known as "White Nights," when it remains light nearly all night long. During White Nights the entire city celebrates with art and music festivals, etc. It is a very special time. The two conferences also took place just as the final negotiations on the terms for ending the NATO bombing of Yugoslavia were underway, as Russian forces occupied the airport in Pristina and as the G-8 meeting took place in Cologne, so they could not have been more timely. Naturally, the situation in Kosovo was a major topic of discussion at both conferences, and anti-NATO feelings ran strongly. The Abolition 2000 conference addressed this issue in the preamble to the St. Petersburg Declaration: "We must move to common security based on human and ecological values and respect for international institutions and law. NATO's recent assertion of the right to engage in "out-of-area" operations conducted without United Nations authority is contrary to this imperative. Future European security arrangements must comply with international law, encompass all European countries including Russia, and exclude nuclear weapons. Genuine and lasting peace cannot be achieved by building and expanding military alliances." A remedy was proposed in the sections dealing with principles (3): "Place new emphasis on regional security organizations, such as OSCE, acting under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter and using political rather than military tools for conflict resolution;" and urgent measures (1): "Massively increased funding and resources for OSCE; transparency and democracy in the creation of its forthcoming "Charter for European Security in the 21st Century" with the full involvement of civil society." As an American in Russia, I never felt any hostility directed at me personally. Most Russians I encountered -- at the conferences, in the hotel, in shops and museums, in taxis and on the street -- were friendly and helpful.

While this brief report is about the Abolition 2000 meeting, I would be remiss if I didn't mention the broader participation of the HAP NGO delegation in the Centennial Conference. HAP President Cora Weiss presented a strong statement on behalf of "civil society," based on the "Hague Appeal," during the opening plenary of the conference, and several members of the delegation made additional interventions during sessions on disarmament and humanitarian law. (The text of Cora's speech is available from the Hague Appeal for Peace office in New York: hap99@igc.apc.org.) Pushing the Abolition 2000 agenda, John Burroughs, Executive Director of the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, called for rejection of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence as a prerequisite for true nuclear disarmament and specified the need to de-alert nuclear forces and commence multilateral negotiations on the elimination of nuclear weapons. He also stressed that progress between the US and Russia on nuclear disarmament must not be blocked by the stalled START process. "Critical negotiations on, indeed parallel, reciprocal actions leading to, far-reaching reductions in and de-alerting of both strategic and tactical weapons must not be held hostage to already outdated agreements." In my comments, I explained how "Stockpile Stewardship" laboratory testing programs in the nuclear weapon states are fundamentally intended to ensure the nuclear disarmament does not occur and thus violate both the NPT and the CTBT, and I called for the closure and monitoring of the nuclear weapons infrastructure in all states to begin early in the process of nuclear disarmament. "Nuclear weapons research,

testing and component production should be halted while reductions are in progress, not after, with nuclear weapons production and research facilities subject to intrusive verification regimes at the earliest possible time."
(Texts of John's and my comments are available from me on request.)

The NGO representatives felt that our presence had a major impact at the conference, and we took the opportunity to chat and mingle with government delegations from a number of countries who seemed very interested in what we had to say. The final report from the two governmental Centennial Conferences (the first one took place in The Hague in May, just after the HAP), will be submitted to the United Nations Secretary General and circulated to UN member countries for follow-up this fall. The report, which will address disarmament, humanitarian law, and conflict resolution, will probably not contain recommendations, but it will identify points that were raised and recommendations from the Conference participants, including the NGOs. Some of these points thus will be raised for the first time in the United Nations!

>From Russia with love, Jackie Cabasso
Executive Director, Western States Legal Foundation, USA
member, Abolition 2000 Coordinating Committee

ST. PETERSBURG DECLARATION

St. Petersburg, Russia - 19 June 1999

Conference on Nuclear Policy and Security on the Eve of the 21st Century
Abolition 2000 Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

In 1899, the Russian Czar Nicolas II took the initiative to convene a general peace conference which was hosted by the Dutch Queen Wilhelmina in The Hague. 100 years later in St. Petersburg, we, the participants in the Abolition 2000 Conference, summarize our findings on nuclear policy and security on the eve of the 21st century. These will be forwarded to the International Conference "Centennial of the Russian Initiative: From the First Peace Conference, 1899 to the Third, 1999" in St. Petersburg 22 - 25 June, 1999.

There can be no peace and security with nuclear weapons. The dogma of "nuclear deterrence" led to the building of ever larger arsenals by the nuclear weapon states. It is illegal, immoral and irresponsible; it must be rejected. For worldwide security, nuclear weapons must be eliminated.

We must move to common security based on human and ecological values and respect for international institutions and law. NATO's recent assertion of the right to engage in "out-of-area" operations conducted without United Nations authority is contrary to this imperative. Future European security arrangements must comply with international law, encompass all European countries including Russia, and exclude nuclear weapons. Genuine and lasting peace cannot be achieved by building and expanding military alliances.

Despite reductions, the nuclear weapon states still hold enough explosive power to annihilate the planet. Nuclear weapons have not prevented war.

Across the world and within Europe, at the end of the millennium, brutal conflicts rage. The spirit and the letter of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty have been broken. By maintaining and modernizing their nuclear arsenals, the United States, Russia, France, the United Kingdom and China have encouraged other states including India, Israel and Pakistan to follow their example.

In the development of nuclear weapons, these governments have brought death and suffering to succeeding generations of innocent people and irreversible environmental destruction. Vast resources have been devoted to nuclear warfare preparations. In the last 50 years, the gap between rich and poor has grown, not least within the nuclear weapon states. Funds have been denied to international bodies concerned with conflict prevention, especially the United Nations and its constituent regional organizations including the Organization for Cooperation and Security in Europe (OSCE). The OSCE is a pan-European security organization, representing 54 countries including Russia, the United States, and Canada, which promotes non-military solutions to conflict.

We call for recognition and implementation of the following principles:

- 1) Redefine security in terms of peoples rather than states, where protection of human health and preservation of the natural environment have overriding priority;
- 2) Support and strengthen the role of the United Nations, which was created after World War II to resolve international disputes peacefully;
- 3) Place new emphasis on regional security organizations, such as OSCE, acting under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter and using political rather than military tools for conflict resolution;
- 4) Uphold and apply international law in a consistent and non-discriminatory manner;
- 5) Recognize the link between nuclear energy and proliferation, and give high priority to energy conservation and development of alternative energy sources.

The following urgent measures are needed to implement these principles, which should be taken simultaneously and in parallel:

- 1) Massively increased funding and resources for OSCE; transparency and democracy in the creation of its forthcoming "Charter for European Security in the 21st Century" with the full involvement of civil society;
- 2) Taking all nuclear forces off alert status through coordinated measures lowering their readiness for use, including separation of warheads from delivery systems and withdrawal of nuclear-armed submarines from patrol;
- 3) Removal of US nuclear weapons from Europe back to the United States;
- 4) Initiation of parallel, reciprocal actions between the United States and Russia to de-alert, reduce, and account for warheads and fissile materials,

bypassing the blocked START process;

5) Commencement of multilateral negotiations on the elimination of nuclear weapons to culminate in a comprehensive treaty. These negotiations could incorporate or be conducted in parallel with negotiations on interim steps including no first-use and no modernization pledges and a fissile materials ban;

6) Reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons research and development infrastructures and capabilities. This process should accompany the reduction and elimination of warheads and delivery systems. It will require a new emphasis on development of societal verification methods;

7) Reduction and elimination of other weapons of mass destruction and/or indiscriminate effect, including depleted uranium, cluster bombs, and land mines.

In conclusion, we strongly endorse the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as echoed in the words of UN Secretary General Kofi Annan: "Today security is increasingly understood not just in military terms, and as far more than the absence of conflict. It is in fact a phenomenon that encompasses economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament and respect for human rights. These goals -- these pillars of peace -- are interrelated. Progress in one area begets progress in another. But no country can get there on its own. And none is exempt from the risks and costs of doing without... The world today spends billions preparing for war; shouldn't we spend a billion or two preparing for peace?"

ORIGINAL IN ENGLISH

Conference on Nuclear Policy and Security on the Eve of the 21st Century
Abolition 2000 Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

St. Petersburg, Russia 18 - 20 June 1999

Host Organisations:

St. Petersburg Peace Council

Russian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (RPPNW)

Finnish Peace Committee

International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW Germany)

Swedish Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW Sweden)

International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility
(INES)

With support from the Heinrich Böll Foundation, Germany, and the Finnish Foreign Ministry

Participants:

Vera Brovkina, St. Petersburg Peace Council

Russia

Boris Bondarenko, RPPNW

Russia

Terttu Ahokas, Finnish Peace Committee

Finland

Karl-Otto Aly, IPPNW Sweden

Sweden

Klaus Arnung, IPPNW Denmark

Denmark

Jørgen Madsen, United Nations Association	Denmark
Janet Bloomfield, Oxford Research Group	UK
Richard Bloomfield	UK
Bernice Boermans, International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms	
Netherlands	
John Burroughs, Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy	USA
Jacqueline Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation	USA
Tobias Damjanov, INES	Germany
Aurel Duta, For Mother Earth	Romania
Michel Fernex, Physicians for Social Responsibility/IPPNW	Switzerland
Solange Fernex, Womens International League for Peace and Freedom	France
Majlis Fridén, Swedish Peace Council	Sweden
Robert Green, World Court Project	UK
Margareta Gustaffson, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Xanthe Hall, IPPNW Germany	Germany/UK
Anna Hellman, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Rebecca Johnson, Acronym Institute	UK
Alexander Kemnade, IPPNW Germany	Germany
Lars Pohlmeier, IPPNW Germany	Germany
Lena Pohlmeier	Germany/Russia
Ira Kiessliech-Köcher, Assistant to Elisabeth Schroedter, MEP	Germany
Helmut Krause, IPPNW Germany	Germany
Lars Lindskog, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Christine Vigre Lundius, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Klas Lundius, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Alistair Millar, Fourth Freedom Forum	USA/UK
Otfried Nassauer, Berlin Information Centre for Transatlantic Security	
Germany	
Carin Odhner, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Eva Olivecrona, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Ramoa Maria Piciu, For Mother Earth	Romania
Sharon Riggle, Centre for European Security and Disarmament	Belgium/USA
Heinz - P. Romberg, IPPNW Germany	Germany
Alice Slater, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment	USA
Rae Street, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament	UK
Frida Sundberg, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Gunnar Westberg, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Bo Wirmark, Swedish Peace Council	Sweden
Olga Andriyanova, RPPNW	Russia
Natalya Antonuk, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Anastasija Bitiukova, Lithuanian Christian Fund College	Lithuania
Tatiana Blazhkevich, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Rimvydas Cepurna	Lithuania
Rima Cepurniene	Lithuania
Marta Dargyte	Lithuania
Roman Dolgov, RPPNW	Russia
Julia Dubchak, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Ntatalya Farion, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Lev Feoktistov	Russia
Aleksandra Feoktistova	Russia
Tomas Giedraitis, Lithuanian Peace Forum	Lithuania
Halina Girnyak, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Simo Granat, Physicians for Social Responsibility	Finland
Zivile Januskaite, student, Vilnius University	Lithuania

Malla Kantola, Committee of 100	Finland
Pekka Koskinen, Finnish Peace Committee	Finland
Aldona Kucinskaite	Lithuania
Laura Lodenius, Peace Union	Finland
Teemu Matinpuro, Finnish Peace Committee	Finland
Arvydas Paldavicius, student, Vilnius University	Lithuania
Mikhail Pogorely, National Press Institute	Russia
Voctorya Ponomarenko, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Lydia Popova, Socio-Ecological Union	Russia
Natalya Romaniv, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Irene Rummyantseva, RPPNW	Russia
Ivan Safrantchouk, PIR Center	Russia
Patrick Sandström, Physicians for Social Responsibility	Finland
Ilkka Taipale, Physicians for Social Responsibility	Finland
Tatiana Tkachenko, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Olga Tkchachenko, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Vera Velychko, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Alla Yaroshinskaya, INES	Russia
Irina Yatsunenko, National Press Institute	Russia
Alexander Yemelyenenkov, RPPNW	Russia
Vladimir Iakimets, Russian Academy of Sciences/ Center for Russia Environmental Science	Russia

Contact Organisations:

IPPNW Germany; Xanthe Hall, Co-Director
 Körtestraße 10; D-10967; Berlin, Germany
 Tel: 030/693 02 44; Fax: 030/693 8166; E-mail: IPPNW@VLBerlin.comlink.de

St. Petersburg Peace Council; Vera Brovkina, Chairperson
 21, Fontanka; House of Friendship and Peace
 St. Petersburg, 191011, Russia
 Tel: (812) 210-45-13; Fax: (812) 314-83-21; E-mail: vera@smis.spb.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 19:24:56 -0400
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@pgs.ca>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: St Petersburg meeting participants
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id QAB14758

This message is provided by Jackie Cabasso and forwarded due to a "file to large" error.

Conference on Nuclear Policy and Security on the Eve of the 21st Century
Abolition 2000 Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

St. Petersburg, Russia 18 - 20 June 1999

Host Organisations:

St. Petersburg Peace Council
Russian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (RPPNW)
Finnish Peace Committee
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW Germany)
Swedish Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW Sweden)
International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility
(INES)

With support from the Heinrich Böll Foundation, Germany, and the Finnish
Foreign Ministry

Participants:

Vera Brovkina, St. Petersburg Peace Council	Russia
Boris Bondarenko, RPPNW	Russia
Terttu Ahokas, Finnish Peace Committee	Finland
Karl-Otto Aly, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Klaus Arnung, IPPNW Denmark	Denmark
Jørgen Madsen, United Nations Association	Denmark
Janet Bloomfield, Oxford Research Group	UK
Richard Bloomfield	UK
Bernice Boermans, International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms Netherlands	
John Burroughs, Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy	USA
Jacqueline Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation	USA
Tobias Damjanov, INES	Germany
Aurel Duta, For Mother Earth	Romania
Michel Fernex, Physicians for Social Responsibility/IPPNW	Switzerland
Solange Fernex, Womens International League for Peace and Freedom	France
Majlis Fridén, Swedish Peace Council	Sweden
Robert Green, World Court Project	UK
Margareta Gustaffson, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Xanthe Hall, IPPNW Germany	Germany/UK
Anna Hellman, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden

Rebecca Johnson, Acronym Institute	UK
Alexander Kemnade, IPPNW Germany	Germany
Lars Pohlmeier, IPPNW Germany	Germany
Lena Pohlmeier	Germany/Russia
Ira Kiessliech-Köcher, Assistant to Elisabeth Schroedter, MEP	Germany
Helmut Krause, IPPNW Germany	Germany
Lars Lindskog, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Christine Vigre Lundius, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Klas Lundius, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Alistair Millar, Fourth Freedom Forum	USA/UK
Otfried Nassauer, Berlin Information Centre for Transatlantic Security	
Germany	
Carin Odhner, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Eva Olivecrona, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Ramoa Maria Piciu, For Mother Earth	Romania
Sharon Riggle, Centre for European Security and Disarmament	Belgium/USA
Heinz - P. Romberg, IPPNW Germany	Germany
Alice Slater, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment	USA
Rae Street, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament	UK
Frida Sundberg, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Gunnar Westberg, IPPNW Sweden	Sweden
Bo Wirmark, Swedish Peace Council	Sweden
Olga Andriyanova, RPPNW	Russia
Natalya Antonuk, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Anastasija Bitiukova, Lithuanian Christian Fund College	Lithuania
Tatiana Blazhkevich, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Rimvydas Cepurna	Lithuania
Rima Cepurniene	Lithuania
Marta Dargyte	Lithuania
Roman Dolgov, RPPNW	Russia
Julia Dubchak, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Ntatalya Farion, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Lev Feoktistov	Russia
Aleksandra Feoktistova	Russia
Tomas Giedraitis, Lithuanian Peace Forum	Lithuania
Halina Girnyak, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Simo Granat, Physicians for Social Responsibility	Finland
Zivile Januskaite, student, Vilnius University	Lithuania
Malla Kantola, Committee of 100	Finland
Pekka Koskinen, Finnish Peace Committee	Finland
Aldona Kucinskaite	Lithuania
Laura Lodenius, Peace Union	Finland
Teemu Matinpuro, Finnish Peace Committee	Finland
Arvydas Paldavicius, student, Vilnius University	Lithuania
Mikhail Pogorely, National Press Institute	Russia
Voctorya Ponomarenko, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Lydia Popova, Socio-Ecological Union	Russia
Natalya Romaniv, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Irene Rummyantseva, RPPNW	Russia
Ivan Safrantchouk, PIR Center	Russia
Patrick Sandström, Physicians for Social Responsibility	Finland
Ilkka Taipale, Physicians for Social Responsibility	Finland
Tatiana Tkachenko, Women for the Future	Ukraine
Olga Tkchachenko, Women for the Future	Ukraine

Vera Velychko, Women for the Future
Alla Yaroshinskaya, INES
Irina Yatsunenko, National Press Institute
Alexander Yemelyenenkov, RPPNW
Vladimir Iakimets, Russian Academy of Sciences/
Center for Russia Environmental Science

Ukraine
Russia
Russia
Russia
Russia

Contact Organisations:

IPPNW Germany; Xanthe Hall, Co-Director
Körtestraße 10; D-10967; Berlin, Germany
Tel: 030/693 02 44; Fax: 030/693 8166; E-mail: IPPNW@VLBerlin.comlink.de

St. Petersburg Peace Council; Vera Brovkina, Chairperson
21, Fontanka; House of Friendship and Peace
St. Petersburg, 191011, Russia
Tel: (812) 210-45-13; Fax: (812) 314-83-21; E-mail: vera@smis.spb.org

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Wed, 30 Jun 1999 19:45:29 -0400
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@pgs.ca>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: ST. PETERSBURG DECLARATION
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

By courtesy of Jackie Cabasso <wslf@earthlink.net>

ST. PETERSBURG DECLARATION
St. Petersburg, Russia - 19 June 1999

Conference on Nuclear Policy and Security on the Eve of the 21st Century
Abolition 2000 Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons

In 1899, the Russian Czar Nicolas II took the initiative to convene a general peace conference which was hosted by the Dutch Queen Wilhelmina in The Hague. 100 years later in St. Petersburg, we, the participants in the Abolition 2000 Conference, summarize our findings on nuclear policy and security on the eve of the 21st century. These will be forwarded to the International Conference "Centennial of the Russian Initiative: From the First Peace Conference, 1899 to the Third, 1999" in St. Petersburg 22 - 25 June, 1999.

There can be no peace and security with nuclear weapons. The dogma of "nuclear deterrence" led to the building of ever larger arsenals by the nuclear weapon states. It is illegal, immoral and irresponsible; it must be rejected. For worldwide security, nuclear weapons must be eliminated.

We must move to common security based on human and ecological values and respect for international institutions and law. NATO's recent assertion of the right to engage in "out-of-area" operations conducted without United Nations authority is contrary to this imperative. Future European security arrangements must comply with international law, encompass all European countries including Russia, and exclude nuclear weapons. Genuine and lasting peace cannot be achieved by building and expanding military alliances.

Despite reductions, the nuclear weapon states still hold enough explosive power to annihilate the planet. Nuclear weapons have not prevented war. Across the world and within Europe, at the end of the millennium, brutal conflicts rage. The spirit and the letter of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty have been broken. By maintaining and modernizing their nuclear arsenals, the United States, Russia, France, the United Kingdom and China have encouraged other states including India, Israel and Pakistan to follow their example.

In the development of nuclear weapons, these governments have brought death and suffering to succeeding generations of innocent people and irreversible environmental destruction. Vast resources have been devoted to nuclear

warfare preparations. In the last 50 years, the gap between rich and poor has grown, not least within the nuclear weapon states. Funds have been denied to international bodies concerned with conflict prevention, especially the United Nations and its constituent regional organizations including the Organization for Cooperation and Security in Europe (OSCE). The OSCE is a pan-European security organization, representing 54 countries including Russia, the United States, and Canada, which promotes non-military solutions to conflict.

We call for recognition and implementation of the following principles:

- 1) Redefine security in terms of peoples rather than states, where protection of human health and preservation of the natural environment have overriding priority;
- 2) Support and strengthen the role of the United Nations, which was created after World War II to resolve international disputes peacefully;
- 3) Place new emphasis on regional security organizations, such as OSCE, acting under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter and using political rather than military tools for conflict resolution;
- 4) Uphold and apply international law in a consistent and non-discriminatory manner;
- 5) Recognize the link between nuclear energy and proliferation, and give high priority to energy conservation and development of alternative energy sources.

The following urgent measures are needed to implement these principles, which should be taken simultaneously and in parallel:

- 1) Massively increased funding and resources for OSCE; transparency and democracy in the creation of its forthcoming "Charter for European Security in the 21st Century" with the full involvement of civil society;
- 2) Taking all nuclear forces off alert status through coordinated measures lowering their readiness for use, including separation of warheads from delivery systems and withdrawal of nuclear-armed submarines from patrol;
- 3) Removal of US nuclear weapons from Europe back to the United States;
- 4) Initiation of parallel, reciprocal actions between the United States and Russia to de-alert, reduce, and account for warheads and fissile materials, bypassing the blocked START process;
- 5) Commencement of multilateral negotiations on the elimination of nuclear weapons to culminate in a comprehensive treaty. These negotiations could incorporate or be conducted in parallel with negotiations on interim steps including no first-use and no modernization pledges and a fissile materials ban;
- 6) Reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons research and development

infrastructures and capabilities. This process should accompany the reduction and elimination of warheads and delivery systems. It will require a new emphasis on development of societal verification methods;

7) Reduction and elimination of other weapons of mass destruction and/or indiscriminate effect, including depleted uranium, cluster bombs, and land mines.

In conclusion, we strongly endorse the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as echoed in the words of UN Secretary General Kofi Annan: "Today security is increasingly understood not just in military terms, and as far more than the absence of conflict. It is in fact a phenomenon that encompasses economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament and respect for human rights. These goals -- these pillars of peace -- are interrelated. Progress in one area begets progress in another. But no country can get there on its own. And none is exempt from the risks and costs of doing without... The world today spends billions preparing for war; shouldn't we spend a billion or two preparing for peace?"

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
From: Dealert99@aol.com
Date: Sat, 3 Jul 1999 20:36:55 EDT
Subject: (abolition-usa) Now it's only 181 days!
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Thanks, Jan, for your message! I am pleased to hear that another group is really serious about taking the Abolition 2000 message to the people. And I am very impressed with your signature count of nearly 10,000. Our group had originally planned to petition for Abolition 2000, but changed to de-alerting because it is a much less complex issue with a simple solution and a critical deadline for action before Y2K. Unfortunately, not many others in the USA appear to be concerned about it. They must still be pacified by the knowledge that all US and Russian nuclear missiles are "de-targeted" as I was for far too long, until I realized that re-targeting takes about one second!

When de-alerting has been accomplished, we will work for Abolition 2000, but we see de-alerting as an essential, crucial first step.

If you would like, I will be glad to s-mail you a copy of our petition and information brochure, or send them as e-mail attachments in Word 97 format. I'll need a mailing address for s-mail.

Tell me briefly, what has worked well in your campaign, and what has not?

Peace!

Bill Santelmann
Metro-Boston Committee to De-alert Nuclear Weapons
2600 Massachusetts Ave., Lexington, MA 02421-6798

In a message dated 1999/06/29 5:13:23 PM Eastern Daylight Time, jahn@cruzio.com writes:

> Here in Santa Cruz, CA, we've been getting signatures on the Abolition 2000
> petition to abolish all nuclear weapons worldwide for over a year now,
> every Saturday downtown, and have gathered nearly 10,000 of them. Our
> group, a committee of Women's International League for Peace and Freedom,
> has also held public meetings, made talks at churches, and got as much as
> we could into the local media. De-alerting may be our next big push.
>
> Now we're doing radio spots, and your clear and eloquent letter is going to
> be a take-off point for one of them. Thanks for your efforts and your
> energy. Peace, Jan Harwood
>

-

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: Mon, 05 Jul 1999 16:01:32 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news: 5 Senators write Helms on CTBT

July 5, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: 5 Senators write Helms calling for prompt hearings on CTBT

On Friday, July 3, Senator Dorgan held a small briefing for reporters on the impasse in the Senate on the CTBT. Joined by LAWS president, Tom Graham, he noted that it has been 648 days since the Treaty was sent to the Senate and said that the Senate is "dragging its feet on the issue at a time when ... global events ... suggest that we ought to be recommitting ourselves to the CTBT." He released the text of a June 28 letter signed by 5 senators urging Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms to hold hearings on the CTBT.

The text of that letter is below. For a copy of the final, signed version, go to <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbltr062899.htm>> and for a copy of the Dorgan press release, see <<http://www.senate.gov/~dorgan/press/7299.pdf>>

DK

June 28, 1999

The Honorable Jesse Helms
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We urge you to hold hearings on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), and to report it to the full Senate for debate. Most importantly, we ask that this be done with sufficient time to allow the United States to actively participate in the Treaty's inaugural Conference of Ratifying States, which may be held as early as this September, should the Senate ratify the Treaty.

President Clinton signed the CTBT on September 22, 1996 and sent the Treaty to the Senate for its advice and consent on September 24, 1997. We are now midway through the first session of the 106th Congress and the Foreign Relations Committee has held no hearings on this Treaty. As early as September of this year, the 37 countries that have ratified the CTBT will hold a conference to discuss how to facilitate the Treaty's early entry into

force. If the United States is to maintain its leadership role and convince other countries to forego nuclear weapons tests, the full Senate must be given the opportunity to consider ratification of the CTBT before that Conference begins.

Many nations are waiting for the United States to lead on this important issue before completing ratification in their countries. Failure to act on the Treaty will deny the U.S. an active voice at the conference and could severely weaken U.S. non-proliferation efforts, including the effort to bring India and Pakistan into this treaty. The recent hostilities in Kashmir are a sober reminder of the need to do all we can to prevent a nuclear holocaust in that region.

The United States must not relinquish its leadership in the nuclear non-proliferation arena. We respectfully urge you to hold all necessary hearings and to report the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty to the Senate for timely consideration before the CTBT inaugural conference.

Sincerely,

Byron L. Dorgan

Arlen Specter

Edward M. Kennedy

James Jeffords

Patty Murray

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 06 Jul 1999 09:36:47 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: WA voters support CTBT says CRND poll

July 6, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Coalition-commissioned poll shows WA voters support CTBT by 8-1 margin

The latest state-specific poll commissioned by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, which shows that Washington state voters of all stripes and in all regions of the state support Senate approval in overwhelming numbers. The results are described in the attached WordPerfect file version of the news release and in the e-mail text version (below).

The poll was released today in conjunction with Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility, the state affiliate of PSR National.

For the final version of the press release (with bar chart) and for other state and national polling results on the CTBT, see the Coalition's CTBT Site <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctsuppor.htm#polls>>.

Look for the new set of national polling results on the CTBT, which will be released next week.

DK

Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility

NEWS RELEASE -- FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: July 6, 1999

"82% of Washington Voters Support the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty:
But the Senate Has Failed to Act on the Treaty for Over 21 Months"

CONTACT: Adam Eiding (202)-547-3577 or Martin Fleck (206) 547-2630

(WASHINGTON, DC) According to a new statewide public opinion survey, Washington voters strongly support Senate approval of a treaty banning all nuclear weapons test explosions, known as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). An overwhelming 82% of Washington adults say the nuclear test ban treaty should be approved, while only 10% "disapprove," and 8% don't know. Support for the CTBT is overwhelming among Republicans (78%), Democrats (84%), and independent (84%), and all regions in the state (Seattle/Tacoma, 85%; Spokane East, 80%; Yakima Central, 80%; and Olympia West, 83%).

The new poll conducted by the non-partisan polling firm, Research 2000, for the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, shows support for the CTBT in Washington is even higher than it is nationwide (with 73% supporting the treaty, according to a May 1998 survey by The Mellman Group).

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control and disarmament organizations, including Physicians for Social Responsibility and Peace Action, commissioned the poll. The survey results are based on the findings of an opinion survey of 608 registered Washington State voters conducted by Research 2000, between June 18-21, 1999. The statistical margin for error for the sample as a whole is plus or minus 4%.

Registered voters were asked: "The United States and 140 other countries have signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty which would prohibit nuclear weapons test explosions worldwide. Do you think the United States Senate should approve or disapprove of this treaty?"

The test ban treaty was transmitted to the Senate for its approval for ratification over a year and half ago, but Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC) has so far blocked its consideration and has not even allowed hearing on the treaty in his Committee. President Clinton and Secretary of State Albright have repeatedly stated that ratifying the treaty is the best way to advance U.S. security interests and help reduce the spread of nuclear weapons.

Last week, Washington Senator Patty Murray and other Democratic and Republican Senators recently wrote Senator Helms on the CTBT. In their June 28 letter, they urge Helms "to hold all necessary hearings and to report the ... Treaty to the Senate for timely consideration before the CTBT inaugural conference [in October]."

Despite strong public support for the CTBT, Senator Slade Gorton not yet declared his position on the CTBT since it was sent to the Senate in 1997. Before the negotiation of the CTBT, he said: "The abolition of nuclear tests by all nuclear powers, achieved without jeopardizing our security or that of our allies, must remain our fundamental long-term objective. I fully support negotiations which will bring us closer to this goal."

The CTBT was signed by President Clinton and the leaders of Britain, France, China and Russia in September 1996. To date, 152 nations have signed and 37 — including Britain, France, and Japan — have ratified. However, the treaty will not take effect until the United States and other key countries ratify the pact. Treaty experts expect it to win the two-thirds majority needed for Senate approval if a vote is allowed.

"The U.S. Senate's do-nothing approach on the test ban treaty is irresponsible and dangerous. It hurts efforts to protect America and the world from the proliferation of nuclear weapons and from the possibility of nuclear war. Washingtonians clearly want their Senators to provide the leadership needed to approve the test ban treaty to help make the world safer for future generations," said David Hall, M.D., of Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) and past-president of PSR

National. PSR is the U.S. affiliate of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, winner of the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize.

"The CTBT will improve our nation's ability to detect, inspect, and deter nuclear test explosions, thereby helping to block the development of new bomb types by countries like China. By failing to consider and approve the CTBT — let alone hold hearings — the Senate leaves the door open to nuclear proliferation and renewed nuclear arms races, " added Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

- 30 -

See the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers' Web Site <<http://www.crnd.org>> for other CTBT polling results. For inquires regarding spokespeople for interview, please contact Adam Eidinger at 202-547-3577.

WAPSR -- 4554 12th Ave. NE, Seattle, WA 98105 • Phone: (206) 547-2630 • Fax: (202) 547-2631 • e-mail: wpsr@wpsr.org

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\warel699.wpd

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <issues@billbradley.com>
Reply-To: <issues@billbradley.com>
From: "Issues" <issues@billbradley.com>
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: thank you
Date: Tue, 6 Jul 1999 11:16:08 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id IAA19303

Dear Howard:

Thank you for contacting my campaign. Not enough Americans take the time to write letters expressing their concerns about the future of our nation. I appreciate your suggestions and have taken them under advisement. We may not agree on every issue, but my policy positions will always be honest and forthright.

Today more than ever before, the test of presidential leadership is the willingness to confront tough challenges. Our country must elect a president who can be trusted to do just that, and who trusts the American people to do their part in return. We hear again and again that we live in times of unprecedented economic prosperity. And that is certainly true for many, though not everyone, in our society. Yet good times haven't erased the serious problems that plague our children, our system of health care, and the civic underpinnings of our society. Nor do they spare our leaders the burden of rising to new and complex demands abroad.

Rising to the big challenges facing our country is the central message of my campaign, and America is paying attention. I've staked my campaign on a standard of leadership that is equal to our country's potential. I am honored by the palpable momentum that is building behind me. The overwhelming public support my campaign has already received shows that I can win the Democratic nomination and then go on to win the presidency next November.

I am not going to rely on poll-tested phrases as a substitute for my own convictions. Instead, I will tell people what I believe and where I think the country should go. I owe it to all Americans to be candid-out of respect for their ability to deal with the complexity and uncertainty of life-in a way that allows our children to have a better future than we do today.

As the campaign progresses, I urge you to follow my campaign on our website at www.billbradley.com <<http://www.billbradley.com/>>, where you can obtain regular updates on campaign activities, statements on the issues, and information on how to get involved and make a contribution. I appreciate your interest and the time you have taken to contact me and hope I can count on your support.

Sincerely,
Bill Bradley

Bill Bradley for President
395 Pleasant Valley Way
West Orange, NJ 07052
973-731-2100 phone
973-324-9231 fax
www.billbradley.com

Paid for by Bill Bradley for President, Inc.

Contributions and gifts to Bill Bradley for President, Inc. are not tax deductible.

Return-Path: <MARY_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org>
Sender: MARY_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org
Date: Tue, 6 Jul 1999 13:30:24 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: CTBT TESTIMONIALS
To: mupj@igc.apc.org (Howard W. Hallman)
From: MARY_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org (MARY MILLER)

To: mupj@igc.apc.org (Howard W. Hallman)

Howard,

I didn't respond to your request on June 24th for "testimonials" to be used with appointments with the Administration for reasons of time and energy mostly, but also because the only body that really matters to EPF in this case is the Episcopal Church. If you did *not* get a reply from Jere Skipper or Tom Hart, would you please let me know? I would like to help get them on record that the Episcopal Church's policies and energies will be used in the service of the CTBT cause by official folks this time and not just EPF.

What EPF will be doing when the CTBT comes up for a vote is more of the same things we've been doing - part of which is to prod the Church into being present and accounted for. On nuclear issues we have no additional policies to guide our work than the official offices of the Church do.

mary

mary h miller, epf

11:40 am Tue, Jul 6, 1999

Return-Path: <km1005@erols.com>
From: "karen mcmanus" <km1005@erols.com>
To: "barbara Lane" <echoes11@aol.com>, "cherie ashcroft" <cashc54525@aol.com>,
"david dennigton" <cardington@aol.com>,
"howard hallman" <mupj@igc.org>,
"marla fogelman" <mfogelman@keoric.com>,
"michael Gurwitz" <mountainmonkey@hotmail.com>,
"nick lawrence" <nlawrence@atpco.net>,
"sara wildberger" <swildberg@aol.com>
Cc: <rockynrudy@aol.com>
Subject: class list
Date: Tue, 6 Jul 1999 13:41:29 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Hello Class!
Here is the list of class members:

Barbara Lane
echoes11@aol.com
703-548-5781

Howard Hallman
mupj@igc.org
301-897-3668

Cherie Ashcroft
cashc54525@aol.com
202-637-7034

Marla Fogelman
mfogelman@keoric.com
301-587-7932

Karen McManus
km1005@erols.com
301-540-8267

Roger Theil
202-328-3286
1319 Naylor Ct. NW
Wash DC 20001

David Dennington
703-444-8831
cardington@aol.com

Nick Lawrence
900 N. Stuart St. #908
Aslington, VA 22203
nlawrence@atpco.net
703-524-4032

Michael Gurwitz
4607 Connecticut Ave., NW
#220
Wash DC 20008
202-237-9079
mountainmonkey@hotmail.com

Sara Wildberger
3001 Veazey Ter #607 NW
Wash DC 20008
swildberg@aol.com
202-363-1296

Michael and Roger are going to the Pitch Fest the last weekend in July. Me and maybe (hopefully) Cherie are going to the How to Sell to Hollywood Conference the first weekend in August. Barbara is also going to CA this summer to talk to some contacts she has. I think we should get together in mid August and discuss how these events went. I'll contact you all later in the summer. Good Luck and write on.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>

X-Sender: wslf@mail.earthlink.net

Date: Wed, 07 Jul 1999 18:02:02 -0700

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, bjburkes@capecod.net (Betty Burkes),
dccogan@aol.com (Doloris Cogan), CNUNC@aol.com (Tad Daley),
ufwpa@aol.com (Bob Downey/United Farm Workers),
susangordon@earthlink.net (Susan Gordon),
globalkids@igc.apc.org (Esther Hilsenrad/Global Kids),
jackisue@ix.netcom.com (Jackie Hudson),
wiednerb@aol.com (Bernice Kring), EMLECAIN@aol.com (Eleanor LeCain),
arjun@ieer.org (Arjun Makhijani), AFSCCT@igc.apc.org (Bruce Martin),
lamiles@ibm.net (Loulena Miles), metropeace@aol.com (Tom Roderick),
nonukes@cris.com (Marion Pack), zabarte@nevada.edu (Ian Zaparte),
ksmick@wenet.net (Katherine Smick), asur@mit.edu (Abha Suhr),
ccs@igc.org (James Lerager)

From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@earthlink.net>

Subject: (abolition-usa) US Campaign Facilitators' Group call notes: 6/14/99

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by harrier.prod.itd.earthlink.net id SAA16605

Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

US Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons
Facilitators' Group Conference Call Minutes, 6/14/99

Facilitator and timekeeper, Jackie Cabasso; Note taker, Jan Harwood.
Present on call: Dave Robinson, Alan Haber, Esther Pank, Sally Light, Alice Slater, John Burroughs, Jackie Cabasso, Jan Harwood

Jackie reviewed the agenda. Minutes from 5/28 and 6/7/99 were accepted and approved.

Old Business:

1. Lori has sent Jackie a list of Santa Barbara conference participants who are not on the Abolition Caucus list-serve, about thirty people. Jackie will make a "nickname list" of those people and send them the minutes and other important information.
2. Responses to Working Group posting: Alice got one from Janet Cuevas of Promoting Enduring Peace, who volunteered to convene the Star Wars group. Andy Lichterman, convenor of the "bottom-up" working group, has had a lot of requests for his strategy paper on organizing an abolition movement in the U.S. No other responses were received by people on this call; conveners will be asked if they had responses and a report will go out to the list-serve.
3. Next meetings: Jackie summarized that we had come close to an agreement about a plenary meeting in October at Ann Arbor, in connection with a teach-in there, but we were unsure about a "facilitators and friends" meeting prior to that. Jackie had not yet drafted a proposed agenda for such a meeting, but gave some ideas: we would have as many members of the Facilitators' Group and Working Group conveners there as possible, we would start with our Mission Statement and our Democracy Statement; try to figure

out what structures and resources we need to carry out our mission. She suggested we might select five priorities to work on during the next year--activities in addition to the working groups--and fashion a structure to carry them out. We would also develop a structure for fund-raising.

John noted that campaign planning would justify a face-to-face meeting. He added that we could plan the Ann Arbor meeting; plan for staff or organize ourselves to carry out the campaign without staff; try to find a structure to help all the groups work together. He suggested we could break into small groups to work on these different aspects.

4. It was noted that Kevin Martin and Karina Woods have been hired by the Abolition Project of the Fourth Freedom Forum to work on abolition issues. A discussion followed about how best to work with them. Alan will talk with Kevin Martin about the Michigan teach-in, and Alice, as a representative of the US Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, will talk with David Cortright to see if resources could be made available for the teach-in and if they think that's a good venue to launch a US Campaign. They will try to get this done before our next call, July 7th.

5. Campaign or Network?: John noted that an established organization, such as Project Abolition, NAPF, AFSC or Pax Christi, would need to take the lead in a national campaign, doing a lot of the basic work, or that we would have to hire staff ourselves; otherwise, we should recognize ourselves as a network, rather than a campaign. Alan notes that there's space to house staff at Ann Arbor. Sally suggests we put together two "strategy and structure" models, campaign and network, before we "launch" ourselves at the October meeting. She will try to come up with drafts of these.

6. Staff Job Description: Alan has written a first draft of a job description for hired staff, which was agreed to be wide-ranging and full of important ideas for a campaign. Staff would, among other things, do coordination, financial planning, delegate duties, "hold everything together."

7. John asked if, in planning a campaign, we want to focus on a particular issue, such as de-alerting? He suggests we find a way to plug people who come to any of our events into meaningful work for abolition.

8. Alan will write up a report on the planning and development of the Ann Arbor teach-in and post it on the list-serve.

9. Next Conference Call: July 7th, 1 P.M. eastern, 10 A.M. western time.

Jackie, John and Alice will be freshly back from Russia--and bon voyage!

US Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons
Facilitators' Group Conference Call Minutes, 6/14/99

Jacqueline Cabasso, Executive Director
WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION
1440 Broadway, Suite 500

Oakland, California USA 94612

Tel: +(510)839-5877

Fax: +(510)839-5397

E-mail: wslf@earthlink.net

Western States Legal Foundation is part of ABOLITION 2000
A 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.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
Date: Wed, 07 Jul 1999 22:49:25 -0400
From: "William F. Santelmann, Jr." <wsantelmann@peacenet.org>
Organization: none
X-Accept-Language: en
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) US Campaign Facilitators' Group call notes: 6/14/99
References: <4.1.19990707175910.00971310@mail.earthlink.net>
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Jackie Cabasso wrote:

> 7. John asked if, in planning a campaign, we want to focus on a particular
> issue, such as de-alerting? He suggests we find a way to plug people who
> come to any of our events into meaningful work for abolition.

>

Hey, get with it, please!! DE-ALERT NOW!! THERE ARE ONLY 176 DAYS BEFORE Y2K.
Do you know what the Russian (or our) nuclear missiles will do then? The risk
is simply unacceptable. PLEASE, WORK TO DE-ALERT....

Bill Santelmann
Metro-Boston Committee to De-Alert Nuclear Weapons
dealert99@aol.com
wsantelmann@peacenet.org

-

To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com"
with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.
For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send
"help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

Return-Path: <owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: napf@silcom.com
Date: Thu, 08 Jul 1999 16:44:33 -0700
To: sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Subject: (sunflower-napf) The Sunflower, No. 26, July 1999
Sender: owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com

=====
THE SUNFLOWER
=====

ISSUE NO. 26, July 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/sf/index.html>

=====
CONTENTS
=====

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

Chinese President Calls For Nuclear Weapons Ban
Clinton and Yeltsin Will Discuss START III In September
US Senate Kills Nuclear Weapons Reduction Amendment

FUTURE OF DOE

Possible New Agency For US Nuclear Weapons Program

NUCLEAR WASTE AND TERRORISM

Nevada Governor Files Petition With NRC To Re-Examine Security

NAS PANEL LISTENS TO HANFORD STUDY CRITICS

Doses Were Underestimated, Math Incorrect

AMERICA MOVING CLOSER TO UN DEBT PAYMENT

Senate votes to pay \$819 million of \$1.6 billion owed

WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

British Columbians Say "No Nukes"
Great Britain Has Shortage Of Bomb Designers - Youth Not Interested

BILLIONAIRES CLUB

465 Billionaires Count Their Loose Change

RESOURCES

EVENTS

=====

"Let All The Souls Here Rest In Peace; For We Shall Not Repeat The Evil."
Inscription on the Memorial Cenotaph at Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park

=====

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

=====

Chinese President Calls For Nuclear Weapons Ban

President Jiang Zemin of China has likened nuclear weapons to the sharp sword of Damocles hanging over our heads by a single hair and threatening humanity with its ever-present peril. In an editorial on June 16th, he called for the negotiation of a convention on the comprehensive ban of nuclear weapons and added, "Countries that have not yet joined the [Nuclear Non-Proliferation] treaty should do so at the earliest possible date so as to make it truly universal." He added, "Since biological and chemical weapons have been prohibited, there is no reason why nuclear weapons which are more destructive, should not be comprehensively banned and thoroughly destroyed."

Progress in nuclear disarmament cannot be achieved without global strategic equilibrium and stability, President Jiang Zemin emphasized. "Research for and development, deployment and proliferation of sophisticated anti-missile systems, and revision of or even withdrawal from, the existing disarmament treaties, would inevitably exert a negative impact on international security and stability, triggering new arms races and obstructing disarmament and nonproliferation efforts."

He urged efforts for "early entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty" and recognized that recent nuclear tests by India and Pakistan have made the task more pressing. He announced that the Chinese government will soon submit the treaty to the National Peoples Congress for ratification. (International Herald Tribune, June 16, 1999)

Clinton and Yeltsin Will Discuss START III In September

Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin agreed to discuss changes to the linchpin accord on nuclear weapons as well as the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty at their September 1999 meeting.

The ABM Treaty sets limits on the type of systems that Russia and the United States can deploy to intercept incoming missiles. President Yeltsin's agreement to discuss the ABM Treaty is a change from his past position in which he stressed that the 1972 ABM Treaty was a cornerstone of political stability and that any changes to it could move the two countries from a defensive into an offensive stance. Clinton has pledged \$6.6 billion for the development of missile defense. Bipartisan majorities in the US Senate and House passed the National Missile Defense Act to "make it US policy to deploy as soon as technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack (whether accidental, unauthorized, or deliberate)..." Clinton could sign the legislation this

month.

The START III Treaty would reduce nuclear arms on both sides to roughly 2,000 apiece (from a Cold War high of 30,000). President Yeltsin pledged to work this summer toward the ratification of the START II Treaty, which has been stalled in the Duma. (New York Times, June 21, 1999)

US Senate Kills Nuclear Weapons Reduction Amendment

Constructing the 2000 Defense Bill, the US Senate tabled an amendment allowing the US to reduce its nuclear weapons at a faster pace, by a vote of 56 to 44. At issue was how quickly the US should implement the START I and START II arms agreements, both ratified by the Senate. The 2000 Defense Bill prohibits the US from going beyond START I reductions until Russia implements START II. The now-tabled amendment would have removed that statutory limit action, allowing the US administration more flexibility in moving to lower levels of nuclear arms. (Washington Post, June 6, 1999)

=====

FUTURE OF DOE

=====

Possible New Agency For US Nuclear Weapons Program

The report from the presidential panel on nuclear weapons security has recommended creation of a new agency to oversee the \$6 billion-a-year US nuclear weapons program. The DOE nuclear weapons complex presently includes weapons laboratories, reactors and assembly plants that employ more than 30,000 workers. "These weapons are not safe," said the panel's chair, former Senator Warren Rudman (R-NH). In light of recent Chinese nuclear spying he added, "These secrets are not safe." He might have added that the world is not safe so long as these weapons exist. We hope that Senator Rudman and the current members of the Senate read Jiang Zemin's recent editorial (see above), and become serious about fulfilling their obligations to achieve the elimination of nuclear weapons globally. (Washington Post June 20 and June 26, 1999; Associated Press, June 21, 1999)

=====

NUCLEAR WASTE AND TERRORISM

=====

Nevada Governor Files Petition With NRC To Re-Examine Security

Nevada Governor Kenn Guinn asked the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission to re-evaluate its requirements for safeguarding spent fuel shipments in light of the changing nature of threats involving domestic terrorism and sabotage, including the greater accessibility of new and powerful armor-piercing weapons. These rules have not been revised since the 1970s. The present rules do not take into account the availability of modern weapons and delivery systems that could be used by terrorists and others not only on the shipments themselves, but also on bridges, tunnels and rail

lines throughout the country.

The petition asks that all new rules be published and made readily available to the public. Nevada's Attorney General Frankie Sue Del Papa encouraged others to join in the rulemaking effort, states, local governments, Indian tribes, public interest groups, all who are concerned about the security and safety of nuclear materials transportation. She argues that "the current regulations expose the public -- not just in Nevada, but in almost every state in the country -- to potentially unacceptable levels of risk when it comes to the transportation of highly radioactive materials." (June 24, 1999 - <http://www.businesswire.com>)

=====
NAS PANEL LISTENS TO HANFORD STUDY CRITICS
=====

Doses Were Underestimated, Math Incorrect

For eight hours in a Spokane hotel conference room, a parade of scientists, state health officials and Hanford activists skewered the \$18 million Hanford Thyroid Disease Study, conducted by the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center of Seattle for the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. On June 20 the special fact-finding subcommittee from the National Academy of Science (NAS) listened as Hanford downwinders and others assailed the study which reported no link between Hanford's Iodine 131 releases and increased thyroid cancer in 3,441 people born near Hanford from 1940 to 1946.

Trisha Pritikin, attorney and Hanford downwinder now living in Berkeley California, said that "significant thyroid disease was found, but that message was buried." She added that the Hanford doses are general estimates at best, and the study is inconclusive. Keith Baverstock of the World Health Organization spoke to the panel by telephone from Finland and also questioned the validity of the study. Serious problems include a mathematical error in the estimation of doses, the actual Iodine 131 releases to the environment from 1951 to 1957, which were underestimated by 2.5 times. Also in question is the correct calculation of releases from several plutonium reprocessing plants at Hanford in the 1950s. (Spokane Spokesman-Review, June 20, 1999)

=====
AMERICA MOVING CLOSER TO UN DEBT PAYMENT
=====

Senate Votes to Pay \$819 Million of \$1.6 Billion Owed

US Senate has passed the Helms-Biden Plan to pay \$819 million of the US debt to the United Nations, by a count of 98-1 in June, moving the legislation along to the House and, ultimately, President Clinton for approval. The US is currently assessed at a rate of 25 percent for the UN's regular budget and approximately 31 percent for peacekeeping. The proposed payment is conditional on a decision by UN member states that the US share

of the UN Regular Budget would be reduced to 20% and the US share of peacekeeping would decline to 25%. US arrears now total \$1.6 billion. The decision by the Senate was reportedly the result of a compromise between Senator Jesse Helms and Secretary of State Madeleine Albright. In exchange for agreeing to the payment conditions, Albright was believed to have secured the confirmation of Richard Holbrooke as US Ambassador to the UN. (Washington Weekly Report, June 24, 1999; <http://www.unausa.org>)

=====
WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION
=====

British Columbians Say "No Nukes"

The Canadian federal government seeks to re-lease a seabed offshore British Columbia to the US Navy for use in torpedo testing. The seabed is an essential component of the ongoing weapons testing activities in the Strait of Georgia. The lease terms would allow the US Navy ships to bring nuclear warhead torpedos into the Strait without having to "confirm or deny." Weapons testing cannot continue without a renewed lease or license to occupy the seabed. The province of British Columbia, which is nuclear-free, is opposed to renewing the lease unless the federal government agrees to a no-nukes clause. The province has collected statements from more than 2,500 objecting to Ottawa's attempted expropriation of the Nanoose seabed. At least several hundred of these objectors will meet the qualifications to appear at hearings that must be held before the expropriation can proceed and the lease be renewed. Ottawa had planned to complete the lease renewal arrangement by September 4th, the date of the lease expiration; however, the lengthy hearings are likely to go past that date. Canadian forces and the US Navy have been using the Nanoose seabed for torpedo testing since 1965. (For more information, go to the website of the Nanoose Conversion Campaign/Nuclear Free Georgia Strait at http://www.user.dccnet.com/lagasse/Nuclear_Free_Georgia_Strait/nanoose.html)

Great Britain Has Shortage of Nuclear Bomb Designers - Youth Not Interested

Senior staff at the Atomic Weapons Establishment (AWE) at Aldermaston is trying to persuade scientists that its work is still relevant. According to a recent news article, the staff are concerned that British expertise in thermonuclear weapons design could decline unless the current generation of bomb-makers and testers is replaced as they retire. AWE hopes to persuade talented young scientists that H-bomb making is not necessarily all megadeath and destruction.

Robin Bradley, AWE chief executive, admitted that their poor public image "does not make it easy to recruit." Life has also become harder for the weapons scientists these days because of Britain's adherence to international bans on nuclear testing. The UK ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1996. (Daily Telegraph; Issue 1487; June 21, 1999)

=====

SIGN UP FOR THE BILLIONAIRES CLUB

=====

465 Billionaires Count Their Loose Change

Expanding at hyperspace speed, newly created Internet wealth and a rising stock market have pushed the collective net worth of the richest 200 working people beyond one trillion dollars. The billionaires club now numbers 465. Not surprisingly, the Forbes Magazine 13th Annual World's Billionaires List for the World's Working Rich is topped by Microsoft co-founder and chairman Bill Gates in first place with \$90 billion. In second place is investor Warren Buffet at \$36 billion. In Forbes list of wealthy Kings, Queens, and Dictators, the number one spot is held by the Sultan of Brunei with \$30 billion in wealth; and number three is Iraq's President Saddam Hussein with \$6 billion. Meanwhile, thousands of children die daily from starvation and preventable diseases. (Associated Press, June 21, 1999)

=====

EVENTS

=====

More events are listed at http://www.napf.org/calendar/events_current.html

July 8

Third anniversary of the International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion on the illegality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons

July 16

54th anniversary of the first nuclear explosion, the Trinity Test at Alamogordo, New Mexico

July 16 - ACTION

CTBT Call-In Day. The Disarmament Clearinghouse is organizing a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Call-In Day to the Senate on this day. Write, phone, fax, and tell your senators to do everything in their power to ratify the CTBT this year. For guidance and more information phone (202)898-0150 or e-mail disarmament@igc.org

July 23-24

Fourth "Tokyo Forum" on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, Tokyo.

