

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

Programme to Overcome Violence

The Executive and Central Committees of the World Council of Churches have been meeting since last Tuesday, August 24, 1999. Consisting of delegates from member churches around the world, one of their main tasks is to make decisions about what the main foci of the Council will be for the coming years, and discuss how that might best be carried out.

We are very pleased that planning for the Decade to Overcome Violence is seen as a priority for this Central Committee. Please find following several Media Releases of WCC on overcoming violence, for your information.

CENTRAL COMMITTEENo. 02

EMBARGOED AGAINST DELIVERY

CHURCHES SHOULD FOCUS ON OVERCOMING *CULTURE OF VIOLENCE,* SAYS WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES GENERAL SECRETARY

Churches around the world should consider spending the first decade of the next century working to overcome the world's *generalized culture of violence,* and acknowledge that their own theological traditions have helped shape the world's current attitudes, said World Council of Churches (WCC) general secretary Rev. Dr Konrad Raiser.

Dr Raiser, in a report to the WCC's Central Committee here August 26, said *the commitment to overcome violence and build a culture of peace may indeed be the prophetic witness which the churches have to render at a time when the struggles for power and resources, identity or sheer survival* result in conflict between various groups, including communities of faith.

When the WCC held its assembly in Harare, Zimbabwe, last December, a proposal suggested that the international church organisation proclaim the years 2001-2010 *An Ecumenical Decade to Overcome Violence.*

Violence in the homes and on the streets, between ethnic and religious groups, within and between nations and societies, is the most powerful force destroying human community life, said the German theologian who has headed the WCC since 1992.

The concern is not a new one for the WCC, Raiser said. Since the WCC's response in 1968 to Dr Martin Luther King's call for non-violence in the search for social justice, and in its own Programme to Combat Racism of the 1970s, the organization of Protestant and Orthodox churches has been dealing with the issue.

Dr Raiser cited a resolution from the WCC's 1993 assembly in Vancouver, Canada, which noted that *peace is not just the absence of war*. Peace cannot be built upon the foundations of injustice, the Vancouver statement said, but must be based on *justice for and within all the nations, and respect for the God-given humanity and dignity of every person.*

Dealing with the issue of violence may require new times of moral and ethical reflection, Raiser said. *We are still deeply conditioned by thinking in the categories of the cold war, based on the clear identification of an enemy and the confrontation of absolute good and evil,* he said. Today's violence, he added, *cannot be overcome by imposing superior power and enforcing obedience and submission, since violence is itself an expression of the war logic of power.*

In noting that the churches themselves may have contributed to the climate of violence, Raiser said the WCC's previous Decade of Churches in Solidarity with Women brought the churches some *painful insights* about their own attitudes towards women. If there is serious reflection on violence in the world, Raiser said, churches will be obliged to *enter into a self-critical assessment of those theological, ecclesiological or cultural traditions which tend to justify violence in the name of defending order and enforcing obedience.*

It is my hope and prayer, Raiser concluded, *that as an ecumenical community we will be able, through this decade, to render a faithful witness to the One who is our peace and who has broken down the dividing wall of hostility.*

The WCC leader also said that the churches' concern for violence in the first decade of the next century would parallel other efforts in government and the wider society.

Evaluating the WCC's assembly in Zimbabwe last December, the general secretary told the Central Committee that the overall assessment of the international meeting was *quite positive*. Some, he said, felt that issues were dodged, or that the Assembly focussed too much on internal organization. Referring to the document *Common Understanding and Vision,* Raiser said the WCC was affirmed as a *fellowship of churches*, but that intense discussion continued on the meaning of ecumenical endeavour.

The discussions might mean, Raiser said, that the traditional assemblies of the 50-year-old WCC * held every seven years * might some day be replaced with a *new form of expressing and fostering the bonds of ecumenical fellowship.*

The WCC Central Committee meeting continues here until September 3. *

Contact: Karin Achtelstetter, Media Relations Officer
Tel: (+41.22) 791.61.53 Mobile: (+41) 79. 284. 52.12

CENTRAL COMMITTEE No. 3

WCC WOULD REINFORCE AND ASSIST PROGRAMMES IN MEMBER CHURCHES AND LOOK TO OTHER RELIGIONS FOR ANTI-VIOLENCE EFFORTS

Though a decade of concern for violence in the world may not officially begin until 2001, existing programs of the World Council of Churches (WCC) and its member churches are already preparing for it, said the Rev. Dr Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the WCC, Thursday, 26 September.

Dr Raiser stressed that the Decade to Overcome Violence would start with initiatives that have already taken place in member churches and *reinforce and assist them*. Dr Raiser said *this is not to be a program master-minded from Geneva,* referring to the headquarters city of the international organization.

The WCC General Secretary also said, in response to a question at a news conference, that there would be an inter-religious component to the effort. He noted that other world-wide organizations such as the UN had been seeking contacts with a wide variety of religious leaders, and said that *religions need to overcome the stereotypes with which they have treated each other historically*.

In the concern for world violence, Dr Raiser said, *We as Christians have to be humble and listen to the wisdom of eastern religions, especially Buddhism which has had much to say on peace and non-violence.*

Dr. Raiser spoke during the WCC's Central Committee meeting here August 26-September 3

Referring to his evaluation of the WCC's Assembly in Harare, Zimbabwe, last December, Dr Raiser told reporters that the WCC and others were exploring whether a new *forum* of Christian organizations might contribute to the ecumenical movement. International Christian organizations, like the WCC, the Lutheran World Federation (LWF) and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC) currently meet separately; but Dr Raiser suggested that it may be possible that the groups could meet together in parallel assemblies in the future. *This,* he said, *would make common discussions possible.*

Contact: Karin Achtelstetter, Media Relations Officer

Tel: (+41.22) 791.61.53 Mobile: (+41) 79. 284. 52.12

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

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

CENTRAL COMMITTEENo. 7

UN OFFICIAL ASKS CHURCHES TO JOIN CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT CHILDREN FROM THE SCOURGE OF WAR

The United Nations secretary-general's special representative for Children and Armed Conflict has asked the World Council of Churches (WCC) to put its moral weight behind the recently-passed Security Council Resolution aimed at saving children from the scourge of war.

We are witnessing unspeakable abominations against children, said Dr. Olara A. Otunnu, addressing the WCC Central Committee in Geneva on Aug. 28. *Over the last decade alone two million children were killed in conflict, one million made orphans, six million injured or permanently disabled, and 10 million left with psychological problems,* he said. About 20 million children are displaced within their own country or have become refugees, according to the UN official.

His plea came just three days after the Security Council's passage of Resolution 1261 dealing with the effects of warfare on children. Otunnu called the Security Council Action *unprecedented* as the council normally deals with large geo-political issues rather than specific social problems.

Otunnu said children were the *most innocent and blameless* victims of armed conflict and suffer disproportionately when wars break out. *Almost all the conflicts in the world today are civil wars,* he said, *fought among those who know each other very well and marked by widespread social breakdown and lawlessness.*

He termed the problem a *moral and spiritual* failing because the enemy is *demonized,* and often defined in religious, racial, ethnic or regional terms. Traditional protections of civilians in combat have been set aside, he said, and *the village has now become the battlefield.*

Otunnu said that in backing the UN resolution, the world's churches should help in launching an era of energetically applying international standards such as the Geneva convention and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Support is also needed, he said, for traditional value systems that once provided an ethical basis for behavior. *The most damaging loss for a society to suffer is the collapse of its value system,* he said. *Today the moral center is no longer holding, and all have become fair game in a single-minded struggle for power.*

Otunnu said children should be made a *zone of peace.* He told the WCC Central Committee that warring parties must -- under threat of international sanctions -- be obliged to allow the distribution of relief aid, provide for *humanitarian ceasefires,* and agree not to use land mines or recruit children for combat.

Recruitment of children for conflict, he said, *is one of the most horrendous developments of recent times.* However, he admitted that the UN resolution did not define *children* clearly. He and others favour the age of 18, but he noted that there is no consensus on that age. Many nations consider 18-year-olds fit for combat, but recent civil wars have found children as young as 10 carrying weapons.

Nations should also take special note of the needs of children when conflicts end, Otunnu said. *When war is over, it is not over for children for whom violence has become a part of life,* said the UN official. *We need to recuperate the young and restore to them a sense of renewed hope.*

Citing his long familiarity with the WCC, Otunnu, a native of Uganda, said the care for children was part of a campaign

of spiritual renewal. *More than ever before,* he said, *We need spiritual renewal and when we see signs of this around the world, let us embrace people of faith -- of all faiths -- and have them embrace each other and promote fundamental values of faith, love, forgiveness and reconciliation.*

He urged the WCC to become an advocate within the churches and civil structures for children suffering from the effects of war, and asked the WCC to lift up the needs of those children in its regular programmes.

The concern for the effects of wartime violence on children is likely to be a major part of the WCC*s *Decade to Overcome Violence*, an initiative growing out of the WCC Assembly in Harare, Zimbabwe, last December.

UN Security Council Resolution 1261, passed August 25, strongly condemns targeting children in armed conflict, and outlines a number of actions aimed at providing relief for children when conflicts break out, including *days of tranquillity

* so that relief supplies can be delivered. Concern for the rights of children during peace negotiations, and notes the impact of the proliferation of small arms on the security of refugees and children.

Contact: Karin Achtelstetter, Media Relations Officer

Tel: (+41.22) 791.61.53 Mobile: (+41) 79.284.52.12

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

Howard:

We are publishing this brief in our next issue. Is this the same program you participated in?

Dean

Russian citizens experience UM hospitality

HIGHLAND - Five Russian citizens spent a week with members of Mt. Zion UMC in August. The church responded to an appeal by the General Board of Global Ministries to find host families for the Library of Congress' U.S.-Russian Leadership Exchange. Nationwide, United Methodists hosted 1,000 of the 3,000 participating Russian political leaders and company executives. The program provided opportunities for United Methodists to "share and model their religious lives, and to extend the social witness of the Christian faith," said the Rev. Tom Connar, one of the hosts.

Mt. Zion host families planned a number of activities for their Russian guests including visits to schools, meetings with governmental leaders in Annapolis and Howard County, and a tour of Washington, D.C. Special worship and fellowship opportunities at Mt. Zion included a baseball game and an American cook out. "Hopefully, when the Russian visitors return to their country, they will have many positive observations and ideas of American political, religious, and cultural practices," Connar said.

At 04:51 PM 8/30/99 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard:

>We are publishing this brief in our next issue. Is this the same program you participated in?

>Dean

>

Dean:

Yes, it is.

Howard

This is the eGroups.com service.

You have been added to the bumc@egroups.com group
by the group's moderator: mingomae@aol.com

Here is a welcome message provided by mingomae@aol.com:

Welcome to WASHMOREFEET, a private e-mail list for family and friends of Bethesda United Methodist Church. This list is to provide quick information to it's subscribers about the life of BUMC. Please do not pass along chain letters; no spamming or flaming. Anyone posting inappropriate material will be deleted from this list. To UNSUBSCRIBE, send a message to mingomae@aol.com and type "unsubscribe" in the message body. To post a message to the entire group, send an e-mail to WASHMOREFEET@egroups.com. If you are responding or posting to an individual, please make sure their e-mail address is in the address box. Please send any questions to mingomae@aol.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:

mingomae@aol.com
bumc-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/bumc>

If you have questions about the group, please contact the group moderator at bumc-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>

US CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS - NATIONAL MEETING

TO: All activists who are working for the abolition of nuclear weapons and a positive peace and justice policy in the United States

FROM: The Facilitator's Group and Working Group Convenors of the US CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS (partial list depleted by August vacations, including but not limited to):

John Burroughs, Lawyer's Committee on Nuclear Policy, New York; Jackie Cabasso and Andy Lichterman, Western States Legal Foundation, California; Alan Haber, Peace and Environment Coalition for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons and Megiddo Peace Project, Michigan; Odile Haber, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, US Section; Jan Harwood, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, US Section and Abolition 2000 Coalition, Santa Cruz, California; Sally Light, Tri-Valley Communities Against a Radioactive Environment, California; Pamela Meidell, The Atomic Mirror, California; Bob Musil and Bob Tiller, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Washington, DC; Carah Ong, Abolition 2000 Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons; Esther Pank, Peace Links, Washington, DC; Richard Salvador, Pacific Island Association of NGOs, Hawaii; Susan Schaer, Women's Action for New Directions, Washington, DC; Alice Slater, Global Resource Action Center for the Environment, New York

WE CORDIALLY INVITE YOU to participate in a national meeting of the US CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS which will take place on October 9, 10 and 11, 1999, in Ann Arbor, Michigan in connection with a nuclear abolition teach-in and community forum at the University of Michigan. We also encourage you to come early and stay late for the teach-in and related community forum activities! (see below)

We are continuing to develop plans for a coordinated US campaign in furtherance of the MISSION STATEMENT and DECLARATION adopted at the February 1999 meeting of some 60 organizations in Santa Barbara, California, (see enclosed), and in recognition of the linkages between democracy, power and nuclear weapons. The campaign will utilize the working groups identified in Santa Barbara and resources provided by the cooperating organizations. A brief outline of the working groups is included. We encourage you to contact the convenors if you are interested in getting involved.

We hope that you and your organization will join us in this unified effort to eliminate nuclear weapons and build towards a more peaceful and just future. Please return the enclosed registration form right away! If you have questions or would like to offer proposals for the agenda or the campaign's structure or activities, or if you'd like to submit a working paper, please respond to Carah Ong by September 15, if possible. A follow-up mailing is planned, which will include a meeting agenda, proposals, and final teach-in schedule. (Carah's contact information can be found on the registration form.)

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN COMMUNITY FORUM/TEACH-IN

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1999

12:45 p.m. - Panel: Nuclear Proliferation Peace Science Society
Panelists: Russell Leng, Middlebury College; Mike Simon,
University
of Iowa
Moderator: J. David Singer, University of Michigan.

2:45 p.m.- Presentation: Chances of Accidental Nuclear Launch
Speaker: Bruce Blair, Brookings Institution

3:30 p.m. - Presentation: Environmental and Public Health Hazards of Nuclear
Weapons Production
Speaker: Arjun Makhijani, Institute for Energy & Environmental
Research

4:15 p.m.- Presentation: Serpent River First Nation People (tentative)

7:15 p.m.- Presentation: The Case Against Nuclear Weapons Abolition
Speaker: Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Hoover Institution at Stanford
University

8:15 p.m.- Presentation: The Need for International Agreements to Abolish
Nuclear Weapons.
Speaker: Merav Datan, International Physicians for the
Prevention of
Nuclear War

9:00 p.m.- Panel Discussion
Panelists: Blair, Makhijani, Bueno de Mesquita, and Datan

For information on the October 8 Community Forum:
www.nuclearabolition.research.umich.edu

US CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS - NATIONAL MEETING

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 9: 9 a.m. - meeting activities begin; meeting continues all
day. Agenda will include introductions, updates and reports, including
from the working groups, and reflections on the responses of the government
to questions from the community. The goal of the meeting is to lay the
foundation for and develop a national campaign for the abolition of nuclear
weapons. A full agenda will follow in a separate mailing. An informal
reception is scheduled in the evening at an historic building in downtown
Ann Arbor

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 10: meeting continues all day

MONDAY, OCTOBER 11/INDIGENOUS PEOPLE'S DAY: 2 p.m. - meeting ends
(afternoon activity may follow)

COMMUNITY FORUM WITH LYNN RIVERS

MONDAY, OCTOBER 11:

Forum on Nuclear Weapons - Monday evening October 11, 7-9 p.m. at the community college. This not part of our program but a separate event hosted by Representative Lynn Rivers. Questions about the Monday evening forum should be directed to Lynn Rivers office, (734) 485-3741; lynn.rivers@mail.house.gov

The local Peace and Environmental Coalition for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons is working to organize other events and activities prior to and during the weekend of October 8-10.

Beginning October 4, programs are projected to include the politics of abolition, the international abolition movement, nukes in space, stockpile stewardship, new weapons, weapons and energy, ethics, the environment, affected peoples, international law and terms of an abolition treaty, low level radiation, health questions, depleted uranium, Israel, the bomb and Mordechai Vanunu, India-Pakistan, Korea, Russia, NATO, new frontiers of peace research, the science of peace, and others. Many schools and departments of the University have been asked to host programs relevant to their areas of knowledge. A film and video program is also being planned. (Suggestions welcomed.) Opportunities will be sought for the various working groups of the US CAMPAIGN to 'report to the community' the state of thought and work on particular aspects of the nuclear question, such as direct action, civil society, and indigenous people's concerns. For further information and inquiries about participation, please contact Alan Haber, (734)761-7967, megiddo@umich.edu. A fuller schedule will be circulated in our follow up letter.

LODGING IN ANN ARBOR

HOTEL: A limited number of rooms have been reserved at the Hampton Inn at the rate of \$65 + tax per night, either single or double occupancy, including continental breakfast. A shuttle will provide transportation to and from the conference.

HOME STAYS: The local coalition is arranging home stays. Those who would like to stay as a guest in the home of an Ann Arbor peace activist should contact Shana Milkie by e-mail at smilkie@mich.com or by phone at 734-332-1106. E-mail is preferred.

A \$25 suggested minimum donation is requested to help cover material and location expenses, although no one will be turned away for inability to contribute to conference costs. Please include a check or money order with your registration form. Make your check payable to the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation or NAPF, and write "conference fee" on the memo line.

US CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS OCTOBER 9,10 and 11, 1999

MEETING REGISTRATION FORM

__ Yes, I plan to attend the meeting in Ann Arbor, Michigan. I have enclosed a check or money order for \$25 and my complete registration information is below.

--- Yes, I plan to attend the meeting in Ann Arbor and am enclosing an additional contribution of \$__ to help expand diversity at the meeting and defray additional meeting expenses.

--- No, I cannot attend the meeting, but enclosed is my contribution of \$__ for a successful meeting and campaign launch.

Name _____
Organization _____
Address _____
Phone _____
Email _____

__ Please reserve a room for me at the group rate of \$65.00 s/d at the Hampton Inn. I understand that there is limited availability at the group rate so I have provided my credit card number to reserve my room. I understand that there will be no charges to my credit card until I check into my room but there is a 72 hour cancellation policy, so I must send Carah Ong my cancellation notice at least three days prior to my scheduled arrival.

__ I would like to share a room with:
(name)_____.

__ Please help me find a room mate, if possible.

I plan to arrive on (date)_____ and leave on (date)_____. Please reserve my room for (number)_____ nights.

Credit Card (circle one): Visa Mastercard American Express Discover Diner's Card

Number_____

Expiration Date_____

Authorized Signature_____

__ I will contact Shana Milkie by E-mail atsmilkie@mich.com or by phone at (734)332 -1106 and let her know I am interested in a home stay arranged by the local coalition of Ann Arbor peace activists.

__ I will make my own arrangements for accommodations.

PLEASE RETURN THIS COMPLETED FORM, WITH YOUR VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTION, TO:

Carah Ong
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
1187 Coast Village Rd., Suite 1
Santa Barbara, California 93108
Phone 805-965-3443
Fax 805-568-0466
E- mail: A2000@silcom.com

US CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS

MISSION STATEMENT

To ensure a just, secure, healthy and sustainable world for our children, grandchildren, all future generations and all living things, we aim to educate public opinion and mobilize persistent popular pressure to move the United States government to take prompt and unequivocal actions to eliminate nuclear weapons.

These actions must include halting continued development of new and modified nuclear weapons, de-alerting nuclear forces, addressing the environmental degradation and human suffering arising from testing, production, deployment and use of nuclear weapons, and undertaking negotiations with other countries on a treaty for their elimination.

Our objective is nothing less than the universal, complete, verifiable, and enduring abolition of nuclear weapons.

SANTA BARBARA DECLARATION

From all corners of this land, representing diverse constituencies and traditions, including indigenous nations, we have come together in common cause, determined to end the threat to all life posed by nuclear weapons.

We recognize that nuclear weapons and the nuclear fuel cycle have caused widespread suffering, death and environmental devastation. We further recognize that resources used for nuclear arms need to be redirected to meeting human and environmental needs.

The United States bears special responsibility as the only country to use nuclear weapons in war. It continues to spend vast sums on its massive nuclear weapons complex, and its current policies would upgrade and maintain a huge nuclear arsenal far into the future.

The conference has initiated a campaign tailored to address the unique obstacles in the United States to achieving nuclear weapons abolition. Our campaign builds upon the foundations laid by Abolition 2000 and other efforts to abolish nuclear arms. We commit our hearts, our spirits, and our energy to achieving a world free of nuclear weapons and invite all people of

goodwill to join us.

-- Santa Barbara, February 14, 1999

WHY THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN?

STATEMENT BY ALAN HABER, US CAMPAIGN LIAISON TO THE MICHIGAN PEACE AND ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION FOR THE ABOLITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Our purpose in initiating and hosting this community forum, teach-in and national action meeting is to assert the relevance and urgency of public education and policy change on the nuclear question.

We seek to bring the full intellectual, and knowledge resources of the university and the community generally to the consideration of the nuclear question, especially the urgency to embrace a policy change, directed to the elimination of nuclear weapons, their removal from the world's arsenals, along with all other weapons of mass destruction, as well as adopting more affirmative peacemaking policies.

Leading work has gone on at the university in the study of peace and war, conflict resolution, and transformation, general systems theory, social organization, etc. an opportunity should be made available, in and of itself to showcase this work, and especially so in the context of considering changes in America's current strategic defense policies

The weapons side of the nuclear question is our first focus. Ultimately all aspects of the nuclear question are related. The University of Michigan is eminent in nuclear engineering; our previous president is a nuclear engineer. The post war idea of "atoms for peace" virtually began at the University of Michigan and continues in the Phoenix laboratories on north campus. This is an appropriate, knowledgeable environment in which to consider and debate the nuclear question.

Nuclear waste is a byproduct of nuclear weapons, as well as of nuclear energy. And how to deal with nuclear waste and clean it up is a matter of national debate and made especially urgent and relevant by the continuing concern about nuclear waste and leaky kegs by Lake Michigan, and the distressed, dangerous Fermi2 plant by Lake Erie, and also the citizen initiative for restoring the Great Lakes nuclear free zone embracing the whole great lakes area in which Michigan is central.

The first "teach-in" occurred at the University of Michigan, March 24, 1965, and spread the debate about foreign policy, then concerned with the Vietnam war, across the country's campuses, and then to Washington, to debate the government. The high government officials we sought to reach subsequently acknowledged in their memoirs and tapes that the questions, the inter-university committee for debate on foreign policy, as it had come to be called, were asking were the right questions and they, the government, should have faced them more honestly, and directly then.

We hope this occasion also will propel debate across the country, and a continuing interrogation of the government, on why it holds to a dangerous

destabilizing deterrence policy of nuclear and space age high tech weapons in violation of treaty obligations , common sense and common humanity. We believe the end of the cold war gives us a gift of time to get rid of these weapons, before they somehow or other, bring catastrophe. Holocaust still haunts the horizon.

The overwhelming leadership of the United States gives us opportunity here to turn the tide. America now is the main block to adopting a comprehensive convention for the elimination of nuclear weapons. We call on the United States government to take a leadership in the world campaign for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

US CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS WORKING GROUPS

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. 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.

*Convenor: Janet Michelle Cuevas (Promoting Enduring Peace, New York)
enduringpeace@email.msn.com

=====
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.

*Convenors: 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 US Congress. Examples include the pending Markey and Woolsey resolutions, aimed respectively at scaling back US 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.

*Convenors: 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.

*Convenor: Alan Haber (Michigan Coalition of Peace and Environmental Organizations) megiddo@umich.edu; (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.

*Convenor: 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.

*Convenor: 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.

*Convenors: Michele Xenos (Shundahai Network), shundahai@shundahai.org; (702)647-3095; Richard Salvador (Pacific Islands Association of NGOs) salvador@hawaii.edu; (818)956-8537

=====

NATO: This working group initially focused on the NATO 50th anniversary meeting in Washington, D.C. in April, 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.

*Convenors: to be determined

=====

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 theater and domestic ballistic missile deployments, and the stagnation of arms control negotiations, this working group will help the abolition campaign in the US remain aware of the effects US nuclear weapons and military policies have on efforts to achieve abolition in other nuclear weapons states and globally.

*Convenors: 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.

*Convenor: Joseph Gerson (American Friends Service Committee) 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.

*Convenors: 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.

*Convenor: 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.

*Convenor: 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.

*Temporary convenor: Carah Ong (Nuclear Age Peace Foundation),
A2000@silcom.com; (805) 965-3443

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.

Please forward this alert to other activists.

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

Don't let Jesse Helms
block the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty
that America wants!

Rally at the Capitol Building
September 14th • 1:00-2:00pm

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

For decades, responsible leaders in both parties have worked to extend President Kennedy's 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty with a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) to end nuclear weapons testing forever. Nations that have ratified the treaty will meet this October to plan its implementation. If the United States doesn't ratify now, it won't be allowed to participate.

Senator Jesse Helms has bottled up the CTBT in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, holding it hostage to his extreme agenda. Tell the U.S. Senate to stand up to him and let the Senate vote.

Join the Rally for a Nuclear Test Ban NOW!

September 14th
1:00–2:00pm
U.S. Capitol Building (Eastern center steps)
• Speakers from peace, environmental and religious groups
• Street theater

Nuclear Test Ban Now campaign endorsed by:
Church Women United • Disarmament Clearinghouse
Peace Action • Peace Action Education Fund
Peace Links • 20/20 Vision
Physicians for Social Responsibility
Women's Action for New Directions

For more information,
call Sheila Dormody
Peace Action Field Director
202.862.9740 x3006
1819 H Street NW #420
Washington DC 20006
www.peace-action.org

□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

□ □
□ Nuclear Test Ban Treaty NOW! □
□ □
□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□□

September 1, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: S. Andreasen (NSC) and M. Billingslea (Sen. Helms) debate test ban Sept. 1

I encourage those of you in the Washington area to attend an upcoming debate on the CTBT sponsored by the CATO Institute. The format will allow for questions from the audience, so it would be helpful to the cause for test ban proponents to attend in large numbers.

The event will be held in CATO's auditorium, but seating in the auditorium is limited and those who arrive early will have a better chance of getting a seat.

To register, see the information bulletin below.