July 26-Sept. 8

U.N. Conference on Disarmament, third session of 1999, Geneva. For a summary of the statements addressing stalemate in the work of the Conference on Disarmament, which ended June 25, 1999, go to <http://www.unog.ch/news2/documents>

July 25

National Day to acknowledge the devastation of indigenous peoples by the nuclear industry. Contact: Commemorating the anniversaries of French nuclear testing at Bikini Atoll and the nuclear accident at Rio Puerco. Indigenous Environmental Network, POB 485, Bemidji, MN 56619, USA;

ien@igc.apc.org

August 1-7

5th Triennial World Indigenous Peoples' Conference on Education. Hilo, Hawai'i. Contact: (808)934-7722, or <http://admin.hawcc.hawaii.edu/wipc>

August 3-9: World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs. For more information, contact antiatom@twics.com.

August 6 and August 9

54th anniversary of Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings - commemorative events in Japan and around the world. For more information, go to http://www.napf.org/calendar/events_current.html

August 6

Sadako Peace Day. Ceremony at the Sadako Peace Garden at La Casa de Maria in Santa Barbara. Sponsored by the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. For more information, directions, place, and time, call (805)965-3443.

August 9

Livermore Conversion Project is coordinating a rally and nonviolent direct action at the Livermore Nuclear Weapons Laboratory. For information call (510)832-4347.

August 6-8

Beyond the Bomb: A New Agenda for Peace and Justice, Albuquerque, NM, contact Bruce Hall, Peace Action, panukes@igc.apc.org. See <http://www.peace-action.org/beyond.html>

August 9

Peace Action will also stage a non-violent protest at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico. The ability to produce primary nuclear weapons explosives is being reestablished at that laboratory. Their weapons complex is performing major refurbishment of several weapon types, giving extended service to older nuclear bombs and the W-87 warhead, which is used on the MX intercontinental ballistic missile. The first W-87s were delivered to the Air Force last month. Go to <http://www.peace-action.org/beyond.html>

=====
RESOURCES
=====

General Lee Butler's Acceptance Speech for the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation's Distinguished Peace Leadership Award, April 30, 1999, is available online at <http://www.wagingpeace.org/>. In this speech General Butler describes his experience as a former commander-in-chief of the Strategic Air Command; outlines his critique of the U. S. nuclear weapons policy; and examines the task to reduce and to eliminate the dangers posed by nuclear weapons.

<http://www.peacewire.org/campaigns/index.html> features excellent audio links to speeches by General Lee Butler and other key documents in the

campaign to get rid of all nuclear weapons.

Abolitionists in US and France are circulating an international appeal against both the National Ignition Facility (NIF) at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory and the Laser Megajoule in France. Both projects would develop high-energy lasers to achieve explosive nuclear fusion and maintain nuclear weapons capabilities. This is in violation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). As both the US and France have signed onto the CTBT and the NPT, the appeal urges the two nations to respect their commitments to these treaties by discontinuing the NIF and Megajoule and immediately declaring a moratorium on all such programs. To sign the petition or get more information, go to the website of Tri-Valley CAREs (Communities Against Radioactive Environment at <http://www.igc.org/tvc>

Presentations by NGOs to the 1999 Meeting of the Preparatory Committee for the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, May 11, 1999, United Nations, New York are available online at <http://www.peacenet.org/disarm/nptngo99.htm>

The Middle Powers Initiative (MPI) has a new website at www.middlepowers.org. It offers "Fast Track to Zero Nuclear Weapons" downloadable in PDF form. This is one of the finest current summaries of the major issues involved with nuclear weapons proliferation and abolition.

http://hiroshima.tomato.nu/English/index_e.html is a website designed to convey the spirit of Hiroshima and advocate nuclear weapons abolition and world peace. It features survivors' stories, a Peace Park Tour, letters from the world, and more. Hiroshima survivor Miyoko Matsubara prepared the site. Also of interest is the No More Nagasaki's site at <http://base.mng.nias.ac.jp/Nomore-e.html>. Links to all this and more are at <http://www.napf.org/peacelinks.html>.

To subscribe to an ongoing discussion for the youth perspective on The Hague Appeal for Peace, history's largest peace conference ever held, send a blank message to youthmovement-subscribe@egroups.com

=====
EDITORS
=====

David Krieger
Penny Sidoli

=====
SPONSOR
=====

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"
with "unsubscribe sunflower-napf" in the body of the message.
For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send
"help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Two reminders and a status report on the CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

Next Meeting

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT will meet on Tuesday, July 20 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the FCNL Conference Room, 245 Second Street, NE, Washington, DC

Request for Information

A couple of weeks ago I wrote you requesting information on how your denomination or association is prepared to push for Senate ratification of the CTBT. I want to use this compilation to demonstrate to the political arm of the Clinton Administration that there is strong faith-based support for the CTBT around the country. So far I have had only one reply. Therefore, I repeat my request.

What I am seeking is a paragraph or so that shows what you will be doing when the CTBT is up for consideration by the Senate. You might indicate the name of denomination or association, your basic policy toward the CTBT, name of central unit that is working on the CTBT, number of members in U.S., number of churches/meetings/synagogues, number of geographical bodies (diocese, conference, synod, etc.), titles of prelates or other officers who head these bodies and will be active in the ratification campaign, geographical officer or units that mobilize local churches on peace and justice issues, etc. You might indicate special ways you reach out to your constituency, such as through alerts and other communications to X number of persons or local units. You might indicate who you will be mobilizing to get in touch with their senators when the CTBT is before the Senate.

I realize that this is an extra burden on busy people, but I believe such a compilation will be useful. An e-mail reply would be easiest for me to work with, but I'll accept fax or regular mail. Thanks.

What's Happening in Congress

On June 28 five senators -- Dorgan, Spector, Kennedy, Jefforts, and Murray -- wrote to Senator Helms, urging him "to hold all necessary hearings and to report the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty to the Senate for timely consideration before the CTBT inaugural conference." The latter refers to the conference of ratifying states that will take place in the fall. For a copy of the final, signed version, go to <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctbltr062899.htm>> and for a copy of the Dorgan press release, see <<http://www.senate.gov/~dorgan/press/7299.pdf>>

During the week of July 19 there is likely to be a news conference involving these and other Democrats and Republicans to press for hearings on the CTBT. This will be followed by floor speeches by various senators.

When we meet on July 20 I would like to discuss whether we might circulate the letter to Helms and statements from the news conference and ask our grassroots networks to contact their senators, requesting them to likewise write to Senator Helms for public hearings on the CTBT and to join other senators in their public commitment to the CTBT. This could be the focus of grassroots activities during the August recess when a number of senators will make public appearances around their states.

Clinton Administration

We are still waiting to see whether the White House will make a serious push for CTBT ratification. One observer told me that dealing with the ABM treaty -- with Russia and with Senator Helms -- has a higher priority because national missile defense has become a major issue.

On July 6 the White House sent out a fax blast (Test Ban News), headlined "Prominent Republicans and Democrats call for CTBT Ratification". This is the first fax blast in quite a while and may or may not represent a renew campaign.

I have been unsuccessful in getting appointments with Chief of Staff John Podesta, Vice President Gore or his representative, and Mrs. Clinton. I will continue trying.

At the moment Senate Democrats are working harder for CTBT ratification than the Administration. We'll talk more about this on July 20. I'll see you then.

Shalom,
Howard

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, 9 Jul 1999 15:45:00 -0400
Subject: CTBT
Content-Disposition: inline

To: Howard Hallman
From: J. Daryl Byler
Date: 7/9/99 3:36:56 PM
Subj: CTBT

Hi Howard:

Thanks for the CTBT update.

Unfortunately, I plan to be in St. Louis on July 20, so I'll miss the next interfaith CTBT meeting.

Here's a quick summary.

Mennonite Central Committee has long opposed the development, testing and use of nuclear weapons. An MCC statement from 20 years ago states in part: "We believe that the concept of nuclear deterrence, which involves a trust in nuclear weapons, is a form of idolatry."

MCC supports the CTBT as a first step toward the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons.

MCC is the relief, development and peacebuilding agency of Mennonite and Brethren in Christ churches in North America.

Warm regards,
Daryl

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3
Date: Mon, 12 Jul 1999 15:40:47 -0400
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) bill bradley
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear Friends,

I just checked out Bill Bradley's website, www.billbradley.com and he asks for our personal stories. How about flooding him with our stories of how we are working for nuclear abolition? Did anyone check out any of the other websites? ie, Bush, Gore, etc? Maybe we can start putting nuclear abolition on the agenda right now. Regards,

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: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 09:35:13 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Dorgan on CTBT (again); CTBT call-in day, 7/16

July 12, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Dorgan makes 4th floor speech on CTBT

Attached below is the text of Senator Byron Dorgan's latest speech on the floor of the Senate on the importance of prompt Senate consideration and approval of the CTBT.

Also, please remember that this Friday, July 16, is the 54th anniversary of the first nuclear weapon test explosion and also "CTBT Call-In Day." See the Disarmament Clearinghouse's Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now! site <<http://www.psr.org/ctbtaction.htm>> for more details.

For other recent statements and analysis on the CTBT, see the Coalition's CTBT site <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

DK

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY (Senate - July 12, 1999)

[Page: S8206] Link to GPO's PDF version for this page.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we are now turning to a 4-week period here in the Senate in which we will work, prior to the August recess, on a range of issues--today beginning with the Patients' Bill of Rights, and then turning to appropriations bills and other matters.

I want to call to everyone's attention two issues that are of vital concern that I think ought to be and must be part of the Senate agenda. The first is an issue dealing with the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is something that has been before the Senate now for some long while. Efforts to achieve a nuclear test ban treaty originated with President Eisenhower. It has been around a long time. This President, after long negotiations through many administrations, finally signed the treaty. It has now been sent to the Senate for ratification. But it has languished in the Senate for 658 days, during which time there has not been even a hearing on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

I will put up a couple of charts to describe the circumstances with this

treaty.

The rule in the Senate requires that the Senate should consider treaties as soon as possible after their submission.

In fact, the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963 was considered by the Senate in 3 weeks; SALT I, 3 months; the ABM Treaty, 10 weeks; ABM Treaty Protocols, 14 months; START I, 11 months.

We have had the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty before the Senate for 658 days with not even a hearing. I think that is a shame. This treaty ought to be part of this Senate's agenda. If we do not have a hearing and do not ratify this treaty by the end of September, we will have only a limited role when a conference is formed in October of the countries that have ratified this treaty to discuss its entry into force. It does not make any sense to me.

This country ought to lead on issues concerning the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. One way to lead on those issues is to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It does not make any sense for the treaty to have been signed, negotiated and sent to this Senate, and then to have it languish for all of these days.

I would like to put up a chart which shows a concern that some of the critics have. They say: Well, gosh, with all this Chinese espionage, the last thing we want, is to do something with respect to a treaty on banning nuclear tests.

The Cox report on the Chinese espionage makes references to the CTBT. The report says it will be more difficult for the Chinese to develop advanced nuclear weapons if we have this treaty in place. If the People's Republic of China violated the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by testing surreptitiously to further accelerate its nuclear development, we could detect it given the monitoring system imposed by the treaty. If the Chinese are signatories to the treaty and the Russians are signatories to the treaty--and they are waiting for us--and we can stop testing, the only conceivable way they could validate any kind of nuclear stockpile is through the use of advanced computers. The restrictions imposed by the CTBT make it extremely difficult or impossible to improve nuclear weapons designs except by high performance computers.

The Cox report appears to make the point that it is more important for us to restrict the shipment of advanced computers to the Chinese.

The point is this--we deserve an opportunity to debate the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. We should have done so long ago. I don't mean to argue the merits of it on the floor today.

My hope is, we will not go through July as if this treaty doesn't exist. It was negotiated, signed, and has been before the Senate over 600 days. There hasn't been one hearing. There ought to be a hearing. It ought to be brought to the floor so the American people can, through this Senate, debate that treaty.

Finally, support for the nuclear test ban : 75 percent, 74 percent, 85 percent, 80 percent, these are national polls over time, always consistently high support for this kind of a treaty. This Congress has a responsibility. I say to my colleagues who really don't want to do this: You have a responsibility to the country to do this. I hope that in the month of July we can make progress in passing this Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

[Page: S8207] Link to GPO's PDF version

for this page.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send a resolution to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 09:40:24 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: CTBT Working Group Mtg. 7/16, 9:30am

July 13, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: CTBT Wkg. Grp. Mtg., July 16 at 9:30am at 100 MD. Ave. NE, Conf. Room 4

The next CTBT Working Group Meeting of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers will be held this Friday from 9:30-10:30am.

PLEASE NOTE that the meeting will take place at 100 Maryland Avenue NE (the Methodist Building), conference room #4. The entrance is located at the intersection of Maryland Avenue and 1st Street NE, across from the Supreme Court.

Attached below is the draft meeting agenda and update of NGO activities in support of the CTBT. Please come to the meeting with your ideas and suggestions. Contact Tom Collina (332-0900 or tcollina@ucsusa.org) or me if you have questions or suggestions.

DK

CTBT Working Meeting, July 16, 1999

Introductions

1. Pursuing Our "Post-Kosovo" Plan of Action on CTBT - Reports and Discussion

- A. Report on Meetings with Administration officials (John Isaacs)
- B. Report on Hill Developments (John Isaacs and Daryl Kimball)
- C. CTBT polling and dissemination (Daryl Kimball)
 - * National Polling Press Conference -- July 20
 - * North Carolina (underway) and Washington (completed) State Polls
- D. Report on CTBT Call-In Day (July 16) and other Grassroots Activities (Joan Wade)
- E. Generating News Coverage
 - * op-eds
 - * editorials (Matt Henson)
 - * Scientists letter (Tom Collina) and other expert letters

3. Update on Article XIV Special Conference

- * NGO letter to conference organizers

*An Ad Hoc Lobbying Meeting Will Follow

NGO PUBLIC EDUCATION ACTIVITIES ON THE CTBT (7/12/99)

MAY (Underway or Ongoing)

* Interfaith CTBT petition drive from March-May. Petitions signed by 8000 people from 23 states and delivered to Senators in field offices and sign-on letter from various denominational leaders is delivered to Senate offices in DC. For more information on the petition, see <<http://www.loga.org/CTBTalt.htm>>

* 20/20 Vision CTBT action alert postcard to members on CTBT. A total of 26,000 CTBT "Action-Alert" post-cards have been distributed since March by 25 organizations to their memberships and by individual activists. Several of these groups (including PSR and others) are also sending additional action alert mailings to their memberships.

* Individual meetings with Senate CTBT aides to deliver collections of letters written by leaders of 20 national organization with grassroots members.

* CDI documentary on CTBT aired on PBS stations; distributed to 100 grassroots leaders for presentations to member and outreach to new groups by Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers has been pitching defense and political reporters on the CTBT-COX Committee-Senate inaction story resulting in coverage by Associated Press and Albuquerque Journal.

* Special campaign to deliver letters to Jesse Helms urging action on CTBT, asking constituents to include photos of their children with plea for hearings organized by Interfaith CTBT Working Group.

JUNE-JULY (Underway or Planned)

* Representatives of 5 major religious denominations (representing 60 million) met with Sen. Lott's foreign affairs aide in early June.

* June 15 Coalition letter sent to the President urging immediate action on the CTBT.

* Meetings with key Clinton Administration officials, being coordinated by John Isaacs and other NGOS. Contact John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org> for more information.

* Op-ed placement effort by 20/20 Vision in IN, KS, MS, NE, OR, TN underway.

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers op-ed and columnists effort underway. Has produced 2 placements and one pro-CTBT column as of June 29.

* Editorial board advisory on CTBT and follow-up calls by National Security News Service underway.

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers-commissioned Washington state-specific poll released July 6.

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers-commissioned North Carolina state-specific poll released week of July 20.

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers-commissioned bipartisan national polling on public attitudes on the CTBT. Results will be available by the week of June 21; public release date set for July 20.

* CTBT Conference Call Training for New Mexico 20/20 Vision members and Catholic Church activists and leaders, organized by 20/20 Vision on June 29. Previous CTBT conference call trainings have reached nearly 200 activists in 25 key states. Contact Marie Rietmann for more information <ctbt@2020vision.org>

* Background briefing for reporters organized by Office of Sen. Dorgan and LAWS. LAWS paper rebutting arguments against the CTBT made by Heritage Foundation released. (See <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/laws062299.htm>>)

* Senate lobbying by grassroots activists in state and DC offices over July 3-11 recess. Contact Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org> or Marie Rietmann <ctbt@2020vision.org> for more information.

* CTBT "Call-In Day" to the Senate on July 16, organized by the Disarmament Clearinghouse (and allied groups Peace Action, PSR, 20/20 Vision, WAND, FCNL). Flyers and postcards to publicize the activity are available. Contact Joan Wade at <disarmament@igc.org> or 898-0150.

* Green Group (presidents of 12 major environmental organizations) letter of support for the CTBT to Senators, to be delivered in late-June. Contact Marie Rietmann <ctbt@2020vision.org> or Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>

* Nobel-laureates letter of support for the CTBT/public event being organized by Francis Slakey of the American Physical Society. Release date not yet set.

* New letter of support for the CTBT from nuclear weapon scientists (to follow up on similar effort in 1998, see <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ucsltr.htm>>) being organized by Tom Collina of the Union of Concerned Scientists. Release date not yet set.

* Letter of support for the CTBT from women's groups being organized by PeaceLinks. Release date not set.

* Letter of support for the CTBT from several dozen historians, including Stephen Ambrose and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., being organized by Daryl Kimball of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. Release date not yet set.

NOTE: a list of NGOs and prominent individuals who support the CTBT is available from the Coalition through a hidden link on the Coalition Web

Site at <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbtlist.htm>>

AUGUST

* Peace Action National Congress & Demonstration, Los Alamos, NM, August 6-9

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER

* Womens Action for New Directions/Womens Legislators Lobby National Conference & Lobby Day, September 26-28

* Article XIV Special Conference on CTBT EIF scheduled for October 6-8 in Vienna. NGO activities still being planned.

Compiled by Daryl Kimball with assistance from CTBT Working Group members
(7/12/99)

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnnd.org>>

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Tue, 13 Jul 1999 10:37:44 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
X-Accept-Language: en
To: btiller@psr.org, dealertingana@lists.speakeasy.org, mupj@igc.org,
jdi@clw.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, jdean@ucsusa.org,
tcollina@ucsusa.org, fteplitz@peace-action.org, kcrandall@psr.org,
dkimball@clw.org, johnpike@fas.org, mkrepon@stimson.org,
smk@armscontrol.org, bmsil@psr.org, basicusa@igc.org
Subject: Proposed de-alerting resolution

Rep. Ed Markey would like to introduce a House resolution on de-alerting sometime soon. The first draft developed by Markey's staff is pasted below. I volunteered to receive comments from NGOs and collate them for Markey's staff. So I encourage you to send me your comments over the next few days, and I will pass them along. I have already told Markey's staff that I think grassroots folks will not be happy with the first Resolved.

Shalom,
Bob Tiller

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress that nuclear weapons should be taken off
hair-trigger alert.

Whereas accidental or mistaken launch of a nuclear missile could devastate
a city, and launch of a nuclear force could wreak worldwide destruction;

Whereas the United States and Russia currently maintain thousands of nuclear weapons on "hair-trigger" alert, such that they can be fired within
minutes;

Whereas in several incidents false signals of missile attacks have triggered a process in which National leaders had to decide in only a few minutes
whether to fire nuclear weapons;

Whereas the failure of computers to recognize the year 2000 date change could infect command, control, communications, and intelligence systems,

causing false signals or blank monitoring screens;

Whereas Russian monitoring and control systems are deteriorating;

Whereas tensions between Russia and the United States are increasing due to

a number of policy disagreements;

Whereas a massive preemptive attack attempting to destroy the nuclear weapons capability of the United States is extremely unlikely, and mutual

measures to slow the firing of nuclear weapons would make a preemptive strike even more difficult;

Whereas much of the nuclear force of the United States, including submarines at sea, is almost invulnerable and thus would preserve retaliatory ability through a nuclear attack, making immediate firing of weapons unnecessary;
Whereas President Bush in 1991 ordered a unilateral stand-down of United

States strategic bombers and de-alerted some missiles, and Soviet President Gorbachev quickly reciprocated with similar actions, improving bilateral

relations and national security; and
Whereas there are several ways that land and submarine based weapons could be temporarily disabled, with times ranging from minutes to weeks in order to reactivate them:

Now, therefore be it Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that-

(1) the United States should immediately take off of hair-trigger alert

as many of its nuclear weapons as is feasible and consistent with strategic

plans, and should encourage Russia to reciprocate, in hopes of decreasing

the risk of accidental or mistaken firing of nuclear weapons;

(2) the Department of Defense and the State Department should study methods to increase further the time needed to launch all nuclear missiles

and study the effect these actions would have on nuclear deterrence, relations with other recognized nuclear powers, the international nuclear

nonproliferation regime, and other aspects of national security;

(3) the President should expedite the establishment of a United States-Russian joint early-warning center to ensure accurate detection of

any missiles and effective communication in the event of a false alarm, computer malfunction, accident, or diplomatic crisis, as set forth in the

"Joint Statement on the Exchange of Information on Missile Launches and Early Warning", agreed to in 1998, and should facilitate the establishment

of a temporary center before the end of 1999 that could address any problems which might arise due to the failure of computers to recognize the year

2000 date change.

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

At 10:37 AM 7/13/99 -0400, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Rep. Ed Markey would like to introduce a House resolution on de-alerting
>sometime soon. The first draft developed by Markey's staff is pasted
>below. I volunteered to receive comments from NGOs and collate them
>for Markey's staff. So I encourage you to send me your comments over
>the next few days, and I will pass them along.

Bob,

I have mixed feelings about the Markey resolution. I'm glad that he is bringing the issue before the House. But I am bothered by repeated statements that preserve the legitimacy of nuclear deterrence, which I consider an immoral policy. Such as:

Whereas 1 that suggests that the U.S. would retaliate to an accidental launch by wreaking worldwide destruction.

Whereas 8 that speaks of preserving retaliatory ability.

Clause 1 that stops short of total de-alerting.

Clause 2 that speaks of continuing deterrence rather than at how to eliminate nuclear weapons altogether.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
From: "Janet Bloomfield" <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
To: "Abolition-Europe" <abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de>,
<abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,
"abolitionusa" <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
Subject: (abolition-usa) A2000 Co-ordinating Committee Conference Call Minutes July 1999.
Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 14:35:43 +0100
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2014.211
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

MINUTES OF ABOLITION CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL JULY 8, 1999.

(Action items in Capitals)

1. Present: Janet Bloomfield, Alice Slater, Ross Wilcox, , Jackie Cabasso, John Burroughs (substitute for Alyn Ware), Carah Ong (substitute for David Krieger)
Apologies: Hiro Umbeyashi, Richard Salvador
Facilitator - Jackie, Note taker - Janet.

2. Financial update: No firm information as David was not on the call. CARAH will ask David to circulate a report on e-mail when he gets back to the office. We need to really make an effort with fundraising.

3. The New Co-ordinator: We welcomed Carah who reported that she was engaged in learning about the job. We stressed that we are all available for help and advice and support. Carah asked about how we should respond to requests for a hard copy mailing of the HAP minutes. It was AGREED that we should circulate the minutes with a covering letter etc as a hard copy mailing as soon as possible. ALICE will put up a list of items that should go in the mailing. The circulation would be handled as follows:

USA - Alice
Europe - Xanthe (need to check if this would include Russia)
UK - Janet
Canada - Ross
Rest of the World - Carah

4. Global Council:

The following names were added to the Global Council GC):-

Dave Knight - CND (UK)
Myrla Baldonado - (Philippines)
Amos Guirtz - (Israel)
Andy Lichterman - (USA)

It was AGREED to invite Vera Brovinka (ALICE) and Boris Bonderenko (ROSS) to join the Global Council
It was AGREED that ROSS would set up a listserv for the Global Council. ROSS and ALICE would discuss the technicalities and costs of setting up an Abolition bulletin board to reduce the amount of postings to the main listserv. The relationship between the ACC and Global Council and the functioning of both was discussed at length. It was AGREED that when these minutes were circulated that they stress that the ACC needs the advice, counsel and feedback of the Global Council. It was also AGREED that the ACC should put concrete suggestions to the GC for further discussion and agreement and should solicit their concrete suggestions for action. (SEE LIST AT THE END OF THESE MINUTES)

5. Action Items from the Hague Meeting:

- (a.) The Week of Action - March 1 to 8, 1999. CARAH would contact the people identified in the Hague minutes agreed to work on this and find out if they were doing anything. The proposal should be re-circulated to the abolition-caucus with a request for ideas and input and the GC should be asked to consider this. It was AGREED that CARAH should re-post the Calendar every month to the caucus.
- (b.) Working Groups Status: It was AGREED that CARAH would contact all the Working Group Convenors to establish their true status. JANET would help CARAH draft a letter. We discussed both the new groups established at the Hague. The Y2K group was active. Need to check with Daniel Durand what is happening with the CD monitoring group
- (c.) NPT Review Plan of Action: ALICE would put up her proposal for discussion. JANET would contact Zia as to how we can get a discussion on the Amendment Proposal moving. Jackie reported that WILPF are trying to get funding to provide a better infrastructure and co-ordination for NGO activity at the Review.
- (d.) John Burroughs reported that a HAP Steering Committee was being established to carry forward the work of the Hague conference. Each campaign strand would have a representative. Admiral Ramdas had been suggested as a possible Abolition rep. There was support for this name but we asked John to find out more and keep us informed.

6. Action items from St Petersburg Meeting:

The report and declaration had been sent to the Documentation Centre of the OSCE by Ross. This will be forwarded to the meeting in St Petersburg. It was AGREED that we should propose to the Global Council that the St Petersburg Declaration be circulated for endorsement as widely as possible for presentation to the Istanbul OSCE Summit in November. In the meantime lobbying of OSCE parliamentary representatives should be encouraged. JANET would circulate the action ideas on the OSCE produced in St Petersburg.

7. Other Action Items:

- (a.) Concern was expressed about the nuclear dangers of the confrontation in South Asia. We ask the Global Council to consider what action A2000 could take on this in addition to what people are already doing.
- (b.) New Agenda Coalition Resolution will go the UN in October. There is work to be done to pressure NWS's and to move abstentions to positive votes.
- (c.) ICJ Resolution also needs support.

A.O.B.

CARAH to ask David Krieger to circulate his proposal for a Handbook for discussion on the next call.

NEXT CALL:

August 12.13 (depending on your time zone!) at 10.00pm GMT, 5.00pm EST.

CARAH will set up.

JANET to circulate draft agenda one week before.

EVERYONE PLEASE USE E-MAIL TO CIRCULATE IDEAS AND OPTIONS BEFORE THE CALL.

CARAH to contact Pol and find out why he has missed our calls.

N.B ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION BY GLOBAL COUNCIL:

- (a.) The March Week of Action
- (b.) Circulation of the St Petersburg Declaration
- (c.) Work on the UN resolutions
- (d.) Activity at the NPT Review 2000
- (e.) Situation in South Asia

(f.) Fundraising

Janet Bloomfield
25 Farmadine
Saffron Walden
Essex
CB11 3HR
England
Tel/Fax: +44 (0)1799 516189
e-mail: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

<HTML><HEAD>

<META content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1" http-equiv=Content-Type>

<META content="MSHTML 5.00.2014.210" name=GENERATOR>

<STYLE></STYLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>

<DIV>

<P>MINUTES OF ABOLITION CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE CONFERENCE CALL JULY 8, 1999.

(Action items in Capitals)

1.Present: Janet Bloomfield, Alice Slater, Ross Wilcox, , Jackie Cabasso, John Burroughs (substitute for Alyn Ware), Carah Ong (substitute for David Krieger)
Apologies: Hiro Umbeyashi, Richard Salvador
Facilitator - Jackie, Note taker - Janet.
</P>

<P>2. Financial update: No firm information as David was not on the call. CARAH will ask David to circulate a report on e-mail when he gets back to the office.

We need to really make an effort with fundraising.
</P>

<P>3. The New Co-ordinator: We welcomed Carah who reported that she was engaged in learning about the job. We stressed that we are all available for help and advice and support. Carah asked about how we should respond to requests for a hard copy mailing of the HAP minutes. It was AGREED that we should circulate the minutes with a covering letter etc as a hard copy mailing as soon as possible.

ALICE will put up a list of items that should go in the mailing. The circulation would be handled as follows:

USA - Alice
Europe - Xanthe (need to check if this would include Russia)
UK - Janet
Canada - Ross
Rest of the World - Carah

4. Global Council:
The following names were added to the Global Council GC):-
Dave Knight - CND (UK)
Myrla Baldonado - (Philippines)
Amos Guirtz - (Israel)
Andy Lichterman - (USA)
It was AGREED to invite Vera Brovinka (ALICE) and Boris Bonderenko (ROSS) to join the Global Council
It was AGREED that ROSS would set up a listserv for the Global Council. ROSS and ALICE would discuss the technicalities and costs of setting up an Abolition bulletin board to reduce the amount of postings to the main listserv.
The relationship between the ACC and Global Council and the functioning of both was discussed at length. It was AGREED that when these minutes were circulated that they stress that the ACC needs the advice, counsel and
feedback of the Global Council. It was also AGREED that the ACC should put concrete suggestions to the GC for further discussion and agreement and should solicit their concrete suggestions for action. (SEE LIST AT THE END OF THESE MINUTES)

5. Action Items from the Hague Meeting:
(a.) The Week

of Action - March 1 to 8, 1999. CARAH would contact the people identified in the Hague minutes agreed to work on this and find out if they were doing anything. The proposal should be re-circulated to the abolition-caucus with a request for

ideas and input and the GC should be asked to consider this. It was AGREED that CARAH should re-post the Calendar every month to the caucus.
(b.) Working Groups Status: It was AGREED that CARAH would contact all the Working Group Convenors to establish their true status. JANET would help CARAH draft a letter. We discussed both the new groups established at the Hague. The Y2K group was active. Need to check with Daniel Durand what is happening with the CD monitoring group
(c.) NPT Review Plan of Action: ALICE would put up her proposal for discussion. JANET would contact Zia as to how we can get a discussion on the Amendment Proposal moving. Jackie reported that WILPF are trying to get funding to provide a better infrastructure and co-ordination for NGO activity at the Review.
(d.) John Burroughs reported that a HAP Steering Committee was being established to carry forward the work of the Hague conference. Each campaign strand would have a representative. Admiral Ramdas had been suggested as a possible Abolition rep. There was support for this name but we asked John to find out more and keep us informed. </P>

<P>
6. Action items from St Petersburg Meeting:
</P>

<P>The report and declaration had been sent to the Documentation Centre of the OSCE by Ross. This will be forwarded to the meeting in St Petersburg. It was AGREED that we should propose to the Global Council that the St Petersburg Declaration be circulated for endorsement as widely as possible for presentation to the Istanbul OSCE Summit in November. In the meantime lobbying of OSCE parliamentary representatives should be encouraged. JANET would circulate the action ideas on the OSCE produced in St Petersburg.
</P>

<P>7. Other Action Items:
(a.) Concern was expressed about the nuclear dangers of the confrontation in South Asia. We ask the Global Council to consider what action A2000 could take on this in addition to what people are already doing.
(b.) New Agenda Coalition Resolution will go the UN in October. There is work to be done to pressure NWS's and to move abstentions to positive votes.
(c.) ICJ Resolution also needs support.
</P>

<P>A.O.B.

CARAH to ask David Krieger to circulate his proposal for a Handbook for discussion on the next call.

NEXT CALL:
</P>

<P>August 12.13 (depending on your time zone!) at 10.00pm GMT, 5.00pm EST.

CARAH will set up.
JANET to circulate draft agenda one week before.

EVERYONE PLEASE USE E-MAIL TO CIRCULATE IDEAS AND OPTIONS BEFORE THE CALL.

CARAH to contact Pol and find out why he has missed our calls.

N.B

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION BY GLOBAL COUNCIL:
(a.) The March Week of Action

(b.) Circulation of the St Petersburg Declaration
(c.) Work on the UN

resolutions
(d.) Activity at the NPT Review 2000
(e.) Situation in South

Asia
(f.) Fundraising </P>

<P>
Janet Bloomfield
25 Farmadine
Saffron Walden
Essex
CB11

3HR
England
Tel/Fax: +44 (0)1799 516189
e-mail: <FONT

size=2>jbloomfield@gn.apc.org

</P></DIV></BODY></HTML>

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: July 20 meeting of Interfaith Group for the CTBT
Cc: ctbt
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT will meet on Tuesday, July 20 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the FCNL Conference Room, 235 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC.

Among other matters we will assess the likelihood of Senate action on the CTBT during the remainder of this session of Congress. This will help us determine what (if any) grassroots actions to pursue in August and in the fall.

I will be out of town for a family event from early Friday morning, July 16 until noon on Tuesday, July 20. I won't have access to my e-mail messages prior to the meeting. Therefore, if you have anything to convey related to the meeting, please get in touch with Kathy Guthrie at kathy@fcnl.org.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Meeting of Interfaith Group for the CTBT
1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, July 20, 1999
FCNL conference room, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC.

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Status of CTBT
 - a. Congress
 - b. Administration
3. Polling results
4. Grassroots activities
 - a. August
 - b. September-October
5. Possible D.C. lobby day in September
6. Our meeting schedule for remainder of year
7. Other

Return-Path: <palee@pegasus.rutgers.edu>

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 15:24:47 -0400

From: Seok-Hwan Lee <palee@pegasus.rutgers.edu>

Reply-To: palee@pegasus.rutgers.edu

Organization: Rutgers University- Graduate Department of Public Administration

To: 1burton@os.dhhs.gov, abalutis@doc.gov, abramson@leadership.com, adean@napawash.org, afrye@email.cfr.org, ailchman@rockfound.org, alan_altshuler@harvard.edu, alzuck@aol.com, amerget@maxwell.syr.edu, amerspeaks@aol.com, andrew_fogarty@csx.com, austinb@ext.missouri.edu, awalsh@theipa.org, barry_white@omb.eop.gov, bekeartk@cacities.org, Bertsch.2@osu.edu, bhansell@icma.org, Bhillenb@NACO.Org, bill.fischer@cusys.edu, biller@praetor.usc.edu, bjs@wkkf.org, bmaynes@eurasia.org, bonser@indiana.edu, borrone_1@panynj.gov, borut@nlc.org, bradshirl@aol.com, bross@american.edu, bwamsley@prodigy.net, cban+@pitt.edu, cbarnett@dcfra.com, cbostron@erols.com, cggs@aol.com, citymgr@ci.dayton.oh.us, ckerwin@american.edu, cleve004@maroon.tc.umn.edu, clockwood@memun.org, cnewell@scs.cmm.unt.edu, cohe7300@mlb.com, cstenberg@ubmail.ubalt.edu, curtiss@tiger.hsc.edu, cwjinmsp@aol.com, David_Chu@rand.org, davidm@ci.salinas.ca.us, DeSeve_G@A1.eop.gov, dgarriso@saspe.dhhs.gov, dick.fogel@lmco.com, disneyd@pr.osd.mil, diw@flash.net, dmathiasen@compuserve.com, dolphnor@aol.com, donawalf@aol.com, donawolf@aol.com, dosborne@aol.com, dralloway@aol.com, drice@urogenesys.com, eabock@mailbox.syr.edu, eddavid@theadvisorygroup.com, ehollander@compact.org, ekellar@icma.org, ellen.schall@wagner.nyu.edu, embassy@sover.net, epa8106@epa.state.il.us, eperkins@ou.edu, eporter@well.com, featherh@dpw.state.pa.us, fesler@yale.edu, ffairban@ci.phoenix.az.us, fheady@unm.edu, fjt21@cnsvox.albany.edu, forsyd@mbia.com, fritschl@dickinson.edu, fstover@erols.com, future@u.washington.edu, FxHouse@compuserve.com, gcalvert@aol.com, gchristopher@napawash.org, gcopel@uis.edu, gcunning@azleg.state.az.us, gene.denton@jocoks.com, geno@uclink4.berkeley.edu, gfred@falcon.cc.ukans.edu, ggoodman@mml.org, gilambert@acf.dhhs.gov, gjohnson@os.dhhs.gov, gmossing@aol.com, goodsell@vt.edu, gordon.sherman@ssa.gov, gorham@ui.urban.org, grahamww@aol.com, gsis@ccs.sogang.ac.kr, gtseaborg@lbl.gov, hbf24@aol.com, herberta@borfl.org, hhatry@ui.urban.org, hillsman@ojp.usdoj.gov, hinchmanj@gao.gov, hjasper@mminet.com, hmessner@acec.org, hwest@atlreg.com, ipuadm01@uconnvm.uconn.edu, irvings.aimd@gao.gov, cban+@pitt.edu, jbrown@os.dhhs.gov, jcolvard@crosslink.net, jdvaldez@u.arizona.edu, jennadorn@aol.com, jfearnsi@mitre.org, jfischbach@ci.fort-collins.co.us, Jh@airmail.net, jim.murley@dca.state.fl.us, jjkirlin@ix.netcom.com, jjun@csuhayward.edu, jmd@mit.edu, jnorwood@nas.edu, jodia@microsoft.com, johnnan@esper.com, Jonathan_D._Breul@omb.eop.gov, jonathan_howes@unc.edu, jparr@usa.net, jpfiffne@gmu.edu, jpt6n@virginia.edu, jrogers@puafmail.umd.edu, jwreed@aol.com, kenneth.s.apfel@ssa.gov, Kettl@pegasus.rutgers.edu, Kettl@LaFollette.wisc.edu, kfsaunders@aol.com, kiepper@PBworld.com, king_no@sanbag.ca.gov, kingsburyn.ggd@gao.gov, koskinen@who.eop.gov, Kunde@uta.edu, lfisher@crs.loc.gov, lgawthrop@ubmail.ubalt.edu, lkorb@cfr.org, m.lipsky@fordfound.org, kenneth.s.apfel@ssa.gov, marshallgroup@mindspring.com, max.sherman@mail.utexas.edu,

mcdowell@intergov.com, mdestler@puafmail.umd.edu,
melissa.allen@ost.dot.gov, mgoldstein@dcfra.com, mguy@mailier.fsu.edu,
michael@maccoby.com, mKeane@sedona.net, mortimer.downey@ost.dot.gov,
mtg@u.washington.edu, mult.chair@co.multnomah.or.us, mupj@igc.apc.org,
murray@cua3.csuohio.edu, murrayr@CNA.org, nalband@falcon.cc.ukans.edu,
newcomer@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu, newland@usc.edu, nlynn1@uis.edu,
npeirce@citistates.com, nrice@fhlbsea.com, Page@PBworld.com,
paignrah@maxwell.syr.edu, pcl@pewtrusts.com, pete_andrews@unc.edu,
pfloreth@mhec.state.md.us, pisano@scag.ca.gov, pisano@usc.edu,
plsz@aol.com, pmcginnis@excelgov.org, podeen@bdm.com,
posnerp.aimd@gao.gov, profcom@aol.com, quillpen@u.washington.edu,
rawegman@gdblaw.com, rbd@udel.edu, rdavidso@bss2.umd.edu,
regina.v.k.williamsci.sj.ca.us@pegasus.rutgers.edu,
rhanson@umbc7.umbc.edu, richardmonteilh@hotmail.com,
rkleeman@gwis2.circ.gwu.edu, robert_putnam@harvard.edu,
robin@alliance4ed.org, ronei1@co.fairfax.va.us, ronmjboster@erols.com,
reischauer@brook.edu, rtgolem@uga.cc.uga.edu,
rtranter@socrates.berkeley.edu, rutledge@indiana.edu,
rwhite@theadvisorygroup.com, Rx4govt@compuserve.com,
sandrajh@maroon.tc.umn.edu, schcli@swbell.net,
schexnidera@wssu1.adp.wssu.edu, sdk@apscompany.com,
sfosler@napawash.org, s-gove@uiuc.edu, sminter@clevelandn.org,
sokeefe@maxwell.syr.edu, spayton@umich.edu, sschwab@puafmail.umd.edu,
steve_kelman@harvard.edu, stolchin1@gmu.edu, http:@igc.org
CC: mholzer@pipeline.com, olshfski@andromeda.rutgers.edu, olshfski@imcnet.net,
palee@pegasus.rutgers.edu
Subject: PPMR Call for Papers

To: Members in National Academy of Public Administration,

CALL FOR PAPERS

Public Productivity & Management Review seeks articles and commentaries from practitioners and academicians alike on public administration and public management, as well as proposals for featured topics (groupings of three to five articles on a particular subject). Manuscripts should conform to the following guidelines: Submit five typed, double-spaced copies. Include your title, name, and organizational affiliation on a separate cover sheet. Authors must closely follow the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (fourth edition). Submission to Public Productivity & Management Review implies that your article has not been simultaneously submitted to other journals or previously been published elsewhere. Blind review process normally takes up to 12 weeks. Send manuscripts and symposia proposals to:

Marc Holzer, Editor-in-Chief
Dorothy Olshfski, Managing Editor
Public Productivity & Management Review
Graduate Department of Public Administration
Rutgers University, 7th Floor, Hill Hall
360 King Blvd., Newark, NJ 07102

For further information, please visit our website at
<http://newark.rutgers.edu/~ncpp/publications/ppmr.html>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 09:26:11 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Dorgan on CTBT, July 16 & 19; 9 Sens. on CTBT

July 20, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Sen. Dorgan speaks on CTBT twice more; Nine Senators to speak at CTBT briefing today

Stepping his effort to put the CTBT on the Senate agenda, Senator Byron Dorgan took to the floor of the Senate for a sixth time in a month to speak about the importance of the test ban treaty to efforts to curb nuclear proliferation and make the world safer for future generations.

Attached below is the text of his latest speeches (July 16 and July 19).

Later today, Dorgan will be joined by eight other Senators including the Minority Leader, Tom Daschle (D-SD) and the ranking Democrats on the Foreign Relations (Biden D-DE), Armed Services (Levin D-MI), Intelligence Committees (Kerrey D-NE, along with Senators Specter (R-PA), Jeffords (R-VT), Bingaman (D-NM), and Murray (D-WA), in calling for action on the CTBT at a press briefing sponsored by the Coalition in the Capitol. The Coalition's new polling results on support for Senate approval of the CTBT will be released at the briefing.

DK

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE - JULY 16, 1999

A COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST BAN (Senate - July 16, 1999)

[Page: S8737]

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today is an anniversary that almost no one will recognize. It was 54 years ago today that the first nuclear explosion occurred at the Trinity Test Site in New Mexico. Mr. President, 54 years ago today we saw the first nuclear explosion on the face of the Earth. At that time, of course, we developed nuclear weapons because we were locked in a life and death struggle with the Axis powers. We developed nuclear weapons to end the most destructive war the world had ever seen, the Second World War. We then got involved in a cold war with the Soviets and we saw the buildup of thousands and thousands of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons, warheads, and delivery vehicles.

I want to tell you what President Dwight D. Eisenhower said towards the end of his term about the spread of nuclear weapons. He said not achieving a test ban--that is, a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons--`would have to be classified as the greatest disappointment of any administration of any decade of any time and of any party.' That belief, expressed by President Eisenhower, was echoed by President John F. Kennedy, who stated that a comprehensive nuclear test ban would `increase our security; it would decrease the prospects of war.' He said, `Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit.'

That was the late 1950s and the early 1960s. We still do not have a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in force, but we are close. Almost 3 years ago, this country, the United States, along with over 100 nations, signed a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. The President sent that treaty to the Senate 662 days ago. What has happened? What has been done with that treaty? Nothing. Not a hearing. Not a minute, not an hour, not a day of hearings, not one hearing on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

The only way another country in this world who wants to develop nuclear weapons can have some guarantee that they have nuclear weapons that work is if they can test them. That is true of China; it is true of any other country. A test ban treaty in which this country provides leadership, signs and ratifies it, is a significant step towards removing the dangers of the proliferation of nuclear weapons around the world. We ought to do this. We ought to be able to do it soon.

I used a chart on the floor of the Senate recently in which I showed the number of days it took to ratify treaties. No treaty that I am aware of languished here for over 600 days except this treaty.

We have a responsibility to lead in this country with respect to this treaty, and we are not leading. This treaty is before the Senate. The committee has a responsibility to hold a hearing and give the Senate the opportunity to debate the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. There is precious little discussion about it. No one seems to know it is here. It has been here almost 2 years.

Next week, several of my colleagues and I are going to hold a press conference to announce the results of a recent bipartisan poll that will demonstrate, once again, overwhelming support for this treaty. This chart shows the support all across this country from last year's poll. Overwhelmingly, the American people support a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

It has been negotiated, it has been signed, but it has not been ratified. Why? Because it was sent to the Senate over 600 days ago and there has been no debate about it, no discussion of it to speak of, and there has not been 1 minute of hearings held on this treaty. This Senate ought to have the opportunity to debate and to vote on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

I reach back to President Eisenhower to make the case only because I want to demonstrate how long the desire for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

has been around--decade after decade.

Most recently, when India and Pakistan detonated nuclear weapons, virtually under each other's chins--and these are countries that do not like each other much--it should have sent a signal to all of us that we need to be concerned about the proliferation of nuclear weapons. How do we manifest concern? By expressing leadership. How do we express leadership? By bringing a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty that has been negotiated and signed before this body for ratification.

I yield the floor.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE - JULY 19, 1999

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY (Senate - July 19, 1999)

[Page: S8810]

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I want to discuss an item of very significant importance that has brought me to the floor of the Senate several times and brings me here again today. That is the issue of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

I earlier mentioned President John F. Kennedy. President John F. Kennedy was very interested in a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. I want to describe why that is the case and relate it to the comments made by my colleague dealing with China in which he talked about accountability and responsibility. I agree with those terms and in most cases with the use of those terms on the floor of the Senate.

It was 54 years ago last Friday that the first nuclear explosion took place on this Earth; the first nuclear bomb was detonated 54 years ago last Friday. Virtually everything changed because of it.

Following the detonation of a nuclear device it was used to end the Second World War. Eventually nuclear weapons led to a cold war with the Soviet Union in which both sides began to stockpile thousands and thousands of nuclear bombs and nuclear weapons of various types. Presidents of the United States started talking about the need to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons, to keep them in as few hands as possible among the countries of the world. Many countries aspired to have nuclear bombs, nuclear weapons. However, it was obviously in the interests of the safety of humankind to try to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of those who aspired to have them.

President Eisenhower, in May of 1961, spoke about a ban on testing nuclear devices. If you can't test a nuclear device, you don't know whether you have one that works. A test ban effectively means that anyone who claims to have a nuclear weapon cannot claim to have a nuclear weapon that works because they will never know.

That is the value of a ban on testing, a ban that was aspired to as long

ago as President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who said the following:

"Not achieving a test ban would have to be classed as the greatest disappointment of any administration, of any decade, of any time and of any party."

He left office deeply disappointed that even in those early days long before the buildup of nuclear weapons existed so aggressively across the world, he was profoundly disappointed at not getting the test ban.

President John F. Kennedy got a test ban in place in 1963 dealing with atmospheric tests. The ban on atmospheric tests in 1963 was partially successful. He desired a total ban. He said:

"A test ban would place the nuclear powers in a position to deal more effectively with one of the greatest hazards man faces. . . . It would increase our security, it would decrease the prospects of war. Surely this goal is sufficiently important to require our steady pursuit, yielding neither to the temptation to give up the whole effort nor the temptation to give up our insistence on vital and responsible safeguards."

Now, since that time, we have seen more nations achieve the ability to build nuclear weapons and the ability to deliver them. We have seen our country and the Soviet Union stockpile tens of thousands of nuclear weapons. It is quite remarkable, the United States and Russia, together, currently have more than 30,000 nuclear weapons. China has nuclear weapons. The number, to the extent we know, is classified. But, it is a minuscule amount as compared to 30,000. We know from recent events that India and Pakistan both have nuclear weapons. Both have exploded nuclear devices literally beneath each other's chin--and these are two countries that don't like each other. Two countries with a common border, with a great deal of animosity, both testing nuclear devices in a provocative way. Other countries aspire to achieve or to obtain nuclear weapons.

What are we doing about all of this? There is a treaty that has been negotiated over a long period of time--in fact, ultimately over decades--and signed by 152 countries. It is a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty. That comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty is a treaty which prohibits the testing of nuclear weapons, it bans the explosive testing of nuclear weapons all across this world.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 13:00:41 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: News: CRND Poll on CTBT; 9 Sens. call for action; Clinton on CTBT

July 20, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: CTBT Poll News Release;
Nine Senators' Call for Action on Treaty;
Clinton Speaks on CTBT

This afternoon at a news conference sponsored by the Coalition on Capitol Hill, a group of nine Democratic and Republican Senators -- including Minority Leader Tom Daschle and Senators Biden (D-DE), Levin (D-MI), Kerrey (R-NE), Specter (R-PA), Jeffords (R-VT), Bingaman (D-NM), Murray (D-WA), and Dorgan (D-ND) -- will call for prompt Senate consideration and approval of the CTBT, citing overwhelming public (82%) support for the Treaty.

Earlier this morning, President Clinton spoke at some length in the Rose Garden on the importance of CTBT ratification and praised the efforts of the pro-CTBT Senators. He said, in part, "I believe it is strongly in our interest to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The American people consistently have supported it for more than 40 years now. At a minimum, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should hold hearings this fall... We have a chance right now to end nuclear testing forever. It would be a tragedy for our security and for our children's future to let this opportunity slip away. I thank those senators in both parties who today are announcing their clear intention not to do that."

In addition, Senator Harkin (D-IA) joined the nine other Senators urging action on the CTBT, and former Senator Mark O. Hatfield, co-author of the Exon-Hatfield-Mitchell nuclear testing moratorium act and member of the LAWS CTBT Support Committee, released a statement saying that "...Senators have a responsibility to the world, to the nation, and to their constituents to put partisan politics aside and allow the Senate to consider this Treaty."

Below is the e-mail text version of the Coalition's NEWS RELEASE on the CTBT polling results. In the attached WordPerfect 7.0 file is the final

version with charts.

Available on the Coalition's web site are:

* Coalition News Release <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/rel072099.htm>>

* Stmts. from Senators at CTBT Press Briefing (available Wednes.)
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/senators072099.htm>>

* Stmt. by the President on the CTBT, July 20 (available later today)

* Stmt. by Senator Mark O. Hatfield on CTBT Ratification
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/hatfield072099.htm>>

* Mellman/Withlin Polling Analysis
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/mellmanwirthlin0799.htm>>

For more information, contact the Coalition at 202-546-0795.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

"Eight in Ten Americans Support Test Ban Treaty:
More Want Senate Approval of Pact in Year Since South Asian Blasts

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: July 20, 1999

CONTACT: Adam Eiding 202-547-3577; or Daryl Kimball (202) 546-0795, ext. 136

(WASHINGTON, DC) An overwhelming majority of American voters want the U.S. Senate to approve the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), according to a new, bipartisan opinion survey. The CTBT will ban all nuclear test explosions and help prevent nations from making new and more deadly types of nuclear weapons.

When asked if the United States should approve or disapprove of a treaty which would prohibit nuclear weapons test explosions worldwide, over eight in 10 Americans (82%) want the Treaty approved. Indeed, more than 7 in 10 Americans (71%) support Treaty ratification strongly. Only 14% say the Treaty should not be approved.