CATO has not taken an institutional position on the issue, but it has published an anti-CTBT paper by Kathleen Bailey. That paper is available from <<http://www.cato.org>> and a point-by-point rebuttal by Chris Paine of NRDC is available at <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/nrdc299b.htm>>

DK

The Cato Institute invites you to a Policy Forum:
The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: Thumbs Up or Thumbs Down?

featuring
Steven P. Andreasen, National Security Council Staff
Marshall S. Billingslea, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Staff

The Clinton administration would like the U.S. Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty--an international treaty that prohibits all explosive tests of nuclear weapons. Sen. Jesse Helms of North Carolina, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, is holding up a vote on the treaty until the administration submits other international agreements for congressional scrutiny. Should a vote be allowed on the CTBT? Will U.S. ratification of the treaty help stop, or at least impede, the proliferation of nuclear weapons to nonnuclear states? Could the United States verify that other nations were not cheating? If the United States ratifies the CTBT, will its nuclear weapons remain safe, reliable, and militarily effective without testing? Our participants will debate the issue.

Thursday, September 16, 1999
11:00 a.m.
(Luncheon to follow)

To register, call Christie Raniszewski by noon, Wednesday, September 15, at (202) 789-5229, fax her at (202) 371-0841, or e-mail to christier@cato.org.

Cato Institute, 1000 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20001

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.crn.org>>

<x-rich>

The September Sunflower will be shipped in about 7 days. Meanwhile, please allow us to advertise our newest electronic product: The Nuclear Files @ <http://www.NuclearFiles.org> -- Explore the ethical and political challenges of the Nuclear Age.

Nuclear Files intends to become the ultimate research and reference site on nuclear matters (Hiroshima to Stockpile Stewardship). It currently contains 1,400+ pages, 600+ graphics, audio and video files, nuclear bookstore ... and more.

Why the Nuclear Files?

Although only a few college courses in the U.S. are specifically offered on topics of the Nuclear Age, interest in nuclear weapons and foreign policy has increased since the explosion of nuclear devices by India and Pakistan last year.

A number of websites contain information on nuclear issues, but they typically appeal to relatively narrow audiences such as grassroots peace activists or policy specialists. Some sites have collected treaties and presidential documents, while others chronicle a particular historical event or refer to nuclear information to promote a CD or book. Until now, there has been no single, comprehensive online source for easy-to-access information on the Nuclear Age.

Conceived as an online citizens' guide for all matters nuclear, NuclearFiles.org is designed also for use by educators and students. Teachers of international relations, international law and organization, foreign policy, and public policy will find the Nuclear Files a welcome and excellent enhancement to their courses. In Fall 1999, students in Boston, Schenectady, and Santa Barbara will use this online resource in their classes.

A Unique and Educational Resource

NuclearFiles.org goes well beyond a collection of links and documents for narrow audiences, probing the ethical and political implications of the Nuclear Age. To be sure, NuclearFiles.org provides access to the major nuclear-related websites and documents, but it also features:

- Several "journeys" guiding you through the politics and personalities behind key events of the nuclear age.
- Twenty-four subject areas, including nuclear weapons accidents, likelihood of an accidental nuclear war, predicaments of nuclear strategy and nuclear ethics, legal aspects, nuclear proliferation, and efforts to achieve arms control, disarmament, and nuclear weapons abolition.
- Basic information about nuclear science and in-depth information on all aspects of nuclear weapons, energy and waste, as well as quizzes to test your knowledge.
- A glossary of key concepts and acronyms.
- Access to information both chronologically and by issue area.
- Biographies of key scientists, politicians, and peace leaders.
- Data and graphs on current weapons deployment and stockpiles.

- Weapons laboratories, testing sites, waste processing and disposal facilities, and nuclear power plants.
- Photos of nuclear explosions and graphics on the resulting fallout throughout the United States.

About the Nuclear Files

The Nuclear Files project is directed by Dr. Christoph Hanterman, who has taught courses in International Relations, International Organization, American Foreign Policy and American Politics at both the University of California (Santa Barbara) and Ventura College.

NuclearFiles.org is a project of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation (www.napf.org), an international education and advocacy organization located in Santa Barbara, California. Sponsors include the W. Alton Jones Foundation and Project Plowshares (Canada).

The Nuclear Files / Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 1

Santa Barbara, California 93108-2794

phone: (805) 965-3443; fax: (805) 568-0466

e-mail: admin@nuclearfiles.org

This service has been sponsored by <http://www.xmission.com>

<color><param>0000,0000,ffff</param>
<bigger>*****

The Nuclear Files

-- Experiencing the Political and Ethical Challenges of the Nuclear Age

--

</bigger>*****

c/o Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Rd., Suite 1

Santa Barbara, CA 93108

Phone (805) 965-3443 * Fax (805) 568-0466

e- <mailto:admin@nuclearfiles.org>

URL <http://NuclearFiles.org/></color>

-

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.

</x-rich>

September 2, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Helms letter to editor; more pro-CTBT editorials

Senator Helms might learn a thing or two if he held a hearing on the CTBT.

Helms recently wrote a letter (attached below) to the editor in reply to a column in the Raleigh News and Observer (also below) that reports on the strong public support for Senate approval of the test ban in the state. Please note that, among other issues, Senator Helms is incorrect regarding:

* his assertion that the public supports "actions ... violating the CTBT in order to preserve the right of the U.S. to deploy its nuclear defense capability when necessary to protect the American people." Deployment of U.S. nuclear forces is not, in any way, limited by the CTBT.

* his claim that "the treaty plans to specify that all U.S. atomic secrets be kept on a series of supercomputers at one place" is patently false. The CTBT in no way specifies how the US is to maintain its arsenal without nuclear testing.

In addition, three more papers have recently editorialized in favor of the CTBT: Newsday; The Miami Herald; the Portland (ME) Press Herald; and the Casper Wyoming Star-Tribune. The Portland Press Herald editorial also calls for action towards nuclear weapons de-alerting. The Newsday and Miami Herald columns are attached below.

All of these and other CTBT-related editorials are available on the Coalition's Web Site at <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctedit.htm>>.

Also, the August 30 front-page article, "Democrats Ready for Fight to Save Test Ban Treaty," in The New York Times ran in several other newspapers this week including: The Dayton Daily News; Orange County Register; Commercial Appeal (Memphis); Portland (ME) Press Herald; Seattle Post-Intelligencer; Austin American Statesman; San Diego Tribune; and the Omaha World-Herald.

The recent editorials and coverage create an excellent opportunity for letter to the editors. For a sample letter, see <<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbtlte99.html>>

DK

Long Island Newsday
August 31, 1999
p. 32

For Safer World, U.S. Should OK Nuclear Test Ban

A Senate Republican plan to block consideration of a nuclear test-ban treaty unless the Clinton administration commits at the same time to build a national missile defense system could hamper, not help, the effort to control the spread of nuclear weapons. Congress should consider the two issues separately, allowing each to rise or fall on its own merits.

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty has been ratified by 152 nations. But if even one of 44 key nations - including the United States - refuses to sign, the treaty may never take effect. This country should not be the roadblock that stalls progress toward a worldwide ban on underground nuclear tests.

No test ban would mean one less brake on efforts by emerging nuclear powers such as India and Pakistan to develop ever more powerful nukes. Verifying that parties to the treaty play by the rules won't be easy. But even imperfect compliance would result in fewer tests and leave less-sophisticated weapons in the hands of other nations, assuring continued U.S. technical superiority and a safer world.

A treaty with that many pluses should not be shunned in deference to a pie-in-the-sky missile defense system that may never work.

Washington is already committed to spending \$10.5 billion to develop a missile defense, and Congress voted in the spring to deploy a system as soon as technologically possible. That could take a while: It's tough to intercept missiles hurtling through the vastness of space at 15,000 mph., and so far the Pentagon hasn't been able to pull it off reliably.

Besides, deploying such a system would violate the antiballistic missile treaty with Russia. Given time, it's likely that some accommodation can be reached with Moscow that would allow deployment of a limited missile-defense system, preserve the ABM treaty and smooth the way to agreement on further reducing the size of both nations' nuclear arsenals. But first things first: The United States should ratify the test-ban treaty, without entanglements.

Miami Herald
August 31, 1999

Wanted: U.S. Leadership On Arms Control

A safer world isn't a partisan issue. Scores of countries already have ratified the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty limiting the spread of nuclear weapons -- a goal no sane person can oppose. Yet the United States isn't among them. Why? For two years the treaty has fallen hostage to Clinton administration distraction and Republican politicking.

That mustn't continue. After months of dormancy, there's finally talk of passing the treaty. Fearing that the smoldering border war between India and Pakistan might heat up, President Clinton earlier this month warned that U.S. failure to ratify the treaty would encourage other nations to

develop weapons of mass destruction. This isn't an idle concern. Both India and Pakistan have tested nuclear weapons in recent years. In addition, China, North Korea and a host of other nations are furiously developing nuclear weapons.

Now President Clinton and Democratic senators promise a Senate fight if hearings for ratification are prolonged. You'd think that ratification should be a cinch: Nobody wants to live in a world where every nation -- no matter how stable -- has the ability to destroy life on earth as we know it.

But there are few cinches in Washington, D.C. With an eye on the 2000 elections, Democrats see treaty ratification as a giant club with which to pummel Republicans. Americans overwhelmingly support limiting nuclear weapons. Along with other issues such as abortion and gun control, Democrats hope to portray Republicans as a party of extremists who would destabilize the world, limit choice for women and sacrifice American lives to please special interests.

Republicans, on the other hand, also see the issue as a defining and differentiating political issue. Many insist that the United States should commit to building a credible defense against long-range missile attack before initialing the treaty. They say first, defend the homefront against the known capability of rogue nations that can do great harm with long-range missiles.

Given such distinct philosophical differences, it's easy to see how the nuclear-weapons treaty can be a set-piece for upcoming elections. For the moment, the treaty is tied up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, chaired by Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., who says he first wants to stop two other Clinton-backed treaties -- one on global warming, the other an antiballistic-missiles treaty.

But America's political leaders owe the world, and themselves, more than another partisan fistfight. As the world's only superpower and with a frightening arsenal of more than 6,000 nuclear weapons, the United States' credibility is on the line.

America cannot expect to dissuade other nations from joining the nuclear-arms race without first demonstrating its commitment to stop nuclear tests and reducing its nuclear stockpile. Already India and Pakistan, by continuing their nuclear buildup despite U.S. cajoling, and indeed in boasting about their new-found nuclear capacity, are proof that U.S. words, unless backed with deeds, are meaningless.

Ratification of the test-ban treaty is long overdue and too important to be held hostage to bickering. Though he now wants to push the issue, Mr. Clinton also shares blame for the delay. He didn't push ratification soon enough or forcefully enough.

Treaty supporters include the Pentagon, top scientists, arms-control experts and, indeed, some of the leading politicians in both parties. The only question is whether America's politicians can overcome partisanship and demonstrate true leadership.

The News & Observer
Thursday, August 26, 1999

"Safety of citizens first"

U.S. Sen. Sam Ervin always chuckled when he quoted Will Rogers' declaration that the United States had nerve lost a war or won a treaty.

I was reminded of that when I read your Aug. 21 "Under the Dome" citing a July poll indicating "strong support" for the CTBT (Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty).

I do not question the accuracy of this poll, but it does need to be made clear that the majority of those "indicating" support for CTBT also strongly support actions by our government violating the CTBT in order to preserve the right of its nuclear defense capability when necessary to protect the American people.

Moreover, the CTBT will make it even more difficult to protect against countries such as China because, among other problems, the treaty plans to specify that all U.S. atomic secrets be kept on a series of supercomputers at one place.

The Dome piece stated that "President Clinton sent [the CTBT] to the Senate in October 1997, but Helms, who has bottled it up," etc.

It is Clinton who has been holding hostage for more than two years various treaties--including the ABM Treaty against intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Clinton made a legally binding commitment on May 14, 1997 that he would send to the Senate essential revisions to the ABM treaty. he also has failed to send the important Kyoto Climate change convention to the Senate. (I have personally discussed this matter with the president on a number of occasions and have concluded that his advisers have in mind the outrageous notion that Clinton can ignore the Constitution and implement certain treaties without the consent of the Senate.)

I have made clear that if Clinton will simply keep his word and send the ABM Treaty and the Kyoto Climate Change Treaty to the Senate I will immediately schedule hearings on both of them and, in due course, hearings on the CTBT.

I believe that when the Senate begins consideration of all of these treaties the American people will be aghast that the President has not heretofore sent to the Senate all of the treaties identified above.

Regardless of any poll, I shall never allow our country's right to protect the American people to be diminished by presidential politics or poll taking.

JESSE HELMS
U.S. Senate

Washington

The 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 affect unless the United States signs it, and -- per the Constitution -- the United States cannot sign it without Senate ratification.

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>>

THE SUNFLOWER

Sender: owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com

Precedence: bulk

Reply-To: sunflower-napf

ISSUE NO. 28, September 1999

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

The Sunflower is a free, monthly e-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

=====

PROLIFERATION

India Outlines "Credible" Minimum Deterrence Plan

NON-PROLIFERATION

Nunn-Lugar Funding

PROTEST

Nanoose Legal Wrangle Continues In Court

South Africa Province Says "Stay Away" To Nuclear Shipments of MOX Fuel Pellets

Arrests Of UK Trident Protesters Totals Nearly A Hundred, Many Elderly

Excessive Uranium Found In Worker's Bones Who Protested

Jesse Jackson Wants Navy Out of Vieques

Numerous Worldwide Hiroshima Day Protests During August

NUCLEAR WASTE CLEANUP

How Much Is Too Much? Officials Argue While Uranium Leaks

CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY

Bosnian Serb General Arrested For Kosovo Ethnic Cleansing

EVENTS

RESOURCES

=====

PROLIFERATION

=====

India Outlines "Credible" Minimum Deterrence Plan

India has declared its intent to build a nuclear arsenal for rapid response and punitive retaliation. During August, India outlined its draft nuclear policy in a report from its National Security Board. The draft policy declares that "command and control shall be organised for very high survivability against surprise attacks and for rapid punitive response."

The doctrine was aimed at convincing a potential aggressor that "any nuclear attack on India and its forces shall result in punitive retaliation with nuclear weapons to inflict damage unacceptable to the aggressor." The Prime Minister of India has the authority to release nuclear weapons according to the draft policy.

Brajesh Mishra, national security adviser to Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee, told reporters that the doctrine would have to be approved by the new government that will take power after elections are completed in October, adding that the draft was being made public now to encourage debate. (Reuters, Aug. 18 & 19, 1999; Washington Post Aug. 18, 1999. For full text of the draft India nuclear policy, go to http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/CTBT/nuclear_doctrine_aug_17_1999.html)

=====
NON-PROLIFERATION
=====

Nunn-Lugar Funding

The Nunn-Lugar provision of the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (known as the Defense 2000 bill) allocates \$475.1 million for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (CTR) to assist Russia and former Soviet Republics in safeguarding and eliminating their stockpiles of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and related technologies. It is likely that the Ballistic Missile Defense program (BMDO) will receive more than its \$4.5 billion funding request from the White House. The question arises as to which is more cost-effective: the \$4.5 billion for a poorly developed and dangerously provocative missile defense program which gives only an illusion of protection, or 10 percent of that figure -- \$475 million - to help control and dismantle Russia's nuclear arsenal? (CNN Aug. 19, 1999; Washington Post, Aug. 25, 1999; Baltimore Sun, July 20, 1999)

=====
PROTEST
=====

Nanoose Legal Wrangle Continues In Court

Two lawsuits to stop the threatened expropriation of the Nanoose Bay weapons test range by the Canadian federal government have already been filed by non-governmental organizations, as well as by Nanoose First Nation, indigenous peoples of the area. Ottawa is attempting to expropriate the seabed for use in war games and torpedo testing by Canadian and US Navy submarines. The US submarines could carry nuclear weapons; and British Columbia is a nuclear-weapons free province. The Society Promoting Environmental Conservation (SPEC) plans to file a motion in the Federal Court of Canada. Acting for SPEC, Victoria lawyer Andrew Gage argues that the federal government's handling of the Expropriation Act process, and hearings conducted by retired BC Justice D.M. Goldie contained numerous procedural errors, failures, irregularities and violations of the Expropriation Act. Gage also cites constitutional grounds for dismissing

the federal government's first ever hostile takeover of BC owned property.
For more information go to <http://www.spec.bc.ca>; and
http://www.user.dccnet.com/lagasse/Nuclear_Free_Georgia_Strait/nanoose.html)

South African Province Says "Stay Away" To Nuclear Shipments Of MOX Fuel Pellets

South Africa's Western Cape Province asked two armed nuclear transport ships, the Pacific Teal and the Pacific Pintail on their way from France to Japan carrying highly toxic MOX nuclear fuel pellets, to keep more than 200 miles off the South African coast as the ships round the Cape of Good Hope. Ten shipments a year of weapons-usable plutonium fuel are expected to travel from Europe to Japan. South Africa only has the right to force the ships to keep out of its 12 mile territorial waters. Weather did keep the ships outside the 200 mile zone this time. The province wants the shipments to end. Regional Environment Minister Glen Adams stated that "Because the shipments are expected to continue for the foreseeable future, the risk incurred at no benefit to us will be a recurring risk... [a risk] that our province does not want to carry." He said that the shippers failed to obtain the prior consent necessary for the shipment of hazardous cargoes and had not carried out a detailed assessment of the environmental consequences of one of the ships sinking. (Reuters, Aug. 13, 1999) For more MOX info go to the Nuclear Information and Resource Service (NIRS) MOX webpage at <http://www.nirs.org/moxtritium/moxtrit.htm>

Arrests of UK Trident Protesters Nearly A Hundred - Many Are Elderly

Activists from the Trident Ploughshares 2000 disarmament camp at Coulport have pledged to rid the UK of its illegal weapons of mass destruction in a non-violent manner. The UK nuclear weapons arsenal is based on Trident submarines. Each sub carries enough nuclear-armed missiles to destroy our planet. Peter Lanyon, 67, a retired teacher from Leiston in Suffolk was among a group of 8 arrested August 17th and charged with malicious mischief. He explained, "The Trident system, every bit of it, must be exposed for the ugly and malicious thing that it is. That is what we were up to last night." The protesters had painted peace messages on the exterior of a building and on the tarmac of the nuclear weapons submarine testing station at Cove on Lock Long, Scotland, such as "Trident Is Illegal" and "Nuremberg 4" referring to the Nuremberg Principle which states "The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him." For all the Nuremberg Principles go to <http://www.worldcitizen.org/ref/nurem.html> or order the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation Waging Peace Series Booklet #21 titled "Earth Citizenship." For more information on the Trident Ploughshares protest go to <http://www.gn.apc.org/tp2000/>. For sub info go to <http://www.brook.edu/FP/projects/nucwest/trident.htm> or <http://www.subasekb.navy.mip/trident.htm>

=====
"We were hoping to get inside the base and disarm a Trident submarine, if

at all possible. This kind of direct action is necessary to bring to public attention the existence of these hideous weapons of mass destruction."

Kirsty Gathergood, Trident Ploughshares activist in Scotland

=====

Excessive Uranium Found In Worker's Bones Who Protested

"We turned the badges in and that was the last we heard of it," said Al Puckett, a retired union shop steward who worked at the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Kentucky, "No one ever said anything to us." The Paducah plant supplied radioactive fuel for nuclear bombs. Now long-overlooked medical evidence shows that for some workers radiation doses were far higher than previously believed and may have been dozens of times above the federal limits. The exhumed bones of uranium worker Joseph Harding, who died in 1980, offers the strongest corroboration to date of hazardous conditions inside the plant, where workers labored for decades in a haze of radioactive dust that was sometimes laced with plutonium.

DOE Secretary Bill Richardson called Harding a "hero of the Cold War," but for nine years before his death, Harding's claims of radiation exposure were vigorously challenged by contractors (at that time, Union Carbide, Martin Marietta, and Lockheed Martin) and DOE officials who insisted that the plant was safe. Before his death, Harding developed stomach cancer, lung perforations, and growths on his limbs. Harding had insisted that the plant always had a dense fog of uranium dust and smoke that would cling to workers' skin and coat their throats and teeth. A DOE study in 1981 attributed Harding's death to a combination of smoking and eating country ham. A new study is also tracking death rates among workers at the K-25 plant in Oak Ridge where there is an unusually high rate of lung and bone cancer among workers, as well as a third facility in Ohio. DOE admits it is now clear that uranium workers were not properly protected until at least 1990. "This reaffirms our decision to get out of the business of fighting sick workers," said David Michaels, DOE Assistant Secretary for EHS on Aug. 20. "Right now we should be bending over backward to help those workers." (Washington Post, Aug. 22, 1999. For more radiation victim information go to <http://www.downwinders.org>)

Jesse Jackson Wants Navy Out of Vieques

The Rev. Jesse Jackson pledged to make an election issue of the U.S. Navy's use of Vieques, a Puerto Rican island, for military maneuvers. Jackson said that he would he will urge President Clinton to "end the madness of bombing in Vieques...What's happening in Vieques is un-American. It is undemocratic. When the Navy leaves Vieques and the shells and the land mines have been cleaned-up, then the American Dream will have been extended," said Jackson, a former presidential candidate who heads the Rainbow/PUSH Coalition. "It is a particularly important issue for the Puerto Rican community, the larger Hispanic community and every other community that has been marginalized," Jackson said. Puerto Ricans have united in protest against the Navy since security guard David Sanes Rodriguez was killed in an April 19 bombing accident. They want the Navy to stop military maneuvers and return the two-thirds of Vieques it controls. A

report by a panel appointed by Puerto Rico Governor Rossello also found that Navy activities stifle economic development on the 33,000-acre island, harm its environment, and violate the civil rights of its 9,300 residents. President Clinton has appointed a panel to consider the dispute. (Reuters, CNN, Aug. 18, 1999)

Numerous Worldwide Hiroshima Day Protests During August

There were 66 arrests in the crowd of 300 at the Nagasaki Day protest August 9th at the Los Alamos Scientific Lab (LASL) in New Mexico. LASL manufactures plutonium pits for the core of nuclear bombs. One of those arrested, actor Martin Sheen stated, "I'm quite certain that if Robert Oppenheimer were alive today, he would be leading this march." There were hundreds of other protests worldwide to commemorate the bombings of the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In his written message to the Australian Peace Committee demonstration in Adelaide, Iccho Itoh, the Mayor of Nagasaki, wrote that "The citizens of Nagasaki have appealed relentlessly for the abolition of nuclear weapons and for the realisation of lasting world peace to ensure that this tragedy is never repeated on Earth. However, the world situation regarding nuclear weapons is very serious as exemplified by the increasing of the threat of nuclear proliferation. The time has surely come for the people of the world to join together, strictly abiding by the rules of the United Nations Charter, in striving to make the 21st Century free of nuclear weapons and to create an international society in which children can live in peace and security." (Santa Fe New Mexican, August 10, 1999; Australian Peace Committee/Friends of the Earth)

=====
NUCLEAR WASTE CLEANUP
=====

How Much Is Too Much? Officials Argue While Uranium Leaks

"There is nothing like radioactive material in their drinking water to make the public upset," explains Mark Buehler, a Moab, Utah district water quality director. He is referring to a huge pile of uranium mill tailings 750 feet away from the Colorado River at Moab. That's 10.5 million tons of radioactive and toxic waste left over from 20 years of uranium processing by the now-bankrupt Atlas Corporation, which ceased operations during 1984. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and Utah officials are arguing about how much uranium -- a lot or an awful lot -- is leaking into both groundwater and the river. The Colorado River supplies drinking water for 25 million people. Estimates set the cost at over \$100 million to move the waste pile to a plateau 18 miles away. Water treatment plants downstream cannot remove the uranium, which has been proven to cause cancer. Even if the pile is removed, toxic groundwater from under the waste pile will continue flowing into the Colorado River. The NRC has approved the Atlas plans to cover the pile with clay and rock. Utah representatives have introduced parallel bills in the House to force the federal government to excavate and move the waste. Joe Holonich of the NRC said that Lake Meade, along the river's course, is big enough to dilute the radioactive water. He claims that the leaking mill tailings adds "a sliver of uranium to a large

amount of uranium that's already in the river from upstream" uranium deposits and abandoned mines. [Associated Press, July 31, 1999]

=====
CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY
=====

Bosnian Serb General Arrested For Kosovo Ethnic Cleansing

General Momir Talic, chief of staff of the Bosnian Serb military forces, was arrested by plainclothes police on the morning of August 25th in Vienna while he attended a conference fostering greater cooperation between the Bosnian Serbs and the Muslim-Croat Federation. He did not resist and was flown to The Hague to await trial. The Special Prosecutor for the UN War Crimes Tribunal, Louise Arbour, had issued a sealed indictment against the general accusing him of being a member of a Bosnian Serb "crisis staff" set up in 1992 to plan and carry out mass purges or "ethnic cleansing" of 100,000 Muslims, Croats, and other non-Serbs in areas of northwestern Bosnia.

Talic, along with Bosnian Serb Deputy Prime Minister Radislav Brdjanin was charged with having committed crimes against humanity, namely persecutions on political, racial, or religious grounds. Bosnia's Muslim-Croat Commission for Missing Persons has discovered concentration camps and mass graves in areas controlled by Talic and his command unit. Another Bosnian Serb commander, General Ratko Mladic, is also being sought by the UN War Crimes Tribunal on charges of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes. Leading figures still at large who have been indicted include Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic and former Bosnian Serb leader Radovan Karadzic. (Los Angeles Times, Associated Press, Aug. 26, 1999)

=====
"It is not possible to awaken someone who is pretending to be asleep."
Navajo proverb
=====

=====
EVENTS
=====

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

Sept. 13-15: Star Wars International Call-In Days. Call or fax the White House, Congress, US Embassy offices and demand an end to funding and testing the Ballistic Missile Defense system which will heighten a nuclear arms race rather than promote disarmament. Lost that phone number? Locate your US representative at the Physicians for Social Responsibility website, <http://congress.nw.dc.us/physicians/congdir.html>

Sept. 14: International Day of Peace and launch date for the UN commemoration of the Year 2000 as the International Year for a Culture of

Peace. Seek ways to build a culture of peace in your life and in your community. On this day each year individuals in countries all over the world spend a minute in silence at noon in their time zone to support the UN in its mission of world peace. We The Peoples initiative invites you also to join in a minute of meditative focus at noon. See <http://www.pathwaystopeace.org>

Sept. 16-22: Globalize This! Action Camp near Seattle. Co-sponsored by the Rainforest Action Network and The Ruckus Society. Details at <http://www.ruckus.org>. Call 510.848.9565

Sept. 18: Peace Day Celebration with theme "Building Cultures of Peace" at Meditation Mount in Ojai, California. Avon Mattison of Pathways To Peace will be keynote speaker. For more information go to <http://www.meditation.com> or phone (805)646-508.