An overwhelming majority of self-identified Republicans (80%) and Democrats (86%) support approval of the Treaty. Indeed even conservative Republicans (79%) support the Treaty overwhelmingly. Support for approval of the CTBT cuts across every demographic group. And support for the Test Ban Treaty has grown since India and Pakistan's nuclear blasts, when support for the Treaty was at 73% (The Mellman Group, May 1998).

These results are based on the findings of an opinion survey of 1000 adults conducted by Wirthlin Worldwide, a Republican polling firm, and a Democratic firm, The Mellman Group, from June 18-21. (The statistical margin of error is +/- 3.1 percentage points. The margin of error for

subgroups is larger.)

The Test Ban Treaty was transmitted to the Senate for its approval over a year-and-a-half ago, but Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC) has so far blocked its consideration, not even allowing a hearing on the Treaty in his Committee. It must be ratified by the U.S. and other key states before it enters into force. President Clinton has repeatedly stated that ratifying the Treaty is the best way to protect U.S. security and reduce the spread of nuclear weapons.

Today, nine Senators called for prompt action on the CTBT. At a press briefing on the CTBT on the polling data in the Capitol, Democratic and Republican Senators Daschle, Biden, Specter, Levin, Jeffords, Kerrey, Bingaman, Murray, and Dorgan called on Senator Helms to hold hearings and to report the Treaty to the Senate for consideration before an international conference to accelerate the Treaty's entry into force this October.

The CTBT was signed by President Clinton and the leaders of Britain, France, China and Russia in September 1996. To date, 152 nations have signed and 41 have also ratified. However, the Treaty will not take effect until the United States and other key countries ratify the pact. A majority of Senators have called for a vote on the CTBT. Treaty experts expect it would win the two-thirds majority needed for Senate approval if a vote is allowed.

Theft of Nuclear Secrets Is Seen As Further Evidence for CTBT Ratification:

Recent reports of possible Chinese theft of U.S. nuclear weapons secrets may be one factor that has increased support for U.S. ratification of the CTBT. A plurality of Americans say these reports underscore the need for a treaty to ban nuclear tests. Forty-eight percent (48%) agree that "one important way to help prevent China from improving its nuclear arsenal is for the United States to ratify and help encourage global implementation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty which China has also signed and that this Treaty will prevent China from testing new bomb designs to see if they work." Meanwhile, only 17% say that, in light of China obtaining U.S. nuclear secrets, "it is irrelevant for the U.S. to ratify and encourage global implementation of the CTBT because this Treaty will not stop China from improving their nuclear technology and developing new weapons."

Support Cuts Across All Regions:

Support is also consistent and overwhelming across all regions of the country, with 84% of those living in the Northeast, 80% of those in the Midwest, 84% of those in the South and 77% of those in the West favoring Senate approval of the Treaty. These high levels of support are similar to those in individual states across the nation. In no state surveyed does support from Republican, Democratic, or independent voters drop below 70%.

Americans are united (84%) in believing that an international treaty prohibiting all nuclear test explosions is a better way for the United States to protect itself from nuclear threats posed by other countries than is resuming nuclear test explosions. Only 11% think resuming nuclear testing is a better way to protect the United States.

"The Senate's failure to consider the CTBT undermines efforts to protect the U.S. from nuclear proliferation and the possibility of nuclear war," said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. "Americans clearly want their Senators and the President to work together to ratify and implement the CTBT to help make the world safer for future generations," he said.

"The CTBT will improve our nation's ability to detect, inspect, and deter nuclear test explosions, thereby helping to block the development of new bomb types by countries like China. By failing to consider and approve the CTBT the Senate leaves the door open to nuclear proliferation and renewed nuclear arms races," added Kimball.

Americans Prefer A Senate Candidate Who Supports The CTBT:

When given the choice between one hypothetical candidate who supports the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and another who opposes the Treaty, Americans prefer the candidate who supports the Treaty by a two-to-one margin. Sixty-two percent (62%) say they would vote for the candidate for US Senate who supports the Treaty, while fewer than a third (31%) would choose a candidate who opposes the Treaty.

* Candidate A (Supports CTBT): "The U.S. Senate should ratify the almost three years ago and we should honor our promise to the other countries that have signed. Many other countries will not implement this Treaty unless we do, and unless we lead the way to ratify and help implement the Treaty, countries without nuclear weapons will continue their efforts to develop them. Even underground explosions have released radioactive gas and we have a responsibility to future generations to make the world safer and to end the environmental damage caused by nuclear testing."

* Candidate B (Opposes CTBT): "The U.S. Senate should not ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty because the Treaty does not stop other countries from acquiring nuclear weapons and because we cannot be sure other countries are living up to the Treaty. If the United States ratifies this Treaty, we will be obligated to commit millions of dollars to implement it when it cannot be effectively verified. Countries like China and Iran can always conduct nuclear tests in secret, meanwhile we will no longer be able to test our own nuclear arsenal to make sure our existing weapons work and will continue to serve as an effective deterrent to other nations."

A Senate candidate who supports the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is preferred by every demographic subgroup of voters. Indeed this issue pushes partisanship aside with majorities of both parties' voters (58% of Republicans, 66% of Democrats) stating a preference for a candidate who will support the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

"What is striking about the results of the national survey is the overwhelming nature of support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty," commented pollster Michael Dabadie of Wirthlin Worldwide. "Indeed, far from being a partisan issue, support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty comes from all sides of the political and ideological spectrum," he said.

The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of 17 of the nation's leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers and prevent new threats from emerging.

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\REL07209.WPD

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 20 Jul 1999 13:28:08 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news: Clinton's statement on CTBT; early AP story

July 20, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Clinton statement today on CTBT

Attached below are the President's remarks and an early AP article.

DK

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate

Release July 20, 1999

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

Rose Garden

11:43 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: I have just had the privilege of meeting with the three Apollo 11 astronauts, who, 30 years ago, carried out the first landing on the moon: Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins. They and everyone at NASA over the years have made an extraordinary contribution to our nation and to humanity. I am very grateful to them.

President Kennedy, who set a goal of putting a man on the moon by the late 1960s, was committed to using technology to unlock the mysteries of the heaven. But President Kennedy was also concerned that technology, if misused, literally could destroy life on Earth. So another goal he vigorously pursued was one first proposed by President Eisenhower, a treaty to ban for all time testing of the most destructive weapons ever devised -- nuclear weapons.

As a first step, President Kennedy negotiated a limited test ban treaty to ban nuclear tests except those conducted underground. But for far too long nations failed to heed the call to ban all nuclear tests. More countries sought to acquire nuclear weapons and to develop ever more

destructive weapons. This threatened America's security and that of our friends and allies. It made the world a more dangerous place.

Since I have been President, I have made ending nuclear tests one of my top goals. And in 1996, we concluded a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty -- 152 countries have now signed it, and 41, including many of our allies, have now ratified it. Today on Capitol Hill, a bipartisan group of senators is speaking out on the importance of the treaty. They include Senators Jeffords, Specter, Daschle, Biden, Bingaman, Dorgan, Bob Kerrey, Levin, and Murray. I am grateful for their leadership and their support of this critical agreement.

And today I want to express again my strong determination to obtain ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. America already has stopped nuclear testing. We have, today, a robust nuclear force and nuclear experts affirm that we can maintain a safe and reliable deterrent without nuclear tests.

The question now is whether we will adopt or whether we will lose a verifiable treaty that will bar other nations from testing nuclear weapons. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty will strengthen our national security by constraining the development of more advanced and more destructive nuclear weapons, and by limited the possibilities for more countries to acquire nuclear weapons. It will also enhance our ability to detect suspicious activities by other nations.

With or without a test ban treaty, we must monitor such activities. The treaty gives us new means to pursue this important mission -- a global network of sensors and the right to request short notice, on-sight inspections in other countries. Four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff -- David Jones, William Crowe, Colin Powell and John Shalikashvili -- plus the current Chairman, Hugh Shelton, all agree the treaty is in our national interests. Other national leaders, such as former Senators John Glenn and Nancy Kassebaum Baker, agree.

Unfortunately, the Test Ban Treaty is now imperiled by the refusal of some senators even to consider it. If our Senate fails to act, the treaty cannot enter into force for any country. Think of that. We're not testing now. One hundred and fifty-two countries have signed, 41 have ratified, but if our Senate fails to act, this treaty and all the protections and increased safety it offers the American people cannot enter into force for any country. That would make it harder to prevent further nuclear arms competition, and as we have seen, for example, in the nuclear tests in India and Pakistan.

Do we want these countries and other regional rivals to join a test ban treaty, or do we want them to stop nuclear testing? Do we want to scrap a treaty that could constrain them? The major nuclear powers, Britain and France, Russia and China, have signed the treaty. Do we want to walk away from a treaty under which those countries and scores of others have agreed not to conduct nuclear tests? I believe it is strongly in our interest to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The American people consistently have supported it for more than

40 years now. At a minimum, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should hold hearings this fall. Hearings would allow each side to make its case for and against the treaty, and allow the Senate to decide this matter on the merits. We have a chance right now to end nuclear testing forever. It would be a tragedy for our security and for our children's future to let this opportunity slip away.

I thank those senators from both parties who today are announcing their clear intention not to do that. Thank you.

Q Mr. President, did Jiang Zemin tell you that he would use force to counter Taiwan's independence? And would you use force in Taiwan's defense?

THE PRESIDENT: First let me tell you I'm going to have a press conference tomorrow and I will answer a lot of questions. The answer to that question is, we had a conversation in which I restated our strong support of the one China policy and our strong support for the cross-strait dialogue, and I made it clear our policy had not changed, including our view under the Taiwan Relations Act that it would be -- we would take very seriously any abridgement of the peaceful dialogue.

China knows very well what our policy is, and we know quite well what their policy is. I believe that the action of the United States in affirming our support of the one China policy and encouraging Taiwan to support that and the framework within which dialogue has occurred will be helpful in easing some of the tensions. And that was the context in which our conversation occurred.

So I thought it was a very positive conversation, far more positive than negative. And that is the light in which I meant it to unfold, and I think that is the shape it is taking. So --

Q The Chinese seemed to make it clear that he would use force --

Q On the treaty, Senator Helms says that he would be happy to hold hearings if you would send up the ABM Treaty and the Kyoto Treaty. Will you?

THE PRESIDENT: Look, the ABM Treaty -- we have to conclude START II first. That's in our national interest. The Kyoto Treaty -- all the people who say they're not for the Kyoto Treaty insist that we involve the developing nations in it. I agree with them -- even the people who are against the Kyoto Treaty under any circumstances say, well, if you're going to have it you've got to have the developing nations in there. So it's inconsistent for me to send it up when we're out there working ourselves to death to try to get the developing nations to participate.

Now, this is a relatively new issue, the Kyoto Treaty. And the other issue is not ripe yet -- clearly, not ripe yet. So to take a matter that has been a matter of national debate for 40 years now, and it is finally a reality -- a treaty that has been ratified by 40 other countries, the prospect of dramatically increasing the safety of the American people in the future -- and hold it hostage to two matters that are literally not

ripe for presentation to the Senate yet would be a grave error, I think.
And I hope that we can find a way around that.

Thank you.

Q Are the Chinese still upset about the embassy bombing?

Q -- test ban, there have been some that say that the Cox report shows that you should actually be developing weapons to stay ahead of proliferators. Is there a comment on that?

Q He's gone.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

11:55 A.M. EDT

7/20/99 -- 12:40 PM

Clinton urges Senate action on nuclear test ban

WASHINGTON (AP) - President Clinton urged the Senate today to act on a long-stalled treaty to ban nuclear testing, saying the United States' failure to act jeopardizes an agreement signed by 152 nations. He said it would be ``a grave error" for the treaty to be derailed because of a dispute with some senators over two unrelated treaties. ``Unfortunately, the test-ban treaty is now imperiled by the refusal of some senators even to consider it," the president said.

Clinton, in an appearance in the Rose Garden, spoke up as part of a new drive by Democrats and Republicans alike to dislodge the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Clinton signed the treaty in 1996. Now the treaty has been signed by 152 countries, and 41 of them have ratified it.

``At a minimum," Clinton said, ``the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should hold hearings this fall. Hearings would allow each side to make its case for and against the treaty, and allow the Senate to decide this matter on the merits.

``We have a chance right now to end nuclear testing forever," the president said. ``It would be a tragedy for our security and for our children's future to let this opportunity slip away."

Under the treaty, all 44 states with some nuclear capacity must sign for it to take effect. Even one holdout could doom the treaty. So far, only 18 nations with nuclear capabilities have acted.

The treaty is bottled up in the Foreign Relations Committee by its chairman, Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C.

Before moving on the test-ban treaty, Helms wants the administration to

first submit to the Senate modifications in the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty agreed to three years ago by Clinton and Yeltsin. The administration says it will submit the modifications, but only after Russia ratifies START II.

Helms also wants the administration to submit the climate treaty negotiated in Kyoto, Japan, in December 1997, even though it would likely be defeated.

Clinton said the ABM and climate treaties "are literally not ripe for presentation to the Senate yet" and it would be a "grave error" to delay the test-ban treaty.

Supporters of the test-ban treaty say it would lock in U.S. superiority gained by more than 1,000 nuclear tests during the Cold War. Failing to ratify the pact could open the door to additional nuclear tests by India, Pakistan or other nations, the supporters claim.

Opponents argue it could threaten America's ability to deliver an effective nuclear strike, if one is ever needed.

Copyright 1999 Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
From: "Bob Kinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>
To: "Janet Bloomfield" <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>,
"Abolition-Europe" <abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de>,
<abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>,
"abolitionusa" <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Re: A2000 Co-ordinating Committee Conference Call Minutes July 1999.
Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1999 17:13:24 -0600
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.71.1712.3
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

At our meeting at the Hague we discussed the idea of identifying the Major Barbaras of the world--ie arms merchants/researchers and, in particular the nuclear people--who are making large profits from their activities and subverting the democratic process via campaign contributions. How exactly we would use the information may be a subject of discussion but perhaps at the very least we could attempt to make known within their local environment that this is what these folks, neighbors, etc are doing and that they should be known -- in part -- for their creating this particular definition of human being. (see Sartre). In any event, I wonder if folks support the creation of such an annotated list and if so would they send me any info they have to be added to such a list. Also, does anyone have some research that would help ferret out the Corps and their CEOs names and information. Perhaps we could be calling them as well as the Senators they influence on call in days.

Bob Kinsey, Peace and Justice Task Force
United Church of Christ, Rocky Mountain Conference
bkinsey@peacemission.org
303-425-0348

"Two paths lie before us. One leads to death, the other to life." Jonathan Schell

"Faith has need of the whole truth" Teilhard de Chardin

"Jesus was non-violent. Shouldn't Christians be?"

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<META content=text/html;charset=iso-8859-1 http-equiv=Content-Type><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">

<META content="MSHTML 4.71.1712.3" name=GENERATOR>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>

<DIV>At our meeting at the Hague we discussed the idea of identifying the Major Barbaras of the world--ie arms merchants/researchers and, in particular the nuclear people--who are making large profits from their activities and subverting the democratic process via campaign contributions. How exactly we would use the information may be a subject of discussion but perhaps at the very least we could attempt to make known within their local environment that this is what these folks, neighbors, etc are doing and that they should be known -- in part -- for their creating this particular definition of human being. (see Sartre). In any event, I wonder if folks support the creation of such an annotated list and if so would they send me any info they have to be added to such a list. Also, does anyone have some research that would help ferret out the Corps and their CEOs names and information. Perhaps we could be calling them as well as

the Senators they influence on call in days.</DIV>

<DIV><FONT color=#800000

face=Verdana>

Bob

Kinsey, Peace and Justice Task Force
United Church of Christ, Rocky Mountain

Conference
bkkinsey@peacemission.org
303-425-0348
"Two

paths lie before us. One leads to death, the other to

life." Jonathan Schell
"Faith has need of the whole

truth" Teilhard de Chardin
"Jesus was non-violent.

Shouldn't Christians be? </DIV></BODY></HTML>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
From: "Lachlan Forrow" <Lforrow@igc.org>
To: <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
Subject: RE: (abolition-usa) Major Barbara data
Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 18:50:10 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Thanks, Andrew. This kind of information is very helpful and should be widely publicized. I do hope that when we think of "odious weapons merchants" we keep in mind that many of the people who lead even the top 50-100 nuclear weapons contractors do not necessarily have very different core values from those of us on this list. We need strategies that not only "speak truth to power" but also keep ourselves open to the possibility that engagement in dialogue in a spirit of nonviolence (i.e. not attacking them personally as much as confronting them in ways that engage their own reflection) with some of the most important people involved in these corporations may bear important fruit. This is not only because the spirit that we bring to our antinuclear work is crucial to our own integrity. I also believe, for sheerly practical reasons, that if we approach this as a "war" against this "enemy" we are not likely to "win" in the foreseeable future, and nuclear abolition has special urgency, as we all understand. "Hate the sin; love the sinner", or something like that.

--LF

"...There is no greater misfortune than underestimating your enemy. Underestimating your enemy mean thinking that he is evil. Thus you...become an enemy yourself."

Tao te Ching, 69

Stephen Mitchell translation

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

From: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
[mailto:owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com]On Behalf Of California Peace Action

Sent: Saturday, July 17, 1999 2:54 AM

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Subject: (abolition-usa) Major Barbara data

Hello to the fine people of the Abolition list serve,

I think the idea that Bob Kinsey just put out here is a great one. The peace community needs to publicize the fact that these horrible decisions to endanger humanity and squander resources are not beyond the control of human intervention, but in fact the result of human intervention.

Major Barbara #1 (in terms of nuclear weapons) is the Center for Security

Policy. Started in 1988 by Frank Gaffney (Reagan Pentagon appointee) this think tank recieved over \$2 million in corporate donations from companies like Lockheed Martin and Boeing which profit from Star Wars. The board members include 5 Lockheed Martin Execs, and Edward Teller. These folks are the major power behind the Star Wars lobby.

I got this information from an article by William Hartung of the World Policy Institute. I'm sure they have a lot of the information you seek. I imagine Council for a Livable World also has a lot of information on odious weapons merchants. Below are two lists: the top 100 military contractors , and the top fifty nuclear contractors. Unfortunately they are in a rather unweildy format, but it's a start. I hope this helps get the project under way. I'd love to kept appraised of any developments of this.

Sincerely,
Andrew Page
Northern California Political Director
California Peace Action

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

<META HTTP-EQUIV="Content-Type" CONTENT="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1">

<?fontfamily><?param Geneva><?bigger><HTML><HEAD>

<META content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1" http-equiv=Content-Type>

<META content="MSHTML 5.00.2314.1000" name=GENERATOR></HEAD>

<BODY>

<DIV>Thanks, Andrew. This kind of information is very helpful and should be widely publicized. I do hope that when we think of "odious weapons merchants" we keep in mind that many of the people who lead even the top 50-100 nuclear weapons contractors do not necessarily have very different core values from those of us on this list. We need strategies that not only "speak truth to power" but also keep ourselves open to the possibility that engagement in dialogue in a spirit of nonviolence (i.e. not attacking them personally as much as confronting them in ways that engage their own reflection) with some of the most important people involved in these corporations may bear important fruit. This is not only because the spirit that we bring to our antinuclear work is crucial to our own integrity. I also believe, for sheerly practical reasons, that if we approach this as a "war" against this "enemy" we are not likely to "win" in the foreseeable future, and nuclear abolition has special urgency, as we all understand. "Hate the sin; love the sinner", or something like that.</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>--LF</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>"...There is no greater misfortune </DIV>

<DIV>than underestimating your enemy.</DIV>

<DIV>Underestimating your enemy</DIV>

<DIV>mean thinking that he is evil.</DIV>

<DIV>Thus you...become an enemy yourself."</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Tao te Ching, </DIV>

<DIV>Stephen Mitchell translation</DIV>

<BLOCKQUOTE

style="BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px">

<DIV align=left class=OutlookMessageHeader dir=ltr>-----Original Message-----
From:

owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

[mailto:owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com]On Behalf Of California

Peace Action
Sent: Saturday, July 17, 1999 2:54 AM
To:

abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Subject: (abolition-usa) Major

Barbara data

</DIV>Hello to the fine people of the Abolition

list serve,

I think the idea that Bob Kinsey just put out here is a great one. The peace community needs to publicize the fact that these horrible decisions to endanger humanity and squander resources are not beyond the control of human intervention, but in fact the result of human intervention.

Major Barbara #1 (in terms of nuclear weapons) is the Center for Security

Policy. Started in 1988 by Frank Gaffney (Reagan Pentagon appointee) this

think tank recieved over \$2 million in corporate donations from companies like

Lockheed Martin and Boeing which profit from Star Wars. The board members

include 5 Lockheed Martin Execs, and Edward Teller. These folks are the major

power behind the Star Wars lobby.
I got this information from an article by

William Hartung of the World Policy Institute. I'm sure they have a lot of the

information you seek. I imagine Council for a Livable World also has a lot of

information on odious weapons merchants. Below are two lists: the top 100

military contractors , and the top fifty nuclear contractors. Unfortunately

they are in a rather unweildy format, but it's a start. I hope this helps get

the project under way. I'd love to kept appraised of any developments of

this.

Sincerely,
Andrew Page
Northern California Political

Director
California Peace

Action

</BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: capazaction@pop2.igc.org (Unverified)
Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1999 23:54:13 -0700
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: California Peace Action <capazaction@igc.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Major Barbara data
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Hello to the fine people of the Abolition list serve,

I think the idea that Bob Kinsey just put out here is a great one. The peace community needs to publicize the fact that these horrible decisions to endanger humanity and squander resources are not beyond the control of human intervention, but in fact the result of human intervention.

Major Barbara #1 (in terms of nuclear weapons) is the Center for Security Policy. Started in 1988 by Frank Gaffney (Reagan Pentagon appointee) this think tank recieved over \$2 million in corporate donations from companies like Lockheed Martin and Boeing which profit from Star Wars. The board members include 5 Lockheed Martin Execs, and Edward Teller. These folks are the major power behind the Star Wars lobby.

I got this information from an article by William Hartung of the World Policy Institute. I'm sure they have a lot of the information you seek. I imagine Council for a Livable World also has a lot of information on odious weapons merchants. Below are two lists: the top 100 military contractors , and the top fifty nuclear contractors. Unfortunately they are in a rather unweildy format, but it's a start. I hope this helps get the project under way. I'd love to kept appraised of any developments of this.

Sincerely,
Andrew Page
Northern California Political Director
California Peace Action

The 100 Largest Military Contractors

Data are for fiscal year 1997. Numbers in parentheses indicate rank order.

Source: Publication DIOR/PO1-97, U.S. Government Printing Office, Wasbington DC 20402.

Aerospace Corp. (41) Boeing Co. (2) Federal Express Corp.
Alleghy Teledyne, Inc. Boeing Sikorsky (45)
(91) Comanche Team (78) Federal Prison Indus-
Alliant Techsystems, Inc. Booz Allen & Hamilton,
tries, Inc. (71)
(30) Inc. (34) Federal Republic of Ger-
Allied Signal, Inc. (23) BTG, Inc. (92) many (95)
American Automar, Inc. CBS Corp. (15) FMC Corp. (37)
(81) Chevron Corp. (48) Foundation Health Sys-
AT&T (67) Chrysler Corp. (75) tems, Inc. (18)
Atlantic Richfield Co. Clark Enterprises, Inc. Gencorp, Inc. (89)

(51) (73) General Dynamics CO@.
Avondale Industries, Inc. Computer Sciences Corp. (4)
(19) (17) General Electric Co., In-
BDM International, Inc. Draper, Charles Starks, (8)
(29) laboratories (74) General Electric Co.
Bechtel Group, Inc. (50) Dyneorp (25) PLC (53)
Bell Atlantic Corp. (99) Electronic Data Systems General
Motors Cop. (6)
Bergen Brunswig Corp. Corp. (33) Government
of Canada
(98) Exxon Corp. (24) (68)

Government Technology Massachusetts Institute Shell Oil Co. (43)
Services (77) of Tech. (32) Soltek of San Diego (87)
GTE Corp. (12) MCI Communications Southwest Marine, Inc.
Gulfstream Aerospace Corp. (60) (85)
Corp. (94) McKesson Corp. (100) Ssangyong (USA), Inc.
Halliburton Co., Inc. (44) Mitre Corp., The (40) (84)
Harris Corp. (63) Motorola, Inc. (39) Standard Missile Co.
Hensel Phelps Construc- Nasseo Holdings, Inc. (46) LLC
(27)
tion Co. (69) Newport News Ship- Stewart &-
Stevenson Ser-
Highmark, Inc. (59) building, Inc. (16) vices (49)
Honeywell, Inc. (72) Nichols Research Corp. Sverdrup
Corp.(36)
Humana, Inc. (20) (52) Texas Instruments, Inc.
International Business Northrop Grumman(26)
Machines (79) Corp. (3) Texas Instruments/Martin
International Shipholding OHM Corp. (42) Marietta (62)
Corp. (97) Olin Corp. (82) Textron, Inc. (10)
ITT Industries, Inc. (13) Oshkosh Truck Corp. (66)
Thiokol Corp. (83)
The Johns Hopkins Uni- Philip Morris Cos., Inc. Tracor,
Inc. (22)
versity, Inc. (-i6) (88) Triwest

Healthcare
Johnson Controls, Inc. Phillip Holzmann Alliance (64)
(47) Aktiengesefls (58) TRW, Inc. (14)
Kaman Corp. (90) Primex Technologies, Unisys Corp. (65)
Kuwait Petroleum Corp. Inc. (96) United Defense, LP
(86) Procter & Gamble Co. (56) (21)
Litton Industries, Inc. (9) Raytheon Co., Inc. (5) United
States Depart-
Lockheed Martin Corp. Renco Group, Inc. (38) ment of
Energy (31)
(1) Rockwell International United Technologies
logicon, Inc. (35) Corp. (28) Corp. (7)
Longbow LLC (34) Rolls-Royce PLC (57) Vanstar Corp. (80)
Maersk, Inc. (61) Science Applications VSE Corp. (93)
Mantech International International Corp. Worldcorp., Inc. (55)
Corp. (70) (11)

The Top 50 Nuclear Weapons Contractors

Data are for fiscal Year 1997. Numbers in parentheses indicate rank order.

Source: Department of Defense data compiled by Eagle Eye Publishers.

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| Alliant Techsystems, Inc.
Maritime
(15) | BDM Corp. (12) | Continental
Industries (46) |
| Allied Signal, Inc. (16) | Boeing Co. (2) | |
| Draper, Charles Stark,
Bath Holding Corp.
Laboratories (13)
(8) | Colsa Corp. (26) | Computer Science/
Raytheon (17) |
| Dynetics, Inc. (37) | | |
| Eaton Corp. (29) | Mevatec Corp. (38) | Sequa Corp. (35) |
| Gencorp, Inc. (32) | Motorola Corp. (30) | Southwest Marine, Inc.
(19) |
| General Dynamics Corp
(9) | Nassco Holdings (50) | Sparta, Inc. (43) |
| General Electric Co. (7) | building, Inc. (10) | Teledyne,
Inc. (23) |
| General Electric Co.
PLC (48) (22) | Nichols Research Corp.
(39) | Texas Instruments, Inc.,
(44) |
| Thomas W A. Hoffman
Corp. (3) (24) | Northrop Grumman
Thermo Electron Corp. | Textron, Inc. (44) |
| Honeywell, Inc. (27) | Ogden Corp. (47) | (44) |
| ITT Corp. (36) | Olin Corp. (40) | Thiokol Corp. (31) |
| The Johns Hopldns Uni-
versity (45) | Orbital Sciences Corp. (42) | Tracor, Inc. (14) |
| Owen Corp. Systems
Group (20) | TRW, Inc. (II) | United Technology
Corp. (6) |
| Johnson Controls (18) | Raytheon Co., Inc. (4) | |
| K Systems, Inc. (34) | Rolls Royce PLC (41) | |
| Litton Industries, Inc.(9) | Wales-Weapon Systems | |
| Lockheed Martin Corp.
(49) | Science Applications | Engineering |
| (1) | International Corp. | Westinghouse Electric
(21) |
| Lucas Industries, Inc.(3)
Corp. (28) | | |

California Peace Action
2800 Adeline St, Berkeley, CA 94703
tel:(510)849-2272 fax:(510)849-2068
email: capazaction@igc.org
www.capa.org

"No social advance rolls in on the wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and persistent work of dedicated individuals."

- Martin Luther King, Jr.

people of the Abolition list serve,

Hello to the fine

I think the idea that Bob Kinsey just put out here is a great one. The peace community needs to publicize the fact that these horrible decisions to endanger humanity and squander resources are not beyond the control of human intervention, but in fact the result of human intervention.

Major Barbara #1 (in terms of nuclear weapons) is the Center for Security Policy. Started in 1988 by Frank Gaffney (Reagan Pentagon appointee) this think tank recieved over \$2 million in corporate donations from companies like Lockheed Martin and Boeing which profit from Star Wars. The board members include 5 Lockheed Martin Execs, and Edward Teller. These folks are the major power behind the Star Wars lobby.

I got this information from an article by William Hartung of the World Policy Institute. I'm sure they have a lot of the information you seek. I imagine Council for a Livable World also has a lot of information on odious weapons merchants. Below are two lists: the top 100 military contractors , and the top fifty nuclear contractors. Unfortunately they are in a rather unweildy format, but it's a start. I hope this helps get the project under way. I'd love to kept appraised of any developments of this.

Sincerely,
Andrew Page
Northern California Political Director
California Peace Action

The 100 Largest Military Contractors

Data are for fiscal year 1997. Numbers in parentheses indicate rank order.

Source: Publication DIOR/PO1-97, U.S. Government Printing Office, Wasbington DC 20402.

Aerospace Corp. (41) Boeing Co. (2) Federal Express Corp.
Allegheny Teledyne, Inc. Boeing Sikorsky (45)
(91) Comanche Team (78) Federal Prison Indus-
Alliant Techsystems, Inc. Booz Allen & Hamilton, tries, Inc. (71)
(30) Inc. (34) Federal Republic of Ger-
Allied Signal, Inc. (23) BTG, Inc. (92) many (95)
American Automar, Inc. CBS Corp. (15) FMC Corp. (37)
(81) Chevron Corp. (48) Foundation Health Sys-
AT&T (67) Chrysler Corp. (75) tems, Inc. (18)
Atlantic Richfield Co. Clark Enterprises, Inc. Gencorp, Inc. (89)
(51) (73) General Dynamics CO@.
Avondale Industries, Inc. Computer Sciences Corp. (4)
(19) (17) General Electric Co., In-
BDM International, Inc. Draper, Charles Starks, (8)
(29) laboratories (74) General Electric Co.
Bechtel Group, Inc. (50) Dyneorp (25) PLC (53)
Bell Atlantic Corp. (99) Electronic Data Systems General Motors Cop. (6)
Bergen Brunswig Corp. Corp. (33) Government of Canada
(98) Exxon Corp. (24) (68)

Government Technology Massachusetts Institute Shell Oil Co. (43)
Services (77) of Tech. (32) Soltek of San Diego (87)
GTE Corp. (12) MCI Communications Southwest Marine, Inc.
Gulfstream Aerospace Corp. (60) (85)
Corp. (94) McKesson Corp. (100) Ssangyong (USA), Inc.
Halliburton Co., Inc. (44) Mitre Corp., The (40) (84)
Harris Corp. (63) Motorola, Inc. (39) Standard Missile Co.
Hensel Phelps Construc- Nasseo Holdings, Inc. (46) LLC (27)

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| tion Co. (69) | Newport News Ship- | Stewart &- Stevenson Ser- |
| Highmark, Inc. (59) | building, Inc. (16) | vices (49) |
| Honeywell, Inc. (72) | Nichols Research Corp. | Sverdrup Corp.(36) |
| Humana, Inc. (20) | (52) | Texas Instruments, Inc. |
| International Business | Northrop Grumman(26) | |
| Machines (79) | Corp. (3) | Texas Instruments/Martin |
| International Shipholding | OHM Corp. (42) | Marietta (62) |
| Corp. (97) | Olin Corp. (82) | Textron, Inc. (10) |
| ITT Industries, Inc. (13) | Oshkosh Truck Corp. (66) | Thiokol Corp. (83) |
| The Johns Hopkins Uni- | Philip Morris Cos., Inc. Tracor, Inc. (22) | |
| versity, Inc. (-i6) | (88) | Triwest Healthcare |
| Johnson Controls, Inc. | Phillip Holzmann | Alliance (64) |
| (47) | Aktiengesefls (58) | TRW, Inc. (14) |
| Kaman Corp. (90) | Primex Technologies, | Unisys Corp. (65) |
| Kuwait Petroleum Corp. | Inc. (96) | United Defense, LP |
| (86) | Procter & Gamble Co. (56) | (21) |
| Litton Industries, Inc. (9) | Raytheon Co., Inc. (5) | United States Depart- |
| Lockheed Martin Corp. | Renco Group, Inc. (38) | ment of Energy (31) |
| (1) | Rockwell International | United Technologies |
| logicon, Inc. (35) | Corp. (28) | Corp. (7) |
| Longbow LLC (34) | Rolls-Royce PLC (57) | Vanstar Corp. (80) |
| Maersk, Inc. (61) | Science Applications | VSE Corp. (93) |
| Mantech International | International Corp. | Worldcorp., Inc. (55) |
| Corp. (70) | (11) | |

The Top 50 Nuclear Weapons Contractors

Data are for fiscal Year 1997. Numbers in parentheses indicate rank order.
Source: Department of Defense data compiled by Eagle Eye Publishers.

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Alliant Techsystems, Inc. | BDM Corp. (12) | Continental Maritime |
| (15) | Boeing Co. (2) | Industries (46) |
| Allied Signal, Inc. (16) | Colsa Corp. (26) | Draper, Charles Stark, |
| Bath Holding Corp. | Computer Science/ | Laboratories (13) |
| (8) | Raytheon (17) | Dynetics, Inc. (37) |
| Eaton Corp. (29) | Mevatec Corp. (38) | Sequa Corp. (35) |
| Gencorp, Inc. (32) | Motorola Corp. (30) | Southwest Marine, Inc. |
| General Dynamics Corp | Nassco Holdings (50). | (19) |
| (9) | Newport News Ship- | Sparta, Inc. (43) |
| General Electric Co. (7) | building, Inc. (10) | Teledyne, Inc. (23) |
| General Electric Co. | Nichols Research Corp. | Texas Instruments, Inc, |
| PLC (48) (22) | (39) | |
| Thomas W A. Hoffman | Northrop Grumman | Textron, Inc. (44) |
| (24) Corp. (3) | Thermo Electron Corp. | |
| Honeywell, Inc. (27) | Ogden Corp. (47) | (44) |
| ITT Corp. (36) | Olin Corp. (40) | Thiokol Corp. (31) |
| The Johns Hopldns Uni- | Orbital Sciences Corp. (42) | Tracor, Inc. (14) |
| versity (45) | Owen Corp. Systems | TRW, Inc. (II) |
| Johnson Controls (18) | Group (20) | United Technology |
| K Systems, Inc. (34) | Raytheon Co., Inc. (4) | Corp. (6) |
| Litton Industries, Inc.(9) | Rolls Royce PLC (41) | Wales-Weapon Systems |
| Lockheed Martin Corp. | Science Applications | Engineering (49) |

(1) International Corp.
Lucas Industries, Inc.(3)

Westinghouse Electric
(21) Corp. (28)

California Peace Action
2800 Adeline St, Berkeley, CA 94703
tel:(510)849-2272 fax:(510)849-2068
email: capazaction@igc.org
www.capa.org

"No social advance rolls in on the wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and persistent work of dedicated individuals."

- Martin Luther King, Jr.

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
From: "Janet Bloomfield" <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
To: <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
Cc: "Janet Bloomfield" <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>,
"Oxford Research Group" <org@oxfrg.demon.co.uk>
References: <001301becfdd\$8fe19400\$1871ae86@bidmc.harvard.edu>
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) Major Barbara data
Date: Mon, 19 Jul 1999 12:13:42 +0100
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2014.211
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear Abolition Friends in the USA,

I hope it will be acceptable for a Brit to add some thoughts to the discussion on engaging with decision makers involved in the US nuclear complex. Some of you may know of the work of the Oxford Research Group which has been doing this, in the spirit that Lachlan advocates, since 1982. If you are interested in this approach please check out our web site at www.oxfrg.demon.co.uk.

We are currently working on putting the details of key nuclear decision makers on the web and would very much like to know if people such as yourselves would find this a useful resource. Please let either myself or my colleague Paul Ingram know on org@oxfrg.demon.co.uk. We are also hoping to produce a basic Handbook on Dialogue for use by grassroots groups as well.

I look forward to seeing this work develop in the US. Good luck.

Yours in peace,
Janet Bloomfield.

Janet Bloomfield
25 Farmadine
Saffron Walden
Essex
CB11 3HR
England
Tel/Fax: +44 (0)1799 516189
e-mail: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org

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

From: Lachlan Forrow
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Sent: 16 July 1999 23:50
Subject: RE: (abolition-usa) Major Barbara data

Thanks, Andrew. This kind of information is very helpful and should be widely publicized. I do hope that when we think of "odious weapons merchants" we keep in mind that many of the people who lead even the top 50-100 nuclear weapons contractors do not necessarily have very different core values from those of us on this list. We need strategies that not only "speak truth to power" but also keep ourselves open to the possibility that engagement in dialogue in a spirit of nonviolence (i.e. not attacking them personally as much as confronting them in ways that engage their own reflection) with some of the most important people involved in these corporations may bear important fruit. This is not only because the spirit that we bring to our antinuclear work is crucial to our own integrity. I also believe, for sheerly practical reasons, that if we approach this as a "war" against this "enemy" we are not likely to "win" in the foreseeable future, and nuclear abolition has special urgency, as we all understand. "Hate the sin; love the sinner", or something like that.

--LF

"...There is no greater misfortune
than underestimating your enemy.
Underestimating your enemy
mean thinking that he is evil.
Thus you...become an enemy yourself."

Tao te Ching, 69

Stephen Mitchell translation

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

From: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com [mailto:owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com] On Behalf Of
California Peace Action

Sent: Saturday, July 17, 1999 2:54 AM

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Subject: (abolition-usa) Major Barbara data

Hello to the fine people of the Abolition list serve,

I think the idea that Bob Kinsey just put out here is a great one. The peace community needs to publicize the fact that these horrible decisions to endanger humanity and squander resources are not beyond the control of human intervention, but in fact the result of human intervention.

Major Barbara #1 (in terms of nuclear weapons) is the Center for Security Policy. Started in 1988 by Frank Gaffney (Reagan Pentagon appointee) this think tank recieved over \$2 million in corporate donations from companies like Lockheed Martin and Boeing which profit from Star Wars. The board members include 5 Lockheed Martin Execs, and Edward Teller. These folks are the major power behind the Star Wars lobby.

I got this information from an article by William Hartung of the World Policy Institute. I'm sure they have a lot of the information you seek. I imagine Council for a Livable World also has a lot of information on odious weapons merchants. Below are two lists: the top 100 military contractors , and the top fifty nuclear contractors. Unfortunately they are in a rather unweildy format, but it's a start. I hope this helps get the project under way. I'd love to kept appraised of any developments of this.

Sincerely,

Andrew Page

Northern California Political Director

California Peace Action

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

<HTML><HEAD>

<META content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1" http-equiv=Content-Type><?fontfamily><?param Geneva><?bigger>

<META content="MSHTML 5.00.2014.210" name=GENERATOR>

<STYLE></STYLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>

<DIV>Dear Abolition Friends in the USA,</DIV>

<DIV>I hope it will acceptable for a Brit to add some thoughts to the discussion on engaging with decision makers involved in the US nuclear complex. Some of you may know of the work of the Oxford Research Group which has been doing this, in the spirit that Lachlan advocates, since 1982. If you are interested in this approach please check out our web site at www.oxfrg.demon.co.uk</DIV>

<DIV>We are currently working on putting the details of key nuclear decision makers on the web and would very much like to know if people such as

yourselves would find this a useful resource. Please let either myself or my colleague Paul Ingram know on org@oxfrg.demon.co.uk We are also hoping to produce a basic Handbook on Dialogue for use by grassroots groups as well.

I look forward to seeing this work develop in the US. Good luck.

Yours in peace,

Janet Bloomfield.

Janet Bloomfield
25 Farmadine
Saffron Walden
Essex
CB11 3HR
England
Tel/Fax: +44 (0)1799 516189
e-mail: jbloomfield@gn.apc.org

BLOCKQUOTE

BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; MARGIN-RIGHT: 0px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px; PADDING-RIGHT: 0px

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

<DIV

From:

Lforrow@igc.org Lachlan Forrow

</DIV>

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

</DIV>

Sent: 16 July 1999 23:50

Subject: RE: (abolition-usa) Major Barbara data

</DIV>

</DIV>

Thanks, Andrew. This kind of information is very helpful and should be widely publicized. I do hope that when we think of "odious weapons merchants" we keep in mind that many of the people who lead even the top 50-100 nuclear weapons contractors do not necessarily have very different core values from those of us on this list. We need strategies that not only "speak truth to power" but also keep ourselves open to the possibility that engagement in dialogue in a spirit of nonviolence (i.e. not attacking them personally as much as confronting them in ways that engage their own reflection) with some of the most important people involved in these corporations may bear important fruit. This is not only because the spirit that we bring to our antinuclear work is crucial to our own integrity. I also believe, for sheerly practical reasons, that if we approach this as a "war" against this "enemy" we are not likely to "win" in the foreseeable future, and nuclear abolition has special urgency, as we all understand. "Hate the sin; love the sinner", or something like that.

"...There is no greater

misfortune

than underestimating your

enemy.

Underestimating your

enemy</DIV>

<DIV>mean thinking that he is evil.</DIV>

<DIV>Thus you...become an enemy yourself."</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Tao te Ching, </DIV>

<DIV>Stephen Mitchell translation</DIV>

<BLOCKQUOTE

style="BORDER-LEFT: #000000 2px solid; MARGIN-LEFT: 5px; PADDING-LEFT: 5px">

<DIV align=left class=OutlookMessageHeader dir=ltr>-----Original Message-----
From:

owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

[mailto:owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com]On Behalf Of

California Peace Action
Sent: Saturday, July 17, 1999 2:54

AM
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Subject:

(abolition-usa) Major Barbara data

</DIV>Hello to the fine

people of the Abolition list serve,

I think the idea that Bob Kinsey just put out here is a great one. The peace community needs to publicize the

fact that these horrible decisions to endanger humanity and squander resources are not beyond the control of human intervention, but in fact the

result of human intervention.
Major Barbara #1 (in terms of nuclear weapons) is the Center for Security Policy. Started in 1988 by Frank Gaffney

(Reagan Pentagon appointee) this think tank recieved over \$2 million in corporate donations from companies like Lockheed Martin and Boeing which

profit from Star Wars. The board members include 5 Lockheed Martin Execs, and Edward Teller. These folks are the major power behind the Star Wars

lobby.
I got this information from an article by William Hartung of the World Policy Institute. I'm sure they have a lot of the information you

seek. I imagine Council for a Livable World also has a lot of information on odious weapons merchants. Below are two lists: the top 100 military

contractors , and the top fifty nuclear contractors. Unfortunately they are in a rather unweildy format, but it's a start. I hope this helps get the

project under way. I'd love to kept appraised of any developments of

this.

Sincerely,
Andrew Page
Northern California Political Director
California Peace

Action

</BLOCKQUOTE></BLOCKQUOTE></BODY></HTML>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1999 11:08:59 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news: Senators push for CTBT

July 21, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: select news coverage of President, Senators, polls on CTBT

Attached below are five articles on yesterday's news conference by nine Senators on the CTBT, the President's remarks, and the Coalition-commissioned poll on public attitudes on the CTBT:

- * USA Today
- * Baltimore Sun version of the Associated Press article
- * Congressional Quarterly Daily Monitor (note Daschle comment at end)
- * The Financial Times
- * The Los Angeles Times

A complete transcript of the press briefing will be available on the Coalition's Web Site <<http://www.crnd.org>> by this afternoon.

DK

USA Today

July 21, 1999

"Senate Asked To Move On Test Ban Treaty"

By Bill Nichols, USA Today

WASHINGTON - President Clinton urged the Senate on Tuesday to take action on a long-stalled nuclear test ban treaty, saying it would be a "grave error" for partisan disagreements to unravel it.

Clinton's Rose Garden appearance to urge passage of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) was part of a bipartisan drive in the Senate to dislodge the treaty from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

A group of nine senators - seven Democrats and two Republicans - called for action Tuesday.

At the same news conference, a poll commissioned by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers showed that 82% of Americans want the CTBT approved.

A Democratic polling firm and a Republican polling firm took the poll of 1,000 people June 18-21. The poll had a margin of error of +/-3.1 percentage points.

Clinton signed the treaty, which includes a pledge against testing nuclear devices, in 1996. It also sets up a global system of sensors to monitor compliance.

A total of 152 countries have signed the CTBT, but the Senate has yet to hold a hearing on it.

The reason is a disagreement between Foreign Relations Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C., and the White House over two other treaties.

Helms insists that before he allows any action on the CTBT, the administration must submit to the Senate modifications in the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, agreed to three years ago by Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

The White House says it will submit the changes, but only after Russia ratifies the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) II on nuclear weapons reduction .

Helms also wants the administration to submit to the Senate the global climate agreement negotiated in Kyoto, Japan, in 1997.

Clinton said he didn't want to submit that treaty, which aims at reducing greenhouse gas emissions many scientists believe contribute to global warming, until it includes developing countries.

White House officials admit privately that the Kyoto treaty would be defeated if submitted now.

Helms' argument is not so much over the substance of either issue, but that any treaty negotiated by the executive branch should be promptly presented to the Senate for its approval.

Clinton said that to hold the test ban "hostage to two matters that are literally not ripe for presentation to the Senate yet would be a grave error, I think."

Sen. Joseph Biden, D-Del., the ranking Democrat on Foreign Relations, was more blunt, saying the hold-up of the treaty "is counterintuitive; it is irresponsible and it is stupid."

Clinton aides, however, said they have had no sign of compromise from Helms, whose office declined to comment on the issue.

Adding pressure to the process is a Sept. 23 deadline for ratification of the CTBT. In order for the treaty to take effect, the 44 nations with nuclear capability must ratify it. So far, 21 have ratified it.

After Sept. 23, the third anniversary of the treaty's opening for signature, a conference will be held to gauge what actions should

be taken, including possible economic sanctions, to persuade nonratifying members to act.

Only nations that have ratified the treaty can participate, leading the White House to argue that action by the Senate is essential to give the United States a voice in the treaty's future.

The [Baltimore] Sun, Wednesday, July 21, 1999

"Vote sought on nuclear treaty held hostage by Senate panel"

By The Associated Press

WASHINGTON (AP) -- President Clinton led a drive by a bipartisan group Tuesday to salvage a stalled treaty signed by 152 countries for a global ban on nuclear test explosions. Treaty supporters promised an aggressive campaign in the Senate to try to force a vote.

"The question now is whether we will adopt or whether we will lose a verifiable treaty that will bar other nations from testing nuclear weapons," the president said.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which Clinton signed in 1996, has been held up by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, led by Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., because of disputes over other matters.

"Unfortunately, the test ban treaty is now imperiled by the refusal of some senators even to consider it," the president said in a brief address in the Rose Garden. "If our Senate fails to act, the treaty cannot enter into force for any country."

At a news conference in the Capitol, Sen. Joseph Biden of Delaware, the senior Democrat on Helms' committee, said Republicans holding up the treaty "will pay a price for their irresponsibility."

The refusal of Helms to schedule a hearing and of Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., to pull the treaty out of the committee and schedule it for a floor vote "is counterintuitive, it is irresponsible, and it is stupid," Biden said.

The president's remarks coincided with the intensification of a campaign by senators from both parties to dislodge the treaty from the Foreign Relations Committee and bring it to the Senate floor for a vote to ratify, which 41 nations already have done.

"It is high time that the Senate acted on it," said Sen. Arlen Specter, R-Pa.

Supporters released a poll, conducted jointly by Democratic pollster Mark Mellman and Republican pollster Richard Wirthlin, showing that 82 percent of Americans in a June survey said they wanted the treaty approved when its purpose was explained. Seventy-one percent said they strongly wanted

ratification.

Some 80 percent of those identifying themselves as Republicans supported ratification, as did 86 percent of those identifying themselves as Democrats. Among those identifying themselves as conservative Republicans, support for ratification was 79 percent.

The June 18-21 opinion survey of 1,000 adults had an error margin of plus or minus 3.1 percentage points.

CQ Daily Monitor, July 21, 1999

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS:
CLINTON, DEMOCRATS PRESS FOR SENATE TEST BAN TREATY VOTE

By Chuck McCutcheon, CQ Staff Writer

Jul. 20, 1999 - Senate supporters of a treaty to ban nuclear weapons testing worldwide joined President Clinton in serving notice Tuesday that they will press for a vote on the pact this year.

The Clinton administration has been pushing off and on since September 1997 for the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, whose objective of banning underground tests has been the subject of debate for the past four decades.

But conservative Republicans have resisted bringing up the pact, questioning the effects of a test ban on the long-term readiness of the nation's nuclear arsenal.

Senate Foreign Relations Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C., has indicated that before bringing up the test ban, Clinton must submit the Kyoto protocol on global warming as well as revisions to an older arms control pact, the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Clinton, however, told reporters Tuesday that it is wrong for Republicans to take such an approach.

"To take a matter that has been a matter of national debate for 40 years now ... and hold it hostage to two matters that are literally not ripe for presentation to the Senate yet would be a grave error, I think," Clinton said. "And I hope that we can find a way around that."

Meanwhile, a group of mostly Democratic senators released the results of a bipartisan poll conducted last month showing that 82 percent of those surveyed back a test ban.

Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr., Del., the Foreign Relations Committee's ranking Democrat, said he believes a majority of senators also support the ban. He criticized Helms and Majority Leader Trent Lott, Miss., for refusing to bring up the treaty.

"It is counterintuitive, it is irresponsible, it is against the wishes of the American people, it overrides the wishes of a majority of senators and it is stupid," Biden said.

Minority Leader Tom Daschle, S.D., said he is prepared to seek to attach a resolution calling for debate on the treaty to force Senate consideration if necessary.

"We haven't decided exactly what our plans will be, because we aren't sure what the schedule is," Daschle said. "Our intention is to press this every bit as hard as other issues we have raised in the past."

The Financial Times

"Clinton calls for ratification of N-treaty"

Wed, 21 Jul 1999

The US President says Americans back the ban on weapons testing, writes Stephen Fidler in Washington

President Bill Clinton and a bipartisan group of senators yesterday called separately for US ratification of an international treaty banning nuclear testing.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has been held up for 21 months in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Jesse Helms, its chairman, says he will not consider the CTBT until the administration sends two other unrelated treaties to the Senate for consideration.

Mr Clinton, speaking in the Rose Garden of the White House, said the treaty had had consistent US public support.

"We're not testing now. A hundred and fifty-two countries have signed, 41 have ratified. But if our Senate fails to act, this treaty and all the protections and increased safety it offers the American people cannot enter into force for any country," the president said, adding that this would make it harder to prevent further nuclear arms competition, for example, in India and Pakistan.

"At a minimum, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should hold hearings this fall. Hearings would allow each side to make its case for and against the treaty and allow the Senate to decide this matter on the merits," Mr Clinton said.

Separately, a bipartisan group of nine senators, including minority leader Tom Daschle and Republicans Arlen Specter and James Jeffords, called for a push to ratify the Treaty, which was negotiated in 1996. They cited a poll carried out on behalf of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a not-for-profit group, that showed 82 per cent of Americans wanted the treaty approved, with 71 per cent saying they strongly supported ratification.

Mr Helms's committee has jurisdiction over treaties and he has refused to consider the CTBT until the administration sends up two other treaties for ratification: the Anti-Ballistic Missile protocol and the Kyoto global warming treaty.