Sept. 20: Y2K World Systems Forum in Berlin. Dr. Helen Caldicott is keynote speaker. Contact Xanthe Hall by e-mail at ippnw@oln.comlink.apc.org

Sept. 29: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation 1999 World Citizenship Award honoring Daisaku Ikeda. Los Angeles.

Oct. 1-6: State of the World Forum, San Francisco. For information go to <http://www.worldforum.org>

Oct. 9-11: US Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons National Meeting and campaign launch in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Teach-ins will precede the meeting Oct. 4-9. Object is to mobilize the grassroots and interject the nuclear question into the public and political arena.

Oct. 9-10: French Mouvement de la Paix campaign for a moratorium on nuclear lab testing and modernization of nuclear weapons. Demonstration on Oct. 9 at the Barp near Bordeaux; and on Oct. 10 at l'Ile Longue to include a rally and a seminar with admirals and generals from various countries who support nuclear weapons abolition.

October 10-15: The 1999 Seoul International Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). 5,000 participants are expected to discuss "The role of NGOs in the 21st Century: Inspire, empower, and Act!" Nobel Laureate and President of Green Cross International Mikhail Gorbachev and Former President of Ireland Mary Robinson will join the conference. The Seoul website for the conference is <http://www.ngo99korea.org>

Oct. 21-24: The 12th Annual Conference of Concerned Philosophers for Peace. Topic is "Peace and Global Issues." At Radford University, Radford Virginia. For more info call (540)831-5213, Dr. Glen Martin.

Oct. 22-24: The 2nd Annual Conference of Men's International Peace Exchange (MIPE) with this year's theme, "Changing a Culture: Moving from Violence to Peace." Contact (610)872-8178.

Oct. 23: Fourth Annual Worldwide Action Day to support full funding of the UN. Organized by the NGO Millennium Forum at the UN. Call your representative and urge Congress to pay up. Go to the Global Policy Forum

at <http://www.globalpolicy.org>

Oct. 24: United Nations Day

Nov. 9: Anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, and what future historians may consider as the beginning of a culture of peace.

Nov. 27-Dec. 3: Abolition 2000 Working Group on Corporate Issues will sponsor a forum at the World Trade Organization's ministerial meeting in Seattle

Mark your calendars for April 2000. The Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference will be held at the UN in New York and is scheduled to last four weeks, from April 24 through May 19, 2000.

=====
RESOURCES
=====

Buying books from amazon.com? To order, go to <http://www.nuclearfiles.org> and click on amazon.com to support our encyclopedic compendium of the Nuclear Age. Nuclear files is a great resource for easy-to-access facts on nuclear matters. Bookmark it!

High School Seniors: two great things that your graduating class can leave for the community as the Senior Class Gift. Ask your mayor or governor make a proclamation declaring January 1, 2000 as One Day In Peace (go to One Day In Peace Campaign <http://www.worldpeace2000.org/letters>). Get signatures on the Abolition 2000 petition and have your community can join other municipalities throughout the world in the movement to eliminate all nuclear weapons (go to <http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition2000>)

Mordechai Vanunu, nuclear whistle-blower and prisoner of conscience can receive letters of encouragement, although the prison censors some of his mail. Write a letter of support to him at: Mordechai Vanunu, Ashkelon Prison, Ashkelon, Israel. Ask your US Senator to take the lead in initiating a joint Senate letter asking President Clinton to urge Israel to release him on humanitarian grounds. Vanunu has served 11-1/2 years in solitary confinement, and was released into the prison population in March 1998 to serve the remaining 6-1/2 years of his sentence for revealing Israel's nuclear weapons program. For more information go to Amnesty International at <http://www.amnesty.org>.

"...a new global order in which human concerns come first and nuclear weapons have no place." That's from the essay titled "Lobbying For Nuclear Disarmament" in the book Peace Is Possible, written by New Zealand nuclear activist Alyn Ware. For information on to order the book, go to The International Peace Bureau website at <http://www.ipb.org>.

Need to read the full text of the Start II Treaty again? That treaty and all other nuclear disarmament treaties can be found at <http://www.nuclearfiles.org>. This site is a project of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation with support from the W. Alton Jones Foundation and Project Ploughshares.

The Rural Alliance for Military Accountability (RAMA) supports, educates, and helps rural communities who are organizing to correct the problems caused by the U.S. military and DOE weapons complex activities. View their website at <http://www.rama-usa.org>

The Hiroshima Peace Institute publishes a non-proliferation and disarmament research newsletter which is available on their website, <http://serv.peace.hiroshima-cu.ac.jp/> and click on "English version." The newsletter contains updates on the effort to make Central Asia a nuclear-weapon-free zone at the Sapporo meeting in October 1999.

A "webquest" created by a teacher in Pakistan challenges students to deal with looming nuclear war by seeking solutions to resolve deeply rooted political problems and ensure a lasting peace. It is called "Quest for Peace & Diplomacy: A Webquest on the Pakistan-India Conflict." Try a webquest - it's creative and inspiring --- by going to <http://www.angelfire.com/wy/peacequest> .

Look for "A Case Against Virtual Nuclear Testing" by Christopher E. Paine in the Sept. 1999 issue of Scientific American magazine, pp. 74-79. Article summary: The DOE stockpile stewardship program aims to keep the US nuclear arsenal intact while replacing actual underground weapons tests with supercomputer simulations, but the technical goals of the program might contribute to a new arms race.

=====
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.

FYI re BOUNCE mail and related List problems.

Many sources of information are available now including Ike Jeans longstanding nuclear news facility <http://www.nukefix.org/link.html#news>, Ellen Thomas' useful <http://prop1.org/nucnews/links.htm> and try www.newsindex.com for newspapers.

Some nuclear and other WMD concerns in recent crises added to this list activity as a measure of international concern. Should WMDs be included or excluded from abolition-caucus? Far more people died in recent reality from light weapons, economic sanctions and other WMDs, than from nuclear bombs.

Is it timely to review all A2000 communications and revise (or create) policies?

Feedback and opinion is appreciated to owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

abolition-caucus -- content, relevance and BOUNCE messages

Some people and organizations habitually want to advertise their own mail but do not want to read the customary list mail - this seems like cheating! Others send infrequent messages for their own reasons as and when necessary. Much BOUNCE mail is irrelevant to stated List purposes (supporting the Abolition Statement) or may be relevant locally but not internationally. Some people appear to have unsubscribed alternate addresses - and apparently forget.

Occasionally important mail is sent by members as an attachment that makes the message too long. All abolition-caucus mail should be sent as text - the most economical way - and also avoids macro virus risks.

There is no tidy way to forward bounce mail short of making new messages. This is done infrequently. The only way of being sure of delivering messages to this unmoderated list is to join it.

Excess messages and irrelevant content impair good communication. It has not been necessary to exclude people from the list for such reasons, but public and private comments by members have helped to keep order and focus on this list.

The List membership is spared irrelevant bounce messages but a perfect procedure seems impossible.

These items were sent to abolition-caucus in the last 2 weeks by non-members on the topics:

=?iso-8859-1?q?martha lopez-cabrera?= <mcplc@yahoo.com> on freedom "Fractura de Radio" <fra.rr@teleline.es> address announcement
Khaled Elgindy <kelgindy@arab-aa.org> Arab American Institute Countdown to 2000
Drew W Hempel <hemp0027@tc.umn.edu> The Religion of Technology-Sons of Adam
"Ruth Lopez" <pardners@ctaz.com> Re: Price of Health on the Lower Colorado River
sustainrwf@esva.net NEW SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT NEWSLETTER

"Ruth Lopez" <pardners@ctaz.com> Newspaper reports "untold" sewage spill.
"Ruth Lopez" <pardners@ctaz.com> Lake Havasu City Beware Needles' Best Kept Secret
"Ruth Lopez" <pardners@ctaz.com> Needles' Best Kept Secret
bnd@omslag.antenna.nl The Next International Buy Nothing Day
"International Peace Bureau (IPB)" <mailbox@ipb.org> INVITATION: INT'L SEMINAR ON POST-KOSOVO, 17-18 SEPT (forwarded)
Khaled Elgindy <kelgindy@arab-aa.org> AP: Iraq delegation
"Environment News Service (ENS)" <ENS-NEWS@PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM> News Report sent regularly but rarely contains information relevant to A2000 .
Nichigu Asangha <nichigu-asangha1@ma.newweb.ne.jp> Bojakuan Home Page URL correction please <http://www.asahi-net.or.jp/~qf2k-stu/>
"Fredrik S. Heffermehl" <fredpax@online.no> Zia Mian on India/Pakistan nuclear madness - Message too long due to an attachment
"Environment News Service (ENS)" <ENS-NEWS@PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM> (ENS) NEWS SEPTEMBER 3, 1999
"Environment News Service (ENS)" <ENS-NEWS@PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM> (ENS) NEWS SEPTEMBER 2, 1999
"Environment News Service (ENS)" <ENS-NEWS@PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM> (ENS) NEWS SEPTEMBER 1, 1999
"Environment News Service (ENS)" <ENS-NEWS@PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM> (ENS) NEWS AUGUST 31, 1999
"Environment News Service (ENS)" <ENS-NEWS@PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM> (ENS) NEWS AUGUST 30, 1999
WISE-Paris <WISE-Paris@globenet.org> Plutonium-Investigation - URLs of recent postings on www.pu-investigation.org, the WISE-Paris' web site
Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org> news: will India join CTBT?; CTBT conference dates; good op-ed
smirnowb@ix.netcom.com BACK UP GENERATORS AT NUKE PLANTS SUSCEPTIBLE TO Y2K & NOT ENOUGH FUEL!
Andrew.Bacelis@directory.Reed.EDU (Andrew Bacelis) DESIGNATION OF SERBIA AS A TERRORIST STATE
Jennifer Olaranna Viereck <heal@kay-net.com> Schedule: Fall HGW Gathering at Nevada Test Site
IPPNW@OLN.comlink.apc.org (IPPNW Int Aerzte gg Atomkrieg) First Announcement Y2K WASH Forum, Berlin
"Environment News Service (ENS)" <ENS-NEWS@PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM> (ENS) NEWS AUGUST 27, 1999
"Environment News Service (ENS)" <ENS-NEWS@PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM> (ENS) NEWS AUGUST 26, 1999
"Environment News Service (ENS)" <ENS-NEWS@PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM> (ENS) NEWS AUGUST 25, 1999 "Anuvrat vishwa Bharti" <anuvibha@datainfosys.net>
IVICPNA-INVITATION
Martin Kalinowski <dh3m@hrzpub.tu-darmstadt.DE> Re: Austrian constitution - forwarded
Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org> US/Russia n-arms talks - forwarded
smirnowb@ix.netcom.com New Space Policy Defines Acts of War, Military Astronauts
"Environment News Service (ENS)" <ENS-NEWS@PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM> (ENS) NEWS AUGUST 23, 1999
"Environment News Service (ENS)" <ENS-NEWS@PEACH.EASE.LSOFT.COM> (ENS) NEWS AUGUST 20, 1999
Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>] news: reactions to draft India n-doctrine

At 12:54 AM 9/6/99 -0400, you wrote:

>FYI re BOUNCE mail and related List problems.

>

>Many sources of information are available now including Ike Jeans

>longstanding nuclear news facility <http://www.nukefix.org/link.html#news>,

>Ellen Thomas' useful <http://prop1.org/nucnews/links.htm> and try

>www.newsindex.com for newspapers.

>

>Some nuclear and other WMD concerns in recent crises added to this list

>activity as a measure of international concern. Should WMDs be included or

>excluded from abolition-caucus? Far more people died in recent reality from

>light weapons, economic sanctions and other WMDs, than from nuclear bombs.

>

>Is it timely to review all A2000 communications and revise (or create)

>policies?

>

>Feedback and opinion is appreciated to owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

>

Dear Ross,

If I understand your communication, you supplied a list of "bounce" items you turned down. Thank you. If I had received all of those, it would be the final straw to take me out of abolition-caucus list serve. As it is, I have a number of senders and marginal subjects filtered to go directly to trash. I glance at trash to be sure there is nothing I want to read (rarely is), so I don't have to do a lot of individual clicking.

On the broader question, I believe we should stick to nuclear weapons and not take up other weapon systems. On the nuclear front we should concentrate on nuclear weapons and not every other issue that has nuclear in it. I realize that a considerable number of our members deal with nuclear power, so I expect that subject to be covered. However, I believe radioactive food strays far from our core concern.

Thanks for managing the list.

Howard Hallman

<x-html><HTML>

Friends,

<P>As discussed among ourselves frequently in the past 2 years and as detailed in several e-mails, relating our vision of a nuclear weapon free world to the public is of paramount importance today. We had many successful events in this regard in the past, culminating in symphony concerts, postcard campaigns and most recently the NO NUKES campaign, initiated by Mary Wynne Ashford in Canada. Its Video has been selected for screening and presentation at a German Film Festival.