The ABM treaty, first signed in 1972 with the Soviet Union and subsequently amended with Russia, would probably fail to pass the Senate. Mr Helms wants this to happen because he sees the treaty as an obstacle to the deployment of a US national ballistic missile defence system.

Because of this, the Clinton administration has delayed sending it to the Senate until the Russian Duma ratifies the Start II treaty, which would bring about a reduction in strategic nuclear weapons. If Start II was ratified, the chances for the ABM treaty would be enhanced, the administration believes.

Daryl Kimball from the Coalition to reduce Nuclear Dangers said the CTBT "appears to be stuck in a treaties 'traffic jam' in the US Senate". Nowhere, except perhaps in India, was ratification of the CTBT more problematic, he said.

Although Mr Clinton has made several calls for CTBT to be ratified, the administration has been criticised by groups such as Mr Kimball's for not acting more forcefully to secure ratification. A conference is scheduled for October in Vienna to bring the treaty into force.

Foreign Desk
JFK's Name Invoked in Push for Nuclear Test Ban
TYLER MARSHALL

07/21/1999
Los Angeles Times
Home Edition
Page A-4
Copyright 1999 / The Times Mirror Company

WASHINGTON -- President Clinton and several key senators on Tuesday launched a concerted campaign to ratify a global treaty banning nuclear tests, invoking the legacy of John F. Kennedy, one of the initial supporters of such an international pact.

"Nuclear experts affirm that we can maintain a safe and reliable deterrent without nuclear tests," Clinton told a small gathering in the White House Rose Garden. "The question now is whether we will adopt or whether we will lose a verifiable treaty that will bar other nations from testing nuclear weapons."

At a news conference in the Capitol later in the day, Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr. of Delaware, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, condemned efforts by a small group of Senate Republican leaders to block a full floor debate on the treaty. He called the action "counterintuitive, irresponsible and against the wishes of the American people and the willing

of a majority of U.S. senators."

"It is stupid," Biden concluded.

In his brief White House remarks, Clinton made three direct references to the former president, including Kennedy's commitment to arms control. Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-S.D.) also quoted Kennedy's 1961 plea for a test ban treaty.

Both White House officials and senators participating in the news conference denied any attempt to capitalize on the wave of public sympathy in the wake of the Kennedy family's latest tragedy, the fatal crash last week of a small plane piloted by John F. Kennedy Jr. But arms control specialists who have worked for months to secure a high-profile commitment for early ratification admitted that the Kennedy connection probably would help them. Kennedy negotiated a treaty banning atmospheric nuclear testing with Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev in 1963.

Although listed as a major White House priority at the start of the year, efforts to win ratification of the test ban treaty have been persistently sidelined by other developments, including the war against Yugoslavia. As time went on, some arms control specialists interpreted Clinton's silence as a decision to withhold his personal backing--a development that probably would have doomed any chance of Senate approval.

The United States was one of the original sponsors of the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and Clinton was the first world leader to sign the ban. However, resistance from conservative Senate Republicans, including powerful Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), has blocked ratification.

Helms has refused to open committee hearings on the accord until the White House submits two other treaties to the Senate first--the Kyoto Protocol that limits greenhouse gas emissions, and modifications to another treaty linked to deployment of a national missile defense system.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) could maneuver the treaty around Helms' committee and take it directly to the Senate floor for debate, but so far he has refused to do so.

Senate action is considered extremely important, even though only 18 of the 44 nations designated as nuclear-capable states have so far ratified the ban. Arms control specialists are convinced ratification by the United States would quickly bring many of the remaining countries on board, including nuclear giants Russia and China. It also might persuade the newest members of the nuclear club, India and Pakistan, to sign and ratify.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>

X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org (Unverified)

To: cdavis@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org, jsmith@clw.org, syoung@clw.org, maureene@earthlink.net, bamorse@earthlink.net, disarmament@igc.org, kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, sara@fcnl.org, ieer@ieer.org, mupj@igc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org, fteplitz@peace-action.org, epank@peacenet.org, kcrandall@psr.org, btiller@psr.org, brian@taxpayer.net, ctbt@2020vision.org, laura@2020vision.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, wand@wand.org

From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)

Subject: 20/20 news release on CTBT

Date: Wed, 21 Jul 1999 16:37:16 -0400

Dear NWWG friends,

FYI, here's something we sent to press yesterday on all the great CTBT developments.

Marie

PRESS RELEASE

Immediate Release: July 20, 1999, 2:00 pm

Contact: James Wyerman 202-833-2020

"President Clinton Urges Test Ban Treaty Action in Senate;
Cites Huge Public Support in New Poll."

(Washington, DC)-In a statement issued today from the Rose Garden, President Clinton urgently called upon the Senate to ratify a treaty that would ban future nuclear test explosions and make it more difficult for new nations to develop nuclear weapons. Supporting his call to action, the President cited recent statements of bipartisan support in the Senate, along with a new public opinion poll released today showing that more than 80% of the American public supports the test ban treaty. He urged the Senate not to block a treaty which has both widespread support in the U.S. and around the world. "Think of it," he said, "if the U.S. fails to act, the treaty cannot enter into force in any country in the world." This is because the treaty's provisions require approval of existing nuclear powers before it can take effect.

Around the country, hundreds of nonprofit groups have been calling on the Senate to ratify the test ban treaty for the past two years, while it has been logjammed in Committee. Most recently, a letter from thirteen national environmental groups called for Senate approval and the measure enjoys broad support from most religious and interfaith groups. According to a spokesperson for 20/20 Vision, a grassroots peace and environment group based in Washington, D.C., "This is just the latest example of how a Senate with its head in the sand and its hands in corporate pockets is ignoring the will of the people on handguns, the environment and now nuclear disarmament."

"The only reason for this delay has been the political stubbornness of one powerful man, Sen. Jesse Helms, who continues to hold the treaty hostage in his committee for his own narrow political reasons," said 20/20 Vision Executive Director James Wyerman. "It's absolutely outrageous that one parochial man can single-handedly obstruct a measure that's essential to our nation's security and that's supported by such a huge margin of the public."

Although President Clinton signed the treaty on September 24, 1996, and it has already been ratified by 41 countries (a total of 152 have signed), the U.S. remains an obstacle to its implementation until the Senate takes action to ratify it. Unless the Senate ratifies the treaty the U.S. will not be permitted to participate in the first meeting of the ratifying parties, now scheduled for this fall in Vienna. "It's a national embarrassment that the U.S. initiated this treaty many years ago and is now too twisted up in its own political machinations to take advantage of this opportunity to close the deal," said Wyerman. "This has been on the table since the Eisenhower era, enjoying support of Republican and Democratic presidents alike, but current Senate leadership is stuck in its own political mud. No wonder people are calling for change."

Nuclear tests in space, oceans and on land have been banned by the U.S., Soviet Union, and Great Britain since 1963, but a loophole still allows under-ground tests. An international alarm sounded in May of last year when India and Pakistan resumed underground nuclear tests. These concerns have been exacerbated by recent leaks of nuclear weapons design information to China, raising questions about whether the best remedy is enhanced defense or prevention .

Observers like 20/20 Vision are calling for "an ounce of prevention through the nuclear test ban, rather than wasted billions on systems like national missile defense that don't work." Even for countries that possess design blueprints for nuclear weapons, developing actual weapons capability is wholly dependent on actual tests. Said Wyerman, "Without nuclear tests, new nations can't develop nuclear weapons. It's that simple. Senate Leadership just doesn't get it, though the public does. If the public cares enough about this-and we think they do-they can make the Senate do the right thing. And if it doesn't, we need a new Senate."

-30-

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: lynette
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Thanks!
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Lynette:

I certainly enjoyed visiting you, Rick, and Clint, seeing your new house, going on the boats, swimming in the lake, sitting on the dock, eating all the good food. Thanks for your hospitality.

Do you have an e-mail address for Sara and Mike? If so, please send it to me.

With love,
Howard

To: Robin Ringler <Dringler@umc-gbcs.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: PwJ Newsletter
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 07:46 AM 7/22/99 -0400, Robin Ringler wrote:

>Hi Howard,

>

>I'm sorry I wasn't able to make the mtg. on Tues. - I had a Dr. appt. Bad timing on my part.

>

>I just completed a PwJ Newsletter and am planning the next issue to come out in late Sept./early Oct. But I was wondering if there might be a better time re: the CTBT for getting the newsletter in people's hands. Is late Sept./early Oct. good for something important on the CTBT that we can ask people to do? I've had info on the PwJ Sun. offering on the front page of the last two issues, and I don't want to put it on the cover of the next issue. I'd like to put the CTBT on it if there's something we can ask folks to do.

>

Robin,

We don't know for sure what the situation will be in late September, but it will be very timely to focus on the CTBT.

Our best scenario is that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has agreed to hold public hearings and may have even started such hearings. If not, activists should be urged to write their senators to urge hearings and floor action on the CTBT. At any rate activists can write their senators, telling them how important the CTBT is -- for the future of our children, and other reasons -- and urging them to support ratification.

I'm not sure whether you can write a contingency, such as, if hearings haven't started, ask for them, because many of your readers won't know. So maybe it's best to stick with the request for basic support for the treaty.

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT agreed to focus on all ten Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee in August at town meetings and other appearances in their home states. The message will be: hold hearings. Marie Rietmann is collecting schedules. I'll communicate separately on this. Perhaps this will be enough on the hearing matter and let your Sept-October issue deal with support for ratification.

Shalom,
Howard

To: "Lachlan Forrow" <lforrow@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: IPPNW handbook
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Lachlan,

I would like a copy of your 1995 handbook on nuclear abolition. Thanks for the offer.

Howard W. Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Return-Path: <lmehall@ibm.net>
Reply-To: <lmehall@ibm.net>
From: "LYNETTE MEHALL" <lmehall@ibm.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Thanks!
Date: Sat, 24 Jul 1999 09:49:05 -0500
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal

Dear Uncle Howard,

Sara and Mike's address is MVettraino@aol.com or Musicanv@aol.com. I know I sometimes get e-mails from Nicole and the later address.

It was GREAT to have you guys here last weekend! You know you are welcome anytime, because we have plenty of room. I like it when someone else enjoys my lake!

Luke E-mailed me on Tuesday that he was okay and a long way from home. Then on Thursday he said he was in Phoenix, AR. That is a long way from home. Today he tells me he is living in his car!!! I may try to fly out to get him settle somewhere. I will have to see when he responds today! He is writing to us from libraries. He has not found the girl who infected him. He has asked to borrow money from us to get set up somewhere. It is comforting to know he is alive, but frustrating to not know his exact location.

I need to close to get ready to go to a funeral with Rick in Streator. We loved having you here. Any of your family is always welcome!!! Love, Lynette

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: 1998 receipts
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Phil:

Would you please provide me with information about our gross receipts in 1998 in our two funds? I need this for a report to IRS to show that we have less than the \$25,000 minimum required before filing a full report.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 17:26:55 -0400
From: "Joan Wade" <disarmament@igc.org>
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: August is CTBT Radio Call-In Month!
To: <ctbt-organize@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Greetings CTBT Activists,

August is the month to call into local radio shows about the CTBT. Below you will find an action alert from Marie Reitmann of 20/20 Vision about what you can do to publicize CTBT in your area. 20/20 Vision's Roots on the Radio projects in the past have been nothing short of fabulous, so all are encouraged to take action. Please contact Marie with any questions and, as always, feel free to share your own tips or stories about radio call-ins by sending e-mail to ctbt-organize@igc.org.

Sincerely,

Joan L. Wade
Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator

Roots on the Radio
...A project to amplify the voice of grassroots activists

Attention Grassroots Activists:

JOIN A NATIONAL RADIO CALL-IN DURING AUGUST TO HELP END NUCLEAR TESTING

August is the anniversary month of the only time nuclear weapons have ever actually been used--in 1945 by the United States to bomb Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), an international treaty to ban nuclear weapons test explosions, would curb the spread of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, it has been stalled in the U.S. Senate for nearly two years.

There is renewed focus on the treaty as a result of President Clinton's recent White House Rose Garden appearance when he called for prompt action, saying it "would be a tragedy for our security and for our children's future to let this opportunity slip away." In addition, a new national bipartisan poll was released the same day (July 20) showing that 82% of American voters, Republicans and Democrats alike, want the treaty approved.

Please call your locally-hosted radio talk shows during August and urge listeners to call your Senators. The Capitol switchboard phone number is 202/224-3121. Ask Senators to do everything in their power to ratify the CTBT this year!

If you want more information, including suggested additional talking points

away." In addition, a new national
bipartisan poll was released the same day (July 20) showing that 82% of
American voters, Republicans and Democrats alike, want the treaty approved.

Please call your locally-hosted radio talk shows during August and urge
listeners to call your Senators. The Capitol switchboard phone number is
202/224-3121. Ask Senators to do everything in their power to ratify the
CTBT this year!

If you want more information, including suggested additional talking points
to use, how-to tips, and talk shows in your area, please contact Marie
Rietmann at

20/20 Vision
(202) 833-2020
fax: (202) 833-5307
e-mail: ctbt@2020vision.org
web: www.2020vision.org
</DIV><DIV>--
Joan L. Wade
Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator
1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC, 20010
Ph: (202) 898-0150 x232
Fax: (202) 898-0172</DIV></BODY></HTML>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 18:18:15 +0900
From: Hiro Umebayashi <CXJ15621@nifty.ne.jp>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Tokyo Forum Statement and Recommendation
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

Dear Friends,

The final meeting of the Tokyo Forum for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, an international experts' forum initiated by the Japanese government after nuclear tests by India and Pakistan last year, took place in Tokyo on 23-25 July. It released the following statement and key recommendations. The full report was announced to be leased soon after some final adjustments.

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

25 July 1999 \$B!! (B

THE TOKYO FORUM
FOR NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION AND DISARMAMENT

STATEMENT

A decade after the end of the Cold War, at the threshold of the 21st Century, the fabric of international security is unravelling and nuclear dangers are growing at a disturbing rate. Relations among major powers are deteriorating. The United Nations is in political and financial crisis. The global regimes to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction are under siege. Acts of terror are taking an increasingly worrisome turn, with the possible advent of sub-state groups armed with weapons of mass destruction. Nuclear tests by India and Pakistan have shown that not all countries share the view that the usefulness of nuclear weapons is declining. Years of relentless effort have not eliminated the clandestine weapons of mass destruction programs of the most determined proliferators. The US-Russia nuclear disarmament Process is stalled, with adverse consequences for the global disarmament agenda. The situation in Asia is particularly fluid, portending negative changes for disarmament and non-proliferation in coming years.

Unless concerted action is taken, and taken soon, to reverse these dangerous trends, non-proliferation and disarmament treaties could become hollow instruments. A renewed sense of commitment to both non-proliferation and disarmament is urgently needed. We, the members of the Tokyo Forum, have released this report to draw attention to

growing dangers and to propose remedial actions, both immediate and for the longer term.

The Forum commends the initiative of the Japanese Government in calling it into being and sustaining its work. We express the hope and expectation that the Japanese Government will continue to play a positive role in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. (end)

25 July 1999 1710

Adopted

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Stop and reverse the unravelling of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty regime by reaffirming the treaty's central bargain.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) demands both disarmament and non-proliferation. The nuclear-weapon states must demonstrate tangible progress in nuclear disarmament, while the non-nuclear-weapon states must rally behind the treaty and take stronger steps of their own, such as adopting improved International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. To support the treaty's core bargain, a permanent secretariat and consultative commission should be created to deal with questions of compliance and to consider strengthening measures for the treaty.

2. Eliminate nuclear weapons through phased reductions.

The world faces a choice between the assured dangers of proliferation or the challenges of disarmament. The better choice is the progressive reduction and complete elimination of nuclear weapons. No other cities must be put through the devastation wrought by nuclear weapons and the agony of recovering from their effects, endured by Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Nuclear weapon states must reaffirm the goal of elimination and take sustained, concrete steps towards this end.

3. Bring the nuclear test ban into force.

The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty must be ratified urgently by those key states still holding out - the United States, Russia, China, India, Pakistan, North Korea and Israel. All states must respect a moratorium on nuclear testing and pay their fair share of the treaty's verification costs.

4. Revitalise START and expand the scope of nuclear reductions.

The Tokyo Forum calls on the United States and Russia to initiate new comprehensive talks on nuclear arms reduction and security issues, to combine the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty II and III processes, and to further extend reductions to 1,000 deployed strategic warheads. If these treaties remain stalled, we call on both countries to pursue parallel and verifiable reductions to that level. Verifiable reductions and elimination should be extended to non-deployed and non-strategic nuclear weapons. In addition, the Tokyo Forum calls on China to join the United Kingdom and France in reducing and, in the first instance, not increasing nuclear weapon inventories.

5. Adopt nuclear transparency measures.

Irreversible reductions in nuclear forces require great transparency. The Tokyo Forum welcomes the transparency measures undertaken so far by the nuclear-weapon states and calls on them to take steps to increase transparency further. Recent transparency measures by the United Kingdom and France have shed considerable light on their nuclear weapons numbers and stocks. These could be further developed. The United States has put in place many transparency measures concerning its doctrines, deployments and technical developments. More information on reserve stocks would have a positive impact on steps towards nuclear disarmament. Russia has declared some aspects of its nuclear weapons program. Russia could increase the degree of transparency concerning doctrine, numbers of tactical nuclear weapons and stocks of fissile material. China has put in place few transparency measures. The implementation of further transparency measures on the numbers and types of nuclear weapons and on the amounts of fissile material should be encouraged in view of the favorable regional and global impact.

6. Zero nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert.

The Tokyo Forum calls for all states with nuclear weapons to endorse and implement the goal of zero nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. To this end, we call on the United States and Russia to immediately stand down nuclear forces slated for reduction in START II. To eliminate the risk of the millennium computer bug leading to an accidental launch, all nuclear weapons in all states should be removed from alert for the period of concern.

7. Control fissile material, especially in Russia.

We call on the United States to continue and to increase cooperative threat-reduction efforts in the former Soviet Union. The world community, especially the G8 states and the European Union, must substantially expand cooperative threat-reduction efforts. We call for the prompt conclusion of a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty. We further call on China, India, Pakistan and Israel to declare moratoria on producing fissile material for nuclear weapons. Nuclear-weapon states should put all excess military stocks of fissile materials and civil fissile materials under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

8. Terrorism and weapons of mass destruction.

The Tokyo Forum calls for regional and global cooperative efforts to prevent weapons of mass destruction from falling into the hands of extremist, fanatical or criminal groups.

9. Strengthen measures against missile proliferation.

The guidelines of the Missile Technology Control regime need to be strengthened. We call on all states, particularly North Korea, to respect these guidelines, and for expanded participation in the MTCR. The international community should explore realistic ways to control and reverse missile proliferation, including global or regional agreements drawing upon the provisions of the 1987 US-Soviet treaty on Intermediate and Shorter-Range Nuclear Forces. A special conference of concerned states should be convened to deal with the growing problem of missile proliferation.

10. Exercise caution on missile defence deployments.

The Tokyo Forum recognises the uncertainties and complications missile defence deployments could produce. Recognising the security concerns posed by ballistic missiles, we call on all states contemplating the deployment of advanced missile defences to proceed with caution, in concert with other initiatives to reduce the salience of nuclear weapons.

11. Stop and reverse proliferation in South Asia.

In the near term, the Tokyo Forum calls on India and Pakistan to: maintain a moratorium on nuclear testing; sign and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty; support prompt negotiation of a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty; adopt and properly implement nuclear risk-reduction measures, suspend missile flight tests; confirm pledges to restrain nuclear and missile-related exports; cease provocative actions; and take steps to resolve the Kashmir dispute. In the long term, we urge India and Pakistan to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as non-nuclear-weapon states.

12. Eliminate weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

The Tokyo Forum recognises the linkage between the core objectives of a Middle East that is peaceful and one free of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). We call for: a revitalised Arab-Israeli peace process, resumption of an effective WMD control regime for Iraq under UN Security Council auspices; restraint on missile and flight test programs; effective and verifiable implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention and Biological Weapons Convention by all states in the region; implementation of strengthened International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards; and Israel's accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear weapon state.

13. Eliminate nuclear and missile dangers on the Korean Peninsula.

The Tokyo Forum urges all parties to redouble their efforts to achieve the goal of a denuclearised Korean Peninsula as soon as possible. We call for coordinated global efforts to maintain North Korea's freeze on its graphite-moderated nuclear reactors and related facilities. All nuclear weapon and missile-related activities in North Korea must cease, including production and sale of WMD-capable missile technology. We call for the full and effective implementation of the 1994 Agreed Framework, North Korea's full compliance with an International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards agreement, and its adherence to the agency's strengthened safeguards system.

14. No vetoes in support of proliferation.

The Tokyo Forum calls on the UN Security Council to pass a resolution declaring that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction constitutes a threat to international peace and security. Permanent members of the Security Council have a special responsibility to prevent proliferation. We call on them to refrain from exercising their vetoes against efforts to assist or defend UN member states that have become victim to the use or the threat of use of weapons of mass destruction. All current and prospective permanent members of the UN Security Council should have exemplary non-proliferation credentials.

15. Revitalise the Conference on Disarmament.

The Tokyo Forum calls on the Conference on Disarmament to revise its procedures, update its work program and carry out purposeful work, or suspend its operations. The consensus rule is causing perpetual deadlock. Consensus among members of the Conference on Disarmament should not be necessary to begin or conclude negotiations on a multilateral convention.

16. Strengthen verification for disarmament.

The Tokyo Forum calls for widespread adoption of effective verification measures. The scope of verification of nuclear disarmament should be expanded to non-deployed nuclear weapons and the dismantling of nuclear weapons. An effective verification protocol should be agreed for the Biological Weapons Convention, and implementation decisions weakening the verification regime of the Chemical Weapons Convention should be stopped and reversed.

17. Create effective non-compliance mechanisms for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

The Tokyo Forum calls on all states seeking nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament to actively support the development of arrangements through which states in non-compliance with arms control treaties will know not only that they will be caught, but also that they will face serious consequences. The international community must be united and unequivocal in its intended response to would-be violators based on a broad consensus, including possible recourse to Chapter VII of the UN Charter. A revitalised United Nations with a reformed and authoritative Security Council is essential to building and maintaining the support of the international community for the effective enforcement of compliance. (end)

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3
Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1999 19:32:13 -0400
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org,
"Abolition 2000 NY Metro":@igc.org
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Vote by email
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear Friends,

Earlier I posted the website of Bill Bradley, www.billbradley.com which takes comments on issues. Additionally you can comment to www.algore2000.com and www.georgewbush.com. Please take some time out to put nuclear abolition on the Presidential Campaign Agenda. It's only an email away. Also, forward this message to your other lists--let's swamp 'em. Peace,

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.

To: lyubak@hotmail.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Need for interpreter
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Lyuba Komova:

My wife and I are hosting two Russian visitors under the Library of Congress's Russian Leadership Program. Each day we have a need for volunteers to serve as interpreters. I was told that you might be available.

Specifically we have a need for an interpreter during the day on Thursday, August 5. If you would be willing to serve, would you please get in touch with me. You can reach me at 301 897-3668 or by e-mail reply.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 13:54:34 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Dems, Helms exchange ltrs. on CTBT

July 27, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: 45 Dems/2 Republicans and Jesse Helms exchange letter on CTBT

As part of the effort by the bipartisan group of 9 Senators to step up pressure for Senate consideration of the CTBT, all 45 Senate Democrats wrote Senator Helms on the topic. That letter was sent on July 20. The text of the letter is attached below.

The Washington Times reports today that Senator Helms has replied to that letter (and to a separate letter on the CTBT from Sens. Specter, Jeffords, Dorgan, Murray and Kennedy) in his own unique way. The Washington Times reports:

"Sen. Jesse Helms, North Carolina Republican, sent a letter yesterday to the entire Democratic Caucus, plus Republican Sens. Arlen Specter and James M. Jeffords, responding to their letters promoting the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. 'I note your distress at my floccinaucinihilipilification of the CTBT,' Mr. Helms wrote, among other mouthfuls. If you have a thick enough dictionary, it defines 'floccinaucinihilipilification' as the estimation of something as valueless. Mr. Helms says he got the big word from Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan."

The upshot is that Senator Helms has found new ways to say "no" and, for the moment, the Chairman remains unmoved. However, other Senators may very likely feel less comfortable in remaining silent than they were before the July 20 CTBT efforts. Contact me if you would like a copy of the letter.

For complete coverage of recent CTBT developments see the Coalition's web site, where the following items are available:

* Coalition press release on "Senators, President Call for Action ..."
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/relb072099.htm>>

* Coalition poll results news release
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/rel072099.htm>>

* Mellman/Wirthlin analysis of poll results
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/mellmanwirthlin0799.htm>>

* prepared statements by Senators and transcript of the July 20 press briefing
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/senators072099.htm>>

* July 20 remarks by the President on the CTBT
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/wh072099-02.htm>>

* Letter from all 45 Democratic to Helms on CTBT
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/dem-sen-ltr-ctb072099.htm>>

DK

United States Senate
WASHINGTON, DC 20510

July 20, 1999

The Honorable Jesse Helms
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We urge you to hold hearings on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), and to report it to the full Senate for debate. Most importantly, we ask that this be done with sufficient time to allow the United States to actively participate in the Treaty's inaugural Conference of Ratifying States, which may be held as early as this September, should the Senate ratify the Treaty.

President Clinton signed the CTBT on September 22, 1996 and sent the Treaty to the Senate for its advice and consent on September 24, 1997. We are now midway through the first session of the 106th Congress and the Foreign Relations Committee has held no hearings on this Treaty. As early as September of this year, the 37 countries that have ratified the CTBT will hold a conference to discuss how to facilitate the Treaty's early entry into force. If the United States is to maintain its leadership role and convince other countries to forego nuclear weapons tests, the full Senate must be given the opportunity to consider ratification of the CTBT before that Conference begins.

Many nations are waiting for the United States to lead on this important issue before completing ratification in their countries. Failure to act on the Treaty will deny the U.S. an active voice at the conference and could severely weaken U.S. non-proliferation efforts, including the effort to bring India and Pakistan into this treaty. The recent hostilities in Kashmir are a sober reminder of the need to do all we can to prevent a nuclear holocaust in that region.

The United States must not relinquish its leadership in the nuclear non-proliferation arena. We respectfully urge you to hold all necessary hearings and to report the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty to the Senate for timely consideration before the CTBT inaugural conference.

Sincerely,

[Signed]

Byron L. Dorgan
Tom Daschle
Bob Kerrey
Joe Biden
Carl Levin
Jeff Bingaman
Tom Harkin
Ted Kennedy
Kent Conrad
Charles Schumer
Robert C. Byrd
Jack Reid
Russ Feingold
Chris Dodd
Herb Kohl
Patrick Leahy
Patty Murray
Paul Sarbanes
Frank R. Lautenberg
Paul D. Wellstone
Dick Durbin
Barbara A. Mikulski
John Rockefeller
Evan Bayh
John F. Kerry
Diane Feinstein
Daniel Inouye
John Breaux
Richard Bryan
Max Baucus
Mary Landrieu
Ron Wyden
Harry Reid
Barbara Boxer
Max Cleland
Bob Graham
Robert Torricelli
Blanche L. Lincoln
Daniel K. Akaka
Fritz Hollings
Tim Johnson
Chuck Robb
Daniel Moynihan
Joseph Lieberman
John Edwards

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 16:08:46 -0400
To: Kimball Daryl <dkimball@clw.org>
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news: Biden stmt. on CTBT

July 27, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Senator Biden's floor speech today on CTBT

This morning, the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee delivered the following speech on the floor of the Senate calling for swift approval of the CTBT.

NOTE that the actual delivered version included some additional comments. The final version (as delivered) will be available on Thomas and the Coalition's CTBT Web Site tomorrow.

DK

"LISTEN TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE -- AND RATIFY THE COMPREHENSIVE
TEST-BAN TREATY"
STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR. (D-DE)

July 27, 1999

On July 20, many of us gathered together to announce the results of the latest national poll on ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, or CTBT.

I won't keep my colleagues in suspense. The bottom line is that Americans support this treaty by a margin of 82 percent to 14 percent. That's nearly six to one.

For nearly two years, we Democrats -- and a few courageous Republicans -- have tried to convince the Republican leadership in this body to move this treaty and to let the Senate vote on ratification. The latest poll results are a welcome reminder that the people are with us on this important issue.

The Senate Must Act on this Treaty

I know that some of my colleagues have principled objections to this treaty. I respect their convictions, even though I strongly believe that they are wrong on this issue.

What I cannot respect, however -- and what my colleagues should not tolerate -- is the refusal of the Republican leadership of this body to permit the Senate to debate and vote on ratification of this vital treaty. It is simply irresponsible for the Republican leadership to hold this treaty hostage to other issues, as it has for nearly two years.

Some of my colleagues believe nuclear weapons tests are essential to preserve our nuclear deterrent. Both I and the directors of our three nuclear weapons laboratories disagree. The \$45 billion "Stockpile Stewardship" program enables us to maintain the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons without weapons tests.

The fact is that the United States is in the best position of all the nuclear weapons states to do without testing. We have already conducted over 1,000 nuclear tests. The "Stockpile Stewardship" program harnesses these data, new high-energy physics experiments, and the world's most advanced supercomputers to improve our understanding of how a nuclear explosion (and each part in a weapon) works.

In addition, each year our laboratories take apart and examine some nuclear weapons to see how well those parts work.

The old data and new experiments enable our scientists to diagnose and fix problems without full-scale weapons testing. This is already being done. By this means our nuclear weapons laboratories are already maintaining the reliability of our nuclear stockpile.

Still, if nuclear weapons testing should be required in the future to maintain the U.S. nuclear deterrent, then we will test. The Administration has proposed, in fact, that we enact such safeguards as yearly review and certification of the nuclear deterrent and maintenance of the Nevada Test Site.

Thanks in part to those safeguards, officials with the practical responsibility of defending our national security support ratification of the Test-Ban Treaty. In addition to the nuclear lab directors, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has spoken in favor of ratification.

Support for ratification is not limited, moreover, to the current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The four previous Chairmen also support ratification. Think of that: this treaty is supported by General John Shalikashvili, General Colin Powell, Admiral William Crowe and General David Jones. Those gentlemen have guided our military since the Reagan Administration.

Why would those with practical national security responsibilities support this treaty? The answer is simple: for practical reasons.

Since 1992, pursuant to U.S. law, the United States has not engaged in nuclear weapons tests. As I have explained, we have been able, through "stockpile stewardship," to maintain our nuclear deterrent

using improved science, state-of-the-art computations and our library of past test results.

Other countries were free to test, until they signed the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty. Now they are bound, as we are, not to test. But that obligation will wither on the vine if we fail to ratify this treaty.

One traditional issue on arms control treaties is verification. The Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty will improve U.S. monitoring capabilities, with the rest of the world picking up three-quarters of the cost. The treaty provides for on-site inspection of suspect test sites, which we have never been able to obtain in the past.

Some of my colleagues believe that our imperfect verification capabilities make ratification of the Test-Ban Treaty unwise. New or prospective nuclear weapons states can gain little, however, from the low-yield tests that we might be unable to detect. Even Russia could not use such tests to produce new classes of nuclear weapons.

The case of China is particularly important. The Cox Committee warned that China may have stolen U.S. nuclear codes. As Congressman Chris Cox explained, however, a China bound by the Test-Ban Treaty is much less likely to be able to translate its espionage successes into usable new weapons.

And The Senate Must Act Promptly

As I noted, however, the Test-Ban Treaty will wither on the vine if we do not ratify it. Then China will be free to resume testing. If we fail to take the opportunity to bind China in this Test-Ban Treaty, that mistake will haunt us for a generation.

The need for speedy ratification of the CTBT is greater than ever before. In India and Pakistan, the world has watched with mounting concern over the last two months as those self-proclaimed nuclear weapons states engaged in a conventional conflict that threatened to spiral out of control.

Were nuclear weapons to be used in those densely populated countries, the result would be a horror unmatched in the annals of war. This would also breach the post-War firebreak against nuclear war -- which has stood for over 50 years -- with incalculable consequences for the world.

The India-Pakistan conflict may be back under control, for now. President Clinton took an active interest in it, and that seems to have been important to the process. The threat of a nuclear holocaust remains real, however, in that region.

We can help prevent such a calamity. India and Pakistan have promised not to forestall the Test-Ban Treaty's entry into force. They could even sign that Treaty by this fall. The Test-Ban Treaty could freeze their nuclear weapons capabilities, and make it harder to

field nuclear warheads on their ballistic missiles.

That will not happen, however, unless we accept the same obligation to refrain from nuclear weapons tests. Thus, we in the Senate have the power to influence India and Pakistan -- for good, or for ill. God help us if we should make the wrong choice, and lose this opportunity to bring India and Pakistan back from the brink.

This body's action -- or lack of action -- may also have a critical impact upon world-wide nuclear non-proliferation. Next spring, the signatories of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (or NPT) will hold a review conference.

If the United States has not ratified the CTBT by that time, non-nuclear weapons states will note that we promised a Test-Ban Treaty five years ago, in return for indefinite extension of the NPT. We would thus risk undermining the non-proliferation resolve of the non-nuclear weapons states.

Let me be clear. The Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty must not be treated as a political football. It is a matter of urgent necessity to our national security. If the Senate should fail to exercise its constitutional responsibility, the very future of nuclear non-proliferation could be at stake.

Two months ago, I spoke on the Senate floor about the need for bipartisanship -- the need to "reach out across that chasm, ...reach out across that aisle." Today, I reach out to the Republican leadership that denies the Senate -- and the American people -- a vote on CTBT.

I was joined, on Sunday, by The Washington Post, which spoke out in an editorial against what it termed "hijacking the test ban." I will not repeat today that editorial's comments regarding my friend from North Carolina who chairs the Foreign Relations Committee. I do call to the attention of my colleagues, however, one salient question from the editorial: "One wonders why his colleagues, of whatever party or test ban persuasion, let him go on."

The Poll Results

The poll that was conducted last month will not surprise anybody who follows this issue. But it should serve as a reminder to my colleagues that the American people are not indifferent to what we do here.

The results go beyond party lines. Fully 80 percent of Republicans -- and even 79 percent of conservative Republicans -- say that they support the Test-Ban Treaty.

And this is considered opinion. In May of last year, the people said that they knew some countries might try to cheat on the test-ban. But they still supported U.S. ratification, by a 73-16 margin. As already announced, today's poll results show even greater support than

we had a year ago.

Last year's polls also show a clear view on the public's part of how to deal with the nuclear tests by India and Pakistan. When asked how to respond to those tests, over 80 percent favored getting India and Pakistan into the Test-Ban Treaty and over 70 percent saw U.S. ratification as a useful response.

By contrast, fewer than 40 percent wanted more spending on U.S. missile defense; and fewer than 25 percent wanted us to resume nuclear testing.

The American people understood something that had escaped the attention of the Republican leadership: that the best response to India and Pakistan's nuclear tests is to rope them in to a test-ban, which requires doing the same for ourselves.

The American people reach similar conclusions today regarding China's possible stealing of U.S. nuclear weapons secrets. When asked about its implications for the Test-Ban Treaty, 17 percent see this as rendering the Treaty irrelevant; but nearly three times as many -- 48 percent -- see it as confirming the importance of the Treaty. Once again, the American people are ahead of the Republican leadership.

The American people see the Test-Ban Treaty as a sensible response to world-wide nuclear threats. In a choice between the Treaty and a return to U.S. nuclear testing, 84 percent chose the Treaty. Only 11 percent would go back to U.S. testing.

Last month's bipartisan poll -- conducted jointly by the Mellman Group and Wirthlin Worldwide -- asked a thousand people "which Senate candidate would you vote for: one who favored CTBT ratification, or one who opposed it?" So as to be completely fair, they even told their respondents the arguments that are advanced against ratification.

By a 2-to-1 margin, the American people said they would vote for the candidate who favors ratifying the Treaty. Even Republicans would vote for that candidate, by a 52-42 margin.

Now, as a Democrat, I like those numbers. The fact remains, however, that both the national interest and the reputation of the United States Senate are on the line in this matter.

The national security implications of the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty must be addressed in a responsible manner. There must be debate. There must be a vote.

In sum, the Senate must do its duty -- and do it soon --

* so that America can remain the world's leader on nuclear non-proliferation;

* so that we can help bring India and Pakistan away from the brink of nuclear disaster;

* and so that the United States Senate can perform its Constitutional duty in the manner that the Founders intended.

Let me close with some words from a most esteemed former colleague, Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon. In a letter of July 20 -- and I ask unanimous consent that the full text of that letter be reprinted in the Record after my statement -- Senator Hatfield began: "The time has come for Senate action on CTBT ratification."

Senator Hatfield adduces some excellent arguments in favor of ratification, which I commend to my colleagues. But I especially want recommend his conclusion, which summarizes our situation with elegant precision:

"It is clear to me that ratifying this Treaty would be in the national interest. And it is equally clear that Senators have a responsibility to the world, the nation and their constituents to put partisan politics aside and allow the Senate to consider this Treaty."

Ladies and gentlemen of the Senate, that says it all.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
From: "Joan Wade" <disarmament@igc.org>
To: <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>, <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: "Karina Wood" <kwood@igc.apc.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) Fall Call for Abolition Action!
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1999 16:35:10 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

To: Abolition Activists

From: Joan Wade, Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator

RE: Fall Action for Abolition Activists

Date: July 26, 1999

FALL CALL FOR ABOLITION ACTION!!!!!!

This fall marks the 10th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall. Though the Cold War is over, the threat of nuclear war persists. Over 36,000 nuclear weapons remain in the world, 5,000 of which are on alert, ready to be launched in moments. Isn't it time to make a change? This fall, two unique series of events will be organized to heighten public awareness about nuclear weapons and to light the abolition flame. We invite you and your organization to take part.

60 Minutes II Organizing Opportunity: This fall CBS will air a new documentary on "60 Minutes II" on the nuclear legacy of the Cold War. A date has not yet been set, but it will air on a Tuesday night no sooner than September 28th. The film will include discussion of the breadth of U.S. and Russian stockpiles as well of the danger of warheads on hair-trigger alert.

This is a rare chance to engage the general public in our issues through the popular media and a perfect opportunity to organize house parties and other group events to ignite the abolition flame! Organizing kits will be available for all those interested in hosting house parties, or bigger events at churches and town halls. Invite potential activists, community leaders, and friends to watch the program and discuss. You can also invite your local CBS affiliate to cover your event and interview participants on their nightly broadcast. If you are unable to host an event the night of the show, tape it and plan on a screening sometime soon after. Or tape it regardless and organize multiple events!

Speakers Tour: Project Abolition will also launch a speakers tour this fall which will consist of several large scale community forums organized around the 60 Minutes piece followed by a greater number of events around the 10th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall (November 9th). The moderated forums will emulate the hip format of the current hit TV show "Politically Incorrect." Speakers will include national and local legislators, activists, and commentators. A publicity campaign is being coordinated around the tour, including print ads, radio appearances, and public service announcements.

The tour will begin in New Hampshire and Iowa and move throughout the country through the fall. If your local group is interested in hosting a tour event, please contact Karina Wood (details below).

Change the Message!: We anticipate a considerable level of media attention to the Berlin anniversary, which will likely focus on how the U.S. "won" the Cold War. It will be up to the abolition community to highlight the fact that the U.S. has squandered the opportunity of the post Cold War decade to make the world safe from nuclear destruction, and as a result, has engaged in a dangerous arms race with itself that is fueling proliferation worldwide.

What Next?: As the dates for the CBS program and the speakers tour are finalized, we encourage you to think about ways to mobilize around both events and contact people you think might be interested in taking part. More information will be provided as soon as it is available. In the meantime, please feel free to contact us with any new ideas or questions through the channels listed below:

Contact:

Joan L. Wade, Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator, ph: (202) 898-0150 x232, fax: (202) 898-0172, e-mail: disarmament@igc.org, web: <http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

Karina H. Wood, Field Coordinator, Project Abolition, ph: (401) 276-0377, fax: (401) 756-1476, e-mail: kwood@igc.org, web: www.fourthfreedom.org

House party organizing kits will soon be available for this fall's abolition-related events. Each kit will include a house party organizing guide, timely action alerts, sample letters to the President, and more! Fill out the order form below to receive up to five kits free, or call Joan Wade at the Disarmament Clearinghouse to order more.

Project Abolition is a new initiative of the Fourth Freedom Forum, with assistance from the Global Resource Action Center for the Environment (GRACE), the Nation Institute, the State of the World Forum, and the Rubin Foundation, working in coalition with leading U.S. disarmament organizations - Disarmament Clearinghouse, Peace Action, PeaceLinks, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and Women's Action for New Directions.

___ Yes! I would like to order a Disarmament Clearinghouse house party kit today!

Please send ___ kits to:

(name)

(organization/affiliation)

(phone, e-mail)

(address, city, state, zip)

Please return this order form to the Disarmament Clearinghouse

no later than September 1st, 1999.

Activist Flash: Disarmament Clearinghouse has updated it's de-alerting organizing kit. Contact the Clearinghouse to find out more!

--

Joan L. Wade
Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator
1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC, 20010
Ph: (202) 898-0150 x232

Fax: (202) 898-0172

E-mail: disarmament@igc.org

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

<HTML><HEAD>

<META content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1" http-equiv=Content-Type>

<META content="MSHTML 5.00.2314.1000" name=GENERATOR>

<STYLE></STYLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>

<DIV>

<DIV>

<P>To: Abolition Activists</P>

<P>From: Joan Wade, Disarmament Clearinghouse

Coordinator</P>

<P>RE: Fall Action for Abolition Activists</P>

<P>Date: July 26, 1999</P>

<P align=center>FALL CALL FOR
ABOLITION ACTION!!!!!!</P>

<P>This fall marks the 10th anniversary of the fall of the
Berlin Wall. Though the Cold War is over, the threat of nuclear war
persists. Over 36,000 nuclear weapons remain in the world, 5,000 of which
are on alert, ready to be launched in moments. Isn't it time to make a
change? This fall, two unique series of events will be organized to
heighten public awareness about nuclear weapons and to light the abolition
flame. We invite you and your organization to take part. </P>

<P><U>60 Minutes II Organizing Opportunity:</U> This
fall CBS will air a new documentary on "60 Minutes II" on the nuclear legacy of
the Cold War. A date has not yet been set, but it will air on a Tuesday night no
sooner than September 28th. The film will include discussion of the
breadth of U.S. and Russian stockpiles as well of the danger of warheads on
hair-trigger alert.</P>

<P>This is a rare chance to engage the general public in our issues through the
popular media and a perfect opportunity to organize house parties and other
group events to ignite the abolition flame! Organizing kits will be available
for all those interested in <I>hosting house parties, or bigger events at
churches and town halls</I>. Invite potential activists, community leaders,
and friends to watch the program and discuss. You can also invite your local CBS
affiliate to cover your event and interview participants on their nightly
broadcast. If you are unable to host an event the night of the show, tape
it and plan on a screening sometime soon after. Or tape it regardless and
organize mutple events!</P><U>

<P>Speakers Tour:</U> Project Abolition will also launch a <I>speakers
tour </I>this fall which will consist of several large scale community
forums organized around the 60 Minutes piece followed by a greater number of
events around the 10th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall
(November 9th). The moderated forums will emulate the hip format of the current
hit TV show "Politically Incorrect." Speakers will include national and local
legislators, activists, and commentators. A publicity campaign is being

coordinated around the tour, including print ads, radio appearances, and public service announcements.

The tour will begin in New Hampshire and Iowa and move throughout the country through the fall. If your local group is interested in hosting a tour event, please contact Karina Wood (details below).

Change the Message! We anticipate a considerable level of media attention to the Berlin anniversary, which will likely focus on how the U.S. "won" the Cold War. **It will be up to the abolition community to highlight the fact that the U.S. has squandered the opportunity of the post Cold War decade to make the world safe from nuclear destruction, and as a result, has engaged in a dangerous arms race with itself that is fueling proliferation worldwide.**

What Next? As the dates for the CBS program and the speakers tour are finalized, we encourage you to **think about ways to mobilize around both events** and contact people you think might be interested in taking part. More information will be provided as soon as it is available. In the meantime, please feel free to contact us with any new ideas or questions through the channels listed below:

Contact:
Joan L. Wade, Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator,
ph: (202) 898-0150 x232, fax: (202) 898-0172, e-mail: disarmament@igc.org, web: <http://www.psr.org/Disarmhouse.htm>

Karina H. Wood, Field Coordinator, Project Abolition,
ph: (401) 276-0377, fax: (401) 756-1476, e-mail: kwood@igc.org, web: www.fourthfreedom.org

House party organizing kits will soon be available for this fall's abolition-related events. Each kit will include a house party organizing guide, timely action alerts, sample letters to the President, and more! Fill out the order form below to receive up to five kits free, or call Joan Wade at the Disarmament Clearinghouse to order more.

Project Abolition is a new initiative of the Fourth Freedom Forum, with assistance from the Global Resource Action Center for the Environment (GRACE), the Nation Institute, the State of the World Forum, and the Rubin Foundation, working in coalition with leading U.S. disarmament organizations - Disarmament Clearinghouse, Peace Action, PeaceLinks, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and Women's Action for New Directions.

Yes! I would like to order a Disarmament Clearinghouse house party kit today!

Please send _____ kits to: _____

<P>_____</P>

<P>(phone, e-mail)</P>

<P><FONT

face=Arial>_____</P>

<P>(address, city, state, zip)</P><I>

<P align=center>Please return this order form to the
Disarmament Clearinghouse </P>

<P align=center>no later than September 1st,&br/>1999.</P></I>

<P align=center></P>

<P>* Activist Flash: Disarmament Clearinghouse has updated it's
de-alerting organizing kit. Contact the Clearinghouse to find out
more!*</P></DIV>

<DIV>--
Joan L. Wade
Disarmament Clearinghouse
Coordinator
1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC, 20010
Ph:
(202) 898-0150 x232</DIV>

<DIV>
Fax: (202) 898-0172</DIV>

<DIV>E-mail: disarmament@igc.org</DIV></DIV></BODY></HTML>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:29:07 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Issue Brief: Editors for CTBT, Pt.4

July 28, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: latest Coalition Issue Brief on pro-CTBT editorials

Last week's positive press on the CTBT has prompted several more editorials, which are excerpted in the Issue Brief below.

If you are interested in exchange of Senate letters referenced in the Issue brief, the full text of the 45 Senators letter to Helms see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/dem-sen-ltr-ctb072099.htm>> and Senator Helms' reply, see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/helms072799.htm>>

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF

VOL. 3, NO. 7, July 28, 1999

"America's Editors Back Test Ban Treaty, Pt. 4 --
Cite Helms As Ally of Proliferators"

LAST WEEK, A BIPARTISAN group of nine Senators gathered in the Capitol to reiterate their call for prompt Senate consideration and approval of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and to draw attention to the fact that 82% of American voters, including 80% of Republicans support the Test Ban Treaty (Mellman/Wirthlin, June 1999). The same day — July 20 — all 45 Democratic Senators wrote Senator Helms:

"The United States must not relinquish its leadership in the non-proliferation arena. We respectfully urge you to hold all necessary hearings and to report the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the Senate for timely consideration before the CTBT inaugural conference [in October]."

In a July 26 reply, Senator Helms apparently found his sense of humor and a new way to say "no" — at least for now. Helms noted his "floccinaucinihilipilification of the CTBT" and reiterated his demand that the Kyoto Climate Protocol and the ABM protocols of 1997 be sent to the Senate. (For those whose command of Latin has escaped them, that 29-letter term is defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as "the habit of estimating as worthless.")

Unfortunately for Senator Helms, American voters and leading commentators overwhelmingly favor Senate approval of the CTBT and do not find his hostage-taking tactics to be amusing. The longer Chairman Helms holds the CTBT hostage to other, unrelated issues, the more frequently he and his allies will find themselves on the receiving end of the American public's flocinaucinihilipilifications. As The Washington Post editorialized this past week, "One wonders why his colleagues, of whatever party or test ban persuasion, let him go on."

Since the CTBT was sent to the Senate in September 1997, over 80 newspaper editorials have expressed support for the CTBT and/or for prompt Senate action, while only 3 have opposed. In the days since the nine Senators' appeal for action on the CTBT, pro-test ban editorials have appeared on the pages of several more newspapers:

The Tennessean, July 12, 1999: "Helms vs. Test Ban Treaty"

The U.S. Senate has yet to schedule a hearing on the [test ban] treaty, much less a floor vote. Unless the Senate ratifies by the deadline, this nation will be dealt out of its leadership position on the issue. And without U.S. leadership, this treaty has no chance of becoming effective. The specific problem now is Sen. Jesse Helms, R-NC, chair of the Foreign Relations Committee. Helms is holding the test ban treaty hostage while he tries to squeeze some concessions on other treaties from the White House.

But it should be evident even to Helms that the nuclear test ban treaty will enhance world security without putting the United States at any disadvantage. The U.S. hasn't conducted a full nuclear test since 1992. Other nations, including France, India and Pakistan, have conducted recent tests. And since this nation already has the largest stockpile of nuclear weapons, the treaty would lock in the United States as the world's premier nuclear power.

Under the best scenario, this measure has a tough road ahead. Nevertheless, putting a cork in the world's development of nuclear weapons is well worth the fight. Helms' GOP colleague, particularly Trent Lott, should convince Helms that this treaty deserves a hearing and a vote.

The Indianapolis Star, July 14, 1999: "Test ban treaty would make world safer"

America has the opportunity to help stop the nuclear arms race by ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and Sens. Evan Bayh and Richard Lugar can help. This international treaty would ban nuclear test explosions, but it is stalled in the U.S. Senate ... ratification of the treaty would strengthen our position in convincing those and other nations to reject testing. The test ban treaty would serve as the last line of defense against nuclear weapons espionage by prohibiting countries such as China from testing new bomb designs to see if they work. The U.S. Senate needs to follow the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and ratify the treaty.

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, July 25, 1999: "Again, Helms Plays Obstructionist"

Once again, the stupidity and intransigence of a single senator are damaging not only the foreign policy of the United States, but even its security. Senators with a more mature sense of patriotism should not allow their colleague to get away with his obstructionism. As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C) has considerable power, and he is neither squeamish nor responsible about using it. Just now, he refuses to schedule a committee hearing on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Preventing nuclear test explosions would make it more difficult for non-nuclear countries to acquire atomic weapons. As more countries and even terrorist groups threaten to use such weapons, the security of this country comes under increasing threat. That is the result of Helms' obstructionism. The Senate GOP leadership overrode Helms' objections to permit a chemical weapons ban to come to the Senate floor for approval. It's time for the same sort of leadership in behalf of a treaty that would help shield the world ... from nuclear weapons.

The Washington Post, July 25, 1999: "... And a Captive Treaty"

The Clinton administration has cranked up a necessary campaign to liberate the nuclear test ban treaty from the parliamentary grip of ... Sen. Jesse Helms The senator is holding the treaty hostage to a personal agenda: to move the United States immediately rather than at the administration's more measured pace to national missile defense and to spike the Kyoto global warming treaty. In hijacking the test ban, he is unswayed by the argument that in fairness the Senate deserves an opportunity to debate and judge the treaty on its merits. One wonders why his colleagues, of whatever party or test ban persuasion, let him go on.

Perhaps the single most telling judgment of the test ban came in the last of seven hearings Sen. Helms chaired this year on the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, his vehicle for advancing missile defense. His star witness on May 26, former secretary of state Henry Kissinger, gave his latest views -- positive -- on missile defense. Sen. Bill Frist then asked him about the test ban. Noting the "constraints" it would place, he said: "I think we have an arms control objective, and must have, to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. And anything that makes it more difficult to develop more nuclear weapons, I would, in principle, favor." The test ban makes it more difficult to develop more nuclear weapons. In short, you can have your test ban and your missile defense, too. Missile defense is moving along. Free the test ban treaty.

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, July 26, 1999: "Testing patience"

... Despite this being an issue of surpassing importance for the United States and the world, there have been no hearings, no consideration by the Senate and no vote [on the test ban treaty]. At the center of this self-destructive inaction is a familiar figure: Sen. Jesse Helms If the treaty is not in force by September, the ratifying nations will hold an

international conference shortly thereafter to seek ways to bring the treaty into force. As the world's superpower, the United States has a key role to play in this -- and it is clearly in the national interest to supply such leadership. It will always be a temptation for some nations to obtain nuclear weapons, but if they are constrained by international treaty from testing them, the dependability of their weapons will be suspect. By contrast, the United States loses nothing by making a formal commitment to a ban that it is already following. As a practical matter, it has had years of experience in weapons production and can employ sophisticated computer simulations. The test ban treaty offers some hope in a world inclined to madness. Holding it a political hostage, cynically refusing to hold hearings and a vote, is more than act of folly -- it is an unconscionable refusal to do the business of the American people.

#

See the Coalition's CTBT Site <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>> for the full text of CTBT-related editorials. The Coalition is a non-partisan alliance of 17 leading arms control and non-proliferation organizations.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 10:32:11 -0400
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: CTBT columns "tell it like it is"
To: dkimball@clw.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id HAA28172
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id HAB28463

July 29, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

RE: Two more stongly pro-CTBT columns

In addition to the many editorials that are stacking up, today's edition of The Washington Post carries two excellent columns that tell it like it is: Mary McGrory's "Atomic Apathy" and Geneva Overholser's "Treaty in a Bottle."

The Overholser piece also ran in several other papers including the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Times-Picayune (New Orleans), The Star-Ledger (Newark), The Philadelphia Inquirer, and the Dallas Morning News.

DK

"Atomic Apathy"

By Mary McGrory

The Washington Post, Thursday, July 29, 1999; Page A03

You might think that a cause that has the support of 82 percent of the American people would have a fairly good chance of prevailing on Capitol Hill. But you would be wrong. A clownish senator and a distracted president have managed to bring the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the brink of meltdown. It's not that it would be voted down on the Senate floor. It's just that Sen. Jesse Helms won't let it get there.

This is not the first time that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who comes from North Carolina and basically hates the rest of the world, has denied his colleagues the right to vote. In 1997, he stood in the Senate door to block consideration of another matter of grave consequence to the country and the planet, the Chemical Weapons Convention. Helms, who glories in being impossible, set his face against it. Republican Senate leader Trent Lott backed him. Sen. Richard Lugar of Indiana, who is regarded by the right as unacceptably rational, rallied like-minded Republicans on the committee to challenge Helms. Lott and Helms finally gave way.

But Lugar is playing no part in the current drama. He wasn't asked. He has not heard from President Clinton, nor has he received battalions of briefers like those of other years who must explain the technical complexities of verification.

Lugar is not the only member of the Senate who feels the president is not concentrating on an issue that is rich in legacy potential and has the Kennedy connection Clinton is usually so eager to seize. John F. Kennedy's finest hour was the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Democratic senators led by Minority Leader Tom Daschle and Joe Biden, the ranking Democrat on Foreign Relations, think they forced the president to speak out on the treaty last week in the Rose Garden. Seven of them held a press conference organized by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. Two Republican senators, James Jeffords of Vermont and Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania, joined in a demand for the release of the treaty.

Biden denounced as "stupid and ridiculous" Helms's insistence that the president seek Senate approval of two other treaties before the test ban could be considered. Helms opposes both the ABM agreement with Russia, which has expired, and the Kyoto Accord, which calls for reductions in greenhouse gasses. Biden says neither of them has anything to do with the test ban.

Lugar's absence from the ranks of moderate Republicans supporting the test ban is keenly felt. So is that of John Chafee of Rhode Island, a stalwart on arms control at home and abroad--he wants a ban on handguns. But he is otherwise engaged, trying to save the ABM Treaty from extinction.

"The CTBT is not anyone's top priority," mourned a GOP staffer.

Some muse that the president, a compulsive compartmentalizer, feels he has expended his quarterly foreign policy component by his attention to Kosovo and has returned happily to his first loves, budget and taxes. His National Security Council expert, Bob Bell, says senators will not concentrate on the issue until a time certain for consideration is set. But Republican senators would like to be sure the treaty is a winner before they declare themselves. The more they hang back, the more the chances of success are diminished. Only the president can reverse the tide.

"We have not given up," says Bell, but his imminent departure--he is off to NATO for an arms control post--has increased Capitol Hill calls for a point person, preferably some grandee either Republican or military or both, a big name like Adm. William Crowe or Gen. Colin Powell, who could knock heads together and give professional reassurances about verification and other knotty matters.

"We have not given up," says Bell.

Lugar says they have: "The administration is giving up--the degree of energy needed is simply not there."

Majority Leader Lott has made it clear he will not intervene this time. "We took it away from the chairman on chemical weapons and there were a lot

of problems," he says. This is South-speak for "hell to pay" after the liberation and passage of the CWC. "I am not inclined to do that again."

Some say that the nuclear explosions in Pakistan and India illustrate the futility of the ban now, although proponents say it would inhibit deadly progress. Some think the treaty is untimely because the North Koreans are madly making missiles.

If Clinton wants it, he will have to mobilize the favorable 82 percent. They may not grasp Senate dictators, egos, etiquette or nervous Nellyism. But they know that a nuclear test ban does not deserve incineration by inaction, the fate it now faces.

© Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company

"Treaty in a Bottle"

By Geneva Overholser

The Washington Post, Thursday, July 29, 1999; Page A29

Do you have friends or family in North Carolina or Mississippi? Then do yourself -- do all of us -- a favor. Beg them to call Jesse Helms and Trent Lott and demand an end to their outrageous refusal to allow Senate consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Mississippi's Lott, the Senate majority leader, and North Carolina's Helms, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, are peevishly, recklessly and -- most of all -- dangerously bottling up the ban on nuclear weapons testing that, by all logic, the Senate should be ratifying.

The treaty was concluded in 1996 after 40 years of bipartisan effort. The United States was the first to sign. President Clinton on that occasion called the treaty "the longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control." Since then 151 other nations have signed; 41 have ratified. Until the U.S. Senate ratifies it, however, the test ban treaty cannot go into force for any country.

The United States has already stopped testing nuclear weapons. Precluding other nations from testing, as this verifiable treaty would do, is powerfully in the interests of this and other countries. Lott and Helms's refusal to allow hearings is not based on the merits of the treaty. They are using it as leverage toward their own agendas -- holding the treaty hostage to goad Clinton to send other, unrelated matters to the Senate.

If allowed to go to the Senate floor, the treaty appears all but certain to be ratified; it has strong support in both parties. Yet the Helms-Lott impetuosity has continued for a year and a half, with only an occasional, ineffectual protest from one or another supporter of the treaty.

Finally, this month, treaty backers showed signs of life. President Clinton -- who could, if he invested enough of himself, put this issue onto the public

agenda so squarely that Helms and Lott could never get away with their recklessness -- gave a brief and fairly lackluster speech, in which he called for hearings.

More vigorous action came from a group of senators of both parties, who fielded a lively news conference in which they called for an end to Helms's and Lott's stonewalling.

"The unwillingness of Trent Lott to allow us to debate this treaty, the unwillingness of the Foreign Relations Committee to even bring up the treaty, is counterintuitive. It is irresponsible, it is against the interests and wishes of the American people, it overrides the vast majority of the view of the United States senators, and it is stupid. It is stupid," said Delaware's Joseph Biden, a Democrat.

"There will be a price to pay, and we plan on making them pay that price if they continue this irresponsible action."

Arlen Specter, a Pennsylvania Republican, said the treaty is a "a matter of survival. . . . My view is that not enough Americans really understand what is going on, because if more people understood what was going on, there would be a demand on the Senate to act and to act favorably."

Public opinion on the treaty is overwhelmingly positive, as a bipartisan poll released at the news conference confirmed. Eight in 10 Americans support the treaty; 14 percent disapprove. Pollster Mark Mellman said at the Capitol, "The support is wide, the support is deep, the support is broad across every demographic-geographic segment of the country. And that support for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban is impervious to the kind of arguments made by the opponents."

Added Byron Dorgan, a Democrat from North Dakota: "There is nothing on the Senate agenda -- nothing, in my opinion -- that is more important than this. We spend days around here debating what we ought to name an airport. . . . This comes under the category of the 'Biggest Issue.' The issue of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons on this earth is the biggest issue."

President Eisenhower said that not achieving a nuclear test ban "would have to be classed as the greatest disappointment of any administration of any decade of any time and of any party."

That was in 1961. Almost 40 years later, Helms and Lott hold the treaty's success or failure in their tight little grip, and only a full-fledged showing of public outrage can jar it loose.

© Copyright 1999 The Washington Post Company

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <syoun@clw.org>
X-Sender: syoun@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Thu, 29 Jul 1999 11:41:20 -0400
To: cdavis@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org, jsmith@clw.org, syoun@clw.org,
bamorse@earthlink.net, kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, ieer@ieer.org,
mupj@igc.org, cpaine@nrdc.org, fteplitz@peace-action.org,
epank@peacenet.org, kroberts@psr.org, btiller@psr.org,
brian@taxpayer.net, ctbt@2020vision.org, laura@2020vision.org,
tcollina@ucsusa.org, wand@wand.org, cferg@fas.org, sara@fcnl.org,
disarmament@igc.org, maureene@earthlink.net
From: Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>
Subject: Nuclear Weapons Policy Update

Dear colleagues,

Below is the text of the Nuclear Weapons Policy Update on START. Only Howard gave me comments, which I tried to incorporate. I also did some tightening of the text.

Please read the NEW final para on NWWG. It includes my name as a contact for this issue, but lists ANA's address as that of NWWG. I would suggest that this be the pattern for all Updates. If another organization would like to have their address used instead of ANA's, I know ANA would not mind.

In the past, have these been dropped? We can fax this out to all Senate staff fairly easily, but would do it w/o a news article. A drop could include the W. Post article from yesterday on Stepashin's visit. Any thoughts appreciated.

Stephen

+ + + + +

Re-START Nuclear Reductions

The Clinton Administration has one final opportunity to make progress on strategic nuclear arms reductions before leaving office, but only if it boldly takes the initiative with Russia on START III.

Fortunately, the June 20, 1999, Cologne agreement between Presidents Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin makes that possible. At that meeting, the two leaders announced that the United States and Russia would discuss the next round of START disarmament talks and the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Russian Prime Minister Sergei Stepashin recent meetings with Vice President Gore confirmed these talks.

However, mere "discussions" have no hope of reaching agreement before elections in 2000 end the terms of both Presidents. To have a chance of success, the two countries must take up negotiations and set a goal of reaching agreement this year, or the opportunity may be lost forever.

This will take a focused effort by both countries. For six years, the nuclear disarmament process has been stuck; the Clinton Administration does

not have a single disarmament treaty to its credit. While circumstances have made progress difficult, this outcome reflects a lack of will in the Clinton Administration to date. The Clinton Administration and the Congress have unwisely conditioned any strategic nuclear arms reductions on the Russian Duma's ratification of START II. This policy has now been mandated by Congress, so that current law requires the United States to maintain START I force levels and alert status until the Duma ratifies START II. As a result, both nations still possess approximately 13,000 strategic nuclear weapons (US: 7,200; Russia: 6,000), many of which remain on Cold War-era "hair-trigger" alert status. This means that both sides can deliver over 4000 nuclear bombs within 30 minutes. While Russian and U.S. troops patrol Bosnia side by side, this situation is needlessly dangerous.

To break this impasse, the United States and Russia should agree a START III treaty this year. The details are not as important as an agreement; however, a breakthrough that lowers the strategic arsenals of both sides to 1,500 or below would dramatically alter the international security regime. For example, if the U.S. and Russia agree to that level, China, the United Kingdom, and France would be more willing to join multilateral disarmament negotiations. To ensure that these reductions are irreversible, the two countries should conclude an agreement that incorporates bold and new verification provisions. Quickly reducing the alert status of weapons to be dismantled and those still in arsenals should also be a priority.

A START III agreement would help prospects for Duma ratification of START II. At present, Russia must build hundreds of single-warhead missiles to keep an arsenal anywhere near the START II limit of 3,000-3,500, a task it can barely afford. The 1997 Helsinki START III framework agreement set a 2,000- 2,500 limit for strategic warheads, but numerous Russian officials have sought numbers of 1,500 or below.

For its part, Congress should convey to the President a clear message: now is the time to conclude a START III agreement. The opportunity may never come again.

+++++

A publication of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group (NWWG), July 1999. NWWG includes leading U.S. arms control and disarmament organizations. Updates do not necessarily reflect the views of every NWWG member. For information on this issue, contact: Stephen Young on 202-546-0795, x102. NWWG: 1801 18th Street, NW, 2nd Floor, Suite 9, Washington, DC 20036. Phone: 202-833-4668; fax: 202-234-9536. Washington, DC 20036. Phone: 202-833-4668; fax: 202-234-9536.

Stephen Young, Deputy Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Ave. NE #505
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795 ext. 102; fax: (202)546-7970

website: <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Mon, 02 Aug 1999 09:47:42 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: poll: NC voters strongly support CTBT

August 2, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: NC statewide poll says three in four NC voters support CTBT

The following press release from the North Carolina Council of Churches reports that a new statewide poll finds that 75% of North Carolinians -- including 73% of Republicans -- support Senate approval of the CTBT. The polling results were released today by the North Carolina Council of Churches, North Carolina Peace Action, and the Coalition.

Thanks to Collins Kilburn with the NC Council of Churches and Bill Towe of NC Peace Action for helping to organize this project.

For more information on public support for the CTBT in other states and across the nation, see the Coalition's Web Site
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/polling.htm#ctbt>>

For more information on the religious community's support for the CTBT, see
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/reli0598.htm>>

DK

NORTH CAROLINA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
Methodist Building * 1307 Glenwood Avenue, Suite 162 *
Raleigh, North Carolina 27605-3258

PRESS RELEASE

FOR RELEASE: August 2, 1999

CONTACTS: Collins Kilburn, 919-828-6501; or Adam Eidinger at 202-547-3577

"Three in Four North Carolina Voters Want Nuclear Test Ban Treaty:
Disagree with Senator Helms' Failure to Act for 22 Months"

(RALEIGH, NC) According to a new statewide public opinion survey, North Carolina voters strongly support Senate approval of a treaty banning all nuclear weapons test explosions, known as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). An overwhelming 75% of North Carolina adults say the nuclear test ban treaty should be approved, while only 19% "disapprove," and 6% don't know. Support for the CTBT is strong among Republicans (73%), Democrats

(76%), and independent (75%), and all regions in the state (Northeast, 78%; Triangle Region, 81%; Triad Region, 73%; Southeast, 72%: Charlotte Metro, 75%; and Western, 71%).

The new poll conducted by the non-partisan polling firm, Research 2000, for North Carolina Peace Action and the Washington, DC-based Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

The survey finds that support for the test ban treaty in North Carolina is similar to that found in nationally. (82% support the treaty, according to a June 1999 Mellman Group/Withlin Worldwide survey; 73% support the treaty according to a May 1998 Mellman survey). The results are based on an opinion survey of 621 registered voters between July 18-21, 1999. The margin of error is plus or minus 4%.

"The U.S. Senate's do-nothing approach on the test ban treaty is dangerous. It hurts efforts to protect our nation and the world from the spread of nuclear weapons and from the possibility of nuclear war," said Collins Kilburn, Executive Director of the North Carolina Council of Churches. "The poll clearly indicates that North Carolinians of every political stripe would like Senator Helms to allow the consideration of the CTBT, which would make world safer for future generations," he added.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was signed in 1996 and sent to the Senate for its approval 22 months ago. It will not take effect until the United States and other key countries ratify the pact. Treaty experts expect it to win the two-thirds majority needed for Senate approval if a vote is allowed.

However, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC) has so far blocked its consideration and has not even allowed hearing on the treaty in his Committee. On July 20, all 45 Democratic Senators, including North Carolina's Jim Edwards wrote Senator Helms and asked that he allow a vote on the test ban treaty this year.

"We are heartened that Senator Edwards has taken leadership and expressed his view that the test ban treaty should be ratified," said William H. Towe, of North Carolina Peace Action. "We respectfully ask Senator Helms to listen to the voices of North Carolinians and allow the Senate to debate and vote on this vital nuclear non-proliferation measure," he added.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has been a goal of American Presidents since Eisenhower. Today, a wide range of military and scientific experts also support the CTBT, including four of the last five Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and President Reagan's former nuclear arms control negotiator, Paul Nitze. The Directors of the nation's three nuclear weapons laboratories have said they are confident in being able to certify the performance of U.S. nuclear weapons without nuclear testing. Even President Richard Nixon's former Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, has positive things to say about the CTBT. In response to a question from Senator Bill Frist (R-TN) in a May 26 hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Kissinger said: "I think we have an arms control objective, and must have, to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. And anything that makes it more difficult to develop more nuclear weapons, I would, in principle, favor."

"The CTBT will improve our nation's ability to detect, inspect, and deter nuclear test explosions, thereby helping to block the development of new bomb types by countries like China," noted Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, an alliance of 17 non-proliferation organizations, including Peace Action. "By failing to consider and approve the CTBT — let alone hold hearings — the Senate leaves the door open to nuclear proliferation and renewed nuclear arms races," he warned.

- 30 -

For further details on the survey results and the Comprehensive Test Ban, see the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers' Web Site <<http://www.crnd.org>>
For inquiries regarding the availability of spokespeople for interview, please contact Adam Eiding at 202-547-3577 or Collins Kilburn, 919-828-6501.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <ctbt@2020vision.org>
X-Sender: ctbt.2020vision.org@mail.2020vision.org
To: mupj@igc.org, lintnerj@ucc.org
From: ctbt@2020vision.org (Marie Rietmann)
Subject: Colorado Delegation
Date: Mon, 2 Aug 1999 11:14:35 -0400

Hi Howard and Jay,

FYI. Hooray for Bob!

Marie

>From: "Joan Wade" <disarmament@igc.org>
>To: "Marie Rietman" <ctbt@2020vision.org>
>Subject: Colorado Delegation
>Date: Fri, 30 Jul 1999 09:06:48 -0400
>MIME-Version: 1.0
>X-Priority: 3
>X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
>X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
>X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

>

>Hey Marie,

>

>Check out this agenda from Bob Kinsey's meeting with Campbell's office! I'm
>still waiting to hear feedback, but I'll forward that to you when I get it.

>--

>Joan L. Wade
>Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator
>1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700
>Washington, DC, 20010
>Ph: (202) 898-0150 x232
>Fax: (202) 898-0172

>----- Original Message -----

>From: Bob Kinsey
>To: Joan Wade
>Sent: Wednesday, July 28, 1999 7:24 PM
>Subject: Re: Disarmament News 7/26/99

>

>

>MEETING WITH SENATOR CAMPBELL'S DENVER STAFF

>

>July 27, 1999 2 PM

>

>

>Ricardo LaFlore

>

>Alton D. Laird

>

>Rev Robert Kinsey, Rocky Mountain Conference, United Church of Christ

>

>Rev Jane Keener, Rocky Mountain Conference, United Methodist Church

>
>Rev. John Wade, Denver Presbytery, Presbyterian Church (USA)
>
>Ms Vickie Wright, Disciples of Christ
>
>Regrets: Denise Madden, Catholic Archdiocese
>
>
>
>
>Subj: Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
>
>
>Acknowledgment of Petitions (Were presented at the Washington Office July 8
>AM,-- 600 signatures from 10 Colorado Churches gathered in April and early May
>and a long list of national religious leaders of most historical religious
>traditions)
>
>
>Concerns:
>
>The Treaty is locked in the Foreign Relations Committee for an unprecedented
>time of over 600 days. (Senator Helms is playing power politics over two
>unrelated measures, the Kyoto Treaty and the ABM Treaty, and this is unethical
>in our system where citizens have a right to expect their government to
>function in a timely manner on an issue effecting their security)
>
>The CTBT was created over 40 years as a bi-partisan effort.
>
>Most observers believe that it has enough support to pass the Senate with 2/3
>vote if it got to the floor.
>
>A recent poles by the Mellman Group(D) and Wirthlin Worldwide(R) show eight
>out of ten Americans favor the treaty.
>
>The treaty has been signed by 152 nations and ratified by 18 of the 44
>required(nuclear capable) nations including France, Great Britain, Japan and
>Germany. It needs United States Leadership to succeed. (We remember well the
>failure of the United States to provide international leadership following
>World War I in the League of Nations)
>
>It is supported by the Department of Defense, the present head of the Joint
>chiefs of Staff and four former heads including Colin Powell as well as the
>past commander of the Strategic Air Command.
>
>
>We are here to urge Senator Campbell to work actively to get this treaty to
>the floor of the Senate where it should be debated and voted on. People will
>lose faith in our system if this doesn't happen. Timely action on the
>people's business is what the people have a right to expect of the
>representatives they elect to office. If we wait long enough, of course, the
>damage will be done in this case. Now is the time to create a system for the
>abolition of nuclear weapons, as General Lee Butler has been saying.
>
>

>Our major Ethical Concerns:

>

>As long as the United States continues to rely on nuclear weapons as the
>cornerstone of its national security policy --including the first strike
>option-- and continues to modernize its nuclear arsenal at the Labs, it makes
>the possession and threatened use of these weapons the ultimate currency of
>geopolitical power. As long as this is so, other countries will want nuclear
>weapons. The CTBT is a major step into the realm of collective security and
>will reduce the pressure to proliferate. Our ratification of this treaty will
>provide crucial leadership in reducing the proliferation of these weapons. Our
>reliance on them is idolatry. It breaks the first and second commandment for
>those who believe these commandments are true.

>

>

>Supplementary Materials:

>

>Steven Mufson article in the Washington Post

>

>Eric Schmitt article concerning the Deutsch Panel report

>

>Operation de-Alert from the Hague Appeal for Peace

>

>Associated Press article on Dorgan and the Foreign Relations Committee

>

>Tests Show Value of CTBT Implementation

>

>Putting It all Together: Verification Technology Information Center

>

>False Accusation, Undetected Test and Implications for the CTBT

>

>The Way to Get on with Nuclear Disarmament" of Jiang Zemin

>

>

>

>Bob Kinsey, Peace and Justice Task Force

>United Church of Christ, Rocky Mountain Conference

>bkinsey@peacemission.org

>303-425-0348

>"Two paths lie before us. One leads to death, the other to life." Jonathan

>Schell

>"Faith has need of the whole truth" Teilhard de Chardin

>"Jesus was non-violent. Shouldn't Christians be?"

>

><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

><HTML><HEAD>

><META content=text/html;charset=iso-8859-1 http-equiv=Content-Type>

><META content="MSHTML 5.00.2314.1000" name=GENERATOR>

><STYLE></STYLE>

></HEAD>

><BODY bgColor=#ffffff>

><DIV>Hey Marie,</DIV>

><DIV> </DIV>

><DIV>Check out this agenda from Bob Kinsey's meeting

>with Campbell's office! </DIV> I'm still waiting to hear feedback, but I'll

>and Germany. It needs United States Leadership to succeed. (We remember well
>the
>failure of the United States to provide international leadership following
>World
>War I in the League of Nations)</P>
><P align=left>It is supported by the Department of Defense, the present head
>of
>the Joint chiefs of Staff and four former heads including Colin Powell as well
>as the past commander of the Strategic Air Command.</P>
><P align=left></P>
><P align=left>We are here to urge Senator Campbell to work actively to get
>this
>treaty to the floor of the Senate<FONT
>face="Times New Roman"> where it should be debated and voted on. People
>will loose faith in our system if this doesn't happen. Timely action on the
>people's business is what the people have a right to expect of the
>representatives they elect to office. If we wait long enough, of course, the
>damage will be done in this case. Now is the time to create a system for the
>abolition of nuclear weapons, as General Lee Butler has been saying.</P>
><P align=left></P>
><P align=left>Our major Ethical Concerns<FONT
>face="Times New Roman">:</P>
><P align=left>As long as the United States continues to rely on nuclear
>weapons
>as the cornerstone of its national security policy --including the first
>strike
>option-- and continues to modernize its nuclear arsenal at the Labs, it
>makes the possession and threatened use of these weapons the ulitmate currency
>of geopolitical power. As long as this is so, other countries will want
>nuclear
>weapons. The CTBT is a major step into the realm of collective security and
>will
>reduce the pressure to proliferate. Our ratification of this treaty will
>provide
>crucial leadership in reducing the proliferation of these weapons. Our
>reliance
>on them is idolatry. It breaks the first and second commandment for those who
>believe these commandments are true.</P>
><P align=left></P>
><P align=left>Supplementary Materials:</P>
><P align=left>Steven Mufson article in the Washington Post</P>
><P align=left>Eric Schmitt article concerning the Deutsch Panel report</P>
><P align=left>Operation de-Alert from the Hague Appeal for Peace</P>
><P align=left>Associated Press article on Dorgan and the Foreign Relations
>Committee</P>
><P align=left>Tests Show Value of CTBT Implementation</P>
><P align=left>Putting It all Together: Verification Technology Information
>Center</P>
><P align=left>False Accusation, Undetected Test and Implications for the CTBT
></P>
><P>The Way to Get on with Nuclear Disarmament" of Jiang Zemin</P></DIV>
><DIV><FONT color=#800000
>face=Verdana>
>_____
Bob

>Kinsey, Peace and Justice Task Force
United Church of Christ, Rocky
>Mountain
>Conference
<A
>href="mailto:bkkinsey@peacemission.org">bkkinsey@peacemission.org
303-425-
>0348
"Two
>paths lie before us. One leads to death, the other to life."
>Jonathan Schell
"Faith has need of the whole truth" Teilhard de
>Chardin
"Jesus was non-violent. Shouldn't Christians
>be? </DIV></BODY></HTML>
>
>

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-usa@lists.xmission.com>
X-Sender: a2000@mail.silcom.com (Unverified)
To: a2000@silcom.com
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <a2000@silcom.com>
Subject: (abolition-usa) A B O L I T I O N 2 0 0 0 G R A S S R O O T S N E W S
Date: Mon, 2 Aug 1999 15:45:15 -0700 (PDT)
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 PAA07468

A B O L I T I O N 2 0 0 0 G R A S S R O O T S N E W S

JULY 1999

***NEW ORGANIZATIONS

Please join me in wishing a warm welcome to the following organizations which have recently signed the Abolition 2000 petition and joined the network. With these additions, there are now 1,347 citizen action groups worldwide actively campaigning for the abolition of nuclear weapons. I urge you to support those within the network and build relationships with like-minded activists. Also, I encourage you to continue efforts to recruit other individuals and organizations to join our common endeavor to reach the ultimate goal...nuclear abolition.

Global Peace & Development Foundation Ghana, Ghana/West Africa
Hawai'i Institute for Human Rights, Hawai'i/USA
Human Rights & Welfare Mobilization Forum, Manikgonj/Bangladesh
Religious Society of Friends/Lake Erie, Perrysburg, Ohio/USA
United Welfare Union, Baluwatar, Kathmandu/Nepal
Voluntary Organization for the Needy-(VON), Manikgonj/Bangladesh
Promoting Enduring Peace, Inc., New York/USA

***NEW MUNICIPALITIES

The following is a list of towns or municipalities which have recently passed a resolution to abolish nuclear weapons. High commendations are deserved by all those who have dedicated themselves to push this issue forward in their city or town council. The number of municipalities having passed a resolution now totals 236! Keep up the excellent work!

Maine

Arrowsic: Town Meeting, passed unanimously
Bangor: City Council, passed unanimously
Georgetown: Town Meeting, passed by majority show of hands
Manchester: Town Meeting, passed 57-38
Sebago: Town Meeting, passed 80-3
South Portland: City Council, passed unanimously
Wayne: Town Meeting, passed by majority show of hands

Massachusetts
Lincoln, overwhelming majority

New Zealand
Clutha District Council, endorsement given
Waimakariri District Council, passed by majority
Waitakere City Council, formally only endorsed but now has passed a resolution

***NEWS

Get the Navy Out of Vieques!

"Navy out of Vieques" is now the official public policy of the Puerto Rican government. After examining recommendations of the Special Vieques Commission, the Governor of PR announced that the official position of the government would be to reclaim the island of Vieques for the people. New Jersey Congressman, Bob Menedez also agreed with the findings of the Commission, citing that "national defense training should not put citizens at risk."

Along with the Lt. Governors Association of the 50 states, the Vega Baja Municipal Council, the Mayor of Catano and the Caribbean Human Rights commission have endorsed the cause. The United Nations Decolonization Committee determined to bring a bill resolving that the Navy should leave Vieques to the floor at the next session of the General Assembly.

Public outrage was sparked when the US Navy killed a civilian Viequense, David Sanes Rodriguez, with an off-target bomb on April 20, 1999. In response, 50,000 protesters marched on the Roosevelt Roads Naval Base on July 4th, demonstrating their disdain at the US Navy for making an inhabited island their target practice and war games site. They also demanded the Navy leave to the island. Protesters continue to gather at the forbidden firing zone in acts of peaceful civil disobedience.

In August, Ruben Arvisu, a representative of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, will travel to Puerto Rico to present the Abolition 2000 petition to the people of Vieques and rally support for the network. While in PR, Arvisu will also give testimony on behalf of the Viequense people to advocate the Navy's departure from the island. For more news on what's happening on the Isla Nena, visit the Vieques Times website at: <http://www.viequestimes.com/index.htm/latest.htm>. For information on how to get involved in a citizen action group in Puerto Rico, visit the Redbatances website (in Spanish only) at: <http://www.redbatances.com>. If you would like to send a message of solidarity to the people of Vieques, please email it to A2000@silcom.com by no later than August 11, 1999.

No Nukes in Nanoose!

Citizens of British Columbia continue efforts to stop the Canadian federal government from expropriating a seabed in the Strait of Georgia. The seabed has been used since 1965 as a torpedo testing site for both the US and Canadian Navy. On June 18, 1999, a formal objection was filed with the Canadian government in opposition to renegotiating a lease extension on the seabed, which is owned by the province. The objection was filed on behalf of the citizens of British Columbia on the grounds that the extension of the lease was contrary to public interest and a violation of

BC legislation.

Since US policy is to "neither confirm nor deny" the presence of nuclear weapons aboard its warships and submarines, citizens are concerned about the possibility of nuclear weapons and reactors entering their nuclear free zone. A resolution passed by the BC Legislative Assembly on April 23, 1992 declares BC a "Nuclear Weapons Free Zone" and therefore, the potential or actual presence of nuclear weapons on foreign warships violates this resolution. In addition, the presence of nuclear weapons and reactors poses a likely threat to health and environmental safety to the people living in Nanoose Bay.

Demonstrations from local peace organizations are scheduled to begin in Victoria on August 3 as the expropriation hearings continue. Citizens are determined to protect the Nanoose seabed as part of their home. Peace and environmental activists are calling for support to keep the Nanoose Bay nuclear free. To obtain further information on the expropriation hearings, visit the Nanoose Conversion Campaign's website at: http://www.user.dccnet.com/lagasse/Nuclear_Free_Georgia_Strait/nanoose.html

Lincoln, MA Actively Campaigning for Abolition

The town of Lincoln, MA voted by an overwhelming majority to adopt a resolution in its Annual Town Meeting on April 6th, 1999 that supports the Abolition 2000 movement. Since May of 1981, one dozen Lincoln citizens have built a townwide organization to urge the US and USSR "to work out an agreement freezing nuclear weapons development and reducing nuclear arsenals" (from the discussion on Warrant Article 34 at the town meeting). Article 34 of the Warrant for the meeting resolves the need to eliminate nuclear weapons under "strict and effective international controls" in order to "support the health and well-being of all people, and to protect and enhance our environment." The town has developed the Lincoln Committee for a Nuclear Free World, which actively campaigns the abolition of nuclear weapons and solicits the President of the US, as well as its senators and representatives. For more information or examples of how you can actively campaign to adopt a similar resolution in your town or municipality, please visit the Abolition 2000 web site at <http://www.abolition2000.org>. If you have a similar story to share about your town or municipality email it to: A2000@silcom.com

"The Unfinished Business of the Century"

On July 12, 1999, the Boston Globe printed a speech given by John Kenneth Galbraith while receiving an honorary degree from the London School of Economics. In his speech, Galbraith emphasized humanity's position "on the edge of a total end to civilized existence on the planet, perhaps life itself." With a legacy of more than 50 years of threatening to destroy life, "the greatest unfinished business of the century now ending is the need to eliminate this weaponry," that is, nuclear weaponry. He also stated, "the most urgent task now and of the new century is to bring to an end the threat of Armageddon, something on which there has been solemn comment over the centuries and which is now a reality."

Galbraith's speech is both illuminating and encouraging. As an economist, he recognizes the need to rid the planet of the destructive power of nuclear weapons. Let us be encouraged to continue to press onward in our endeavor to eliminate nuclear weapons. Putting pressure on

government representatives and authorities is of critical importance. Also, we must seize every opportunity to make others aware of the issue as well encourage others to join the effort.

The story ran on page A11 of the Boston Globe on 07/12/99.

The Unfinished Business of the Century

By John Kenneth Galbraith, 07/12/99

For complete information on the article, please refer to the web site:

[http://www.globe.com/dailyglobe2/193/oped/The_unfinished_business_of_the_century
P.shtml](http://www.globe.com/dailyglobe2/193/oped/The_unfinished_business_of_the_century_P.shtml)

(c) Copyright 1999 Globe Newspaper Company.

French Movement to Pressure Authorities

Lysiane Alezard announced that Le Mouvement de la Paix in France will continue to put pressure on French authorities to urge them to stop the modernization of nuclear weapons and vote for a moratorium on lab testing. The campaign is planned to be launched in the fall and will emphasize the need for France to implement Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Le Mouvement de la Paix would like to convene 2 abolition days on October 9th and 10th. The proposed agenda for the Abolition Days is as follows:

October 9th- a demonstration to take place at the Barp, near Bordeaux to represent a moratorium on laboratory testing.

October 10th - a rally and seminar against the modernization of nuclear weapons which will feature admirals and generals from various countries to take place at l'Île lounge.

Le Mouvement stresses that both events are international and encourages all organizations and individuals to participate. The event will be hosted under the auspices of Abolition 2000. Look for future postings with updated information about the event or contact:

Lysiane Alezard

Le Mouvement de la Paix

139 BD VICTOR HUGO - F-93400 SAINT-OUEN

mvtpaix@globenet.org

website : <http://www.asi.fr/~ddurand/>

Survey Finds US Support for Ratification of the CTBT

In a survey conducted on 1,000 US citizens age 18 or older, 82 percent supported Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The telephone survey was conducted June 18 to 21 by Wirthlin Worldwide and the findings were published by the Mellman Group, a research company in Washington DC. Also among key findings, the survey found that support for the CTBT was favored by the majority in both Democratic (86%) and Republican (80%) parties. The study also noted that 84% of those surveyed agreed that putting an end to nuclear weapons test explosions worldwide is a better way to protect the US from nuclear threats from other countries.

The majority of US citizens support the ratification of the CTBT, especially in light of recent proliferation of nuclear secrets to China, North Korea and Iran as well as heightened concern over relations between Pakistan and India. The survey concludes that Americans will endorse those government representatives who support the treaty. The ratification of the CTBT will be an important factor to secure a world free from nuclear

threats for future generations. Please call or write your representative today and tell them to support the CTBT.

*The Mellman Group/Wirthlin Worldwide for CRND, June 1999: "Voter Attitude Toward the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty."

***EVENTS

August

*Please join in and encourage others to participate in one of the events commemorating the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. For a complete list of events compiled by Abolition 2000, please visit the Nuclear Age Peace foundation website at: <http://www.wagingpeace.org> or email your request to Carah Ong at A2000@silcom.com.

7- PLOWSHARES PLAY COMING TO BALTIMORE

Baltimore's Hiroshima-Nagasaki Commemoration Committee, a coalition of peace organizations including AFSC-Baltimore, will be presenting in Baltimore on Saturday, August 7, Dan Kinch's Plowshares play, "A Clown, a Hammer, a Bomb and God." On the morning of April 1, 1994, an activist priest dressed in a clown suit disabled a nuclear missile. This disarmingly simple play is directed by Rhett Wickham and features Ben Roberts. Doors will open at 7 PM at Stony Run Friends Meetinghouse, 5116 North Charles, for an 8 p.m. performance. Japanese survivors of the atomic bombs [hibakusha] will also be at Stony Run. Refreshments will be available. The Committee will be asking for a free will donation, but no one will be turned away. For more information, call:
Max Obuszewski 410-323-7200 or 410-377-7987

10-The Southern California Federation of Scientists are sponsoring a lecture by John Owen entitled, "Nukes and Peace: Hiroshima/Nagasaki Commemoration." The lecture will take place in the Community Meeting Room of the Midnight Special Bookstore on Tuesday, August 10, 1999 at 7:30pm. The Bookstore is located at 1318 3rd Street Promenade, Santa Monica, CA. For more information contact the Southern California Federation of Scientists at:
3318 Colbert Ave, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90066
310-390-3898 (phone/fax)

September

9-A follow-up meeting for the Hague Appeal for Peace focusing on Next Steps is being hosted by Peace Action and the Peace Caucus in the UNCA lounge at the United Nations in New York on September 9, 1999 at 10:30 a.m.
For more information, contact:
Gouri Sadhwani, Campaign Coordinator
The Hague Appeal for Peace 1999
c/o WFM 777 UN Plaza
New York, NY 10017 USA
Phone: +1 212.687.2623 Fax: +1 212.599.1332 Email: gourihap99@igc.apc.org

14-Join the United Nations in celebrating the International Day of Peace on Tuesday, September 14, 1999 at 12:00 noon. In 1981, the opening day of the General Assembly was designated by the United Nations as the International Day of Peace. On this day, people in all countries are encouraged to take a minute of silence at noon in their time region to support the UN in its mission of peace. If you are leader of an organization or community you may also wish to organize a peace walk, visit a hospital or nursing home, plant a peace pole or request a school conflict resolution program. To be included on the list of participating schools and organizations, please email the name of your school or organization to: peacepal@worldpeace.org.

26/27-CNN Profiles the Lives of Five Representatives of the Colombian Children's Peace Movement who were nominated for the 1999 Nobel Peace Prize. "Soldiers of Peace: A Children's Crusade" will air Sunday, September 26 at 9 p.m. (ETD) on CNN/U.S. It will also replay at 1:00 a.m. (ETD) on Monday, September 27.

2000 and Beyond

Mark your Calendars! The 2000 NPT Review Conference is scheduled to last one week from April 24th to May 19th, 2000. It will be held at the UN in New York.

***ACTION YOU CAN TAKE

*On August 6, the anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, a rally and nonviolent direct action will take place at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory as well as at Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories, all three of which continue nuclear weapons research, development testing and production (also known as "stockpile stewardship"). The theme of this year's demonstration is: **ABOLITION 2000: END THE NUCLEAR THREAT!** If you are not able to attend any of these events, I encourage you to send a short message of solidarity that will be read at the rally and sent out to the media. I especially encourage you to participate in this manner if you live in a Nuclear Weapon or NATO State or if you are from Japan. Please e-mail or fax your messages to Jacqueline Cabasso of the Western States Legal Foundation at:
Fax: +(510)839-5397
E-mail: wslf@earthlink.net

***STAR WARS INT'L CALL-IN DAYS (SEPTEMBER 13-15):** In order to increase visibility and opposition to Star Wars, the Global Network is calling for the "International Call-In Days Against Star Wars" from September 13-15, 1999. I urge you to help spread the word about the Call-In Days to your local membership and to your local media. Please contact the White House and your Congressional delegation and demand an end to Star Wars funding and testing. Even if you are outside of the US, I encourage you to contact President Clinton at the White House and/or the US Embassy in your country via email or fax. Please use the following contact information:

White House Phone # (202) 456-1111
White House Fax # (202) 456-2461
President Clinton's e-mail: president@whitehouse.gov
V-P Al Gore's e-mail: vice.president@whitehouse.gov
Congressional Switchboard (202) 224-3121

*Join organizations and individuals worldwide in writing a letter to US President Bill Clinton and Russia's President Boris Yeltsin stressing the need to de-alert missiles before September of 1999. In your letter, stress the fact that immediate stakes are high and the potential for global catastrophe is clear. Therefore mutually verified de-alerting in the face of the Y2K computer problem must take precedence over all other considerations of politics and national security. To request a copy of the letter already in circulation via email, please write to:

John Hallam

Friends of the Earth Sydney,

17 Lord Street, Newtown, NSW, Australia,

Fax(61)(2)9517-3902 Phone (61)(2)9517-3903

email: nonukes@foesyd.org.au website: <http://homepages.tig.com.au/~foesyd>

Your help in getting US Congressional signatures on this letter will also be greatly appreciated.

*Write a letter to the US Food and Drug Administration. Your letter should urge the Dockets Management Branch to continue to clearly label food with the international irradiation symbol, radura. Labels should also contain a statement indicating the food was treated with radiation.

Please convey to the Dockets Manager that you feel the absence of such a statement would be misleading because irradiation destroys vitamins and causes changes in sensory and spoilage qualities that are not known by the consumer. Irradiation creates a new class of unique radiolytic products that have never been tested for the possible carcinogenic effects on humans. New volumes of radioactive waste from Cobalt-60 and Cesium will plague our nation, exposing workers to toxic radionuclides.

Your letter should be addressed as follows:

Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305)

Food and Drug Administration

5630 Fishers Lane, Room 1061

Rockville MD 20852

Email: FDADockets@fda.gov

**Original letter written by Terry Gips and circulated by Alice Slater on 7/12/99

Terry Gips

President, Sustainability Associates

2584 Upton Ave. S, Minneapolis, MN 55405

tgips@mtn.org

***ANNOUNCEMENTS

*The Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research offers three Doctoral Fellowships in the amount of \$5,000 each for 1999-2000.

Interested doctoral candidates are invited to apply by sending a one-page copy of their doctoral proposal along with a resume and a letter of

recommendation from their thesis advisor. The competition is open to all doctoral students regardless of citizenship and institutional affiliation. The deadline for applications is September 1, 1999. Applications should be sent to:

Dr. Majid Tehranian, Director
Toda Institute
1600 Kapiolani Blvd.
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822
808-955-8231

For more information, please visit the Toda Institute web site at:
<http://www.toda.org>.

* Promoting Enduring Peace will be hosting biweekly meetings to draft a purpose statement for the Working Group on Star Wars/ABM, to discuss objectives and goals of the group, and to recommend strategies for the Abolition USA meeting in Ann Arbor, Michigan in October 1999. Anyone interested in participating in this working group should contact Promoting Enduring Peace at:
enduringpeace@email.msn.com, or call 212-223-7520

*Do you have an announcement or submission that you would like to include in the next edition of "The Grassroots of Abolition 2000"? If so, please email your posting to A2000@silcom.com.

*I reserve the right to use any information submitted to include in upcoming editions of Grassroots News. Your name and email address must be provided in order to give a resource for any inquiries. All articles are subject to modification and verification.

***RESOURCES

"On a Paper Crane" is a colorful peace animation video available in English and Japanese. This is an excellent resource to educate children about the horrors of nuclear war. The story is centered around Tomoko, a sixth grader who meets Sadako when she visits the Hiroshima Peace Park. Sadako takes Tomoko on an enlightening adventure filled with discoveries. To order your copy, send a request to:

Peace Anime no Kai
c/o Dokuritsu Eiga Center Co.
Taiyo bldg 7F, 16-2 Shimbashi 3 chome
Minato-ku, Tokyo 105 Japan

*Trying to find out how to contact your US government representatives? Visit Roll Call's Capital Hill Website Directory at:
<http://congress.nw.dc.us/rollcall/>

*Ideas & Dreams for a Better World: The Fourth Five Hundred Ideas by Dr. Robert Muller is now available. Dr. Muller is a Chancellor of the United Nations University for Peace and a former UN Assistant Secretary-General. The volume is an inspirational "count-up of Dreams to the Year 2000 for your thoughts and actions." It provides new ideas for the next millennium with a positive yet realistic approach to urgent human needs. To order your copy of this inspirational guide, call the United Nations Bookstore at 1-800-553-3210. ISBN # 1-881474--25-9

***LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

Dear Friends,

For those living in affluent societies such as the US, it is easy to get caught up in material and selfish concerns. Often times in the morning, I find myself standing in front of a closet full of clothes and saying, "I have nothing to wear today." I feel humbled when I think of all those who truly do not have clothes on their backs or food in their mouths. It is convenient to forget that many have suffered and continue to suffer on a daily basis so that these affluent societies can continue as such.

What if the situation was reversed? What would it be like to completely rebuild a destroyed home or city that has just been devastated by bombs for a reason you barely understand? What would life be like to lose everyone close to you and all your possessions? The amount of human suffering that has occurred since the advent of nuclear weapons must be stopped immediately. It is time for reparations for all the human suffering and environmental degradation that have occurred as a result of nuclear testing and weapons use.

This August 6th and 9th mark the 54th anniversary of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This tragic event in world history gives each person the opportunity to join others in a time of reflection and action. Let us be reminded of the horrors posed to humanity by the use of nuclear weaponry. Let us consider what we can do to ensure a world free from nuclear threats and the threat of war. I encourage you to participate in an event in your community. If you would like a listing composed by Abolition 2000, please feel free to send me an email at A2000@silcom.com.

Yours In Peace,

Carah Lynn Ong
Coordinator, Abolition 2000
Editor, "Abolition 2000 Grassroots News"

Carah Lynn Ong
Coordinator, Abolition 2000
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
1187 Coast Village Road PMB 121, Suite 1
Santa Barbara CA 93108

Phone (805) 965 3443 FAX(805) 568 0466
Email: A2000@silcom.com
Website <http://www.abolition2000.org>

Join the Abolition-USA or Abolition-Global Caucus list serve to regularly receive updates about the Abolition movement. Both caucus' also provide a forum for conversation on nuclear-related issues as well as they are used to post important articles and information pertaining to nuclear abolition.

To subscribe to the Abolition-USA listserve, send a message (with no subject) to:

abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com

In the body of the message, write:

"subscribe abolition-usa" (do not include quotation marks)

To post a message to the Abolition-USA list, mail your message to:

abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

To subscribe to the International Abolition-caucus, send a message (with no subject) to: majordomo@igc.org

In the body of the message, write:

"subscribe abolition-caucus" (do not include quotation marks)

To post a message to the International Abolition list, mail your message to:

abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

-

To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com" with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.

For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send "help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Interfaith Action for Nuclear Abolition
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

As part of the meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT on August 10, I would like to have another round of discussion on whether this group, once the CTBT is ratified, might continue with a broader agenda of issues dealing with nuclear disarmament.

The most ambitious scope for such an endeavor is laid out in the attached "Interfaith Action for Nuclear Abolition [or "Disarmament" if "Abolition" sounds too radical]. This includes a list of steps for achieving total abolition. An alternative to this broad proactive agenda would be to address particular issues only as they arise in the political scene, such as de-alerting, deep cuts through START III, stockpile stewardship, national missile defense.

Left undeveloped in the attachment are sections on structure and methods. The methods would start with those used in the CTBT campaign and would add other methods used in other interfaith campaigns. There could even be nonpartisan involvement in election campaigns.

As to structure, one possibility would be to expand the mission of the Interfaith Group on the CTBT, rename it, and broaden its membership. Other models are provided by the National Religious Partnership for the Environment, by Jubilee 2000, and by other faith-based campaigns.

What we do should take into account the Nuclear Disarmament Initiative of the Washington National Cathedral, the U.S. Catholic Conference, and the Fourth Freedom Forum. As I understand this endeavor, it encompasses (i) development of a joint statement by religious and military leaders, (ii) release of the statement at a news conference, (iii) an interfaith service at the National Cathedral, and (iv) production of educational material for "people in the pew". This is a welcome initiative.

What I am suggesting focus much more on public policy advocacy, aimed directly at policy making within the Executive Branch and in Congress through a combination of grassroots mobilization and focused attention in Washington on key decision makers. That's what we've done on the CTBT. Extension of such concerted public policy advocacy to the broader agenda of nuclear abolition would complement the educational focus of the Nuclear Disarmament Initiative, based in the Washington National Cathedral.

I believe that a coalition of faith-based organizations with focus on public policy advocacy (operating within the allowable framework of tax laws) could attract foundation funding for a supportive staff and also supplemental staff for participating organizations.

This is what I would like to discuss on August 10. If you're not going to attend, I would welcome your comments prior to the meeting.

Shalom,
Howard

####

Interfaith Action for Nuclear Abolition

A Proposal by

The Problem

For decades religious leaders and religious bodies have condemned the existence of nuclear weapons and have spoken against their use and threatened use. Yet, the world's nuclear arsenal has persisted.

Today the United States and Russia maintain thousands of nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert, poised for rapid launching. The United Kingdom, France, China, and Israel also possess nuclear warheads kept on hair-trigger alert. In 1998 India and Pakistan conducted nuclear weapon tests and are developing their own nuclear arsenals. Several other states would like to do likewise. There is increasing danger that terrorist organizations will gain possession of nuclear weapons.

In face of the continued risk of nuclear war and the unspeakable horror that would result, we are called to speak out once again and to engage in concerted action on the necessity of nuclear abolition.

Our Commitment

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

We have said this before in numerous statements and reports and have called for global nuclear disarmament. However, the political and military leaders of nuclear weapon states have refused to heed our calls for nuclear disarmament. This time as we speak out again on this subject, we intend to move beyond words to action.

To this end we pledge to work together in partnership to press for the elimination of all nuclear weapons on Earth. We commit ourselves and the institutions we represent to engage vigorously in educational activities and public policy advocacy for nuclear abolition. We will sustain our partnership on this issue until our goal is achieved.

Steps to Nuclear Abolition

In order to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons, we call upon the United States and all other possessors of nuclear weapons to carry out the following actions:

- Ø Renounce unconditionally the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes.
- Ø Pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary under any circumstance.
- Ø Immediately take all nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and by other means.
- Ø Embark upon a program to systematically dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles as soon as possible with adequate safeguards and verification, carried out under multilateral treaties and reciprocal national initiatives.
- Ø Ratify and implement the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; cease all research, development, testing, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons; and refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal.
- Ø Enter into a multilateral process to develop, adopt, and carry out a nuclear weapons convention that outlaws and abolishes all nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control.
- Ø Develop and implement a system for control of all fissile material with international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards.

Organizational Framework

To be developed.

Methods for Action

To be developed.

Return-Path: <disarmament@igc.org>
From: "Joan Wade" <disarmament@igc.org>
To: "Joan Wade" <disarmament@igc.org>
Cc: <dkimball@crnd.org>
Subject: URGENT NORTH CAROLINA ACTION!!!!
Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1999 12:44:21 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Greetings Interfaith Working group members,

Below you will find an action alert based on the new CRND North Carolina Poll. Please pass this on to your North Carolina activists as soon as possible. Thank you for your hard work!

Sincerely,

Joan Wade
Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator

ACTION ALERT!

Greetings North Carolina Activists,

Just yesterday the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers released a poll which shows that 75% of North Carolinans are in favor of Senate ratification of the CTBT. This news is remarkable in the home state of Senator Helms who has been holding the treaty hostage for two years. Let's sieze this opportunity to highten public awareness of Helms' irresponsible behavior and inform people of the need to ratify the nuclear test ban treaty now!

Actions:

- 1) Write Senator Edwards and thank him for his continued support for the CTBT. Inform him of the polling data and urge him to use these state-specific results in a floor speech in favor of the CTBT.
- 2) Write Senator Helms. Inform him of the new poll results. Tell him you think denying the opinion of 3 out of 4 constituents is irresponsible. Urge him to schedule a vote for the CTBT as soon as possible, preferably before the special conference this fall.
- 3) Write a letter to the editor of your local paper. Use the sample below, created by Andy Howells of CRND, to develop your own letter. Remember that regardless of whether of not the letter gets printed, your letter will serve to inform editorial boards, which can have great impact in the long run.