<P>We have tried also in Switzerland and Germany, to put emphasis on the need for good PR. We have been particularly impressed by the
sympathy we received by one excellent PR Company in Basel. They not only indicated, that our vision of high moral value would be shared by most people, but also that many PR Companies and Communications specialist would be happy to give us their creativity free of charge, for a shared vision of a nuclear weapon free world. To prove this, they volutarily launched a creativity campaign under the name "Let the sun shine not the Earth - Doctors against nuclear weapons". They invited worldwide approximately 40 Companies in 4 of the 5 nuclear weaponstates, and 6 other key countries, to participate in this campaign. The goal was to find the most original and clever PR Campaign for IPPNW. It was then, when among others HEAT DESIGN London entered this competition, launched by our 2 European affiliates. HEAT suggested we use Brand Marketing for our goal of Aboliton.- The results were presented in Melbourne.- Meanwhile the NO NUKES Campaign undoubtedly made progress and IS very successful in reaching people and attracting VIPs to join our ranks.

<P>The question nowadays is in our opinion:

<P>1. Have we already or would we gladly accept the help of true specialists in communication to enhance further the NO NUKES Campaign?

2. Would a company as HEAT Design in London be able to do this job? Who would decide on this issue? MEDACT and the NO NUKES people??

3. Would HEAT be willing to help our global federation to improve and expand the NO NUKES Campaign and do this for very little money but a high degree of international recognition?

4. Would we want to include brand Marketing into our campagin, i.e. into the NO NUKES Campaign? (Brand Marketing was proposed by HEAT DESIGN)

5. How would we find and decide on the global corporation, willing to share our vision and allowing us to do Brand Marketing (a la mode du BODY SHOP e.g....).

6. And lastly: How do we integrate and streamline PR Efforts by IPPNW with those of the Abolition Caucus. Do we
go on to fight for the same vision, but allow ourselves to have different communications channels / logos / Campaigns??

<P>I will not be able to come to Board Meeting, unfortunately, but I think is not necessary anyway. The questions raised above can be commented upon by anybody interested and responded by HEAT London, the NO NUKES Campaign, Abolition 2000 and IPPNW. Furthermore, MEDACT I guess is already planning to meet the HEAT people. What should be discussed among IPPNW, IALANA,

the IPB and the Aboliton Steering people is the need to have a COMMON PR CAMPAIGN, to further improve the efforts of the many people fighting for Abolition 2000.

I consider it a waste of the time and heartblood of many people, campaigning for a nuclear weapons free world, if we enhance these effort by mediocre PR at the best. I am sure, as IPPNW we WILL find the people with creativity to help us and nowadays we WILL find the company eager to help us out of moral concern and maybe for a higher profile. It is in my Opinion NOT so much a question of money to BUY good PR, but finding the right communications people able to help us in the field where THEY are specialists.... e.g. the people at HEAT DESIGN.

Anyway, I consider the preceding mail by MaryWynne as important and thank her for giving the background to the NO NUKES Campaign and its status and the relation to Aboliton 2000. I do hope, that new proposals will come out of the Board meeting.

Andi Nidecker, Basel / Switzerland

mashford@uvic.ca wrote:

Dear Tiago,

Thank you for pulling together the strands of the Abolition 2000

logo issue. You have raised questions that have not been clarified in

IPPNW, and clearly must be resolved. We have a Board meeting Oct. 1,2,3 in

Boston and can send you an email from that meeting to indicate the wishes

of the Board.

I hope that Andi Nidecker will respond to your questions and outline his

vision because he has put great energy into steering us toward a more professional approach to a public campaign. I hope Andi can come to the

Board meeting to present his concept and participate in the discussion so

so

that a decision can be made there.

You have outlined the history of IPPNW involvement in the two campaigns,

but perhaps it is not clear that each one is independently supported by an

affiliate - the "Let the sun shine not the earth" campaign, by the Swiss

affiliate, and the "No Nukes!" campaign by the Canadian affiliate, and now

by the Simons Foundation (which is Canadian). I don't think the two

campaigns have been seen to be in competition and there has not been a

discussion at the IPPNW Board about the two campaigns. The No Nukes!

campaign does not have a logo but we have asked the Dutch artist who

drew

the little woman kicking a missile for permission to use that image.

<P>Until now, I have thought of your campaign using the word "Abolition"
built

into recognizable corporate logos as another way to bring nuclear abolition

to public consciousness - in fact, as another campaign.

<P>The question of which body, IPPNW or Abolition 2000, would be responsible

has not arisen. If the purpose is to redesign the sunflower, then it

is

A2000 that is responsible because it is their symbol. IPPNW
uses the

sunflower where it is appropriate to indicate that we are part of the

coalition.

<P>I think of No Nukes! as a campaign with a limited purpose - to break
the

media silence about nuclear weapons and bring to public attention the
fact

that the vast majority of people want an end to the nuclear era.
We hope

that the campaign can achieve this goal by having individuals take
a simple

action to show that they are part of the majority, by wearing a T-shirt
or

putting on a bumper sticker etc., and by celebrities using the No Nukes!

slogan in their music or speeches. The campaign seems to strike

an

emotional response in North America that it may not have in other countries

where No Nukes! was not a common slogan in the 1970's and 80's.

The

campaign is meant to be decentralised, with the web site offering ideas
and

room for exchange of effective strategies. The next stage of
the No Nukes!

campaign is a series of 30 second TV public service announcements using

celebrities saying "I said no nukes!".

<P>No Nukes! is a campaign used by IPPNW and some affiliates, (and

particularly with students) but it is a small part of IPPNW because

our

major focus is on medical issues related to nuclear weapons and nuclear

energy. It has also been taken up by other NGO's.

No Nukes! is not trying to become the single common campaign for the

Abolition 2000 coalition, it is simply a strategy that people can take

up

if it engages them.

<P>I hope that we can provide you with more definitive answers before Oct.
5th.

Thank you for your continuing input and professional assistance in
helping

us see the issues involved in this process.

Sincerely,

Mary-Wynne Ashford

<P>Dr. M.W. Ashford, MD, PhD

Co-President, IPPNW

Box.30143, Saanich Centre P.O.

Victoria British Columbia Canada V8X 5W1

tel. +1-250-479-9189

fax: +1-250-479-9309</BLOCKQUOTE>
 </HTML>
</x-html>

Reply to: IGC MindSpring Transition Team <mindspring-questions@igc.org>
To: Marci Lockwood <execdirector@igc.org>
Subject: IMPORTANT! News About Your IGC Account

Dear IGC Internet member,

Our records indicate that you have not yet converted your account to MindSpring. If you have already filled out the form at <http://www.igc.org/igc/join/approve.html>, please disregard this message. You have completed your transition and should be receiving materials from MindSpring soon. If you have any doubts about whether you have successfully converted, simply reply to this message and we will confirm this for you.

If you have not yet converted, we urge you to do so as soon as possible, to avoid interruption of your Internet service. The transition to MindSpring will be completed by September 30. If we have not heard from you by that date, you will no longer be able to access IGC through our access numbers. Your IGC account will be closed unless you make other arrangements.

IGC and MindSpring have worked hard to make sure that switching your account is as easy as possible. There is no cost involved in transferring - no signup fee at MindSpring - and any software you get from MindSpring is absolutely free. You will also keep your igc.org (or peacenet.org, econet.org, etc.) e-mail address.

NOTE: If you have a "98 Rate" account, we encourage you to keep using the software you currently use, so that your bookmarks and other information will be preserved. MindSpring's support department is prepared to help you make the necessary changes to your current software which will allow you to access MindSpring's access numbers.

Here are some of the advantages you can expect with MindSpring:

No More Downtimes

MindSpring's servers are up 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. They advertise having 99.996% uptime in the past 3+ years.

Increased Mail Storage Limit

MindSpring's mail storage limit is 15MB, three times the amount allowed by IGC.

More Local Access Numbers.

MindSpring has better coverage nationally than IGC. Many of you who have had no local number will now enjoy toll-free local access. In addition, MindSpring works with many different access providers nationwide, so that an outage on one provider will not necessarily interrupt your service.

24-Hour Toll-Free Tech Support.

Shorter hold times, no long-distance charges, and world-class technical help.

Flexibility of Plans

MindSpring offers both metered rate and flat rate plans, starting as low as \$6.95 for metered rate plans. You won't have to pay for features you never use.

More Products and Services

Free web pages, free extra e-mail boxes, high-speed ISDN and DSL access, and newly added Global Roaming are just a few of the high-quality products and services that MindSpring offers. Many of these services have never been available to IGC users, or have been offered in a limited way.

To receive these benefits, all you need to do is to visit

<http://www.igc.org/igc/join/approve.html>

and let us know which MindSpring plan you choose. The transfer of your account will take place as soon as we receive your confirmation. MindSpring will then send you a User's Guide and a copy of their software.

Don't have web access right now? You can also transfer via e-mail. Send a blank e-mail to mindspring-info@igc.org and you will receive an e-mail version of the web form. Simply fill it out and return it to the e-mail address specified. Please allow 1-2 extra business days for processing your form.

By transitioning away from providing Internet access, IGC Internet will be better able to fulfill its mission of helping activists and progressives use technology effectively. We will devote more resources to upgrading our online content and technology training. For a look at where we are heading, we urge you to visit our Transition pages:

<http://www.igc.org/igc/transition>

Among other things here, you can tour our new demo site, read our revised mission statement, and get the latest information about MindSpring.

Note that after your account is transferred, you will still be a member of IGC. You will have free access to our APC conferences and tools. You will also receive a weekly digest of your choice containing progressive news and information. Watch the revamped IGC as it grows. More importantly, stay involved and help us refine our direction. We think you will like what you see, and we want to know what you think.

I have included with the letter a list of answers to possible questions you might have about these changes. To avoid interruption of your Internet service, please visit <http://www.igc.org/igc/join/approve.html> and sign up by September 30. You may also write to mindspring-info@igc.org to receive an e-mail version of our on-line reply form.

If you belong to an organization with a group rate at IGC, please contact your group's email administrator about being part of a group rate at MindSpring.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to thank you for your membership to IGC Internet. An exciting new chapter in our organization's history is about to begin, but without you, we would not have been able to move forward, confidently, in new directions.

Sincerely,

Marci Lockwood
Executive Director

P.S. Please transfer to MindSpring today! Go to the IGC site at <http://www.igc.org/igc/join/approve.html> and reply over the web. A reply by September 30 will guarantee no interruption in your Internet service, no change in your email address, no increase in fees for unlimited access, and no hassle. Thank you again!

=====
Frequently Asked Questions:
IGC - MindSpring Transition
=====

Here are answers to some frequently asked questions about the transition to MindSpring:

1. Questions For Individuals

1.1 Will I keep the same e-mail address?

Yes! You will keep your [igc.org](http://www.igc.org) e-mail address. If you use [peacenet.org](http://www.peacenet.org) or one of the other IGC 'net domains, you will keep your current address.

1.2 Will my login and password be the same at MindSpring?

Yes. In fact, most of your software settings, apart from your access number, will remain as they are now.

1.3 Will the rate I am paying now change?

Your rate actually may decrease, depending what level of service you choose. A variety of pricing plans are available starting as low as \$6.95 per month. The MindSpring unlimited use plan is the same price as the IGC unlimited use account plan -- \$19.95 -- but provides more features such as free extra mailboxes. To begin the transfer now and choose a pricing plan, please visit:

<http://www.igc.org/igc/join/approve.html>

For more information on pricing plans, call (800) 557-9614 from 6:00 am to 9:00 PT, Monday - Friday.

1.4 How will my billing work?

You will receive one bill from MindSpring for your dial-up account. You will receive another bill from IGC for web hosting or other services.

MindSpring accepts MasterCard, Visa, Discover and American Express credit cards. They accept payment by check for an additional charge of \$1 per month. If you require a paper invoice by postal mail, there is a further charge of \$1 per month. See:

<http://help.mindspring.com/service/act-mgmt/index.htm>

1.5 What about technical support?

IGC chose MindSpring because of its reputation for top-rated customer service. MindSpring features toll-free 24 hour technical support. Call 800-719-4660. Atlanta residents call 404-815-9111. You may also chat live over the web with MindSpring technical support or contact their support department by e-mail, see:

<http://help.mindspring.com/support/contactsupport.htm>

1.6 Will I continue to use the same access number?

You must use a MindSpring access number. Fortunately, MindSpring offers hundreds of access numbers across the country - in some areas, there are many more numbers than IGC has. A list of MindSpring local access numbers may be found at:

<http://www.mindspring.net/pop.html>

In the unlikely event that MindSpring does not offer a local access number for your area, you may use the MindSpring 800 access number, which costs only \$6.00 per hour. Please see:

<http://www.mindspring.net/prod-svc/800.html>

1.7 Can I continue to use my IGC software?

MindSpring will be sending you free software on CD-ROM and a User Guide. If you have been using IGC Internet software (included with IGC's 98 Rate plans), we encourage you to continue to use it. MindSpring will provide support for IGC Internet software. For help configuring any internet software to connect to MindSpring, please see:

<http://help.mindspring.com/support/contactsupport.html>

IGC InterACT software configured for use with IGC metered rate

accounts will not work with MindSpring. You will need to use the free software you will be receiving from MindSpring.

1.8 What will happen to my subsidized account?

IGC regrets that it is no longer able to offer any complimentary or subsidized accounts. Complimentary or subsidized account holders will need to select a MindSpring monthly access plan, which start at only \$6.95 per month.