Dear Editor:

You would think that the United States would do everything within its power to help prevent the spread of deadly nuclear weapons. Sadly, it is not, thanks to our own Senator, Jesse Helms. For close to two years, Senator Helms, who is the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has refused to allow hearings on an agreement signed by 152 countries to ban the

testing of nuclear weapons worldwide. A wide range of military and scientific experts, including four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, believe that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is in America's national interest. The test ban would ban and verify that countries do not conduct the proof tests needed to make modern nuclear weapons. But to go into effect, the U.S. must ratify the treaty and put pressure on other states to join the test ban. Senator Helms argues that an international agreement to ban nuclear weapons testing is not a high priority for the U.S., and so he blocks Senate consideration of the treaty.

I find Senator Helms actions to be irresponsible and undemocratic. Three out of four North Carolinians agree. A June 1999 state poll released by the North Carolina Council of Churches finds that 75% of voters in the state support Senate approval of the test ban treaty. This fall a special conference by countries which have signed and ratified the treaty will meet to decide what actions they will take to accelerate its entry into force. If the U.S. has not ratified by then, it will be relegated to observer status and will be allowed only limited participation in future decision making. In blocking debate on the CTBT, Senator Helms is jeopardizing America's role as a leader in fight against nuclear weapons proliferation.

North Carolina's other Senator, John Edwards, recently joined other Senate Democrats and several Republicans in sending a letter to Senator Helms asking for prompt consideration of the CTBT. I urge Senator Helms to work with Senator Edwards' to allow consideration and approval of the test ban treaty. Mr. Helms should listen to his constituents and end his blockade of the CTBT.

Sincerely,

Your Name

--

Joan L. Wade

Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator

1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700

Washington, DC, 20010

Ph: (202) 898-0150 x232

Fax: (202) 898-0172

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">

<HTML><HEAD>

<META content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1" http-equiv=Content-Type>

<META content="MSHTML 5.00.2314.1000" name=GENERATOR>

<STYLE></STYLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>

<DIV>Greetings Interfaith Working group members,</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Below you will find an action alert based on the new CRND North Carolina Poll.</DIV>

<DIV>Please pass this on to your North Carolina activists as soon as possible. </DIV>

<DIV>Thank you for your hard work!</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Sincerely,</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Joan Wade</DIV>

<DIV>Disarmament Clearinghouse Coordinator</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV><FONT face=Arial

size=2>*****
</DIV>

<DIV>ACTION ALERT!</DIV>

<DIV>Greetings North Carolina Activists,</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Just yesterday the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear
Dangers released a poll which</DIV>

<DIV>shows that 75% of North Carolinans are in favor of
Senate ratification of the CTBT.</DIV>

<DIV>This news is remarkable in the home state of
Senator Helms who has been holding </DIV>

<DIV>the treaty hostage for two years. </DIV>
<DIV>Let's sieze
this opportunity to highten public </DIV>

<DIV>awareness of Helms' irresponsible behavior and
inform people of the need to ratify</DIV>

<DIV>the nuclear test ban treaty now!</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Actions:</DIV>

<DIV>1) Write Senator Edwards and thank him for his
continued support for the CTBT. </DIV>

<DIV>Inform him of the polling data and urge him to use
these state-specific results in a</DIV>

<DIV>floor speech in favor of the CTBT.</DIV>

<DIV>2) Write Senator Helms. </DIV>
<DIV>Inform him of the new
poll results. </DIV>

<DIV>Tell him you think </DIV>
<DIV>denying the opinion of 3 out of 4 constituents is
irresponsible. </DIV>

<DIV>Urge him to </DIV>
<DIV>schedule a vote for the CTBT as soon as possible,
preferably before the special</DIV>

<DIV>conference this fall. </DIV>

<DIV>3) </DIV>
<DIV>Write a letter to the editor of your local
paper. </DIV>

<DIV>Use the sample below, created by</DIV>
<DIV>Andy Howells of CRND, to develop your own
letter. </DIV>

<DIV>Remember that regardless of </DIV>
<DIV>whether of not the letter gets printed, your letter
will serve to inform editorial boards,</DIV>

<DIV>which can have great impact in the long
run.</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Dear Editor:</DIV>

<DIV>

You would think that the United States
would do everything within its power
to help prevent the spread of deadly
nuclear weapons. Sadly, it is not,
thanks to our own Senator, Jesse Helms.
For close to two years, Senator
Helms, who is the Chairman of the Foreign
Relations Committee, has refused
to allow hearings on an agreement signed by
152 countries to ban the
testing of nuclear weapons worldwide. </DIV>

range of military and scientific experts, including four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, believe that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is in America's national interest. The test ban would ban and verify that countries do not conduct the proof tests needed to make modern nuclear weapons. But to go into effect, the U.S. must ratify the treaty and put pressure on other states to join the test ban. Senator Helms argues that an international agreement to ban nuclear weapons testing is not a high priority for the U.S., and so he blocks Senate consideration of the treaty. I find Senator Helms actions to be irresponsible and undemocratic. Three out of four North Carolinians agree. A June 1999 state poll released by the North Carolina Council of Churches finds that 75% of voters in the state support Senate approval of the test ban treaty. This fall a special conference by countries which have signed and ratified the treaty will meet to decide what actions they will take to accelerate its entry into force. If the U.S. has not ratified by then, it will be relegated to observer status and will be allowed only limited participation in future decision making. In blocking debate on the CTBT, Senator Helms is jeopardizing America's role as a leader in fight against nuclear weapons proliferation. North Carolina's other Senator, John Edwards, recently joined other Senate Democrats and several Republicans in sending a letter to Senator Helms asking for prompt consideration of the CTBT. I urge Senator Helms to work with Senator Edwards' to allow consideration and approval of the test ban treaty. Mr. Helms should listen to his constituents and end his blockade of the CTBT.

Sincerely,

Your Name

--
Joan L. Wade
Disarmament Clearinghouse
Coordinator
1101 14th Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC, 20010
Ph: (202) 898-0150 x232
Fax: (202) 898-0172

Return-Path: <MARY_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org>
Sender: MARY_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org
Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1999 13:54:18 -0400 (EDT)
Subject: CTBT
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: MARY_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org (MARY MILLER)

To: HOWARD W. HALLMAN <mupj@igc.apc.org>

Howard,

Thanks for your note. I'm relieved, frankly - wrestling with Tom about this has gotten wearying.

See you whenever. I get back to the office from vacation August 16th - and am gone an awful lot in September. I think I miss the next *two* meetings of the group and will have to catch up by e-mail.

peace,
mary

mary h miller, epf
Tue, Aug 3, 1999 8:08 am

To: MARY_MILLER.parti@ecunet.org (MARY MILLER)
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: CTBT-ALBRIGHT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 09:46 AM 7/29/99 -0400, MARY MILLER wrote:

>To: mupj@igc.apc.org (Howard W. Hallman)
>
>Howard,
>
>I've talked with Tom Hart again about trying to get an appointment with
>Madeleine Albright.....

Mary,

My personal opinion is that it isn't worth the effort to seek an appointment with Secretary Ahlbright for some of the reasons you stated. The majority at the last Interfaith Group for the CTBT wanted to make a try. We have now explored it and probably should conclude that the cost-benefits aren't worth the effort. I'll bring this up at our meeting on the 10th.

Shalom,
Howard

To: lyubak@hotmail.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Serving as interpreter
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Lyuba Komova:

Thanks for your willingness to serve as an interpreter for our Russian visitors tomorrow, Thursday, August 5.

Your first assignment will be to interpret for Margarita Gaskarova, who will listen in on a meeting of the Working Group on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) from 9:30 to 11:00 a.m. at the Methodist Building, Conference Room 1, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, DC. That is across from the Capitol and next to the Supreme Court Building. Your task will be to let Margarita know about what the meeting participants are talking about. She may say a few words of greeting but will otherwise not be a part of the discussion. I'll be with her and can meet you at 9:25 to explain about the meeting before it begins

The second meeting will be between Mariam Yandieva and a representative of the Institute for Human Rights Intern Program from 1:30 to 2:30 p.m. It will take place at the office of the Institute for International Education, 1400 K Street, NW, Suite 650 (phone 202 898-0600). Your task will be two-way interpretation between Mariam and the Institute representative.

I greatly appreciate you assistance. If you have any questions, please call me at 301 897-3668.

Howard Hallman

To: lyubak@hotmail.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Change of schedule
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Rita has decided not to go to the 9:30 meeting. Therefore, we will need you only at the 1:30 meeting at the Institute of International Education.

Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Fri, 06 Aug 1999 16:45:21 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: CTBT direct lobbying work - August

August 6, 1999

RE: Direct lobbying work on the CTBT for August

TO: T. Z. Collina, UCS
D. Culp, Pu Challenge
K. Guthrie and Joe Volk, FCNL
H. Hallman, MUPJ
J. Isaacs, CLW
J. Lintner, UCC
M. Rietmann, 20/20
K. Robson, WAND
F. Teplitz, Peace Action
B. Tiller, PSR
CC: T. Graham & Damien LaVera, LAWS
Z. Selden, BENS
M. Brooks, LWV
J. Parachini, Monterrey
S. Shaer, WAND
S. Gordon, ANA
B. Musil, PSR
G. Clark, Peace Action
M. Krepon, Stimson
S. Young, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

FR: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

**** Please DO NOT forward this message outside your office ****

As discussed after our August 5 CTBT Working Group Meeting, the following is a list of key Senate offices that I recommend we collectively try to maintain contact with on the topic of CTBT ratification through meetings or phone calls with staffers. Our goal should be to make sure that one or more of us contact each of these offices before the Senate reconvenes on September 7.

The Coalition has compiled a summary of each Senators' position and statements on the CTBT. If you need further information on the status of any Senator please contact me or John Isaacs at CLW.

COMMUNICATION: We will have the opportunity to share legislative information gathered from Hill meetings and other communications at the lobbying meeting following our next Coalition CTBT Working Grp. Mtg. on September 10 (time and location tba).

GENERAL MESSAGE/PURPOSE OF MEETINGS: Gathering information about Senators'

views and questions 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.

ASSIGNMENTS: Please let me know by email which offices you will take responsibility for contacting. The asterisk (*) indicates the lead person for setting up and organizing the mtg.

See <<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbtsenate.html>> if you need the name of the staff person responsible for CTBT issues.

KEY SENATE OFFICES

Bennett —
Chafee —
Collins — * Daryl Kimball
Domenici —
Gorton —
Gregg —
Hagel —
Lugar —
Roberts —
G. Smith — Marie Reitmann*
Snowe —
Specter — Marie Reitmann*
Stevens —
Thompson —
Voinovich — Daryl Kimball*
Warner —
Frist —

PLEASE CONTACT me (202-546-0795 x136 or dkimball@clw.org) if there are any changes, corrections or suggestions, and MOST IMPORTANTLY, if you collect any useful information from your meetings/conversations.

Also, see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/polling.htm>> if you wish to refer to state or national polling data.

Please note that I will be out on travel until August 17.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: CTBT direct lobbying work - August
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 04:45 PM 8/6/99 -0400, you wrote:

>August 6, 1999

>

>RE: Direct lobbying work on the CTBT for August....

Daryl,

Although Senator Lott isn't on your list, I will contact Chris Williams on his staff as a follow-up of a visit from an interfaith delegation in June. Also, I'm going to write Senator Sarbanes to ask him to join Senator Dorgan in floor initiatives (and call his staff). This will follow-up a letter from Maryland faith leaders in May and a visit with his staff. Otherwise I'm going to concentrate on grassroots activities.

Howard

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Interfaith Group for the CTBT meets August 10
Cc: ctbt
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT will meet on Tuesday, August 10 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the FCNL conference room, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, D.C.

All of our work on the CTBT is beginning to pay off. On July 20, the day that the Interfaith Group for the CTBT last met, President Clinton made a Rose Garden statement in behalf of the CTBT and nine senators held a news conference on a poll showing 82 percent of the public supports Senate ratification of the CTBT. In their statements the nine senators called for action by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a floor vote on the treaty. All 45 Democrats signed a letter to Senator Helms, urging hearings. Senator Dorgan has continued to speak out for the CTBT. He intends to step up efforts after Labor Day.

The past ten days I've been hosting two Russians under a Library of Congress Russian Leadership Program. Therefore, I haven't had time to work out an agenda and provide more background information. I'll have something to you on Monday, August 9.

Shalom,
Howard

To: subscription@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Software CD
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

August 6, 1999

On July 23, 1999 I signed up for unlimited use of your e-mail/web access service. Your confirmation number CSOF-13530 indicated that you would send me a CD with Netscape 4 for Win95. It has not arrived. If you have not sent it yet, please send it to me at 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817 (instead of c/o Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036 as originally requested).

Thanks,
Howard W. Hallman

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Fri, 06 Aug 1999 18:47:14 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: CTBT Action Alert & Campaign Update, 8/6/99

August 5, 1999

TO: CTBT supporters across the country
FR: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

RE: Mobilizing public opinion on the CTBT Aug.-Oct.

PLEASE REPLY BY AUGUST 23

At a recent meeting of organizations working on behalf of the CTBT here in Washington, DC, it was agreed that we should alert our members and other CTBT supporters about the importance of delivering big numbers of constituent telephone calls and personal letters (by postal mail or fax) in support of immediate ratification of the CTBT to key Senate offices by the end of September.

The reason: the next several weeks prior to the adjournment of Congress (scheduled for Oct. 29) are pivotal for our CTBT campaign. Our recent success generating news coverage and motivating Senate CTBT supporters on the Hill and in the Administration has been the result of months of effort from the many different CTBT coalition members -- but achieving a real breakthrough depends chiefly on mobilizing and communicating even greater grassroots support for the CTBT.

While the Clinton administration is still assessing what can and should do on the CTBT, it is nevertheless closer to taking action than it was a month. On the other hand, the Senate Democratic leadership has decided to make the CTBT a priority issue for the remainder of the fall session of Congress. In a meeting on August 5 with a group of representatives from organizations working for the CTBT, Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND) said: "We have to convince the Senate leadership that CTBT is the one issue that will focus senate business this fall. Either the CTBT gets a debate and vote or nothing is going to get done. CTBT has to be the one issue."

With the strong support of Senator Dorgan, Minority Leader Daschle, Senator Biden and others, President Clinton will be hard pressed not to push the Senate Leadership for agreement on scheduling a vote on the CTBT this year or early next.

Now is the time for CTBT supporters to weigh-in. With strong public support for the Treaty, we have a chance at securing the vote, which will likely produce over 67 Senators in favor of ratification. Without your efforts, the CTBT will remain stalled for months and possibly years.

PLEASE RESPOND TO THIS NOTE BY PROVIDING AN ESTIMATE OF THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL CALLS AND PERSONALIZED LETTERS THAT YOUR ORGANIZATION'S WILL

DELIVER FOR EACH SENATOR/STATE. The "pledges" will be compiled and someone will contact you later this month to check on progress

What follows is:

- 1) a list of key Senators and suggested activities to communicate public support for the CTBT;
- 2) an updated CTBT calendar of events and anniversaries to assist your planning; and
- 3) a list of important resources that are available for this effort.

Thanks, in advance, for you help and support.

IMPORTANT SENATORS ON CTBT (August-October 1999)

The following are considered to the most important Senators/States based on the likelihood that they may take a public position and/or action on behalf of the CTBT or because of their role on Committees and/or the Senate leadership structure.

All 45 Democratic Senators wrote to Senators Helms and Lott urging hearings in time for a vote before the October 6 special international conference on accelerating CTBT entry into force.

Calls and letters from constituents of other Senators are important, but given our limited resources, it was agreed that national organizations focus their efforts on the following Senators/States.

Our objective is to generate AT LEAST 50-100 COMMUNICATIONS TO EACH SENATE OFFICE by the end of September.

PLEASE FILL IN THE SPACES BELOW AND REPLY about how many call/letters your organization will deliver from each state:

ALASKA NO. OF CALLS/LETTERS PLEDGED:
Stevens (R-AK) *Chair of the Senate Arms Control Observers Group.

INDIANA NO. OF CALLS/LETTERS PLEDGED:
Lugar (R-IN) *Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

KANSAS NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
Brownback (R-KS) *Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.
Roberts (R-KS)

MAINE NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
Collins (R-ME) *Note: wrote letter in May 99 urging hearings on CTBT.
Snowe (R-ME) *Note: issued press statement in May 98 urging hearings on CTBT.

MISSISSIPPI NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
Lott (R-MS) *Majority Leader.

NEBRASKA NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
Hagel (R-NE) *Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

NEW HAMPSHIRE NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
Gregg (R-NH) *Note: joined Sens. Specter (R-PA) and Biden (D-DE) on 98 resolution urging hearings.

NEW MEXICO NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
Domenici (R-NM)

OHIO NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
DeWine (R-OH)
Voinovich (R-OH)

OREGON NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
G. Smith (R-OR) *Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

RHODE ISLAND NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
Chafee (R-RI)

TENNESSEE NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
Frist (R-TN) *Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.
Thompson (R-TN)

UTAH NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
Bennett (R-UT)
Hatch (R-UT)

WASHINGTON NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
Gorton (R-WA)

VIRGINIA NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
Warner (R-VA) *Chairman of Senate Armed Services Committee.

SUGGESTED TOOLS FOR GENERATING CALLS AND LETTERS

1. Contact your field representatives and key activists in each key state and urge them to activate phone, postal mailing, and e-mail alert systems (for National and State Organizations).
2. Action alerts to membership on getting the CTBT message out.
3. Phone banking to individual members in key states asking them to call their Senators. (PSR will sponsor a phone-bank for DC-based national organizations on the evening of September 14.)
4. Approaching local coalition allies in key states for their support in generating pro-CTBT messages to Senators (for State and Local Organizations and activists).
5. Using time at local events and organizational meetings to ask

individuals to write letters.

CTBT CALENDAR: August- November 1999

August 5 36th anniversary of LTBT signing
August 6 & 9 Hiroshima and Nagasaki Days
Aug.9-Sept.6 Senate summer recess
Aug. 23-27 Ninth Preparatory Session of the CTBTO, Vienna, Austria
August 29 50th anniv. of the first Soviet nuclear test, Semipalatinsk Test Site, Kazakhstan
September 24 3rd anniversary of the signing of the CTBT; 36th anniv. of LTBT ratification
October 6-8 First Special Conference on CTBT Entry Into Force, Vienna
October 9-12 Senate Columbus Day recess (estimate)
October 16 35th anniversary of the first Chinese nuclear test, Lop Nor
October 21 U.S. temporary waiver of sanctions against India and Pakistan related to their nuclear testing expires
October 29 target date for adjournment of Congress
Nov. 16-19 Tenth Preparatory Session of the CTBTO, Vienna, Austria

CTBT Outreach and Public Education Resources ---

The following is not a complete list of resources and information. See the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers' CTBT Site
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

and related CTBT Web Sites

<<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctlinks.htm>> for more resources.

* Peace Action Flyer on September 14 CTBT Call-In Day (Contact Peace Action at 202-862-9740 for more information.)

* 20/20 Vision-produced action alert postcards (See <<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbt.html>> for more information.)

* Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers' "For a Safer America" CTBT brochure (See <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbkform.htm>> for more information.) **A updated version will be available in September.

* "Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now!" buttons from the Disarmament Clearinghouse (Contact 898-0150 for more information or see <<http://www.psr.org/buttons.htm>>)

* Information on Senators and staff responsible for CTBT <<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbtSenate.html>> and their state contact information <<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbtfield.html>>

* Library of CTBT-related editorials are available from National Security News Service (466-4310) and are available online from the Coalition's CTBT site <<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctedit.htm#editorials>>

* CTBT video: "Test Anxiety, Should the United States Sign the Test Ban Treaty?" by the Center for Defense Information's America's Defense Monitor, see <<http://www.cdi.org/adm/1235/>>. (Contact Jenny Smith <jsmith@clw.org> for ordering information.)

* "Accelerating the Entry Into Force of the CTBT: the Article XIV Special Conference," a report by Ambassador George Bunn and the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is available online at:
<<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/SpecConfRep0599.htm>>

* Polling Data on Public Attitudes on Nuclear Testing and the Test Ban Treaty (See the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers' Web Site
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctblinks.htm>>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Grassroots letters for CTBT
Cc: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues on Interfaith Group for the CTBT:

At the risk of duplication I'm forwarding a message from Daryl Kimball about producing grassroots letters to selected senators on the CTBT. There is a request for pledges of how many letters you can produce in September in various states. I'll take your pledges at the meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT on September 10, or you can e-mail or fax your pledge to me or Daryl.

Thanks for your continued efforts.

Howard

>Date: Fri, 06 Aug 1999 18:47:14 -0400
>To: dkimball@clw.org
>From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
>Subject: CTBT Action Alert & Campaign Update, 8/6/99
>
>August 5, 1999
>
>TO: CTBT supporters across the country
>FR: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
>
>RE: Mobilizing public opinion on the CTBT Aug.-Oct.
>
>PLEASE REPLY BY AUGUST 23
>
>At a recent meeting of organizations working on behalf of the CTBT here in
>Washington, DC, it was agreed that we should alert our members and other
>CTBT supporters about the importance of delivering big numbers of constituent
>telephone calls and personal letters (by postal mail or fax) in support of
>immediate ratification of the CTBT to key Senate offices by the end
>of September.
>
>The reason: the next several weeks prior to the adjournment of Congress
>(scheduled for Oct. 29) are pivotal for our CTBT campaign. Our recent
>success generating news coverage and motivating Senate CTBT supporters on
>the Hill and in the Administration has been the result of months of effort
>from the many different CTBT coalition members -- but achieving a real
>breakthrough depends chiefly on mobilizing and communicating even greater
>grassroots support for the CTBT.
>
>While the Clinton administration is still assessing what can and should do
>on the CTBT, it is nevertheless closer to taking action than it was a
>month. On the other hand, the Senate Democratic leadership has decided to
>make the CTBT a priority issue for the remainder of the fall session of
>Congress. In a meeting on August 5 with a group of representatives from
>organizations working for the CTBT, Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND) said: "We

>have to convince the Senate leadership that CTBT is the one issue that will
>focus senate business this fall. Either the CTBT gets a debate and vote or
>nothing is going to get done. CTBT has to be the one issue."

>
>With the strong support of Senator Dorgan, Minority Leader Daschle, Senator
>Biden and others, President Clinton will be hard pressed not to push the
>Senate Leadership for agreement on scheduling a vote on the CTBT this year
>or early next.

>
>Now is the time for CTBT supporters to weigh-in. With strong public support
>for the Treaty, we have a chance at securing the vote, which will likely
>produce over 67 Senators in favor of ratification. Without your efforts,
>the CTBT will remained stalled for months and possibly years.

>
>PLEASE RESPOND TO THIS NOTE BY PROVIDING AN ESTIMATE OF THE NUMBER OF
>INDIVIDUAL CALLS AND PERSONALIZED LETTERS THAT YOUR ORGANIZATION'S WILL
>DELIVER FOR EACH SENATOR/STATE. The "pledges" will be compiled and someone
>will contact you later this month to check on progress

>
>>*****

>
>IMPORTANT SENATORS ON CTBT (August-October 1999)

>
>The following are considered to the most important Senators/States based on
>the likelihood that they may take a public position and/or action on behalf
>of the CTBT or because of their role on Committees and/or the Senate
>leadership structure.

>
>All 45 Democratic Senators wrote to Senators Helms and Lott urging hearings
>in time for a vote before the October 6 special international conference on
>accelerating CTBT entry into force.

>
>Calls and letters from constituents of other Senators are important, but
>given our limited resources, it was agreed that national organizations
>focus their efforts on the following Senators/States.

>
>Our objective is to generate AT LEAST 50-100 COMMUNICATIONS TO EACH SENATE
>OFFICE by the end of September.

>
>PLEASE FILL IN THE SPACES BELOW AND REPLY about how many call/letters your
>organization will deliver from each state:

>
>ALASKA NO. OF CALLS/LETTERS PLEDGED:
>Stevens (R-AK) *Chair of the Senate Arms Control Observers Group.

>
>INDIANA NO. OF CALLS/LETTERS PLEDGED:
>Lugar (R-IN) *Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

>
>KANSAS NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
>Brownback (R-KS) *Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.
>Roberts (R-KS)

>
>MAINE NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:
>Collins (R-ME) *Note: wrote letter in May 99 urging hearings on CTBT.

>Snowe (R-ME) *Note: issued press statement in May 98 urging hearings on CTBT.

>
>MISSISSIPPI NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:

>Lott (R-MS) *Majority Leader.

>
>NEBRASKA NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:

>Hagel (R-NE) *Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

>
>NEW HAMPSHIRE NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:

>Gregg (R-NH) *Note: joined Sens. Specter (R-PA) and Biden (D-DE) on 98
>resolution urging hearings.

>
>NEW MEXICO NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:

>Domenici (R-NM)

>
>OHIO NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:

>DeWine (R-OH)

>Voinovich (R-OH)

>
>OREGON NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:

>G. Smith (R-OR) *Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

>
>RHODE ISLAND NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:

>Chafee (R-RI)

>
>TENNESSEE NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:

>Frist (R-TN) *Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

>Thompson (R-TN)

>
>UTAH NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:

>Bennett (R-UT)

>Hatch (R-UT)

>
>WASHINGTON NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:

>Gorton (R-WA)

>
>VIRGINIA NO. OF CALLS LETTERS PLEDGED:

>Warner (R-VA) *Chairman of Senate Armed Services Committee.

>
Added by Hallman for faith community:

WYOMING NO. OF CALLS/LETTERS PLEDGED:
Craig Thomas (R-WY) *Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee

>
>SUGGESTED TOOLS FOR GENERATING CALLS AND LETTERS

>
>1. Contact your field representatives and key activists in each key state
>and urge them to activate phone, postal mailing, and e-mail alert systems
>(for National and State Organizations).

>
>2. Action alerts to membership on getting the CTBT message out.

>

>3. Phone banking to individual members in key states asking them to call
>their Senators. (PSR will sponsor a phone-bank for DC-based national
>organizations on the evening of September 14.)

>

>4. Approaching local coalition allies in key states for their support in
>generating pro-CTBT messages to Senators (for State and Local Organizations
>and activists).

>

>5. Using time at local events and organizational meetings to ask
>individuals to write letters.

>

>

Return-Path: <subscription>
Date: Fri, 6 Aug 1999 14:20:32 -0700 (PDT)
From: subscription <subscription@igc.apc.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Software CD

Hello Howard,

Sorry, it appears that your order was not completed, so I have placed the order for the software and adjusted your file to reflect the unlimited access, my apologies for the delay.

Have a good day,

Pia Jensen
billing2@igc.org

On Fri, 6 Aug 1999, Howard W. Hallman wrote:

> August 6, 1999
>
> On July 23, 1999 I signed up for unlimited use of your e-mail/web access
> service. Your confirmation number CSOF-13530 indicated that you would send
> me a CD with Netscape 4 for Win95. It has not arrived. If you have not
> sent it yet, please send it to me at 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
> (instead of c/o Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street,
> NW, Washington, DC 20036 as originally requested).
>
> Thanks,
> Howard W. Hallman
>

To: ritag@aport.ru
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Greetings
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Rita:

Carlee and I hope you had a safe, uneventful return trip to Russia and that your baggage arrived undamaged.

We greatly enjoyed your visit with us. We were pleased that we could share our home with you, show you around Washington, and arrange for your appointments.

You and Mariam are very talented and dedicated persons. We feel encouraged that you are among the new leaders of Russia. It gives us hope for your country.

If you ever come to Washington again, we invite you to stay with us.

Cordially yours,
Howard

Return-Path: <DRingler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
From: Robin Ringler <DRingler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "'mupj@igc.apc.org'" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: your advice
Date: Mon, 9 Aug 1999 09:40:59 -0400

Hi Howard,

I'm writing to ask you advice about something. Edward Perry, a very active anti-nuclear, UM layman from the Cal-Pac Conference, has written me to ask if the GBCS would consider joining the Global Action to Prevent War coalition. He sent me some materials. In the US, David Cortright, Randall Forsberg, Jonathan Dean and Cora Weiss are some of the Coordinating Committee members. You've probably heard of all this before anyway.

What do you think? He actually asked if the UMC could join the coalition, but that would require Gen'l Conf. action. If you think the GBCS should join, I can take it to our Oct. Board mtg.

Thanks Howard!

Robin

To: Robin Ringler <DRingler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: your advice
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 09:40 AM 8/9/99 -0400, Robin Ringler wrote:

>Hi Howard,

>

>I'm writing to ask you advice about something. Edward Perry, a very active
>anti-nuclear, UM layman from the Cal-Pac Conference, has written me to ask
>if the GBCS would consider joining the Global Action to Prevent War
>coalition. He sent me some materials....

Robin:

I went to a meeting last year on this that Jonathan Dean called. I had some positive feelings but also some concerns, which I've now forgotten. I'll dig out the material and give you a more informed response.

Howard

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Agenda for August 10 meeting
Cc: ctbt
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

Here is the agenda for the August 10 meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT. Please come prepared to make pledges for the number of calls and letters you can produce in September in the key states listed in a previous communication.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Meeting of Interfaith Group for the CTBT
1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, August 10, 1999
FCNL Conference Room, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Status of CTBT, prospects for ratification
3. August activities
 - a. Home state meetings of senators
 - b. Radio call-in
 - c. Interfaith petition in Mississippi
 - d. Contacts with Senate staff
4. September activities
 - a. Letters and calls to senators: pledges for key states
 - b. Phone bank
 - c. Heads of communion letters to Senator Lott (a proposal)
 - d. National day of action, September 14 (a Peace Action initiative)
 - e. Other
5. Approaches to broader nuclear disarmament issues (brief discussion)
6. Other

Next meeting: Tuesday, September 21, 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., same place.

Return-Path: <jdi@clw.org>
X-Sender: jdi@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Mon, 09 Aug 1999 11:46:20 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: President Clinton delivers another strong CTBT endorsement

In another step in the accelerated Administration's campaign on behalf of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, President Clinton delivered a strong endorsement today at the Pentagon ceremonies marking the 50th anniversary of the creation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Clinton noted the importance of the treaty, and asked for hearings in the fall and a vote next year. He also cited the support of past chairs of the Joint Chiefs, including several who were in attendance. John

John Isaacs
Council for a Livable World
110 Maryland Avenue, NE - Room 409
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 543-4100 x.131
FAX (202) 543-6297

Return-Path: <jdi@clw.org>
X-Sender: jdi@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Mon, 09 Aug 1999 12:53:17 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Clinton Prods Senate on Nuke Treaty

Clinton Prods Senate on Nuke Treaty
By Tom Raum
Associated Press Writer
Monday, August 9, 1999; 12:09 p.m. EDT

WASHINGTON (AP) -- President Clinton prodded the Senate today to move on a long-stalled treaty to ban nuclear testing worldwide, telling a military ceremony it would ``strengthen national security, not only of the United States, but of people around the world."

Clinton asked the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to hold hearings on the treaty in the fall. It has been signed by 152 nations but not yet ratified by the United States, Russia or China.

``It is in America's interest," he said. ``Why? Because we have already stopped testing."

The 1996 pact has been held up by that panel's chairman, Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., in a dispute with the administration over arms control agreements between the United States and Russia.

Clinton intensified his campaign on behalf of the treaty at the ceremony at nearby Fort Myer in Arlington, Va., celebrating the 50th anniversary of the creation of the office of chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Six of the 14 men who have served in the post attended, including the present chairman, Gen. Henry Shelton.

Clinton praised those who have held the post, the top uniformed military officer in the country, calling the position ``indispensable" to presidents.

``There will come a time in the service of every president -- my time has come unfortunately on several occasions -- when you have to have the honest advice of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And sometimes, it is the last thing in the world that you want to hear."

As commander-in-chief, Clinton also praised the military and celebrated the recent victory in the Balkans. Still, Clinton added, ``We know not every battle will be like Kosovo. Not every battle can be won from the air."

Clinton used the occasion to step up the White House campaign on behalf of the test ban treaty, noting that four former Joint Chiefs chairmen -- Colin Powell, David C. Jones, William J. Crowe and John

Shalikashvili -- publicly supported the pact.

It remains bottled up in the Foreign Relations Committee, where Helms is holding it hostage to other measures. Mainly, Helms wants the administration to send to the Senate changes in the landmark 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty agreed to by Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin in 1996.

But the administration wants to wait until the Russian parliament first ratifies a later arms-reduction pact, the so-called START II agreement to reduce American and Russian warheads to a maximum of 3,500 each.

Although administration officials had hoped the Duma, the Russian parliament's lower house, would take up that measure when it reconvenes next month, the timetable could be affected by Yeltsin's firing today of his foreign minister and Cabinet.

© Copyright 1999 The Associated Press

John Isaacs
Council for a Livable World
110 Maryland Avenue, NE - Room 409
Washington, D.C. 20002
(202) 543-4100 x.131
FAX (202) 543-6297

To: "Adrienne Fong" <afong@jps.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Nevada Test Site Observance
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Adrienne:

I've heard a little about the December 30-January 2 observance at the Nevada Test Site. It's something we might endorse. Will you please send me more information.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <afong@jps.net>
From: "Adrienne Fong" <afong@jps.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Nevada Test Site Observance
Date: Mon, 9 Aug 1999 14:06:16 -0700
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

Hi Howard,

Thank you for your prompt response. I am going to have Cindy Pile who is the staff person for the NDE send this info to you. Is it OK for me to give her your name and number?? She will be in on Wed.

Adrienne Fong
afong@jps.net

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

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
To: Adrienne Fong <afong@jps.net>
Date: Monday, August 09, 1999 1:48 PM
Subject: Nevada Test Site Observance

>Dear Adrienne:

>

>I've heard a little about the December 30-January 2 observance at the Nevada

>Test Site. It's something we might endorse. Will you please send me more >information.

>

>Shalom,

>Howard

>

>

To: "Adrienne Fong" <afong@jps.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Nevada Test Site Observance
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 02:06 PM 8/9/99 -0700, Adrienne Fong wrote:

>Hi Howard,
> Thank you for your prompt response. I am going to have Cindy Pile who
>is the staff person for the NDE send this info to you. Is it OK for me to
>give her your name and number?? She will be in on Wed.
>Adrienne,.

Yes, that's okay.

Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Cc: mailbox@ipb.org
Date: Mon, 9 Aug 1999 22:59:24 +0200
From: "Fredrik S. Heffermehl" <fredpax@online.no>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Asahi Shimbun - excellent book on NW disarmament
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: fredpax@mail.online.no

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id OAB07817

Oslo, Aug. 9, 1999

Dear friends,

I don't know that I have seen any comments on the book that the biggest Japanese Newspaper, Asahi Shimbun, has distributed in English to the anti-nuclear mvmt of the world.

It is a big, elegant book that carries a huge photo of the Hiroshima empty dome on the cover. I let it lie for a few months, but was quite impressed when I started to read. This is the NW issues in a very up-to-date, broad and readable form (actually a series of newspaper articles in book form). Much of it excellent for teaching. Take a look at it!

Fredrik

Fredrik S. Heffermehl

Oslo, July 21, 1999

The Nuclear Coverage Team
Asahi Shimbun, Osaka

Dear Editor,

I received and wish to thank you warmly for your beautiful book "The Road to the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons"? Asahi Shimbun, has sent this book, apparently, to a great number of peace activists. It took some time before I could sit down with it, but then I was so taken in by the first article on the Hibakusha (and the criminal secrecy on their plight and the use of their fate for study of the effect of radioactivity, rather than giving medical treatment) that I had to read from first to last page without stop.

It is a remarkable presentation in my view. I have been working at a fairly high level with anti-nuclear campaigning for 15 years and am intimately familiar with many of the campaigns and facts covered in the book. It is rare to see such a broad coverage of the whole current nuclear scene -

topically, politically and geographically - in a very understandable and accessible (journalistic) form.

It is a book that deserves wide recognition and use.

With my best regards,

Fredrik S. Heffermehl

```
*****
* Fredrik S. HEFFERMEHL *
* President, Norwegian Peace Alliance *
* Vice President, International Peace Bureau *
* Board/Directors, IA Lawyers Ag. Nuclar Arms *
* International Free Vanunu Committee *
* *
* N. Juels g. 28 A, N-0272 Oslo, Norway *
* Phone +47-2244 8003 (fax: +47-2244 7616) *
* E-mail: fredpax@online.no *
*****
```

Return-Path: <j2000-usa-news-retsub-934249066-424587233-mupj=igc.org@egroups.com>
Date: Tue, 10 Aug 1999 01:37:46 -0000
From: "eGroups.com Manager" <coord@j2000usa.org>
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Subscription Notification for j2000-usa-news@egroups.com
Reply-To: j2000-usa-news-unsubscribe-mupj=igc.org@egroups.com
User-Agent: eGroups-EW/0.76
Mailing-List: contact j2000-usa-news-owner@egroups.com; run by eGroups.com

This is the eGroups.com service.

You have been added to the j2000-usa-news@egroups.com group
by the group's moderator: coord@j2000usa.org

Here is a welcome message provided by coord@j2000usa.org:

Welcome! Thank you for your interest in the Jubilee 2000 Campaign! You have been subscribed to the official news and announcements email list serve of the Jubilee 2000/USA Campaign. Jubilee 2000/USA is a coalition of US environmental, religious, social justice and development groups working to cancel the crushing debts of impoverished countries by the end of the year 2000. You will receive BRIEF campaign news and announcements via this service, for free, so you can stay informed and involved. You will receive no more than three brief messages a month. Your email address will never be shared or accessed by any other group.

Note that controlling your membership is easy! Visit "my space" at www.egroups.com and follow the instructions. To unsubscribe from this list, just send an empty e-mail to J2000-usa-news-unsubscribe@egroups.com

If you do not want to be a member of this group, you can instantly remove yourself simply by replying to this message. Use the "Reply" function of your e-mail program and send us back a blank message.

Please direct any comments or questions about the group or your subscription to the group moderator:

coord@j2000usa.org
j2000-usa-news-owner@egroups.com

eGroups.com asks group moderators to make sure they add no one to their group who might not want to be. If you believe this policy has been violated, please notify us at abuse@egroups.com.

You can receive group messages in your e-mail in-box or read them on the Web at:

<http://www.egroups.com/list/j2000-usa-news>

If you have questions about the group, please contact the group moderator at j2000-usa-news-owner@egroups.com.

If you have other questions, please visit

<http://www.egroups.com/info/help.html>

Welcome!

The eGroups.com Team

FREE Web-based e-mail groups!

<http://www.egroups.com>

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

At 03:33 PM 8/10/99 -0400, Joe Volk wrote:

>FCNL EMAIL MEMO

>

>To: Monday Lobby Group

>From: Joe Volk

>

>RE: Sign on Letter from USCBL (United States Campaign to Ban
>Landmines) to President Clinton

> Deadline Monday, 16 August

> Reply to Mary Wareham, Human Rights Watch, (see contact

>information below)//NOT TO FCNL

>

>-----

>

>We need your sign on by Monday to demonstrate strong support for the Mine

>Ban Treaty and to make a strong appeal to President Clinton to take action

>now for the U.S. to comply with and join the treaty.....

>

To: Mary Wareham

We'll sign the letter.

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

Return-Path: <joe@fcnl.org>
From: Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>
To: Sara Bradbury <sara@fcnl.org>
Subject:
Date: Tue, 10 Aug 1999 15:33:41 -0400
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF61AE675@local.fcnl.org>

FCNL EMAIL MEMO

To: Monday Lobby Group
Date: 8/10/99
ATWG
WISC FP/MS WG
National Coalition for Peace in Yugoslavia
Quaker agencies in the USA

From: Joe Volk

RE: Sign on Letter from USCBL (United States Campaign to Ban
Landmines) to President Clinton
Deadline Monday, 16 August
Reply to Mary Wareham, Human Rights Watch, (see contact
information below)//NOT TO FCNL

We need your sign on by Monday to demonstrate strong support for the Mine
Ban Treaty and to make a strong appeal to President Clinton to take action
now for the U.S. to comply with and join the treaty.

Please do two things as soon as possible and not later than Monday 16
August:

1. Sign on the letter to President Clinton
2. Appeal to representatives of other organizations to sign on too.

Thanks very much.

Contact information for Mary Wareham and the text of the USCBL letter to
President Clinton follow...

The Honorable William Jefferson Clinton
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington DC 20500

August 1999

Dear President Clinton:

We write on behalf of the U.S. Campaign to Ban Landmines, the nationwide

coalition of over 300 non-governmental organizations calling for a total ban on antipersonnel landmines, and one of over 90 country campaigns comprising the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL). We write to express our concern about potential U.S. use of antipersonnel mines in joint military operations with signatories to the 1997 Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and On their Destruction. We ask that you declare that as a matter of policy, the United States will not use antipersonnel landmines if it is engaged in joint military operations or exercises with ban treaty signatories.

This issue was brought to the fore during the NATO operation in Yugoslavia, when the United States publicly reserved the right to use antipersonnel landmines, even as it condemned Yugoslav forces for using them. The ICBL has called for a NATO-wide policy of non-use of antipersonnel mines in joint operations or joint exercises. As you well know, seventeen of NATO's nineteen members are signatories to the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty (the exceptions being, of course, the U.S. and Turkey), and fourteen have already ratified. The United States should not block consensus on a NATO policy prohibiting any use of antipersonnel mines in alliance operations.

The U.S. Campaign to Ban Landmines is relieved that the U.S. did not use antipersonnel mines in Kosovo, but we continue to be alarmed as the U.S. presses its military allies, including signatories to the Mine Ban Treaty, to allow it to use antipersonnel mines in joint operations, to continue stockpiling U.S. antipersonnel mines on their territory, and to permit the U.S. to transport mines through their territory -- all of which are against the spirit, and perhaps the letter, of the Mine Ban Treaty. The U.S. has expressed its support for the treaty and its intention to sign eventually; in the meantime, the U.S. should not engage in activities which undermine the treaty and put signatories in danger of violating it.

Article 1 of the treaty is clear in its obligation that a State Party shall "never under any circumstance...assist, encourage or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in any activity prohibited to a State Party under this Convention." Joint NATO operations involving the use of antipersonnel mines by the U.S. could be a violation of this Article. Surely such operations would go against the spirit of a treaty aimed at an end to all possession and use of antipersonnel mines.

We ask that you, as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, institute a policy of no use of antipersonnel mines in joint military operations or exercises with ban treaty signatories. This would include any NATO operations, as well as operations with non-NATO countries that have signed the treaty, such as Japan, Australia, and New Zealand. We also call upon you to immediately halt U.S. pressure on U.S. military allies, including signatories to the Mine Ban Treaty, to allow the U.S. to continue stockpiling U.S. antipersonnel mines on their territory, and to permit the U.S. to transport mines through their territory.

In addition, we again express our deep regret that the United States continues to refuse to join the Mine Ban Treaty until 2006 and then only if alternatives are found. 2006 is years too late for the world to wait for the U.S. to ban antipersonnel landmines.

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

TO SIGN ON THE HEAD OF YOUR ORGANIZATION TO THIS LETTER PLEASE REPLY TO MARY WAREHAM, HRW BY EMAIL, FAX OR PHONE BY MONDAY 16 AUGUST 1999.

Tel. 202-612-4356

Fax. 202-612-4333

Email. wareham@hrw.org <<mailto:wareham@hrw.org>>

CC:

Heads of State of U.S. Military allies

Secretary of Defense

Secretary of State

ICBL

Attachment Converted: C:\INTERACT\data\download\Untitled

Return-Path: <wareham@hrw.org>
From: wareham@hrw.org
Date: Tue, 10 Aug 1999 17:36:56 -0400
To: <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re[2]: Sign on letter
Content-Description: "cc:Mail Note Part"

Thanks very much Howard, you're on!
Mary

Reply Separator

Subject: Re: Sign on letter
Author: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Date: 8/10/99 2:31 PM

At 03:33 PM 8/10/99 -0400, Joe Volk wrote:

>FCNL EMAIL MEMO

>

>To: Monday Lobby Group

>From: Joe Volk

>

>RE: Sign on Letter from USCBL (United States Campaign to Ban
>Landmines) to President Clinton

> Deadline Monday, 16 August

> Reply to Mary Wareham, Human Rights Watch, (see contact

>information below)//NOT TO FCNL

>

>-----

>

>We need your sign on by Monday to demonstrate strong support for the Mine

>Ban Treaty and to make a strong appeal to President Clinton to take action

>now for the U.S. to comply with and join the treaty.....

>

To: Mary Wareham

We'll sign the letter.

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

To: support
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Installing new system
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

I've installed the CD-ROM for unlimited service. Because my computer is located in Bethesda, Maryland, a D.C. suburb, I entered the area code with the number: 202 222-1110. The first time I tried to enter the system, I got the message that the local number was wrong. Did I miscopy it? Or what do I do now? My area code is 301, and I have to dial 202 to connect with a number in D.C.

Thanks,
Howard Hallman

To: ctbt@2020vision.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: E-mail addresses
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Marie,

Here are the e-mail addresses of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

ograbc@aol.com
"Jim Matlack" <denhartz@erols.com>
washofc@aol.com
ann_d.parti@ecunet.org
tom.hart@ecunet.org
jmskipper@aol.com
epf@igc.org
disarm@forusa.org
joe@fcnl.org
kathy@fcnl.org
rachel@fcnl.org
sara@fcnl.org
mark.brown@ecunet.org
J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org
mknolldc@igc.org
lwright@igc.org
jsammon@networklobby.org
network@igc.org
dave@paxchristiusa.org
Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org
lwyolton@prodigy.net
uuawo@aol.com
arosenbaum@uahc.org
lintnerj@ucc.org
jpmde@ucc.org
Dringler@umc-gbcs.org
gpowers@nccbuscc.org
hnolen@igc.org

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <btiller@psr.org>
Date: Wed, 11 Aug 1999 14:54:13 -0400
From: Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Organization: Physicians for Social Responsibility
X-Accept-Language: en
To: btiller@psr.org
Subject: Markey's de-alerting resolution

Congressman Ed Markey (D-MA) introduced his resolution on de-alerting nuclear weapons at the end of last week. The number is H. Con. Res. 177, and the text is pasted below. (Several of you reviewed the original draft and made suggestions about improving it. Thank you. Markey's staff listed to all of them and incorporated some of them into the final version.)

Due to the way it is written, the primary referral is to the House International Relations Committee, with additional referral to Armed Services. It was introduced without cosponsors, but Markey's staff assures me they will seek cosponsors and welcome them at any time.

So we can now begin our grassroots efforts. As you know, co-sponsorship is a very important coin of the D.C. realm, so we need to urge every House Member to become a co-sponsor of this de-alerting resolution. Let's get a buzz going and build up that co-sponsor list.

Interest in de-alerting is strong at the grassroots level, and we need to channel that into Congressional offices. Remember --- most House offices will not be familiar with this, so we are the first ones to give them a heads-up.

Markey's office is interested in doing a Dear Colleague about the resolution, but has not yet done so. (When I asked if they would object to another House office pulling together a House Members sign-on letter to Clinton on the issue, Markey's staffer said they would not object. So we may still pursue that approach.)

Shalom,
Bob Tiller

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress that nuclear weapons should be taken off
hair-trigger alert.

Whereas accidental or mistaken launch of a nuclear missile could devastate
a city, and launch of a nuclear force could wreak worldwide destruction;

Whereas the United States and Russia currently maintain thousands of nuclear weapons on "hair-trigger" alert, such that they can be fired within
minutes;

Whereas in several incidents false signals of missile attacks have

triggered a process in which National leaders had to decide in only a few minutes whether to fire nuclear weapons;
Whereas the failure of computers to recognize the year 2000 date change could infect command, control, communications, and intelligence systems,

causing false signals or blank monitoring screens;
Whereas Russian monitoring and control systems are deteriorating;
Whereas a massive preemptive attack attempting to destroy the nuclear weapons capability of either Russia or the United States is extremely unlikely, and mutual measures to slow the firing of nuclear weapons would make a preemptive strike even more difficult;
Whereas much of the nuclear force of each country, including submarines at sea and mobile land-based missiles, is almost invulnerable and thus would preserve retaliatory ability through a nuclear attack, making immediate firing of weapons unnecessary;
Whereas President Bush in 1991 ordered a unilateral stand-down of United

States strategic bombers and de-alerted some missiles, and Soviet President Gorbachev quickly reciprocated with similar actions, improving bilateral

relations and national security;
Whereas removing further missiles from hair-trigger alert would help alleviate recent tensions between Russia and the United State; and
Whereas there are several ways that land and submarine based weapons could be temporarily disabled, with times ranging from minutes to weeks in order to reactivate them: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that-

(1) the United States, Russia, and other nuclear powers should negotiate an agreement to take all of their nuclear weapons off of high-alert status in order to decrease the risk of accidental or mistaken firing of nuclear weapons;

(2) to further such an agreement, the United States should immediately

take off of hair-trigger alert as many of its nuclear weapons as is feasible and consistent with national security, and should encourage Russia to reciprocate,

(3) the Department of Defense and the State Department should study methods to increase further the time needed to launch all nuclear missiles and study the effect these actions would have on nuclear deterrence, relations with other recognized nuclear powers, the international nuclear

nonproliferation regime, and other aspects of national security;

(4) the President should expedite the establishment of a United States-Russian joint early-warning center to ensure accurate detection of any missiles and effective communication in the event of a false alarm, computer malfunction, accident, or diplomatic crisis, as set forth in the "Joint Statement on the Exchange of Information on Missile Launches and Early Warning", agreed to in 1998, and should facilitate the establishment of a temporary center before the end of 1999 that could address any problems which might arise due to the failure of computers to recognize the year 2000 date change.

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Stamp money
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Phil,

I'm running out of stamps. Will you please provide me a check for \$66 payable to Postmaster. Thanks.

Howard

To: support
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Assistance with new system
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

I found my way into the new system other than the dial icon on the screen, but I couldn't figure out how to disconnect except turning off the computer. I have other questions, such as how to transfer nicknames and filter items from the old system. Is there is a manual available for the Interact upgrade I've just made to unlimited service so that I can find answers to such questions?

Thanks for your help,
Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <help@igc.org>
X-Sender: igcsupport@popalex1.linknet.net
Date: Thu, 12 Aug 1999 08:47:36 -0500
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: Help <help@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Installing new system

That is a number for DC. There is a problem with the main Internet Backbone they're having problems with their phone services system causing communication problems with the MCI/Worldcom lines. Apparently many of their circuits are down and that is why you are having these problems. It is sporadic and it is not just one area but all over the U.S and there are more ISP's having this problem not just IGC. We've reported it and have no estimated time of repair yet. Sorry.

Tech Support

Please include a copy of this message with any reply. If you are not writing to us from your IGC account, please include your IGC UserID with your message. You may call Tech Support for Technical Assistance at 318-619-1123 (24 hours a day, seven days a week).

If you are needing a new access # go here.
<http://www.bbn.com/support/dialinx/napops.htm>
OR email access98-info@igc.org for a complete list.

If you need to create a vacation message go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_vacation

If you need to change your password go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_passwd

If you need to forward your email to another account go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_forwarding

At 04:58 AM 08/11/1999 -0700, you wrote:

>I've installed the CD-ROM for unlimited service. Because my computer is
>located in Bethesda, Maryland, a D.C. suburb, I entered the area code with
>the number: 202 222-1110. The first time I tried to enter the system, I got
>the message that the local number was wrong. Did I miscopy it? Or what do
>I do now? My area code is 301, and I have to dial 202 to connect with a
>number in D.C.

>
>Thanks,
>Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <help@igc.org>
X-Sender: igcsupport@popalex1.linknet.net
Date: Thu, 12 Aug 1999 12:37:42 -0500
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
From: Help <help@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Assistance with new system

There is no manual that IGC has for that, sorry. However to disconnect could you tell us what operating system that you have on your computer, Win 3.1, 95, etc? To transfer email over could you tell us what email program are we talking about here?

Tech Support

Please include a copy of this message with any reply. If you are not writing to us from your IGC account, please include your IGC UserID with your message. You may call Tech Support for Technical Assistance at 318-619-1123 (24 hours a day, seven days a week).

If you are needing a new access # go here.
<http://www.bbn.com/support/dialinx/napops.htm>
OR email access98-info@igc.org for a complete list.