1.9 Why should I move to MindSpring as part of IGC?

We know that you share the values of the IGC community - peace, human rights, worker's rights, environmental sustainability and women's rights - and you have for 13 years. We want to continue giving you all the benefits of belonging to our progressive online community. However, we know that customer service and reliability have been top concerns recently. That is why we chose MindSpring to provide Internet access service to our members. MindSpring has built a national reputation for top-rated customer service. It consistently rates as one of the nation's best Internet service providers. For information, check out:

<http://www.mindspring.net/aboutms/cvb/>
<http://www.mindspring.net/aboutms/awards/>
<http://www.mindspring.net/aboutms/testy.html>

By moving our Internet service to a company with demonstrated success in customer service and reliability, IGC will be able to focus its resources on our core mission.

Consider also these advantages:

No change in your e-mail address

You get to keep your igc.org (or peacenet.org, econet.org, etc.) address - as long as you make the switch to MindSpring via this page:

<http://www.igc.org/igc/join/approve.html>

or via e-mail to MindSpring-info@igc.org. You get the all benefits of a new ISP, without the hassle that usually accompanies it.

Free 1-year membership in IGC's progressive community.

You will have free access to our APC conferences and tools.
You will also receive a weekly digest of your choice containing progressive news and information. Watch the revamped IGC as it grows. More importantly, stay involved and help us refine our direction. We think you will like what you see, and we want to know what you think.

In terms of Internet service, you can expect these advantages from MindSpring:

No More Downtimes

MindSpring's servers are up 7 days a week, 24 hours a

day. They advertise having 99.996% uptime in the past 3+ years.

Increased Mail Storage Limit

MindSpring's limit is 15MB, three times the amount allowed by IGC.

More Local Access Numbers.

MindSpring has better coverage nationally than IGC.

Many of you who have had no local number will now enjoy toll-free local access.

24-Hour Toll-Free Tech Support.

Shorter hold times, no long-distance charges, and world-class technical help.

Flexibility of Plans

MindSpring offers both metered rate and flat rate plans, starting as low as \$6.95 for metered rate plans. You won't have to pay for a plan you never use.

2. Questions For Organizational Members

2.1 What about group rate plans for access?

You may choose from the following access plans through MindSpring:

Light - \$6.95 per month for 5 hours. Additional hours at \$2 per hour.

Standard Plan - \$14.95 for 20 hours. Additional hours at \$1 per hour.

Unlimited Access - \$19.95 for unlimited use.

2.2 What about my custom domain name? (jsmith@savetheworld.org)

This will work as long as you switch your account to one of the above MindSpring plans.

2.3 What about my web page?

If you have a website on IGC now it can stay here until you decide otherwise. IGC will continue to support our current websites. However, we are presently not accepting new website or DNS orders while we improve these services. We expect to complete our improvements soon.

Please continue to check the IGC webpages for announcements about our new services:

<http://www.igc.org/igc/services/>

2.4 Can my group be billed on one invoice?

Yes! The contact person for your group will be hearing from an IGC staff representative. The contact should let that staff person know which account they would like to have billed for the group.

Remember, IGC can only make changes to group accounts when authorized to do so by the official group contact.

2.5 Will MindSpring be cheaper?

Depending on the number of accounts in your group, the type of package and the amount of time your group spends online, equivalent service from MindSpring will cost you within ten percent, plus or minus, of what you monthly pay to IGC.

Note that MindSpring offers both 'flat rate' plans and 'metered rate' plans. Their metered rate plans start as low as \$6.95 per month. This allows you to choose the most economical rate for each user in your organization.

Organizational members will be getting an individualized letter within the next few weeks, outlining all the steps involved in switching. In addition, they will have an IGC staff person assigned to take care of them. Larger groups will also have a MindSpring representative assigned to them after they make the switch.

3. Additional Questions

3.1 Are there any discounts or special rates available?

MindSpring offers a discount for pre-payment of your bill. For more information, please see:

<http://www.mindspring.net/prod-svc/prepay.html>

3.2 What is the service agreement and acceptable use policy?

Please see:

<http://www.mindspring.net/aboutms/policy.html>

<http://www.mindspring.net/prod-svc/users.html>

3.3 What kind of 56K modems does MindSpring support?

MindSpring supports v.90 and X2 type modems. For more information, please see

<http://www.mindspring.net/pop.html>

3.4 Will I use the same modem initialization string?

Yes. For more information about modem configuration, please see:

http://help.mindspring.com/support/browse/modem_info/toc/d0108.htm

3.5 What are the system requirements for MindSpring's software?

Please see:

http://help.mindspring.com/support/browse/internet_apps/mspgsoft.htm

3.6 How do I transfer my data to the new software?

You can get help transferring your bookmarks, nicknames, address books and offline mail folders (e.g., Netscape folders) to MindSpring. Contact MindSpring technical support at:

<http://help.mindspring.com/support/contactsupport.htm>

3.65 Will my address book entries have to change at all?

If your address book entries look like this:

```
<jsmith@igc.org> "John Smith"  
<jdoe@womensnet.org> "Jane Doe"  
<jsmill@igc.apc.org> "J.S. Mill"
```

they are "qualified addresses." That means you won't have to change anything.

If your address book entries look like this:

```
jsmith "John Smith"  
jdoe "Jane Doe"  
jsmill "J.S. Mill"
```

they are called "unqualified addresses," and you need to do one of the following:

- (a) Make sure that your e-mail program automatically adds "igc.org" to all "unqualified addresses." Most versions of Eudora can be configured to do this. The latest versions of Netscape do this automatically.
- (b) Change your address book entries to be "qualified addresses" such as:

```
jsmith@igc.org  
jdoe@womensnet.org  
jsmill@igc.apc.org
```

If you need further help with your address book entries, please see:

<http://help.mindspring.com/support/contactsupport.htm>

3.7 Can I configure my own software to connect to MindSpring?

Your software will not need to be re-configured, except for an access number and possibly one or two minor settings. For help configuring any internet software, contact MindSpring technical support at:

<http://help.mindspring.com/support/contactsupport.htm>

3.8 What about the mail I have stored on IGC's text-only interface?

Any mail folders you have stored on IGC will be forwarded to MindSpring after your account has been transferred and you have successfully checked your mail at least once. When you have switched your account, you will not be allowed to access the text-only system for your mail anymore.

3.9 Will I continue to be able to access IGC newsgroups?

If you currently have an IGC account, you will have free access to IGC newsgroups via Netscape or Free Agent or a similar program. You will configure your software to connect to apc.news.igc.org and login using your old IGC username and password. Note that if you are using any of the following servers for reading news, you will not need to change anything:

news.igc.org
news.igc.apc.org

You will be able to change your IGC password at any time by going to the IGC Help web page at

<http://www.igc.org/igc/help>

There will be no access to newsgroups via the text-only system.

3.10 What about my conf2mail list?

Your list will still work, but you will need to post your message to the newsgroup. Mailing lists will soon be handled by Topica. List owners should see

<http://www.igc.org/igc/transition/topica.html>

to read about the transfer of all IGC mailing lists to Topica.

3.11 Is MindSpring ready for Year 2000?

MindSpring is near completion of a very aggressive program to ensure that service remains uninterrupted before, on, and after January 1, 2000. Please see MindSpring's statement on Y2K readiness at:

<http://www.mindspring.net/aboutms/y2k/>

3.12 Does MindSpring block unsolicited mail (spam) like IGC does?

Yes, MindSpring actively protects its members from unsolicited e-mail and lets you customize how you block unwanted mail. For more information, please see:

<http://help.mindspring.com/modules/00100/00131.htm>

4. Some products and services at IGC, and their MindSpring equivalents.

4.1 ISDN and xDSL.

MindSpring offers more access numbers with prices comparable to IGC's ISDN. For a complete listing, please see:

<http://www.mindspring.net/pop.html>

MindSpring also offers dedicated leased line services and LAN on demand. xDSL

is currently available in Texas and California, as well as metro Atlanta. More coverage should be added over the next year.

4.2 Mail Forwarding.

Included in all access plans. Please see:

<http://help.mindspring.com/service/act-mgmt/index.htm>

4.3 Vacation Messages.

Included in all access plans. Please see:

<http://help.mindspring.com/service/act-mgmt/index.htm>

4.4 U-Connect Accounts.

The closest equivalent is the \$6.95 MindSpring Light account. See:

<https://register.mindspring.com/cgi-bin/wsisd.dll/sf/signup/aboutplans.html>

4.5 International Dial-Up Access.

Global Roaming now available at:

http://www.mindspring.net/prod-svc/global_roam.html

4.6 Telnet.

MindSpring lets you check your e-mail from their web site. If you are traveling abroad and can use any internet connection, you can go to the following web page and read and send e-mail:

<http://www.mindspring.net/aboutms/mailcenter/>

In emergencies, you can also telnet to the MindSpring POP server and retrieve messages, but you won't be able to use a real mail program such as PINE or ELM. For more information about telnetting to the MindSpring POP server, see:

<http://help.mindspring.com/modules/00100/00129.htm>

4.7 System-Wide (Public) Aliases.

MindSpring offers Vanity Aliases which you will be able to easily set up. See the section about 'Adding a Mailbox Alias' at:

<http://help.mindspring.com/service/act-mgmt/index.htm>

4.8 Web Sites.

We are presently not accepting website or DNS orders while we improve these services. However, we continue to support our current websites, and expect to complete our improvements soon. Please continue to check the IGC webpages for announcements about our new services:

<http://www.igc.org/igc/services/>

4.9 Majordomo Mailing Lists.

These will now be handled by Topica and are free. Please see:

<http://www.igc.org/igc/transition/topica.html>

4.10 Mergemail Lists.

These will now be handled by Topica and are free. Please see:

<http://www.igc.org/igc/transition/topica.html>

4.11 Simple Mailing Lists.

These will now be handled by Topica and are free. Please see:

<http://www.igc.org/igc/transition/topica.html>

4.12 FTP.

Your MindSpring account comes with personal ftp space. See:

<https://register.mindspring.com/cgi-bin/wsis.dll/sf/signup/aboutplans.html>

4.13 WAIS Databases.

IGC will continue to host current WAIS databases and Gophers, however, we are not setting up new ones. IGC is in the process of implementing tools which convert these services to be nicely viewable on the Web and will be contacting you when they are ready. If you have WAIS and Gopher services which you no longer use, email support@igc.org and request they be shut down.

4.14 Autoreply Mailers.

Using MindSpring's Account Management features, you can add a mailbox and setup a vacation message for that mailbox. The vacation message would contain your auto-reply mailer content. See:

<http://help.mindspring.com/service/act-mgmt/index.htm>

4.15 E-mail to Fax Service.

While IGC does not endorse any one service, you may wish to visit the web sites of the following companies that provide e-mail to fax service:

<http://www.fax4free.com/>

<http://www.faxaway.com>

http://www.visionlab.com/vl_english/start.html

http://www.jfax.com/business_fax.html

<http://xcelcom.com/signup/default.asp>

4.16 Org Sponsored Newsgroups and Private Newsgroups.

MindSpring does not offer these services but IGC does and will continue to do so. You will continue to have IGC Membership and access to IGC's Newsgroups.

5. I have more questions about the transition. How can I learn more?

To find answers to many frequently asked questions, we urge you to visit the special "Transition" section of our website:

<http://www.igc.org/igc/transition/>

If you do not find the answer to your question there, please email IGC at: mindspring-questions@igc.org.

To: Interfaith Group for the CTBT

From: Howard W. Hallman

At the risk of duplication, I am forwarding the meeting announcement of the CTBT Working Group, scheduled for Friday, September 10 at 9:30 a.m. in the Methodist Building, Conference Room 3. Although many of you don't ordinarily attend this meeting, you may want to come on Friday because the CTBT ratification campaign is now intensifying. Looking ahead, the next meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is on Tuesday, September 21 at 1:00 p.m. at the FCNL Conference Room.

>TO: Coalition members and friends

>FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

> Tom Collina, UCS and CTBT Working Group Chair

>

>RE: CTBT Wkg. Grp. Mtg., FRIDAY, Sept. 10 at 9:30am at 100 MD. Ave. NE,

> Conf. Room 3;

>

>The next CTBT Working Group Meeting of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear

>Dangers will be held this September 10, from 9:30-10:30am.

>

>This will be a particularly opportunity to gather information and finalize

>workplans for September and October, when we need to make some significant

>progress in our campaign. Achieving a real breakthrough in the Senate will

>depend on everyone's ability and willingness to contribute further. Please

>come to the meeting with your ideas and suggestions about how we can

>maintain the growing momentum for the CTBT.

>

>PLEASE NOTE that the meeting will take place at 100 Maryland Avenue NE (the

>Methodist Building), conference room #3. 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. Contact Tom Collina

>(332-0900 or tcollina@ucsusa.org) or me if you have questions or suggestions.

>

>DK

>

>*****

>

>CTBT Working Meeting, September 10, 1999

>

>Introductions

>

>A. Report on Administration activities

>B. Report on Hill Developments and Meetings

>

>C. Revising/Updating NGO Strategy Plan and Activities

>

>-- Summary of CTBT Grassroots Activities

>-- Summary and Planning of Media and Opinion-Elite Activities

>

>D. Update on Article XIV Special Conference activities

>

>

>*An Ad Hoc Lobbying Meeting Will Follow

Daryl:

I took the liberty of forwarding the announcement of the CTBT Working Group to all members of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT. Some of them may be on your list, but I want others to know about the meeting at this crucial time.