If you need to create a vacation message go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_vacation

If you need to change your password go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_passwd

If you need to forward your email to another account go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_forwarding

At 12:36 PM 08/11/1999 -0700, you wrote:

>I found my way into the new system other than the dial icon on the screen,
>but I couldn't figure out how to disconnect except turning off the computer.
>I have other questions, such as how to transfer nicknames and filter items
>from the old system. Is there is a manual available for the Interact
>upgrade I've just made to unlimited service so that I can find answers to
>such questions?
>
>Thanks for your help,
>Howard Hallman

To: Help <help@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Assistance with new system
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 12:37 PM 8/12/99 -0500, Help wrote:

>There is no manual that IGC has for that, sorry. However to disconnect
>could you tell us what operating system that you have on your computer, Win
>3.1, 95, etc? To transfer email over could you tell us what email program
>are we talking about here?

>

>Tech Support

>

>

Dear Help,

I'm using Windows 95. I have been using Eudora and want to transfer nicknames and filter entries to the new system, which seems to have the name of Eudora Lite.

Thanks for your help.

Howard Hallman

To: Help <help@igc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Connecting
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Help:

Further on my connecting problem. When I click the dial option, it says it is dialing 202 222-1110. Then I get the message, "I'm sorry. Your call cannot be completed as dialed." Is that part of the network problem you wrote about?

Incidentally I don't have to use 1+area code to reach 202, so that part seems normal.

Thanks for your assistance,
Howard Hallman

To: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <a2000@silcom.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Religious Organizations Working Group
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 11:44 AM 8/12/99 -0700, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation wrote:

>Dear Howard Hallman,

>

>Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Carah Ong and I am now the
>coordinator for Abolition 2000 based at the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation in
>Santa Barbara.

>

>Currently I am working on several projects to enhance and expand Abolition
>2000 and reach the goals reaffirmed at the Hague Appeal for Peace. One of
>my projects includes assessing the progress of the working groups. As you
>are convenor of the working group for Religious Organizations, could you
>please bring me up to date on your accomplishments? I would appreciate any
>information you can offer.....

Dear Carah Ong,

A year ago we were very active related to the NPT PrepCom meeting in Geneva. Since then we have been inactive and have discontinued our list serve. I am now working for nuclear abolition within the faith community in other ways. Co-conveners Dave Robinson and Clayton Ramey are more active in Abolition 2000 and Abolition USA than I am. You may want to get in touch with them.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <a2000@silcom.com>
X-Sender: a2000@mail.silcom.com (Unverified)
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <a2000@silcom.com>
Subject: Religious Organizations Working Group
Date: Thu, 12 Aug 1999 11:44:32 -0700 (PDT)

Dear Howard Hallman,

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Carah Ong and I am now the coordinator for Abolition 2000 based at the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation in Santa Barbara.

Currently I am working on several projects to enhance and expand Abolition 2000 and reach the goals reaffirmed at the Hague Appeal for Peace. One of my projects includes assessing the progress of the working groups. As you are convenor of the working group for Religious Organizations, could you please bring me up to date on your accomplishments? I would appreciate any information you can offer.

I am very excited to be in this position and I look forward to working with you.

Best Regards,

In Peace,
Carah Ong

Carah Lynn Ong
Coordinator, Abolition 2000
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
1187 Coast Village Road PMB 121, Suite 1
Santa Barbara CA 93108

Phone (805) 965 3443 FAX(805) 568 0466
Email: A2000@silcom.com
Website <http://www.abolition2000.org>

Join the Abolition-USA or Abolition-Global Caucus list serve to regularly receive updates about the Abolition movement. Both caucus' also provide a forum for conversation on nuclear-related issues as well as they are used to post important articles and information pertaining to nuclear abolition.

To subscribe to the Abolition-USA listserve, send a message (with no subject) to:

abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com

In the body of the message, write:

"subscribe abolition-usa" (do not include quotation marks)

To post a message to the Abolition-USA list, mail your message to:

abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

To subscribe to the International Abolition-caucus, send a message (with no subject) to: majordomo@igc.org

In the body of the message, write:

"subscribe abolition-caucus" (do not include quotation marks)

To post a message to the International Abolition list, mail your message to:
abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

To: help@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Connecting with Netscape
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Help:

I'm still not able to use the new system in any way. As I've previously reported, the telephone number 202 222-1110 doesn't connect. I tried Netscape Communicator and got the message: "Netscape is unable to locate the server www.igc.org. Please check the serve name and try again." What do you advise?

Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>
Date: Mon, 16 Aug 1999 14:46:11 -0400
From: Karina Wood <kwood@igc.org>
Organization: Fourth Freedom Forum
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Subject: (abolition-usa) Project Abolition events
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id LAA20752
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear US Abolitionists:

As you may be aware, Project Abolition -- a new initiative from the Fourth Freedom Forum, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment, The Nation Institute, Peace Action, PeaceLinks, Physicians for Social Responsibility, State of the World Forum, and Women's Action for New Directions -- is coordinating a nationwide series of community forums & a national media campaign on nuclear weapons abolition around the 10th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, November 9, 1999.

I want to update you all on our plans for November, so please read the memo below, or open the attached file, and let us know if you are interested in working with us on any of these events:

Highlighting the Tenth Anniversary of the Fall of the Berlin Wall:
Why Do We Still Have a Cold War Nuclear Policy?

Nationwide Speaking Events & A National Media Campaign

The Project Abolition groups are developing a plan for taking advantage of the forthcoming 10th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall to highlight the need for nuclear weapons abolition. We are planning a series of nationwide community forums to take place against the backdrop of a national media campaign, which will be launched on the anniversary date, November 9.

Our message will be that the United States has wasted the historic opportunity afforded by the end of the Cold War to make serious progress on dismantling the vast nuclear arsenals here and in Russia. Ten years ago, the Berlin Wall fell, but today tens of thousands of nuclear weapons remain and we are developing new ones. We will posit the question: Why does the United States still cling to a Cold War nuclear policy?

Elements of the Campaign:

Community Forums:

We plan to organize community forums in states which meet the following 3 criteria: where there are Senators and/or presidential candidates we particularly wish to educate on the urgent need for nuclear weapons abolition; where we can generate extensive media coverage; and where we have a core of enthusiastic and experienced organizers.

We are currently considering major cities in the following states:

Arkansas, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, and Vermont.

****Please contact us if you live in one of these states and would like to help host a community forum during the week of November 9.****

Definite dates so far:

**** Nov 9: Des Moines, Iowa: community forum: Sen. Alan Cranston & Betty Bumpers confirmed speakers.**

**** Nov 9: Washington, DC: press event (see "Wall of Denial" section below). No speakers confirmed yet.**

**** Nov. 9: San Francisco: press event. Former OR Rep. Elizabeth Furse confirmed speaker. Invited Rep. Lynn Woolsey, Rep. Barbara Lee, Athletes United for Peace. Looking for celebrities.**

**** Nov. 10: New Hampshire (researching venue): community forum: Sen. Alan Cranston & Admiral Turner confirmed speakers.**

**** Nov. 10: Portland, OR: community forum: Former OR Rep. Elizabeth Furse confirmed speaker.**

**** Nov. 12 or 13: Little Rock, AR: (tentative; in planning stages) community forum at a downtown art gallery, hosted by Arkansas WAND & Arkansas Women's Project & area PeaceLinks members. Invited Betty Bumpers.**

These events are in various stages of planning, and more are being developed: we'll post frequent updates.

Editorial Board Meetings:

In order to maximize the opportunity of having a major speaker in town for a community forum event, we encourage local groups to set up meetings with the editorial boards of their leading local newspapers.

"Wall of Denial":

We will construct a "Wall of Denial" somewhere in the area of the U.S. Capitol or the Ellipse in Washington, DC, from lightweight materials, perhaps using thousands of "bricks" representing the thousands of nuclear weapons remaining in US and Russian arsenals. On the wall, slogans will decry "The Cold War Lives," and "We Need Our Nukes" and other such messages of "denial" of the Cold War's demise. Above the Wall, a large banner will be erected, saying, "Mr. President, Tear Down the Wall! Abolish Nuclear Weapons!"

This visual publicity stunt will be modeled after the Berlin Wall and will serve as a backdrop for speakers at a press event on November 9, to which members of Congress, celebrities and prominent individuals will be invited. Musicians will also be invited to attend and perform.

The wall will remain at the site for up to a week or more, permits allowing, during which time the public will be encouraged to come and sign a petition demanding nuclear abolition.

Signature ads:

Depending on the funds we can raise, the Project Abolition groups will place a large signature ad in a national newspaper (New York Times or Washington Post) on November 9. We encourage local groups all over the country to place signature ads in your local newspapers on November 9,

especially in cities where community forums will take place. (Contact us if you need information on how to produce a signature ad.)

Radio Talk Shows:

The Mainstream Media Project has agreed to promote our speakers to be interviewed on national and local radio talk shows during November.

Op-Eds & Letters to the Editor:

We will commission op-eds by prominent individuals and work to get them published in major newspapers on November 9. We will produce model letters to the editor, and we encourage local activists to get letters published in their local newspapers on November 9. These pieces will draw attention to the anniversary, state our "wasted opportunity" message, and call for urgent disarmament measures.

Editorial Advisories:

We will commission a media education organization to produce an editorial advisory promoting our message and encouraging major newspapers nationwide to publish editorials on November 9.

Congressional Action:

We will ask members of the Senate to make speeches on the Senate floor on November 9, expressing the "wasted opportunity" message, and calling for urgent disarmament measures (if they have not adjourned by this date; the House will most likely have adjourned end of Oct).

Confirmed Participating Speakers to date:

- Betty Bumpers, President, PeaceLinks
- Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA), ret.
- Representative Elizabeth Furse (D-1st OR), ret.
- Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-10th OH)
- Jonathan Schell, journalist, author of *The Gift of Time* and *The Fate of the Earth*
- Stephen Schwartz, publisher, *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, author, *Atomic Audit*
- Admiral Stansfield Turner, USN (Ret.), former director, CIA
- Cora Weiss, President, Hague Appeal for Peace Foundation
- Randall Forsberg, Global Action to Prevent War

And the national directors of the Project Abolition groups

If you want to help host a community forum, or need further campaign details, please contact:

--

Karina H. Wood
Field Coordinator, Project Abolition
and U.S. Outreach Coordinator, Hague Appeal for Peace
85 John St.
Providence, RI 02906
Ph: 401-276-0377
Fax: 401-751-1476
Email: kwood@igc.org

For information on Project Abolition: www.fourthfreedom.org

For information on the Hague Appeal: www.haguepeace.org

-
To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com"
with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.
For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send
"help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

To: help@igc.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Dialing in
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Help,

As I await your answers to several queries about use of newly installed internet upgrade, I keep probing. As I listen to the dial-in tone on the quick access icon, I hear seven tones. That suggests that it is dialing only 222-1110 and is not including the area code, 202, which I need to connect to D.C. from the Maryland suburb. How do I re-do the phone-number entry to get a full ten digits?

Thanks for your help,

Howard Hallman

Return-Path: <j2000-usa-news-return-1-mupj=igc.org@returns.egroups.com>
Mailing-List: contact j2000-usa-news-owner@egroups.com
X-Mailing-List: j2000-usa-news@egroups.com
X-URL: http://www.egroups.com/list/j2000-usa-news/
Delivered-To: listsaver-egroups-j2000-usa-news@egroups.com
X-Sender: j2000usa@pop2.igc.org
Date: Tue, 17 Aug 1999 11:06:52 -0400
To: j2000-usa-news@egroups.com
From: Jubilee 2000/USA <coord@j2000usa.org>
Subject: [j2000-usa-news] Jubilee 2000/USA Action Alert 8/17/99

URGENT**URGENT**URGENT*URGENT**URGENT**URGENT**URGENT**URGENT**URGENT

Jubilee 2000/USA Action Alert
August 17, 1999

==> Demand Higher Funding For Debt Cancellation!

==> National Call-in Day: Thursday, September 9!

ISSUE: Legislation to provide foreign aid for the next fiscal year has now been passed by both the House and Senate. The amounts appropriated in these foreign aid bills to pay for debt relief for impoverished countries -- \$33 and \$43 million respectively -- are appallingly low with respect to the amount needed to make a meaningful difference.

The administration is currently considering making a supplemental request of Congress for additional debt relief funding, to support financial commitments made at the G-7 meeting in Cologne, Germany. Jubilee 2000/USA is asking both the Administration and the Congress to go beyond these agreements and provide more than the approximately \$1 billion that will fund the US portion of this initiative.

The next four to six weeks present an important opportunity for constituents to influence the amount of funding for debt relief to be included in the fiscal year 2000 budget. Thus, it is critical that policy makers hear loud and clear by mid-September that people in the US support high levels of additional funding for cancellation of crushing debt. The exact details for implementation of the Cologne agreement remain under discussion, but this will be the only chance to get more US funding for debt relief this year. (See additional background info below.)

ACTION:

Call or write President Clinton and urge him to submit a request to Congress that will provide more debt relief to the most impoverished countries than the approximately \$1 billion deemed necessary to fund the US contribution to the Cologne debt agreement.

Address: President William Jefferson Clinton, The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20500; White House Comment Line: (202) 456-1111; e-mail: president@whitehouse.gov

Call or write your members of Congress and urge them to support a supplemental request for more debt relief funds. Seek a meeting with your legislators while Congress is in recess (until 9/7/99) and members are in their home districts. Tell them you support using US tax dollars to finance an adequate US contribution to international debt relief that exceeds the estimated \$1 billion needed to finance the US share of the Cologne debt agreement. House: The Honorable _____, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515; Senate: The Honorable _____, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510; Capitol Switchboard: (202) 224-3121; e-mail: addresses can be found online at: <http://thomas.loc.gov>

Calls and letters will be critical any time between now and early September. In addition, the Jubilee 2000/USA Campaign is endorsing a national call-in day for debt relief funding on September 9, 1999. Even if you have already called or written about this issue, let's try to flood everyone's office with calls of concern. Let the American government know that its citizens support the Jubilee 2000's call for meaningful debt relief – with the funding needed to deliver levels of relief greater than what is provided through the Cologne agreement.

Idea: Write letters to the editor, responding to stories about the budget surplus. Make the point that if even just a tiny portion of the available surplus were re-directed to real, meaningful debt relief for impoverished nations it could save the lives of seven million children each year.

BACKGROUND:

The Jubilee 2000/USA campaign has urged both Congress and the Administration to recognize the support of the American people for debt relief, and to ask for and appropriate enough funding for debt relief to have a real impact. The Cologne agreement called for countries to commit to both bilateral and multilateral debt relief.

Jubilee 2000/USA sees the financial commitments made at Cologne as a positive step towards providing deeper debt relief. But, the Campaign supports even broader and deeper debt relief than that agreed to at Cologne. The Jubilee 2000 vision of debt relief includes that which truly lifts -- via a fair, transparent and accountable process -- the crushing burden that currently prevents governments from spending in areas of critical human need and environmental distress. Jubilee 2000/USA notes that although the Cologne initiative falls short of its vision, and mechanisms for its implementation -- including linkage to current forms of structural adjustment that have been criticized by many for actually increasing poverty -- are still under serious debate, it urges the U.S. to seize this moment to make a meaningful contribution by committing adequate resources to the cancellation of the debts of the most impoverished countries.

As Representative Spencer Bachus (R-AL-6) so movingly said at the June 15 House Banking Committee hearing on debt relief:

"Debt relief is not an end in itself; it is a means to an end. It is not a total solution to poverty, hunger and disease, but it is a necessary first step.... We in America have been blessed with a period of almost unparalleled economic prosperity. Never in our history has one country had

so much progress, wealth and luxury. Now at the start of the new millennium we can do so much more for the 700 million of the poorest at such a small cost to each of us. What a shame if history should look back at us and say that we passed up so great an opportunity.... This decision will define us. It will define us as either a loving people, a people filled with grace and compassion, or it will define us as a people focused on the monetary.... Most important, it's our decision. We have the responsibility, we have the obligation, and we have the direction as to what is the right thing to do. For whether you are a Muslim, whether you are a Christian, whether you are Jewish, all those religions give us a moral imperative in such a case, and that is to act. And to me there really is only one decision."

For more information: Lisa Wright, CWS/NCCC Washington Office, (202) 543-6336.

For an analysis of the political context of the budget battle see the Washington Post August 7, 1999 story, "Despite Lessons of Past, GOP Picks a Budget Fight" by John F. Harris and Juliet Eilperin. To find the article just use the easy-to-use search function on the Washington Post web site, www.washingtonpost.com

Additional helpful information on the FY 2000 budget process can be found at

<http://www.igc.org/network/hotnews.htm#budget>

Contact Jubilee 2000/USA if you would like to receive a formatted version of this alert in Word or Word Perfect (pls specify). email = coord@j2000usa.org

=====
Jubilee 2000/USA Campaign
222 East Capitol St., NE
Washington, DC 20003-1036
Tel: 202-783-3566
Fax: 202-546-4468
email: coord@j2000usa.org
web site: www.j2000usa.org

GET WHAT YOU DESERVE! A NextCard Platinum VISA: DOUBLE Rewards points,
NO annual fee & rates as low as 9.9% FIXED APR. Apply online today!
<http://clickhere.egroups.com/click/606>

To unsubscribe from this list, just send an empty e-mail to J2000-usa-news-unsubscribe@egroups.com

People can subscribe by sending an empty email message to

J2000-usa-news-subscribe@egroups.com

For full campaign news visit www.j2000usa.org

>Would you please compile the addresses you've been sent and post them
>either to me or to y2k-nuclear.

Dear friends, herewith a compilation to date. Any additions or corrections welcome.

1.China: E-mail: chnun@undp.org

2.France: E-mail: fraun@undp.org, Phone:011-33-147-42-8100,
Fax:011-33-147-42-2465

3.India: E-mail: indun@undp.org Phone:011-91-11-301-3040,
Fax:011-91-11-301-6857

4.Israel: E-mail: pm@pmo.gov.il Phone:011-972-270-5555,
Fax:011-972-266-4838

5.Pakistan: E-mail: pakistan@undp.org Telex:5742

6.Russia:E-mail: webmaster@gov.ru Phone:011-70-95-925-3581, Fax:
011-70-95-205-4219

7.UK: E-mail:gbrun@undp.org Phone:011-44-171-270-3000, Fax:Not Available

8. USA: E-mail: president@whitehouse.gov Phone:202-456-1111 and
202-456-1414, Fax:202-456-2461

Fax numbers of Bill 'n Boris letter:

PRESIDENT BORIS YELTSIN,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
KRASNOPRESENSKAYA-2, MOSCOW, RUSSIA,
+7-095-205-4219, +7-095-206-5173 +7-095-205-4330,

PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON,
WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, US,
+1-202-456-2461, +1-202-456-2883.

WILLIAM COHEN, US SECRETARY OF DEFENCE,
+1-703-695-1149,

BILL RICHARDSON, US SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
+1-202-586-9987.

IGOR SERGEYEV,
DEFENCE MINISTER OF RUSSIA,
Znamenka-19, 103160, Moscow, Russia,
+7-095-293-33-13, 247-2795, 247-2722, 293-3323.

FOREIGN MINISTER OF RUSSIA,
+7-095-244-3276, +7-095-244-2203,

US - Senator Bob Bennett (or is it Bessett?)
+1-202-224-4908

US - Chris Dodd
+1-202-224-1083

UK - PM Tony Blair
+44-171-925-0918

France - Pres, Chirac
+33-1-47-42-24-65

France - Foreign Minister
+33-1-45-51-60-12

Nuclear Weapon States:

Clinton <president@whitehouse.gov>
Boris Yeltsin President Russia <webmaster@gov.ru>,
Tony Blair Prime Minister Britain <gbrun@undp.org>,
Jacques Chirac President France <fraun@undp.org>,
Jiang Zemin President China <chnun@undp.org>,
Ehud Barak Prime Minister Israel <pm@pmo.gov.il>,
Atal Bihari Vajpayee Prime Minister India <indun@undp.org>,
M M Nawaz Sharif Prime Minister Pakistan <pakistan@undp.org>,

NATO MEMBER NATIONS' HEADS OF STATE
ADDRESSES / E-MAIL ADDRESSES / WEB PAGES
PLEASE USE WISELY!!!

M. Jean-Luc Dehaene
Premier Ministre
rue de la Loi 16
B-1000 Brussels, Belgium
phone 02-501-02-11
e-mail jeanluc.dehaene@premier.fgov.be
webpage <http://belgium.fgov.be/>

Jean Chretien, M.P.
Prime Minister
House of Commons, PO Box 1103
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6, Canada
phone 1-613-992-4211, fax 1-613-941-6900
e-mail pm@pm.gc.ca
webpage <http://pm.gc.ca/english.html-ssi>

Vaclav Havel
President
Office of the President of the C.R.

Hrad (Castle)
119 08 Praha 1, Czech Republic
phone 420-2-3337-1111, fax 420-2-2437-3300
e-mail president@hrad.cz
webpage <http://www.hrad.cz/>

Poul Nyrup Rasmussen
Prime Minister
Prime Minister`s Office
Christiansborg, Prins Jorgens Gaard 11
DK-1218 Copenhagen, Denmark
phone 45-33-92-3300, fax 45-33-11-1665
e-mail stm@stm.dk
webpage <http://www.stm.dk/>

M. Jacques Chirac
President de la Republique
Palais de l`Elysee
55 et 57, rue du Faubourg Saint-Honore
75008 Paris, France
phone 331-42-92-81-00, fax 331-47-42-24-65
e-mail page http://www.elysee.fr/mel/mel_.htm
webpage <http://www.elysee.fr/>

Gerhard Schoeder
Chancellor
Adenauerallee 141
PA: Briefpost, PLZ 53106
53113 Bonn, Germany
phone 49-228-56-0, fax 49-228-56-2357
e-mail page <http://www.bundesregierung.de/inland/.bin/pbamaild?10>
webpage <http://www.bundesregierung.de/>

Kostas Simitis
Prime Minister
Office of the Prime Minister
Greek Parliament Bldg., Constitution Square
Athens, Greece
fax 301-671-6183
e-mail mail@primeminister.gr
webpage <http://www.primeminister.gr>

Viktor Orban
Prime Minister
Kossuth Lajos ter 1-3
1055 Budapest, Budapest fovaros
Hungary
phone 36-1-268-3000, fax 36-1-268-4702
e-mail Viktor.Orban@meh.hu
webpage <http://www.meh.hu>

David Oddsson
Prime Minister
Office of the Prime Minister

Stjornarradshusinu
150 Reykjavik, Iceland
phone 354-609400, fax 354-622373
e-mail david@althingi.is
webpage <http://www.althingi.is/~wwwadm/upplens.shtml>

Massimo D'Alema
Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri (Prime Minister)
Piazza Colonna, 370
00187 Rome, Italy
phone 39-6-67791, fax 39-6-678-3998
e-mail page <http://www.palazzochigi.it/contattaci.htm>
webpage <http://www.palazzochigi.it/index.htm>

Jean-Claude Juncker
Prime Minister
Ministere d`Etat
4, rue de la Congregation
L-2910 Luxembourg, Luxembourg
phone 352-47-81
e-mail page <http://www.restena.lu:80/gover/mailbox.html>
webpage http://www.restena.lu/gover/index_french.html

Willem Kok
Prime Minister
Binnenhof 20, 2513 AA
Postbus 20001, 2500 EA
The Hague, Netherlands
phone 31-70-356-4100, fax 31-70-356-4683
webpage <http://www.postbus51.nl/>

Kjell Magne Bondevik
Prime Minister
Akersgt. 42, blokk H
P.O. Box 8001 Dep
N-0030 Oslo, Norway
phone 47-2224-9832, fax 47-2224-2796
e-mail odin@ft.dep.telemax.no
webpage <http://odin.dep.no/>

Jerzy Buzek
Prime Minister
Prime Minister's Office
al. Ujazdowskie 1/3
00-583 Warsaw, Poland
e-mail cirinfo@kprm.gov.pl
webpage <http://www.kprm.gov.pl>

Antonio Manuel de Oliveira Guterres
Prime Minister
Gabinete do Primeiro-Ministro
Lisboa, Portugal
e-mail page <http://www.primeiro-ministro.gov.pt/correio.html>
webpage <http://www.primeiro-ministro.gov.pt/>

Excmo. Sr. Jose Maria Aznar
Presidente del Gobierno
Complejo de la Moncloa
Edf. Semillas
28071 Madrid, Spain
phone 34-1-335-3535, fax 34-1-390-0329
webpage <http://www.la-moncloa.es>

Bulent Ecevit
Prime Minister
Office of the Prime Minister
Basbakanlik
06573 Ankara, Turkey
fax 90-312-417-0476
e-mail ddlbsl@tccb.gov.tr

Rt. Hon. Tony Blair
Prime Minister
10 Downing St.
SW1A 2AA London, United Kingdom
fax 44-171-925-0918
email: tony.blair@geo2.poptel.org.uk
webpage <http://www.number-10.gov.uk/>

William Clinton
President
The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, District of Columbia 20500
United States of America
phone 1-202-456-1414
fax 1-202-456-6218 or 1-202-456-2461
e-mail president@whitehouse.gov
webpage <http://www.whitehouse.gov/>

You'll find a list of web sites below, all of them related to the
ministries of defence and/or foreign affairs of NATO countries

<<mailto:info@mod.fgov.be>>info@mod.fgov.be;
<<mailto:aa576@issc.debbs.ndhg.dnd.ca>>aa576@issc.debbs.ndhg.dnd.ca;
<<mailto:fmn@fmn.dk>>fmn@fmn.dk
<<mailto:Aa576@issc.debbs.ndhg.dnd.ca>> ;
<<mailto:poststelle@auswaertiges-amt.de>>poststelle@auswaertiges-amt.de ;
<<mailto:minister@mod.gr>>minister@mod.gr ;
<<mailto:nmr.norway@shape.nato.int>>nmr.norway@shape.nato.int ;
<<mailto:mdn@esoterica.pt>>mdn@esoterica.pt ;
<<mailto:webmaster@msb.gov.tr>>webmaster@msb.gov.tr ;
<<mailto:public@ministers.mod.uk>>public@ministers.mod.uk ;
<<mailto:PublicAffairs@js.pentagon.mil>>PublicAffairs@js.pentagon.mil;
<<mailto:secretary@state.gov>>secretary@state.gov ;
<<mailto:defense@defense.gouv.fr>>defense@defense.gouv.fr ;
<<mailto:bpimon@wp.mil.pl>>bpimon@wp.mil.pl
<<mailto:postur@utn.stjr.is>>postur@utn.stjr.is ;

<mailto:halldor.asgrimsson@utn.stjr.is>halldor.asgrimsson@utn.stjr.is ;
<mailto:info@udr.org>info@udr.org ;
<mailto:luxun@undp.org>luxun@undp.org;
<mailto:oipp@pp.es>oipp@pp.es;
<mailto:president@hrad.cz>president@hrad.cz;
<mailto:Viktor.Orban@meh.hu>Viktor.Orban@meh.hu

The following are the addresses of the contact points in Japan.

Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi
2-3-1 Nagata-cho, Chiyoda, 100-0014, Japan

Minister of International Trade and Industry
Hajime Yosano
1-3-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda, 100-8901, Japan

Hiroji Ota, Chairman of the Federation of Electric Power Companies
1-9-4 Otemachi, Chiyoda, 100-8118, Japan

Australian MPs fax numbers:

John Howard, (+61-2)-6273-4100 = Prime Minister
Alexander Downer, (+61-2)-6273-4112 = Minister, Foreign Affairs + Trade
Laurie Brereton, (+61-2)-6277-8502, = Shadow Minister, Foreign Aff. + Trade
Kim Beazley, (+61-2)-6277-8495. = Leader of the Opposition

2 more Australian MPs fax numbers:

The Hon. John Moore, Minister for Defence,

(+61-2) 6273 4118, (+61-7) 3878 1671

The Hon. Steve Martin, Shadow Minister for Defence,

(+61-2) 6277 8596, (+61-2) 4285 1132

Australian Peace Committee (SA Branch)Inc.

11 South Tce, Adelaide SA 5000 Australia

Ph: (+61-8) 82127138 Fx: (+61-8) 83642291

Email: r-grayle@msn.com.au

Howard,

I will do what I can today and tomorrow to get the CTBT action alert on our web site. You've provided me with plenty of info to make it easy for me. The only problem might be that our "web master" is on vacation and she won't be back until Aug. 30th, I think. I'll check with her boss and see if there's anything that can be done these next two days. Thanks for thinking of this!

Robin

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

From: Methodists United for Peace with Justice [mailto:mupj@igc.org]

Sent: Wednesday, August 18, 1999 8:11 PM

To: dringler@umc-gbcs.org

Subject: CTBT Action Alert on Website?

Dear Robin,

I've been surfing the internet this evening and checked into the GBCS website and its advocacy section. Would it be possible to enter an alert on the CTBT? The message could explain the treaty briefly, indicate that President Clinton sent it to the Senate nearly two years ago, but that it bottled up by Senator Jesse Helms in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Message: contact your senator and ask him/her to (a) contact (a) Senator Helms and ask for prompt hearings on the CTBT and (b) to ask Senator Lott, Senator majority leader, to schedule a vote on the CTBT before Congress adjourns in 1999. Or whatever you think is appropriate. If you run out of time before your vacation, I would be willing to work with someone else on the staff to craft a message.

Shalom,

Howard

Dear Graham and all, I want to second your comments re John's work. Having seen this from the 'inside' I am tremendously impressed with the effort and care John has put into this campaign. If we succeed in having the n-weapons/forces de-alerted over this critical period it will be, in no small measure, thanks to John.

With regard to fax numbers, in cases like this if a number doesn't work, it is often because it is kept exceedingly busy by all the faxes coming in, rather than that it is the wrong one. But of course we need all the numbers to be correct if possible!

If anyone knows of any errors in those I sent out yesterday, please notify us all a.s.a.p. Please note that where I questioned the name of Senator Bob Bennett, it IS Bennett, and Chris Dodd is also a US Senator.

Here is another listing of nuclear powers addresses:
(cross check them with yesterday's)

CHINA:

President Jiang Zemin
Chinese Communist Party
C.C.P. Central Committee
Zhong Nan Hai
Xi Cheng Qu
Beijing, Peoples' Republic of China

Premier Zhu Rongji Zongli
Guowuyuan
9 Xihuangchenggenbeijie
Beijingshi, 100032
Peoples' Republic of China

INDIA:

Prime Minister A. B. Vajpayee
South Block
New Delhi, 110011 India
Fax: 91-11-301-68-57

PAKISTAN:

Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif
Islamabad, Pakistan
e-mail: primeminster@park.gov.pk

RUSSIA (mailing address):

President Yeltsin
4 Staraya Square
Moscow, 103132
Russia

FRANCE (mailing address & additional Fax #s.)

President Jacques Chirac
Palais du l'Elysee
75000 Paris

France
Fx: 33-1-42-92-81-17
& 33-1-47-42-24-65,

Foreign Min, 33-1-45-51-60-12

Prime Minister Lionel Jospin
Hotel du Matignon
75000 Paris
France
Fx: 33-1-42-34-26-77

U.K. (mailing address & fax):
Prime Minister Tony Blair
10 Downing St
London SW1A 2AA U.K.
Fx: 44-171-925-0918.

RUSSIA:
7-095-205-4330(General Russian Govt fax Number - incredibly slow)
7-095-244-3276 (Foreign Ministry)
7-095-244-2203(Foreign Ministry)
7-095-247-2722(Defence Ministry)
7-095-293-3323(Defence Ministry)

US:
1-202-456-2461 (Clinton)
1-202-456-2883 (Clintons security adviser)
1-703-695-1149(secy for Defence)
1-202-224-4908 (Senator Bob Bennett)
1-202-224-1083 (Senator Chris Dodd)

All the best, Irene

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

From: Graham Daniell <gdaniell@wt.com.au>
To: FoE Sydney - Nuclear Campaign <nonukes@foesyd.org.au>
Cc: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org <abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org>
Date: Thursday, 19 August 1999 19:23
Subject: Re: Y2K CAMPAIGN SUGGESTED SHORT/MID TERM ACTION PLAN

>Dear John,

>

>Re your message and the Sept 1 fax campaign.

>

>It would be nice if we could all be notified of the CORRECT fax numbers to
>send to, and at least a week in advance. Too many times I have seen
>half-baked fax campaigns and the like (not from you, you always seems very
>organised) telling us all to fax someone, and the fax numbers are either
>not included, or worse, are incorrect, resulting in a waste of time and
>effort, and a flop of a campaign. And that other wonderment of the peace
>movement, the LAST MINUTE URGENT CAMPAIGN, where the email is not received

>until it is too late to prepare anything or do anything about it!

>

>It seems that this campaign is being organised reasonably well in advance.

>Lets follow though and do it properly!

>

>Regards,

>Graham Daniell

>-----

Here's a great activity that's open to people of all faiths and outlooks who want to help Jubilee 2000 say DROP THE DEBT.

(also see the upcoming Fast for a World Harvest, calling for debt relief to free up funds for education -- sponsored by a Jubilee 2000/USA member group, Oxfam America! Info at <www.oxfamamerica.org/FAST.HTML>)

Join with the Religious Working Group on the IMF and World Bank, Jubilee 2000/USA and Others in saying:
YES to Life and NO to DEBT!

Join the Countdown to Jubilee
Rolling Fast
September 21-December 31, 1999

Commemorate the last 100 days of the millennium by making a commitment to work for Jubilee-- total debt cancellation for poor countries in the Jubilee Year of Activism

Mark your commitment--and the commitment of your community--by participating in a nationwide "Rolling Fast."

During the last 100 days before the Millennial Year of Activism, from September 21 to December 31 1999, activists, faith communities, and persons and groups of conscience around the US will be working to raise awareness on debt cancellation, in preparation for a millennial year of action on the Jubilee issue. In the United States, the faith community has committed to fast for 100 days.

But just as the crushing global debt burden should be shared, no single person or community will be asked to shoulder the burden of a 100 day fast. Instead, the burden of fast will be shared by persons of faith around the country.

Join us in making a commitment to a 100-Day "Solidarity Fast," which would include eating simple meals in solidarity with the poor majority of the world, to kickoff the Millennial year of Action for Jubilee - -see www.religiouswg.org for menus and details

This Countdown to Jubilee 100-Day Fast will be a "rolling fast" from Sept 21 to Dec 31, with each individual or community signing up for a day of fasting and action, that may include, education, community outreach and media work around the issue of the debt crisis and the need for debt cancellation in the Year 2000. Communities and individuals are invited to sign up for more than one day, if they wish.

The fast itself will be a 24-hour juice-only fast, but participants are invited--though not required-- to do more. Media, outreach and logistical support will be provided to participating groups and individuals by the Religious Working Group on the IMF and World Bank. Jubilee 200/USA will play a supporting role in the National Rolling Fast.

Sign Up Today!

Dates are still open for the Rolling Fast. Please make the commitment to work on the morally imperative issue of debt relief by joining the nationwide 100-Day Rolling Fast. Fill out the form below, and fax or send it to the address listed.

Name

Address

Phone

Fax

E-mail

Date Requested: Any Available Date (organizer's preference)

1st choice _____ 2nd choice _____ 3rd
choice _____

Please note that your preferred dates may not be available. If not, another date will be assigned to you, and you will be notified within 3 days of receipt of the form. If your assigned date is not convenient, please contact the Fast Coordinator (address, phone and e-mail listed below)

Are you part of a religious body/congregation/community? If so, which one

Please return by September 1, 1999 to
Rolling Fast Coordination • Witness for Peace • 1229 15th Street NW,
Washington, DC 20005 • fax (202) 588-1472
bennett@witnessforpeace.org • www.religiouswg.org

=====

Mini-bulletins:

==> Did you know Jubilee 2000/USA has a new video that is getting *rave* reviews? Well, we do and its your for just \$10. A brilliant team of video professionals have created this 24 minute, full color video to help Jubilee 2000 promote the campaign. It's very much advocacy in style and is sure to inspire viewers to action. To get an info sheet on the video call or email us. Or simply send a check payable to Jubilee 2000 marked "video". J2000 also has a new introductory brochure -- that's a key resource that will help your spread the word, especially to beginners. And we have a revised Education Packet, now with new resource sheets on Women & Debt, Debt & Hunger, the US Role in Debt, an a comprehensive chart showing what the countries owe.

==> J2000 fashion tip....Wear the chain! The J2000 chain pin is selling beyond all expectations....20,000 and climbing! It's a fitting symbol of the chains that bind impoverished countries...but also a symbol of hope. Wearing the chain helps us spread the word about the campaign and helps start conversations about it -- wear yours proudly

and ask others to get one! To get the chain call 800-297-1516 x222. :)

=====

=====

Jubilee 2000/USA Campaign
222 East Capitol St., NE
Washington, DC 20003-1036
Tel: 202-783-3566
Fax: 202-546-4468
email: coord@j2000usa.org
web site: www.j2000usa.org

==> to subscribe to a list serve for Jubilee 2000/USA action alerts, news and announcements (three brief messages per month delivered right to your email account) just send an empty email message to:
j2000usa-news-subscribe@egroups.com

<center>

</center>
<center>
Click Here!
</center>

To unsubscribe from this list, just send an empty e-mail to J2000-usa-news-unsubscribe@egroups.com

People can subscribe by sending an empty email message to

J2000-usa-news-subscribe@egroups.com

For full campaign news visit www.j2000usa.org

Howard:

Thanks for yo ur communique of July 6

I kjust returned from RZussia on Aug 10

I have receive no instructions. I do not have the impression that I am responsible for anything programmatically, but only to get them in touchwith their hosts.

I have heard a rumor that a g roup of 11 or 12 will be here Septem ber 7-9. Feel free to contact me again if your curiosity overwhelms you.

Ken Jones

John Hallam
Friends of the Earth Sydney,
17 Lord street, Newtown, NSW, Australia,
Fax(61)(2)9517-3902 ph (61)(2)9517-3903

nonukes@foesyd.org.au <http://homepages.tig.com.au/~foesyd>

WORLD WRITES TO YELTSIN, CLINTON: TAKE N-WEAPONS OFF ALERT, AVOID GLOBAL
NUCLEAR CATASTROPHE.

DearAll,

This letter was released today in Sydney, and in Adelaide, Auckland, Tokyo,
San Francisco, Toronto, New York, London, and Moscow.

IT IS STILL OPEN FOR SIGNATURE!

It was officially posted to Yeltsin and Clinton via the postal service, in
front of TV cameras.

Preliminary versions were faxed a month ago and last week. It will be again
faxed tomorrow.

I trust that you will appreciate the extreme importance of this utterly
vital issue.

FROM:
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH INTERNATIONAL,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH AUSTRALIA,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH NEW ZEALAND,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH ENGLAND WALES AND NORTHERN IRELAND,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH EL SALVADOR,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH NIGERIA,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH UKRAINE,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH GEORGIA, (TBILSI)
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH FINLAND,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH DENMARK,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH ESTONIA
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH FRANCE,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH CYPRUS,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH JAPAN SIBERIA PROGRAM,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH AUSTRIA (GLOBAL-2000)
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH MACEDONIA,
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH BULGARIA/ECOGLASNOST, SOFIA, BULGARIA

AUSTRALIAN PEACE COMMITTEE,
MEDICAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE PREVENTION OF WAR,
PAX CHRISTI N.S.W.,
UNITING CHURCH OF AUSTRALIA,
WAYSIDE CHAPEL, UNITING CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA,
PITT STREET UNITING CHURCH, PITT ST, SYDNEY,
ST JOHNS ANGLICAN CHURCH, DARLINGHURST, SYDNEY,

CAMPAIGN FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND DISARMAMENT (CICD) AUSTRALIA,
AUSTRALIAN ANTI-BASES CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,
PEOPLE FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT, N.S.W.,
WAR RESISTERS INTERNATIONAL AUSTRALIA,
THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,
AUSTRALIAN CONSERVATION FOUNDATION,
ENVIRONMENT CENTRE OF THE NORTHERN TERRITORY,
ARID LANDS ENVIRONMENT CENTRE,
ENVIRONMENT CENTRE OF W.A.,
ANTI-URANIUM COALITION OF W.A.,
PEOPLE FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT WESTERN AUSTRALIA,
CENTRE FOR URBAN ECOLOGY, S.A.,
EVERYONE FOR A NUCLEAR-FREE FUTURE LISMORE,
BIG SCRUB ENVIRONMENT CENTRE,
EVERYONE FOR A NUCLEAR-FREE FUTURE GOLD COAST,
EVERYONE FOR A NUCLEAR FREE FUTURE ADELAIDE,
PACIFIC CONNECTIONS,
TWO BILLION VOICES FOR PEACE PROJECT,
UNITED TRADES AND LABOUR COUNCIL SA.,
UNITED FIREFIGHTERS UNION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA,
MEDIA AND ENTERTAINMENT AND ARTS ALLIANCE S.A.,
CFMEU, SOUTH AUSTRALIAN BRANCH,
A.M.W.U., SA. OFFICE.,
ALL-UNION GREEN CAUCUS,
GRAHAM F. SMITH PEACE TRUST, SA.,
RICHMOND RIVER SHIRE COUNCIL,

SENATOR LYN ALLISON, VIC.,
SENATOR MEG LEES, LEADER, DEMOCRATS, VIC.,
SENATOR NATASHA STOTT-DESPOJA, DEPUTY LEADER AUSTRALIAN DEMOCRATS,
SENATOR VICKY BOURNE, DEMOCRAT SENATOR FOR N.S.W.,
SENATOR ANDREW BARTLETT, DEMOCRAT SENATOR FOR QUEENSLAND,
SENATOR DEE MARGETTS, GREENS, W.A.,
SENATOR BOB BROWN, GREENS, TAS,
SENATOR GEORGE CAMPBELL, ALP, N.S.W.,
SENATOR MARGARET REYNOLDS, ALP, N.S.W.,
SENATOR JIM MC KEIRNAN, ALP., W.A.,
ANTHONY ALBANESE, ALP FEDERAL MP FOR GRAYNDLER,
TANYA PLIBERSEK, ALP FEDERAL MP FOR SYDNEY,
JANN MC FARLANE, ALP FEDERAL MP FOR STIRLING, W.A.,
JILL HALL M.P., MEMBER FOR SHORTLAND,
IAN COHEN, GREEN MLC, NSW.,
LEE RHIANNON, GREEN MLC, NSW.,
SANDRA KANCK, DEMOCRAT MLC, S.A.,
IAN GILFILLAN, DEMOCRAT MLC, SA,
ROBYN GERAGHTY, MP, STATE MEMBER FOR TORRENS, SA,
FRANCES BEDFORD, MP, STATE MEMBER FOR FLOREY, SA.,
JIM SCOTT, W.A., GREENS, LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL, W.A.,
LOUISE CROSSLEY, NATIONAL CONVENOR, GREENS,
HANNAH MIDDLETON, PRESIDENT, COMMUNIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA,

WORLD COURT PROJECT UK,
SENATOR DOUGLAS ROCHE, SENATE, CANADA,
BRITISH-AMERICAN SECURITY INFORMATION CENTRE, US/UK,

GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL,
JAPAN CONGRESS AGAINST A AND H-BOMBS (GENSUIKYO)
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LAWYERS AGAINST NUCLEAR ARMS (IALANA),
WOMENS INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM (Geneva/NY),
CENTRE FOR DEFENCE INFORMATION, WASHINGTON, USA,

CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT U.K.,
SAFFRON WALDEN GROUP AGAINST NUCLEAR WEAPONS,
YOUTH AND STUDENT CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT,
WEST MIDLANDS CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT,
YORKSHIRE CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT,
MEDACT (IPPNW UK),
TRIDENT PLOUGHSHARES 2000 NORFOLK UK.,
NETWORK INFORMATION PROJECT, SOUTHAMPTON,UK, ..
CAMPAIGN FOR ACCOUNTABILITY OF U.S., BASES,
MENWITH HILL WOMENS PEACE CAMP, YORKSHIRE, UK.,
GLOBAL NETWORK AGAINST WEAPONS AND NUCLEAR POWER IN SPACE,
ANGLICAN PACIFIST FELLOWSHIP, MILTON KEYNES, U.K.,
EPISCOPAL PEACE FELLOWSHIP, U.K.,
ST BARTHOLEMES JUSTICE AND PEACE GROUP, ST ALBANS, U.K.,
CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT, U.K.,
CALDERDALE GREEN PARTY, YORKSHIRE, U.K.,
PUBLIC INTEREST CONSULTANTS, SWANSEA, U.K.,
CUMBRIA AND NORTH LANCASHIRE PEACE GROUPS U.K.,
GREEN PARTY OF ENGLAND AND WALES,
Y2K COMMUNITY ACTION NETWORK U.K.,

JEANETTE FITZSIMMONS MP, NZ GREENS,
BRIAN DONELLY, MP,
HARRY DUYNHOVEN, MP, NZ LABOUR,
LIANNE DALZIEL, MP, NZ LABOUR,
JUDY KEALL, MP, NZ LABOUR,
PETER DUNNE, MP, NZ LABOUR,
SANDRA LEE, MP, DEPUTY LEADER, ALLIANCE,
LAILA HARRE, MP, ALLIANCE,
DISARMAMENT AND SECURITY CENTRE, NZ,
AOTEOROAN/NEW ZEALAND PEACE FOUNDATION, AUCKLAND, NZ.,
ENGINEERS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, N.Z.,
NEW ZEALAND GREENS,
NATIONAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON DISARMAMENT, N.Z.,
PEACE ACTION DUNEDIN, N.Z.,
PEACE COUNCIL OF NEW ZEALAND,
ABOLITION-2000 NEW ZEALAND,
IPPNW NEW ZEALAND,
VETERANS FOR PEACE NZ.,
ARCHITECTS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR, NZ.,
C.N.D., VETERANS NEW ZEALAND,
CENTRE FOR PEACE STUDIES, UNIV. OF AUCKLAND, NZ,
NEW ZEALAND NUCLEAR - FREE PEACEMAKING ASSOCIATION,
WILPF AOTEAROA,
CORSO AOTEAROA/NZ.,

PACIFIC ISLANDS ASSOCIATION OF NGOS, BELAU.,
COALITION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCING STATES OF NIGERIA,

MALAYSIAN PHYSICIANS FOR THE PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR WAR,
GREEN ACTION KYOTO,
Y2K WORLD ATOMIC SAFETY HOLIDAY, SENDAI, JAPAN,
SOUTH ASIAN COMMUNITY CENTRE FOR EDUCATION AND RESEARCH, NAGERCOIL, INDIA,
AWAMI COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT, MULTAN, PAKISTAN,
INDONESIAN NATIONAL NETWORK FORUM ANTI-NUCLEAR SOCIETY,
ALTERNATIVE ENERGY PROJECT FOR SUSTAINABILITY, (AEPS) THAILAND,
MOVIMIENTO AUTORIDADES INDIGENAS DE COLOMBIA,

ECODEFENSE KOENIGSBERG/MOSCOW,
WISE-KALININGRAD,
ANTINUCLEAR CAMPAIGN OF SOCIAL-ECOLOGICAL UNION MOSCOW,
PLATAN YOUTH GROUP, KALININGRAD,
EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEE KALININGRAD REGIONAL DUMA,
GREEN WORLD, SOSNOVY BOR, ST PETERSBURG, RUSSIA,
ST PETERSBURG PEACE COUNCIL, ST PETERSBURG, RUSSIA,
CENTRE FOR NUCLEAR ECOLOGY AND ENERGY POLICY RUSSIA,
BAIKAL ENVIRONMENTAL WAVE, RUSSIA,

ECOSSENS, ROMANIA,
COMMITTEE OF 100, FINLAND,
PEACE UNION OF FINLAND,
STUDENT NATURE PROTECTION GROUP, TARTU, ESTONIA,
SWEDISH PHYSICIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR WEAPONS (SLMK - SWEDISH CHAPTER OF IPPNW),
NORWEGIAN PHYSICIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR (IPPNW)
NORWEGIAN PEACE ALLIANCE,
NORWEGIAN LAWYERS AGAINST NUCLEAR ARMS,
INTERNATIONAL PEACE BUREAU, OSLO,
PEACE MOVEMENT OF ESBJERG, DENMARK,
WAR RESISTERS INTERNATIONAL, FREDRIKSHAVN, DENMARK,
ALDRIG MERE KRIG (AMK) DENMARK,
DANISH ASSOCIATION OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS,
WOMENS INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM (FRANCE),
MOUVEMENT DE LA PAIX, FRANCE,
INTERNATIONAL ALBERT SCHWEITZER FOUNDATION,
DR SCHWEITZER HOSPITAL FUND, FRANCE/SWITZERLAND
GLOBAL INITIATIVE FOR IMMEDIATE DISARMAMENT, SWITZERLAND,
DARMSTAEDTER FRIEDENSFORUM, GERMANY,
NUCLEAR-FREE AWARD, GERMANY,
ANTI-ATOM PLENUM, BOCHUM, GERMANY,
CITIZENS INITIATIVE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, LUECHOW-DANNEBURG, GERMANY,
IPPNW HAMBURG,
CENTRE FOR ENCOUNTER AND ACTIVE NON-VIOLENCE, BAD ISCHL, AUSTRIA,
IPPNW AUSTRIA,
ANTI-ATOM INTERNATIONAL, AUSTRIA,
COORDINATION OFFICE OF AUSTRIAN ENVIRONMENT GROUPS, AUSTRIA,
INDEPENDENT SALZBURG PLATFORM AGAINST NUCLEAR DANGERS, AUSTRIA,
PLATFORM GEGEN ATOMGEFAHR, AUSTRIA,
ENERGIE ZUKUNFT MOHTVIERTEL, AUSTRIA,
CENTRUM ENERGIE, CZECH REPUBLIC,
BURGERINITIATIVE UMWELTSCHUTZ, BUDWEIS, CZECH REPUBLIC.,
FOR MOTHER EARTH INTERNATIONAL, GHENT, BELGIUM,
WORLD INFORMATION SERVICE ON ENERGY, AMSTERDAM,
MDB ENERGY PROJECT, NETHERLANDS,

FOR MOTHER EARTH NETHERLANDS,
CENTRE FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES, NETHERLANDS,
GLOBAL ANTI - NUCLEAR ALLIANCE, NETHERLANDS,
ANPED (NORTHERN ALLIANCE FOR SUSTAINABILITY) NETH,
ASEED- EUROPE, (AMSTERDAM)
STROHALM (UTRECHT) NETHERLANDS,
ITALIAN LAWYERS AGAINST NUCLEAR ARMS,

MAJ-BRITT THEORIN, MEP, PRESIDENT, IPB.,
ELIZABETH SCHROEDTER, MEP,
ERNST GULCHER, MEP, GREEN GROUP, GERMANY,
HEIDI HAUTALA, MEP, GREEN GROUP, FINLAND,
GLYN FORD, MEP, LABOR, SW ENGLAND,
OZAN KEYHUN, MEP, GERMANY,
PER GAHRTON, MEP, GREENS, SWEDEN,

CONGRESSMAN EDWARD J. MARKEY, (D-MASS) WASH, D.C.,
GLOBAL RESOURCE ACTION CENTRE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT (GRACE) N.Y., U.S.,
TRI-VALLEY CARES, LIVERMORE, CALIF, U.S.,
NUCLEAR INFORMATION AND RESOURCE SERVICE, U.S.,
WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION, U.S.,
NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION OF NATIVE AMERICANS,
AMERICAN-INDIAN MOVEMENT OF OKLAHOMA,
NUCLEAR-FREE NEW YORK,
SAVE WARD VALLEY, CALIF, U.S.,
METRO-BOSTON COMMITTEE TO DE-ALERT NUCLEAR WEAPONS,
NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION, CALIFORNIA, U.S.,
PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, U.S.,
LIVERMORE CONVERSION PROJECT, OAKLAND, CALIF.,
ACTION SITE TO STOP CASSINI FLYBY,
PROPOSITION-1 COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON DC, US.,
HEALING GLOBAL WOUNDS, TECOPA, CALIF, U.S.,
AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE,
UNITING CHURCH OF CHRIST ROCKY MOUNTAIN CONFERENCE, PEACE AND JUSTICE TASK
FORCE,
ALL SOULS UNITARIAN CHURCH COLORADO SPRINGS, U.S.,
METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE, U.S.,
QUEST MINISTRIES, OHIO, U.S.,
CENTRE FOR MISSION EDUCATION, DENVER, COLORADO,
INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE, SAN FRANCISCO, US,
WAR RESISTERS LEAGUE, NY, USA.,
NEW YORK STUDENT ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION COALITION,
PEACE RESOURCE CENTRE OF SAN DIEGO, CALIF, U.S.,
PROMOTING ENDURING PEACE, NY., U.S.,
PROFESSIONAL NETWORK FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, NY, U.S.,
GRANDMOTHERS AND MOTHERS ALLIANCE FOR THE FUTURE,
WOMENS ACTION FOR NEW DIRECTIONS,
CENTRE FOR ENERGY RESEARCH, OREGON, USA,
CITIZENS PROTECTING OHIO,
OHIO CITIZEN ACTION,
PORTSMOUTH/PIKETON RESIDENTS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY AND SANITY (PRESS),
CONCERNED CITIZENS FOR NUCLEAR SAFETY NEW MEXICO,
PEACE ACTION USA.,
PEACE ACTION CENTRAL NEW YORK,

METRO NEW YORK PEACE ACTION COUNCIL, USA.,
PAX CHRISTI U.S.A.,
PAX CHRISTI NEW YORK,
PAX CHRISTI, MORRIS COUNTY, NJ, USA.,
PAX CHRISTI TEXAS,
PAX CHRISTI ST AUGUSTINE FLORIDA,
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION TASK FORCE ON LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARRIBEAN,
ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION ON NUCLEAR POWER,
CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA CITIZENS FOR SURVIVAL,
THREE MILE ISLAND ALERT, PENNSYLVANIA, U.S.,
ATOMIC MIRROR, CALIF, U.S.,
NATIONAL CAMPAIGN FOR A PEACE TAX FUND,
PEDALS FOR PEACE, SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIF, U.S.,
SACRAMENTO VALLEY CITIZENS ALONG THE ROADS AND TRACKS,
NEVADA DESERT EXPERIENCE, NEVADA, U.S.,
GRANDMOTHERS FOR PEACE INTERNATIONAL, CALIF, U.S.,
TAI MEI PEACE ACTION, SAN GABRIEL, U.S.,
SERIOUS TEXANS AGAINST NUCLEAR DUMPING, U.S.,
STUDENTS FOR A SUSTAINABLE EARTH, W. MICHIGAN, U.S.,
ALLIANCE FOR SURVIVAL, COSTA MESA, CALIF., U.S.,
LONG ISLAND ALLIANCE FOR PEACEFUL ALTERNATIVES,
Y2K-WASH CAMPAIGN BAY AREA CHAPTER,

BILL BLAIKIE MP, HOUSE LEADER, NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF CANADA,
SVEND ROBINSON MP, HOUSE OF REPS, CANADA,
JUDY WASLYCIA-LEIS, MP, WINNIPEG, CANADA
VETERANS AGAINST NUCLEAR ARMS, CANADA,
PHYSICIANS FOR GLOBAL SURVIVAL, CANADA,
NEW GREEN ALLIANCE, CANADA,
PACIFIC CAMPAIGN FOR DISARMAMENT AND SECURITY, BC, CANADA.,
THE SIMONS FOUNDATION, VANCOUVER, B.C.,
PLOUGHSHARES, CALGARY, CANADA,
PLOUGHSHARES, SASKATOON, CANADA,
ICUEC, (INTER-CHURCH URANIUM EDUCATION COMMITTEE) SASKATOON, CANADA,
O.P.I.R.G., PETERBOROUGH, CANADA,
UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF CANADA,
ASSOCIATION OF SERBIAN WOMEN, CANADA,
INDIGENOUS WOMENS NETWORK, CANADA/USA.,

PRESIDENT BORIS YELTSIN,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
KRASNOPRESENSKAYA-2, MOSCOW, RUSSIA,
+7-095-205-4219, +7-095-206-5173 +7-095-205-4330,

PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON,
WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, US,
+1-202-456-2461, +1-202-456-2883.

WILLIAM COHEN, US SECRETARY OF DEFENCE,
+1-703-695-1149,

BILL RICHARDSON, US SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
+1-202-586-9987.

IGOR SERGEYEV,
DEFENCE MINISTER OF RUSSIA,
Znamenka-19, 103160, Moscow, Russia,
+7-095-293-33-13, 247-2795, 247-2722, 293-3323.

FOREIGN MINISTER OF RUSSIA,
+7-095-244-3276, +7-095-244-2203,

CC
ALL HEADS OF STATE (BY EMAIL)
ALL UN MISSIONS (BY EMAIL)

Dear Presidents Yeltsin and Clinton, Defence Ministers and Defence Secretaries, Heads of State and UN Missions,

The organisations above, representing millions of people worldwide, are writing to convey their extreme concern over the possibility that Year 2000 (Y2K)-related computer failures in nuclear weapons systems may lead to an unacceptable risk of nuclear war by accident or miscalculation.

In the current political situation this is most especially the case. According to Alexandr Arbatov, of the Defence Committee of the Russian State Duma, US-Russian relations are at 'the worst, most acute, most dangerous juncture since the US-Soviet Berlin and Cuban missile crises.'

The danger during the Y2K rollover lies primarily in the possibility that spurious data may induce commanders, even at the highest levels, to mistakenly authorise the launches of nuclear weapons.

Events similar to this have already occurred. For example:

In the US in 1980, a malfunctioning computer chip sent spurious alert signals;

In 1983 in Russia, satellites mistook glare off the tops of clouds for a US missile launch, (and disaster was averted by the refusal of the local commander to believe the warnings were real);

In 1995, a Norwegian research rocket prompted a full-scale Russian alert.

If Y2K breakdowns produce inaccurate early warning data, or if communications and command channels are compromised, the combination of hair-trigger force postures and Y2K failures could be disastrous. There should therefore be a 'safety first' approach to Y2K and nuclear arsenals.

Because none of the nuclear weapons states can guarantee that their nuclear-related computer systems are Y2K compliant, the only responsible solution is for them all to stand down nuclear operations. This approach should include taking nuclear weapons off alert status and decoupling nuclear warheads from delivery vehicles.

The stakes involved in any nuclear exchange between Russia and the US are

such that they dwarf any other considerations. The future of life itself on earth could be in doubt.

In light of this, we strongly urge that you remove all strategic and tactical nuclear weapons from 'hair trigger' alert, and place them in a status in which at least hours and preferably days would be required to launch them.

The Canberra Commission in August 1996, noted that terminating nuclear alert status would:

- Reduce dramatically the chances of accidental or unauthorised nuclear missile launch.
- Help set the stage for intensified cooperation on a more far-reaching disarmament agenda
- Have a very positive influence on the political climate between nuclear weapon states.

This last is especially relevant in the current tension between Russia and NATO, which has prompted Russia to withdraw from cooperation with the US on Y2K problems.

According to the Canberra Commission,

"Taking nuclear forces off alert could be verified by national technical means and nuclear weapon state inspection arrangements. In the first instance, reduction in alert status could be adopted by the nuclear weapon states unilaterally"

If both sides are verifiably de-alerted, it will not be possible for either to launch a disarming first strike.

The immediate stakes are so high, and the potential for global catastrophe so clear, that mutually verified de-alerting in the face of the Y2K computer problem must take precedence over all other considerations of politics and national security.

Signed

Kevin Dunion, Chairperson, Friends of the Earth International,
John Hallam, Nuclear Campaigner, Friends of the Earth Australia,
Wendy Johnson, Friends of the Earth New Zealand,
Dr Patrick Green, Senior Energy, Nuclear and Climate Campaigner, Friends of the Earth England Wales and Northern Ireland,
Ricardo Navarro, Friends of the Earth El Salvador,
Nnimmo Bassey, Friends of the Earth Nigeria (Environmental Rights Action),
Benin City, Nigeria,
Viktor Khazan, Friends of the Earth Ukraine,
Manana Kochladze, Friends of the Earth Georgia, Tbilisi, Georgia.
Jan Kunnas, Friends of the Earth Finland,
Bo Stroem, Friends of the Earth Denmark,
Tonu Oja, Chairperson, Friends of the Earth Estonia, Tartu, Estonia.
Amis de la Terre, Paris, France,
Loukia Pavlidou, President, Friends of the Earth Cyprus,
Oleg Svistunov, Friends of the Earth Japan Siberia Program,

Corine Viellers, Global-2000(Friends of the Earth Austria)
Daniela Stojanova, General Secretary, Friends of the Earth Macedonia,
Maria Minkova, Deputy Chair, Friends of the Earth Bulgaria/Ecoglasnost, Sofia,

Peter Garrett, President, Australian Conservation Foundation,
Helen Caldicott, MD, Founding President, PSR,
Irene Gale, Australian Peace Committee, SA Branch,
Denis Doherty, Secretary, Pax Christi NSW,
REV. John Mavor, President, Uniting Church of Australia
Rev. Ray Richmond, Wayside Chapel, Uniting Church in Australia,
Pitt Street Uniting Church, Pitt St, Sydney,
Rev. John Stanley, St Johns Anglican Church, Darlinghurst, Sydney,
Julie Marlow, Australian Anti-Bases Campaign Committee,
Babs Fuller-Quinn, Australian Peace Committee, National Committee,
Susan Wareham, President, Medical Association for the Prevention of War,
IPPNW Regional Vice-President, Aust.,
Pauline Mitchell, Campaign for International Cooperation and Disarmament,
Peter Jones, War Resisters International, Australia.,
Alec Marr, National Campaign Director, The Wilderness Society,
Mark Wakeham, Environment Centre of the Northern Territory,
Deborah Metters, Arid Lands Environment Centre, Alice Springs, NT.,
Rowena Skinner, Environment Centre of W.A.,
Robin Chapple, Anti-Uranium Coalition of W.A.,
Cherie Hoyle, Centre for Urban Ecology, SA.,
Graham Daniell, People for Nuclear Disarmament, Western Australia.,
Zohl D' Ishtar, Pacific Connections,
Richard Goode, 2 Billion Voices for Peace Project,
Ian Dixon, Big Scrub Environment Centre, Lismore,
Isabelle Whyte, Everyone for a Nuclear-free Future, Lismore,
Robin Taubenfeld, Everyone for a Nuclear-Free Future, Gold Coast,
Jonivar Skullerud, ENUFF, Adelaide,
Chris White, Secretary, United Trades and Labour Council, SA,
Paul Martinella, State Secretary, CFMEU, SA,
Trevor Smith, National Secretary, CFMEU, Forests and Forests Products
Division, SA,
Stephen Smith, Secretary, CFMEU, Furnishing trade Division, SA,
Jacob Grech, Earthworker, All-Union Green Caucus,
Mick Doyle, United Firefighters Union of SA,
Paul Noak, Secy, A.M.W.U. SA Office.
Martin O' Malley, Secy, CFMEU, SA Branch.
Stephen Spence, Secretary, Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance, SA.,
Leonie Ebert, Graham F. Smith Peace Trust, SA.,
P.T. Muldoon, General Manager, Richmond River Shire Council,

Senator Lyn Allison, Democrat Senator for Victoria,
Senator Meg Lees, Democrat Senator for South Australia, Leader of the
Australian Democrats,
Senator Vicky Bourne, Democrat Senator for NSW.,
Senator Natasha Stott-Despoja, Deputy Leader, Australian Democrats,
Senator Andrew Bartlett, Democrat Senator for Queensland,
Senator Bob Brown, Green Senator for Tasmania,
Senator Dee Margetts, Green Senator for Western Australia,
Senator George Campbell, ALP Senator for NSW.,
Senator Margaret Reynolds, ALP, NSW,

Senator Jim Mc Kiernan, ALP, W.A.,
Anthony Albanese, ALP, Federal member for Grayndler,
Tanya Plibersek, ALP, Federal member for Sydney,
Jann Mc Farlane, Federal member for Stirling, W.A.,
Jill Hall, M.P., Federal member for Shortland, NSW,
Cheryl Davenport MLC., W.A.,
Ian Cohen, MLC, Greens, NSW,
Lee Rhiannon, MLC, Greens, NSW,
Sandra Kanck, MLC, Democrats, S.A.,
Ian Gilfillan, MLC, Democrats, SA,
Robyn Geraghty MP, Member for Torrens, SA.,
Frances Bedford, ALP State MP for Florey, S.A.,
Jim Scott, WA Greens, Legislative Council, W.A.,
Dr Louise Crossley, National Convenor, Greens, Australia,
Hannah Middleton, President, Communist Party of Australia.

Commander Robert Green RN (Ret'd), Chair, World Court Project UK,
Felicity Hill, Womens International League for Peace and Freedom, Geneva/NY
Martin Butcher, British-American Security Information Centre, US/UK,
Stephanie Mills, Greenpeace International Nuclear and Disarmament Campaign,
Bernice Boermans, Executive Director, International Association of Lawyers
Against Nuclear Arms, (IALANA), The Hague, Neth.,
Rear-Admiral Eugene J. Carroll, USN (ret'd), Deputy Director, Centre for
Defence Information, Washington, USA,

Dave Knight, Chair, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, U.K.,
Janet Bloomfield, Former Chair CND, Abolition U.K, Saffron Walden Group
Against Nuclear Weapons,
Bruce Kent, Vice-President, CND,
Jenny Maxwell, West Midlands CND, Birmingham, U.K,
Tigger Mc Gregor, Youth and Student CND, U.K.,
Dave Webb, Yorkshire CND., U.K.,
Anni Rainbow and Lindis Percy, Campaign for Accountability of American
Bases, U.K.,
Gillian Reeve, Director, MEDACT (IPPNW U.K),
Jane Tallents, Trident-Ploughshares 2000, Norwich, Norfolk, U.K.,
Di Mc Donald, Network Information Project, Southampton, U.K,
Catherine Euler, Menwith Hill Womens Peace Camp, Yorkshire, U.K.,
Catherine Euler, Global Network Against Weapons and Nuclear Power in Space,
Sue Claydon, Anglican Pacifist Fellowship, Milton Keynes, U.K.,
Mary H. Miller, Episcopal peace Fellowship, U.K.,
Monica King, St Bartholemews Justice and Peace Group, St Albans, U.K.,
Calderdale Green Party, Yorkshire, U.K.,
Alan Francis, Chair, Green Party of England and Wales,
Alan Watson, Partner, Public Interest Consultants, Swansea, Wales, U.K.,
Nigel Chamberlain, Cumbria and North Lancashire Peace Groups U.K.,
Paul Swann, National Coordinator, Y2K Community Action Network, U.K.,

Jeanette Fitzsimmons, MP, NZ Greens,
Brian Donnelly, MP,
Harry Duynhoven, MP, NZ Labour,
Lianna Dalziel, MP, NZ Labour,
Judy Keall, MP, NZ Labour,
Peter Dunne, MP, NZ Independent,

Sandra Lee, Deputy leader, Alliance,
Laila Harre, MP, Alliance, NZ.,
Dr Kate Dewes, Disarmament and Security Centre,
Marion Hancock, Aotearoa/NZ Peace Foundation, Auckland, NZ.,
Gerry Coates, Engineers for Social Responsibility, NZ,
Keith Locke, Foreign Affairs Spokesperson, NZ Greens,
Llelwyn Richards, National Consultative Committee on Disarmament, NZ,
Barbara Frame, Peace Action Dunedin, NZ.,
John Ulrich, Peace Council of New Zealand,
Rev. John Murray/Dame Laurie Salas/Robin Halliday, Abolition-2000, New Zealand,
Ian Prior, IPPNW New Zealand,
Chris King, Veterans for Peace New Zealand,
Derek Wilson, Architects Against Nuclear War, NZ,
Robert E. White, Director, Centre for Peace Studies, University of
Auckland, NZ.,
John Gallagher, New Zealand Nuclear-Free Peacemaking Association, Aotearoa/NZ.,
WILPF Aotearoa,
Jim Holdom, CORSO, Aotearoa/NZ.,

Richard N. Salvador, Pacific Islands Association of NGOs, Belau,
Tom Mbeke-Ekarem, Chair, Coalition of Petroleum-Producing States of Nigeria,
Ron Mc Coy, Malaysian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War,
Petaling Jaya, Malaysia,
Yumi Kukuchi, Y2K WASH Campaign, Sendai, Japan/USA,
Aileen Mioko Smith, Director, Green Action Kyoto, Japan.,
Hiroshi Taka, Assistant Secretary, Japan Council Against A and H-Bombs
(Gensuikyo),
S.P. Udayakumar, South Asian Community Centre for Education and Research,
Nagercoil, Tamil Nadu, South India,
Asif Rasheed Leghari, Awami Committee for Development, Multan, Pakistan,
Nana Suhartana, Indonesian National Network Forum Anti-Nuclear Society,
Pipob Udomittipong, Alternative Energy Project for Sustainability, Thailand,
Lorenzo Muelas, Movimiento Autoridades Indigenas de Colombia,

Vladimir Sliviak, Ecodefense, Russia,
Galina Raghoushina, World Information Service on Energy (WISE) Kaliningrad,
Alexandra Koroleva, Educational Committee, Kaliningrad Regional Duma,
Mikhail Trofimov, Ecodefence! International, Kaliningrad,
Alisa Nikoulina, Antinuclear Campaign of Social-Ecological Union, Moscow,
Pavel Malyshev, Platan Youth Group, Kaliningrad,
Oleg Bodrov, Green World, Sosnovy Bor, St Petersburg, Russia,
Vera Brovkina, St Petersburg Peace Council, St Petersburg, Russia,
Lydia Popova, Centre for Nuclear Ecology and Energy Policy, Russia,
Marina Rikhmanova, Baikal Environmental Wave, Baikal, Russia,

George Razvan Marcu, Ecosens, Romania,
Malla Kantola, Committee of 100, Helsinki, Finland,
Laura Lodenius, Peace Union of Finland, Helsinki, Finland,
Pepe Mardiste, Student Nature Protection Group, Tartu, Estonia,
Gunnar Westberg, MD., SLMK (IPPNW), Swedish Physicians Against Nuclear Weapons,
Fredrick S. Heffermehl, President, Norwegian Peace Alliance,
Frederick S. Heffermehl, Norwegian Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms,
Frederick S. Heffermehl, International Peace Bureau, Oslo,
Bjorn Hilt, Chair, Norwegian Physicians Against Nuclear War, (IPPNW)

Poul Eck Sørensen, Peace Movement of Esbjerg, Denmark,
Arne Hansen, War Resisters International, Fredrikshavn, Denmark,
Majken Jul Sørensen, Aldrig Mere Krig, (AMK) Denmark,
Anja Johansen, Militaernaegterforeningen, (Danish Association of
Conscientious Objectors)
Daniel Durand, Secretary, Mouvement de La Paix, France,
Solange Fernex, Womens International League for Peace and Freedom, France,
Chrystoph Wyss, International Albert Schweitzer Foundation, France/Switz,
Chrystoph Wyss, Dr Schweitzer Hospital Fund, Switzerland,
Dr Roland Schutzbach, Global Initiative for Immediate Disarmament, Switzerland,
Xanthe Hall, Assistant Director, IPPNW Germany, Berlin,
Regina Hagen, Darmstaedter Friedensforum, Germany,
Claus Biegert, Nuclear-Free Award, Germany,
Horst Hohmier, Anti-Atom Plenum, Bochum, Germany,
Ilona Joerden, Citizens Initiative for Environmental Protection,
Luechow-Danneburg, Germany,
Dr. Herbert Richter-Peill, IPPNW Hamburg, Germany,
Matthias Reichl, Centre for Encounters and Active Non-Violence, Bad Ischl,
Austria,
Dr Klaus Renoldner, President, IPPNW Austria,
Claudia and Margit, Anti-Atom International,
Claudia and Margit, Coordination Office of Austrian Environment Organisations,
Heinz Stockinger, Independent Salzburg Platform Against Nuclear
Dangers,(PLAGE), Salzburg, Austria,
Josef Puehringer, Platform Gegen Atomgefahr, Austria,
Josef Puehringer, Centrum Energie, Czech Republic,
Josef Puehringer, Burgerinitiative Umweltschutz, Budweis, Czech Republic,
Josef Puehringer, Energie Zukunft Mohtviertel, Austria.,
Pol D'Huyvetter, For Mother Earth International, Ghent, Belgium,
Peer de Rijk, WISE- Amsterdam, Netherlands,
Ophelia Cowell, MDB Energy Project, Netherlands,
Marjan Willemsen, For Mother Earth Netherlands,
Ak Malten, Global Anti-Nuclear Alliance, Netherlands,
Pieter Van Der Gaag, Deputy international Coordinator, ANPED, Northern
Alliance for Sustainability,
Frank Van Schaik, Transport Coordinator, ASEED-Europe,
STROHALM, Utrecht, Netherlands,
Kaj Leers, Journalist, Netherlands,
David Boerma, Coordinator, Pacific Region, Centre for Indigenous Peoples,
Netherlands.,
Giorgio Nebbia, Professor Emeritus, Faculty of Economics, University of
Bari, Italy,
Dr Joachim Lau, Italian Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms,

Maj-Britt Theorin, MEP, Sweden,
Elizabeth Schroedter, MEP, Germany,
Ernst Gulcher, MEP, Green Group, Germany,
Heidi Hautala, MEP, Green Group, Finland,
Glyn Ford, MEP, Labour, SW England,
Ozan Keyhun, MEP, Germany,
Per Gahrton, MEP, Greens, Sweden.,

Congressman Edward J. Markey, (D-Mass), Capitol Hill, Washington, DC.
Alice Slater, Global Resource Action Centre for the Environment, NY., USA.,

Marylia Kelley, Tri-Valley CARES, Livermore, California, US.
Mary Olson, Nuclear Information and Resource Service, US.,
Jackie Cabasso, Executive Director, Western States Legal Foundation, US.,
Grace Thorpe, National Environmental Coalition of Native Americans,
Carter Camp, Chair, American-Indian Movement of Oklahoma, US,
Bill Smirnow, Nuclear-Free New York, US,

Molly Johnson, Coordinator, Save Ward Valley, Calif, USA.,
William F. Santelmann, Metro-Boston Committee to De-Alert Nuclear Weapons
David Krieger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, Santa Barbara, Calif, US.
Robert W. Tiller, Physicians for Social Responsibility, U.S.A.,
Dr Lachlan Farrow, Past Chair, IPPNW,
Jonathan Mark, Action Site to Stop Cassini Flyby,
Sherry Larsen-Beville, Livermore Conversion Project, Oakland, Calif, USA.
Ellen Thomas, Proposition-1 Committee, Washington DC, US.,

Diana Roose, Peace Education Director, American Friends Service Committee,
Patricia Watson, Peacework, American Friends Service Committee,
Robert Kinsey, Peace and Justice Task Force, Uniting Church of Christ,
Rocky Mountains Conference,
Rachel Keeler, Executive Director, Pax Christi, New York,
Nancy Small, National Coordinator, Pax Christi, USA,
Frank Dworak, Pax Christi, Morris County, NJ, USA.,
Adam Eiding, Pax Christi Washington Action Group, U.S.,
Joyce Hall, Pax Christi Texas,
Paul Villavisanis, Pax Christi, St Augustine, Fl,
Betty Obol, SL, The Loretto Community, U.S.,
Phil Mc Manus, Chair, Fellowship of Reconciliation Task Force on Latin
America and the Caribbean, U.S.,
Heidi Cooper, All Souls Unitarian Church, Colorado Springs, US.,
Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, Washington, USA.,
Guy Templeton Black, Quest Ministries, Ohio, U.S.,
Bill Kelly, Executive Director, Centre for Mission Education, Denver,
Colorado, USA.,

Jennifer Olaranna Viereck, Coordinator, Healing Global Wounds, Tecopa, CA,
USA.,
Karen Talbot, Director, International Centre for Peace and Justice, San
Francisco, California, US.,
Chris Ney, War Resisters League, NY, USA.,
Jasmina Arsova, War Resisters League,, NY. USA.,
Holly-Poole Kavana, New York Student Environmental Action Coalition,
Carol Jahnkow, Peace Resource Centre of San Diego, Calif, US.,
Janette Michelle Cuevas, Executive Director, Promoting Enduring Peace, NY.,
Babette Lindfield, Professional Network for Social Responsibility, NY, U.S.,
Susan Lee Solar and Maria Mendez, Grandmothers and Mothers Alliance for the
Future,
Susan Shaer, Executive Director, Womens Action for New Directions,
Peter Bergel, Centre for Energy Research, Salem, Oregon, USA.,
Harvey Wasserman, Citizens Protecting Ohio, USA.,
Sarah Ogdahl, Toledo Area Director, Ohio Citizen Action,
Vina Colley, Portsmouth/Piketon Residents for Environmental Safety and Sanity,
Jay Coghlan, Concerned Citizens For Nuclear Safety, New Mexico, USA.,
Gordon S. Clark, Executive Director, Peace Action USA.,

Diane R Swords, Peace Action Central New York,
Fran Teplitz, Peace Action, Peace Action Education Fund, USA.,
Sonya Ostrom, Metro New York Peace Action Council,
Judith H. Johnsrud, Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power, Pennsylvania,
U.S.,
Judith H. Johnsrud, Central Pennsylvania Citizens for Survival, U.S.,
Scott D. Portzline, Three Mile Island Alert, Pennsylvania, U.S.,
Pamela Meidell, Atomic Mirror, Calif, U.S.,
Tom Keirans, National Campaign for a Peace Tax Fund,
Shiela Baker, Pedals for Peace, San Luis Obispo, Calif, U.S.,
Inga Olson, Sacramento Valley Citizens Along The Roads and Tracks,
Marc M. Blaise-Page, Nevada Desert Experience, U.S.,
Earth-Savers, Syracuse, U.S.,
Barbara Weidener, Grandmothers for Peace International, Calif, U.S.,
Lyn Miles, Tai Mei Peace Action, San Gabriel, U.S.,
Alan Moore, Butterfly Gardeners Association, Berkley, Calif,
Don Moniak, Program Director, Serious Texans Against Nuclear Dumping,
Amarillo, Tex, U.S.,
Andrew Nixon, Students For A Sustainable Earth, W. Michigan University, U.S.,
Jack and Felice Cohen-Joppa, The Nuclear Resister,
Marion Pack, Alliance for Survival, Costa-Mesa, California, USA.,
Peggy Jacobs, Long Island Alliance for Peaceful Alternatives, U.S.,
Jane Grossman/Laurie Grossman, Bay Area Chapter, Y2K WASH Campaign, (World
Atomic Safety Holiday), USA/JAPAN,

Senator Doug Roche, Canadian Parliament,
Bill Blaikie MP, House Leader, New Democratic Party of Canada,
Svend Robinson MP, House of Representatives, Canada,
Judy Waslycia-Leis, MP, Winnipeg, Canada,
Dr David Morgan, President, Veterans Against Nuclear Arms, Vancouver,
Canada,
Dr Barbara Birkett, President, Physicians for Global Survival, Ottawa, Canada.,
Dr Ross Wilcock, Physicians for Global Survival, Canada,
Dave Greenfield, New Green Alliance, Saskatoon, Canada,
Patti Willis, Pacific Campaign for Disarmament and Security, B.C., Canada,
Prof Eric Fawcett, Physics Dept, University of Toronto, Canada,
Dr Jennifer Allen Simons, The Simons Foundation, Vancouver, B.C.,
Sally Hodges, Chair, Ploughshares, Calgary, Canada,
O.P.I.R.G., Peterborough, Canada,
Genivieve Talbot, United Nations Association of Canada,
Snezana Vitorovich, Association of Serbian Women, Canada,
Priscilla Settee, Indigenous Womens Network, Canada/USA.,

-

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.

You have entered the following information into the APSA Membership Directory Website to be changed in your Biographical Listing. Please take a moment to review.... if it is not what you meant to enter, you may return to the website and enter new data.

Title: Mr.

First Name: Howard

Middle Name: W.

Last Name: Hallman

Suffix:

Company Name: Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Department: None

Phone: 301-897-3668

Email: mupj@igc.org

URL:

Birth Date: 02/17/1928

Gender: Male

Ethnicity: Caucasian

Highest Degree: MA

Degree Year: 1951

Street Address:6508 Wilmet Rd

State: MD

City: Bethesda

Zip (Postal) Code: 20817

Country: USA

General Interests:

- 1) Amer Govt & Pol
- 2) Pub Admin & Org Beh

Special Interests:

- 1) Urban Pol
- 2) Fed & IGR
- 3) None
- 4) None

Major Honors:

- 1) Senior Fellow, National Academy of Public Administration
- 2) None
- 3) None
- 4) None

Recent Positions:

- 1) Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1992 to present
- 2) Self-employed

No Company/University
1984 to 1991

3) President

Civic Action Institute
1969 to 1983

Special Publications:

- 1) Neighborhood Government in a Metropolitan Setting | Sage Publications 1974 | Book | English |
- 2) The Organization and Operation of Neighborhood Councils | Praeger Publishers 1977 | Book | English |
- 3) Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis | Sage Publications 1977 | Book | English |
- 4) Community-based Employment Programs | Johns Hopkins University Press 1980 | Book | English |
- 5) Neighborhoods: Their Place in Urban Life | Sage Publications 1984 | Book | English |

August 23, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: coverage of NC CTBT poll; additional editorials for the CTBT

Attached below is a recent News & Observer article on public opinion on the CTBT in North Carolina along with more editorials about the CTBT published this month in the San Diego Union-Tribune and the Detroit Free Press.

For further details on the poll, see
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ncrel080299.htm>> and for the full listing of CTBT editorials, see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctedit.htm>>

Also, Senator Akaka (D-HI) gave another good, strong speech calling for prompt CTBT approval on Aug. 4. It is available at
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/akaka080499.htm>>

DK

The (Raleigh) News & Observer, August 21, 1999

"Under the Dome: Poll shows support for arms pact"

Sen. Jesse Helms might want to check with his constituents before continuing to block the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Three-quarters of adults in North Carolina support Senate ratification of the international treaty that would prohibit nuclear arms tests, according to a poll for the North Carolina Council of Churches.

The survey of 621 registered voters, taken July 18-21, showed strong support for the accord in all parts of the state, ranging from 71 percent in Western North Carolina to 81 percent in the Triangle.

The level of support was close to uniform among people of different political parties -- 76 percent among Democrats, 75 percent for independents and 73 percent of Republicans.

"The U.S. Senate's do-nothing approach on the test ban treaty is dangerous," said Collins Kilburn, executive director of the churches' group. "It hurts efforts to protect our nation and the world from the spread of nuclear weapons and from the possibility of nuclear war."

President Clinton sent the treaty to the Senate in October 1997, but Helms, who is has bottled it up as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Helms and other Republicans are insisting that the test-ban treaty be

considered in combination with two other accords -- the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the Kyoto protocols on global warming. Clinton believes that they want to gut those two accords as the price for ratifying the test-ban treaty.

Support for the test-ban treaty is a bit weaker in North Carolina than in the country as a whole. A national survey in June showed that 82 percent of Americans back the accord.

The treaty cannot take effect unless the United States signs it, and -- per the Constitution -- the United States cannot sign it without Senate ratification.

San Diego Union-Tribune
August 5, 1999

End The Senate Delay

It's time to ratify the nuclear test ban treaty

Three years ago next month, the United States signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, agreeing to end nuclear testing. Since then, 151 other nations have followed our lead as they unite in the view that nuclear testing is no longer necessary.

For two years, Republican leaders in the Senate have refused to bring the treaty to the floor of the Senate, where it is certain to receive the two-thirds vote necessary for ratification.

Their refusal harms U.S. interests, for America has no interest in more testing, which may not be the case for all nations.

Last week, a bipartisan group of top scientists and arms control experts urged the Senate to begin hearings on CTBT ratification without further delay. Their urging comes in the wake of the Cox report accusing China of stealing U.S. nuclear secrets.

"We may never know whether Chinese nuclear weapons development benefited significantly from espionage," these experts wrote. "But if China doesn't resume testing," they said, quoting Harold Agnew, former director of Los Alamos weapons laboratory, "no harm will possibly have been done other than to our egos."

China signed the test ban treaty in 1996, after it finished what it said were its final nuclear tests. But because the United States, the world's primary nuclear power, has not ratified the treaty, it has given other nations, both signatories and nonsignatories, reasons to backslide. That is the last thing we want to happen.

Senate ratification is important for a second reason. Paul Nitze and Sidney Drell, veteran arms control advisers in several

administrations, have pointed out the importance of completing ratification prior to the opening of the first CTBT review conference. The conference, this fall, will bring together the world's 44 nuclear-capable nations.

Without Senate ratification, the United States, the father of the test ban (under President Eisenhower), and the treaty's first signatory (under President Clinton), will be denied a seat at the review conference. The father will have been rejected by his child.

A year ago, Trent Lott, the Senate majority leader, put off CTBT hearings following nuclear tests by India and Pakistan.

Both those nations now say they are ready to sign. As more nations sign, it becomes easier to isolate the few nonsignatories and those nations, such as Iraq, that have signed but violated the treaty.

The CTBT is a commitment to ban testing by the 44 nuclear-capable states (those with nuclear reactors for research or power) to the 185 signatories of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Without the CTBT, the NPT collapses. The NPT pledges non-nuclear states not to acquire weapons, and nuclear-capable states not to provide them.

Since Eisenhower, successive U.S. administrations have worked to create this intricate world architecture that reduces the dangers of nuclear testing and proliferation. The Senate's delay does not serve the national interest. It's time for a Senate vote.

Detroit Free Press
August 15, 1999

For World's Sake, U.S. Must Sign Test Ban Treaty

President Bill Clinton should use a new international report to pressure the Senate into ratifying the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Clinton signed the treaty in 1996, but has not given it the priority it deserves -- or the push to get it past Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C.

The report, by nuclear arms experts commissioned by Japan, notes that the failure of the United States and other nuclear powers to ratify the treaty has undermined decades of arms control. Weakening pacts against other weapons of mass destruction hasn't helped much either.

As more nations develop nuclear capability, the likelihood of weapons falling into the wrong hands grows. The United States needs to lead efforts to curb the race. But it can't put pressure on other countries to sign the treaty until it does so.

Cavalier attitudes toward the treaty helped prompt the escalating nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan, North Korea and China, the report

argues.

Meanwhile, the United States remains the world's biggest exporter of arms. And smaller countries are not only investing in nuclear stockpiles, they're also positioning themselves to be major traffickers for whoever is willing to pay the price.

Continued arms races contribute to international insecurity -- which greatly threatens the United States. So far, this country is part of the majority of nations that have signed the treaty but not ratified it, including volatile countries such as Russia, Israel, India, Pakistan, North Korea and China.

The United States must quickly become the 42nd nation to ratify the treaty. Only then will it have the ability to persuade the other 110 nonsigners to do the same.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Is this just one email or coming from one person or all emails from everyone? Also is this just when you print? Or is this in your email as well?

Please also note you may want to go to the following URL <http://www.igc.org/igc/transition/mspring-full.html> and read about the transition to Mindspring. <http://www.igc.org/igc/join/approve.html> is where you would go for the transition.

Tech Support

Please include a copy of this message with any reply. If you are not writing to us from your IGC account, please include your IGC UserID with your message. You may call Tech Support for Technical Assistance at 318-619-1123 (24 hours a day, seven days a week).

If you are needing a new access # go here.
<http://www.bbn.com/support/dialinx/napops.htm>
OR email access98-info@igc.org for a complete list.

If you need to create a vacation message go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_vacation

If you need to change your password go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_passwd

If you need to forward your email to another account go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_forwarding

At 02:17 PM 08/23/1999 -0400, you wrote:

>Dear Help:

>

>I am just starting to use Eudora Light. I find that the messages are
>coming in so that one line has a word or two carried over to the next line,
>then a return to the left margin without filling out the second line with
>text. Is there a remedy for this so that the text is aligned with left
>margin and unjustified on the right? The way it is it's awkward to read on
>the screen and in printed form.

>

>Thanks,

>Howard Hallman

At 03:04 PM 8/23/99 -0500, you wrote:

>Is this just one email or coming from one person or all emails from
>everyone? Also is this just when you print? Or is this in your 76
email as well?

Dear Help:

It occurs on most in-coming e-mail and appears both on the screen and in printing. In the old Eudora it happened occasionally, but now it is happening even with e-mail from persons whose message formerly appeared in solid blocs

Howard Hallman

>At 02:17 PM 08/23/1999 -0400, you wrote:

>>Dear Help:

>>

>>I am just starting to use Eudora Light. I find that the messages are
>>coming in so that one line has a word or two carried over to the next line,
>>then a return to the left margin without filling out the second line with
>>text. Is there a remedy for this so that the text is aligned with left
>>margin and unjustified on the right? The way it is it's awkward to read on
>>the screen and in printed form.

>>

>>Thanks,

>>Howard Hallman

>

>

Dear Friends and Activists,

The Y2K De-alerting letter can now be accessed from the Abolition 2000 website. The page is called "Call for Action: Letter to Clinton and Yeltsin to take Nuclear Weapons off Alert" . There is a short introduction written by myself obtained from information posted on the Y2K listserv as well as 2 sample letters, the first written by John Hallam and the second by Bob Tiller. There are also links to other websites with Y2K/De-alerting information. I encourage you to become actively involved in the Global Fax Campaign beginning on September 1st. The fax numbers listed on the page are correct and have been verified by John Hallam. If you have any questions about the site, please feel free to email me.

Yours In Peace,
Carah Ong

Carah Lynn Ong
Coordinator, Abolition 2000
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
1187 Coast Village Road PMB 121, Suite 1
Santa Barbara CA 93108

Phone (805) 965 3443 FAX(805) 568 0466
Email: A2000@silcom.com
Website <http://www.abolition2000.org>

Join the Abolition-USA or Abolition-Global Caucus list serve to regularly receive updates about the Abolition movement. Both caucus' also provide a forum for conversation on nuclear-related issues as well as they are used to post important articles and information pertaining to nuclear abolition.

To subscribe to the Abolition-USA listserve, send a message (with no subject) to:

abolition-usa-request@lists.xmission.com

In the body of the message, write:

"subscribe abolition-usa" (do not include quotation marks)

To post a message to the Abolition-USA list, mail your message to:

abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

To subscribe to the International Abolition-caucus, send a message (with no subject) to: majordomo@igc.org

In the body of the message, write:

"subscribe abolition-caucus" (do not include quotation marks)

To post a message to the International Abolition list, mail your message to:

abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org

-

To unsubscribe to abolition-usa, send an email to "majordomo@xmission.com" with "unsubscribe abolition-usa" in the body of the message.
For information on digests or retrieving files and old messages send "help" to the same address. Do not use quotes in your message.

At 03:22 PM 8/24/99 -0500, you wrote:

>The display font is the printing font. That option you mention was under
>the old Eudora Pro. Eudora Light doesn't have that feature. Your width is
>set fine but lets try and decrease that by say 10. So instead of 80 it
>would be 70. Let's see how that works.

Dear Help:

I've tried 70 and 90 but neither makes any difference. The problem with incoming mail remains the same. Whenever Eudora Light wraps an incoming line, it reads the soft return (to use WordPerfect language) of the sender as a hard return, putting only an extra word or two on the next line and then returns to the following line.

I tried it with 8 pt. type, and this problem went away, at least for one communication. But 8 pt. is too small to read comfortably.

I looked at my old Eudora Pro and noticed that it gives me the full screen while Eudora Light takes up space with the "EUDORA: In, Out, Trash" column. So maybe that's the difference.

You refer to a change to MindSpring for e-mail service. Will that occur automatically? If so, will this be a different system than Eudora Light? Will that make this problem moot?

Thanks,
Howard Hallman

The display font is the printing font. That option you mention was under the old Eudora Pro. Eudora Light doesn't have that feature. Your width is set fine but lets try and decrease that by say 10. So instead of 80 it would be 70. Let's see how that works.

Tech Support

Please include a copy of this message with any reply. If you are not writing to us from your IGC account, please include your IGC UserID with your message. You may call Tech Support for Technical Assistance at 318-619-1123 (24 hours a day, seven days a week).

If you are needing a new access # go here.
<http://www.bbn.com/support/dialinx/napops.htm>
OR email access98-info@igc.org for a complete list.

If you need to create a vacation message go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_vacation

If you need to change your password go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_passwd

If you need to forward your email to another account go here.
http://www.igc.org/scripts/webi/igc-order.cgi/change_forwarding

At 03:51 PM 08/24/1999 -0400, you wrote:

>At 11:21 AM 8/24/99 -0500, you wrote:

>>I'm not sure then, printing wise I'd say that you'd need updated printer
>>drivers which normally you can get off your printers manufacturer
>>website. As to viewing it though I can't find anything that would really
>>cause that. When you goto Tools and Options then click on Fonts/Display
>>what is checked there? What is the settings in there for width and
>>height? Also it could be that your Eudora is corrupt.

>

>

>Dear Help:

>The settings on Fonts/Display are 80 width and 20 high? Would a wider or
>narrow width help? Screen Font is Courier New, 9. Would a smaller font help?

>

>I just recently installed Eudora from the disk you supplied.

>

>Also I notice that Eudora Light permits setting heading and footer font but
>not font of the printed text as the old Eudora did. I like a 12 point type
>to help read messages easier. Is there anyway to change the default font
>for printing text?

>

>Thanks,

>Howard Hallman

I am testing word wrap to see if I can get continuous, block messages with out the extra hard returns and needless indents. If I can do this with this trial message, maybe my problem is solved. Let's hope so.

At 09:26 AM 8/27/99 PDT, you wrote:

>Dear Mr Hallman,

>Thank you for your kind attention. We are OK. Do you know whether

>"WashingtonTimes" has published the article about us?

>Rita & Maryam

Dear Rita & Maryam,

Yes, the Washington Times published a nice article with photos. Carlee sent it to each of you at the addresses you wrote in our guest book. In Rita's case it was a St. Petersburg address. If you don't receive it within a week or two, please let me know, and we'll send another copy to the addresses on your calling cards.

With best regards,

Howard Hallman

The transition to MindSpring will not happen automatically. You must do that at that URL which was sent to you. They supposedly send some new software for you for free.

At 02:09 PM 08/26/1999 -0400, you wrote:

>At 03:22 PM 8/24/99 -0500, you wrote:

>>The display font is the printing font. That option you mention was under
>>the old Eudora Pro. Eudora Light doesn't have that feature. Your width is
>>set fine but lets try and decrease that by say 10. So instead of 80 it
>>would be 70. Let's see how that works.

>

>

>Dear Help:

>

>I've tried 70 and 90 but neither makes any difference. The problem with
>incoming mail remains the same. Whenever Eudore Light wraps an incoming
>line, it reads the soft return (to use WordPerfect language) of the sender
>as a hard return, putting only an extra word or two on the next line and
>then returns to the following line.

>

>I tried it with 8 pt. type, and this problem went away, at least for one
>communication. But 8 pt. is too small to read comfortably.

>

>I looked at my old Eudora Pro and noticed that it gives me the full screen
>while Eudora Light takes up space with the "EUDORA: In, Out, Trash" column.
> So maybe that's the difference.

>

>You refer to a change to MindSpring for e-mail service. Will that occur
>automatically? If so, will this be a different system than Eudora Light?
>Will that make this problem moot?

>

>Thanks,

>Howard Hallman

CTBT Organizing Resources Available on the Web!

Jesse-ocracy or Democracy?!
CTBT Day of Action Set for September 14

Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) has held the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) hostage for 22 months! In response, Peace Action is mobilizing activists across the nation to demand their Senators free the test ban for Senate ratification now!

It is very important that we send this urgent message as the entry-into-force conference for the CTBT is scheduled for October 6-8 in Vienna. If the United States doesn't ratify the treaty this month, it will be unable to participate in the conference. This will send a very strong signal to other countries that the United States is no longer serious about arms control, a move which could badly jeopardize attempts to curb nuclear proliferation.

A bipartisan poll released June 1999 showed that even conservative Republicans support the treaty overwhelmingly (79%). It's time to show Jesse that we mean business!

CTBT Day of Action Alert(s) customized for key states are available on the web at the address listed below. Please download and distribute them.

http://www.peace-action.org/ctb_day.html

Sheila Dormody
Peace Action Director of Field Programs
1819 H Street NW #420 Washington DC 20006
ph: 202.862.9740 ext.3006 fax: 202.862.9762
sdormody@peace-action.org www.peace-action.org

August 30, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: "Democrats Ready for Fight to Save Test Ban Treaty," Page A1, NYT

Today's editions of The New York Times carry a front page, above the fold article on the looming battle over the CTBT in the U.S. Senate. The article provides a good analysis of the reasons for the impasse, the depth of support for the Treaty, and what can be expected in the weeks ahead.

Most notably, the article reports that:

* Democrats in the Senate are threatening to bring the Senate to a standstill when Congress returns next month from summer recess unless Republicans agree to hold hearings this year on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

* Arms control advocates and some Senators say the President has not yet made ratification a public issue or fought hard for it in Congress. As Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr. of Delaware, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee says: "... the President has to play a major role. He could affect this more than he has."

* Administration officials say that in the coming weeks, Clinton and top foreign policy aides, like Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright and the national security adviser, Samuel R. Berger, will push the treaty more publicly.

For further information, analysis, statements, and polling results, see the Coalition's CTBT Web Site <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

DK

Article available on the Web at
<<http://www.nytimes.com/library/world/global/083099testban-politics.html>>

The New York Times, page A1

August 30, 1999

"Democrats Ready for Fight to Save Test Ban Treaty"

By ERIC SCHMITT

WASHINGTON -- The White House and Senate Democrats say they are preparing for a pitched battle with the Republican-controlled

Senate to save one of the top foreign policy goals of President Clinton's waning Administration: a treaty banning nuclear testing.

Armed with public opinion polls and the support of many scientists, military commanders and arms control groups, Democrats are threatening to bring the Senate to a standstill when Congress returns next month from summer recess unless Republicans agree to hold hearings this year on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which 152 nations have signed.

Without the treaty, Clinton warned this month, "countries all around the world will feel more pressure to develop and test weapons in ever more destructive varieties and sizes, threatening the security of everyone on earth."

His Administration's new push for the treaty has been prompted in part by a raft of unsettling developments -- India's and Pakistan's growing nuclear ambitions, the possible test-launching of a long-range missile by North Korea, and the strong possibility that China has upgraded its atomic arsenal using stolen American nuclear secrets.

But Senate Republicans are balking, and before the Senate will vote on the treaty the Administration will probably need to satisfy both the Republicans and the Russians on related arms-control issues, the geopolitical equivalent of pulling off a triple bank shot.

The Republicans say they do not want to go forward with any new treaty until they are assured that the country will quickly build a limited defense against long-range missile attack. But Russia wants the United States to slash its nuclear arsenal before it will consider changes to a landmark treaty that bars such a shield.

If these two conditions are met, it could free up the test ban treaty, which Republicans have held up. Clinton signed the treaty in 1996 and sent it to the Senate for approval in September 1997, but arms control advocates say he has not yet made ratification a public issue or fought hard for it in Congress.

"There ought to be the makings of a grand deal in all this," said Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr. of Delaware, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee. "But the President has to play a major role. He could affect this more than he has."

Administration officials say that in the coming weeks, Clinton and top foreign policy aides, like Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright and the national security adviser, Samuel R. Berger, will push the treaty more publicly.

The Democrats' effort faces stiff Republican opposition. The treaty is bottled up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, whose chairman, Jesse Helms of North Carolina, is locked in a fight with the Administration over two other treaties that Helms wants to kill before dealing with the test ban pact.

Those two treaties -- a pact to fight the dangers of global warming that

the United States signed last year and a set of amendments negotiated two years ago to the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty -- are unlikely to gain the two-thirds Senate support needed for approval, Administration officials conceded.

Clinton, citing reasons other than likely defeat, said the time was not "ripe" to send those two treaties to the Senate. Republicans say Clinton cannot pick and choose which treaties the Senate acts on quickly. A stalemate has resulted.

There are three possible paths around Senator Helms and other foes, test ban treaty supporters say. One is to generate public pressure by painting Republicans as reckless for blocking a step that would encourage India and Pakistan to sign the treaty. That in turn could force moderate Republicans to prod Senator Trent Lott of Mississippi, the majority leader, to overrule Helms.

Only two Republicans, Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania and James M. Jeffords of Vermont, openly support the test ban treaty. Other Republicans, including Maine's two Senators, Olympia J. Snowe and Susan M. Collins, support holding hearings, but have not committed to the treaty.

Another tactic, which Democrats have used successfully in the past, would be to tie the Senate floor in knots until Lott relents. Biden, along with the Democratic leader, Thomas A. Daschle of South Dakota, and Senator Byron L. Dorgan, a North Dakota Democrat, say they are willing to wage that kind of guerrilla warfare if needed.

The final and most ambitious route involves a three-way deal that hinges on negotiating changes to the Antiballistic Missile Treaty with the Russians to allow a limited national defense. Such a deal would almost certainly include a new strategic arms reduction treaty, Start III, that the Russians want and that could reduce each side's nuclear arsenals to 1,500 warheads from more than 6,000 currently.

Clinton and President Boris N. Yeltsin of Russia blessed such talks in June, for the first time. Discussions started this month in Moscow and will resume on Sept. 17, when Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott meets with a Russian Deputy Foreign Minister, Georgi Mamedov, in Washington.

Enormous hurdles remain. The United States has said it will not seriously negotiate a Start III treaty until Russia's Communist-dominated Parliament ratifies the Start II pact, which calls for reducing the level of nuclear warheads to 3,000 to 3,500 on each side. That prospect appears increasingly dim.

Russia has long opposed an American missile defense, fearing that the United States would use it as an excuse to reprise the much grander "Star Wars" system, which would be dauntingly expensive to match. But Russia's strategic forces are declining and it lacks money to pay for new systems. Striking a deal, even if it means swallowing modifications to the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, may be the only way for Moscow to maintain

nuclear parity with Washington.

Both sides also see a narrowing political window of opportunity before presidential election politics in Russia and the United States next year make it extremely difficult to strike an accord. Experts say both Clinton and Yeltsin are mindful of their legacies.

"It's a lot like a trans-Atlantic flight," Robert G. Bell, the President's senior director for defense policy and arms control at the National Security Council, said of the nexus of issues. "Landing is the critical phase. What we're trying to do is bring all this in for a landing in the last year or so of the Clinton and Yeltsin administrations."

At the core of the dispute between the Senate and the Administration is a fundamental difference in arms control priorities. Democrats are seeking to maintain and build on three decades of deals that limit and reduce nuclear arsenals and countries' ability to develop more powerful atomic weapons.

Republicans argue that the spread of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and the means to deliver them, has rendered traditional arms control useless, and that building a national defense against long-range attack should be the country's top goal.

"For Republicans, arms control is a secondary approach for national defense," said Senator Gordon H. Smith, an Oregon Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Hindering that goal, Republicans say, is the Administration's continued embrace of the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, which limits the kinds of national defenses Russia and the United States can develop.

Even if some grand deal can be struck, the test ban treaty confronts several roadblocks. Even though 152 nations have signed the accord, so far only 21 of the 44 nations whose approval is required for the treaty to take effect, including Britain, France and Japan, have ratified the pact. Even one holdout among the 44 nations, like North Korea, could prevent the treaty from taking effect.

Although the treaty sets up a global system of sensors to monitor compliance, critics contend that verifying the agreement would be difficult.

Treaty proponents argue that it would lock in American superiority achieved in 1,030 nuclear tests between 1945 and 1992, when the United States agreed to halt testing. Failure to ratify, supporters say, could open the door for emerging nuclear states, like India and Pakistan, to conduct more tests, and may also weaken support for other arms pacts, like the treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons.

Five current and former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff support the testing ban, which would eliminate underground nuclear tests, as atmospheric testing is already banned. The treaty also has the support of most arms control experts and the directors of the nation's nuclear

laboratories, which are responsible for maintaining the safety and reliability of America's nuclear arsenal through nonexplosive nuclear experiments, including sophisticated computer simulations.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>