Howard

Dear Betty:

My work in recent years has shifted away from the interests of the National Neighborhood Coalition. The Civic Action Institute, which was my channel for this interest, is now inactive. Therefore, I do not want to continue membership of the Civic Action Institute in the National Neighborhood Coalition. You may take our name off your mailing list.

Having been in on the formation of the National Neighborhood Coalition and having served as treasurer for several years, I hold NNC in high esteem. I wish your continued success.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

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

Further developments on the Ecumenical Decade.

Central Committee Press Release of September 3, 1999

CENTRAL COMMITTEE PLACES OVERCOMING VIOLENCE HIGH ON AGENDA FOR THE NEXT SIX YEARS

The World Council of Churches (WCC) Central Committee declared an Ecumenical Decade to Overcome Violence and set priorities for the Council's work over the next six years.

The Committee adjourned Friday, 3 September after nine days of meetings in Geneva, following closing worship.

The Decade to Overcome Violence was proposed by delegates to the WCC's eighth assembly last December in Harare, Zimbabwe, and last week the Council's general secretary Rev. Dr Konrad Raiser urged churches to help overcome the world's *generalized culture of violence*.

The Central Committee also heard an appeal to put the Council's moral weight behind the United Nations Security Council resolution to save children from the scourge of war. In making the appeal, Dr. Olara A. Otunnu, the secretary-general's special representative for Children and Armed Conflict, said children should be made *a zone of peace*.

The Ecumenical Decade to Overcome Violence will invite churches to reflect on that theme from Christian perspectives and will run simultaneously with a UN decade to protect children from violence.

In other actions, the Central Committee decided to put significant resources into developing the concept of *ecumenical space*, which may provide opportunities for churches to come together to discuss difficult issues that threaten to divide them. Some members of the Council, both Orthodox and Protestant, have been unable to agree on such issues as human sexuality, ordination of women and styles of mission. The Central Committee hopes *ecumenical space* will enable members to work and talk together in a spirit of trust and mutual respect.

It was announced that the *Special Commission* on Orthodox and Protestant dialogue in the WCC will hold its first meeting in December 1999 in Geneva. The commission, composed of Orthodox and non-Orthodox representatives of member churches, will continue meeting for three years. It is expected to discuss divisive issues as well as issues of common agreement, and seek to move toward greater understanding.

The Committee held a special plenary on Africa to follow up on issues raised at the eighth assembly in Harare, and recommended further work on the impact of war and conflict in Africa, economic justice and the effects of economic globalization on the continent, and programmes on spirituality *and the promotion of ethical values that enhance life with dignity*.

Central Committee members received reports from ACT (Action by Churches Together), the coordinating relief organization created by the WCC in partnership with other worldwide Christian organizations. ACT is responding to the needs of thousands of earthquake victims in Turkey and, in past months, has delivered supplies to North Korea and done intensive refugee support work in Kosovo. Response to emergency situations will continue to be central to the work of the WCC.

The Central Committee's recognition of the membership application of the Anglican Church of Korea brings the WCC membership to 337. The WCC also has 55 associate councils following the Committee's reception of the Council of

Christian Churches in Switzerland.

The Central Committee issued several statements on public issues. A *Memorandum and Recommendations on Response to Armed Conflict and International Law* calls on churches to *be agents of reconciliation in a troubled world* and to commit themselves *at an early stage to prevent the escalation of conflicts*. The ecumenical fellowship, the memorandum said, needs *to expand and intensify its efforts in the broader dimensions of peace-making for the sake of peace and justice in the world*.

A minute on Nigeria, encouraged churches there *to continue to be a prophetic voice in the nation, and offered them support as they pursue reconciliation in Nigeria*. A minute on Peace and Reconciliation between Ethiopia and Eritrea noted that churches and religious groups on both sides *have formed religious committees to promote a peaceful solution*, and conveyed to leaders *on both sides our encouragement and the assurance of our prayers*.

A minute was issued on the status of Jerusalem. The minute responded to a letter the general secretary received from the Patriarchs and Heads of Christian Communities in Jerusalem, expressing appreciation for the eighth assembly *Statement on the Status of Jerusalem*, and reaffirmed *the WCC's conviction that Jerusalem is central to the faith of Christians* and *Christians' responsibility to pray and work for the peace of Jerusalem.*

Another minute focussed on the situation in Indonesia, where violence continues to take place following the referendum in East Timor in which voters declared independence from Indonesia. This minute urges the United Nations to extend its presence in the country *until security there is restored*.

Contact: Karin Achtelstetter, Media Relations Officer
Tel: (+41.22) 791.61.53 Mobile: (+41) 79.284.52.12
E-Mail: eni@eni.ch
PO Box 2100 150 route de Ferney CH-1211 Geneva 2
Switzerland

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

Return-Path: <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
Date: Wed, 8 Sep 1999 09:46:57 -0400
From: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
Subject: Invitation to Join Journey Toward International Peace Force
Sender: William J Price <WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com>
To: "peacetaxfund@igc.org" <peacetaxfund@igc.org>,
Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>, Bill Yolton <lwyolton@prodigy.net>,
Bob Tiller <btiller@psr.org>
Content-Disposition: inline

Dear Partners

Over the last month I've been privileged to arrange for a visit of two pioneers in the journey to establish an International Peace Force. In the meantime their proposal has continued to evolve in exciting ways.

David Hartsough and Mel Duncan, the authors of the following proposal in process, will be at The Church of the Saviour (2025 Mass Ave. NW) this Saturday (Sept. 11), 9am -11am sharing the status of this proposal, a small group of NGO reps.

So hope you can join us. Please forgive me for the lateness of this invitation. Bill Price

Hi Bill,

Here's a revised draft of the peace force proposal. I look forward to seeing you on Saturday. What time should we arrive? Your partner, Mel

A Proposal for an International Peace Force
by Mel Duncan and David Hartsough
September 1999

The concept of war is now irrelevant, the concept of violence is out of date, announced the Dali Lama to thousands of people jammed into New Yorks

Central Park in August. The same message is emerging all over the world as

we come to the end of historys bloodiest century. People have grown tired of blood and bombs sustaining hate. They are demanding and creating new ways to resolve differences.

At the same time thousands of well armed multinational troops are assaulted and shot at as they attempt to keep hatred at bay in the irradiated, blood soaked landscape of Kosovo. Gangs of thugs backed by the

Indonesian army tried to torture and intimidate people out of voting for an

independent East Timor. US/UN imposed sanctions kill thousand of innocent Iraqi citizens each month. And the two newest members of the nuclear club

continue a five decade old war in the snowy peaks of Kashmir.

This century has also witnessed a dramatic increase in the use of nonviolent strategies. The people of India achieved their independence through active and sustained nonviolent struggle. Significant civil rights

gains in the United States were forged through an array of nonviolent tactics

including boycotts, sit ins, freedom rides, marches and massive demonstrations. South Africans threw off apartheid through largely nonviolent

means. A subsequent truth and reconciliation process has avoided a civil war. Phillipinos overthrew the brutal Marcos regime through nonviolent means. The people in most of the nations of the former Soviet block overthrew their communist dictatorships through nonviolent means. In 1991 thousands of unarmed Russians surrounded the White House in Moscow to thwart

a military coup attempt. Gains secured by the labor, womens, disability rights and environmental movements have come primarily through nonviolent organizing.

Third party nonviolent intervention has also progressively escalated during the latter part of this century. Peace Brigades International, the Balkan Peace Teams, Witness for Peace, Peaceworkers, the Helsinki Citizens Assembly, Christian Peacemaker Teams, SIPAZ, the International Fellowship of Reconciliation and others operate in numerous countries including Colombia,

East Timor, Guatemala, the Balkans, the U.S., Israel/Palestine, Mexico and Nicaragua. Most are doing small scale, highly specialized activities designed to be an active presence to lower the potential or current levels of

violence and support local peace makers. They are creating an invaluable knowledge and experiential base of nonviolent tactics and strategies.

Yet when faced with the brutal aggression of Slobodan Milosevic throughout the last decade, the peace movement has lacked a credible, coherent and comprehensive response. The Nation editorialized about this quandary in April. This crisis creates a profound dilemma for principled anti militarists who do not want to turn a blind eye to ethnic cleansing but

do not embrace the NATO air war. While some international activists bravely

carried out nonviolent strategies with people of the Balkans and still are,

many others didnt know what to do and, in some cases, reluctantly shrugged their shoulders and supported the NATO response.

Kosovo presented a need for a substantial, well organized, international nonviolent response. Kosovar Albanian President, Ibrahim Rugova was asking

for an international peace presence in Kosovo as early as nine years ago.

David Hartsough, executive director of Peaceworkers and a Balkan veteran, believes that 200 international peace workers in Kosovo two years ago could

have played a significant role in averting the violence of the past year.

Their activities could have included accompaniment, active support of

local
nonviolent actions, training, and organizing international support and
media
attention for the local nonviolent movement and the possibilities for
peaceful resolution.

Building on the important peace team work throughout the world we need
to
bring our peacemaking activity to a dramatic, new level. We need to
develop
a strategic, efficient and effective response to brutality, violence and
genocide when actions focused on the root causes have either failed or are
ineffective in stopping current slaughter.

The world needs institutions and collective activities that encourage
large numbers of people to engage in peaceful actions that inspire hope and
call them to higher values. We need to develop an international,
multiethnic
standing peace force that would be trained in nonviolent strategies and
tactics and deployed to conflicts or potentially violent areas. The Peace
Force would have to include a significant number of trained volunteers
committed to act strategically to prevent or defuse violence and create the

space for peaceful resolution of conflict.

Last spring over 8,000 activists from 100 countries converged on the
Hague asserting that peace is a human right and that it is time to abolish
war. This concept was drafted as a consequence of a series of formal and
informal discussions during the Hague Appeal for Peace conference. It has
since been reviewed, discussed and critiqued by over 100 nonviolent
activists
from various parts of the world. It truly is a work in progress that will
continue to unfold based on the wisdom and experience of many co-creators.

The Peace Force advances the experiments with
nonviolence and helps bring life to the Dali Lamas proclamation of the
irrelevance of war and violence and Gandhis earlier vision of Shanti Sena
(Nonviolent peace army).

CONCEPT

During the meetings at the Hague conference, there was basic agreement
on
three initial points:

1. Most people doing peace team work, conflict resolution and/or

nonviolent training had shared the vision at some point in their
work
of building a standing nonviolent, peace force of significant
size.

Some still entertained the idea. Usually the idea had been abandoned
because:

- a. Lack of resources, especially financial, to build and
sustain
such an operation,
- b. The important peacemaking work in a particular area had

become so consuming and/or specialized that the vision of a larger scale operation was lost.

2. Most people thought that the idea was worth exploring and developing. Some were very enthusiastic. Others were more cautionary.

3. While this project is very early in development, people representing organizations doing peace team work did not try to protect their groups domain even when directly considering the prospect that a new organization might compete for funds. There was an amazing lack of turf protection.

The GOAL is to create a well trained, standing, multicultural, nonviolent peace force that would be deployed to conflict areas. The Peace Force would be equipped to carry out strategies and tactics in cooperation with local groups committed to peaceful change. Such strategies would be designed to lessen violence or its potential and create the space for peaceful and just resolution to occur.

To begin the program there will need to be significant advance commitments including:

1. At least 200 people willing to commit to participate in training and deployment for at least 2 years.
2. At least 400 people with training and specific peace making skills who would be available on a reserve basis for at least one month per year

over a 2-3 year period.

3. At least 500 supporting members.
4. Five million dollars for operation.
5. Significant media relationships and attention.
6. A well defined, international, efficient and accountable decision making body.

WHO?

Beginning with 200 active members, 400 reserves and 500 supporters, the

Peace Force will be built to a level of 2,000 active, 4,000 reserves and 5,000 supporters over a six year period. Members will be multiethnic, international, intergenerational and have various orientations to faith and

spiritual practices . They will need to demonstrate a great capacity for teamwork, listening, communication, multicultural interaction and bearing dangers and frustrations. All members will be committed to nonviolence and

effective action while participating in this project.

All active members and active reserves would serve as volunteers with room, board, training and transportation provided. Those who need to be paid

will be. A provision for college scholarships and contributions to retirement funds will also be developed.

Members would be recruited from a variety of places including:

1. Former peace team members from a variety of organizations.
2. People referred by other peace organizations.
3. Members of veterans for peace organizations.
4. Youth.
5. Members of religious and spiritual communities.
6. Veterans of other nonviolent movements: civil rights, national

freedom, anti-war, women, environmental.

7. Retired people.

8. Former Peace Corps volunteers and other veterans of international service.

9. Artists.

10. Other ordinary people willing to volunteer a couple of years working with peace teams.

Reserves would be recruited from peace organizations, spiritual communities and other constituencies listed above.

The 5,000 supporters would each contribute at least \$100 per year.

They would be connected to the work of the Peace Force via a Web page and E-Mail.

In addition to financial support, supporters would serve as the local voice

of the Peace Force by communicating with their local media and their religious or social communities about its general work and specific engagements. They would also educate their elected officials about issues related to the Peace Forces work.

ENGAGEMENT

The Peace Force would most often be deployed at the invitation of a local organization or nonviolent movement working for peaceful change/resolution.

There are, however, some situations where deployment will still need to be considered by the steering committee despite the lack of such an invitation..

Strong preference would be given to early intervention. As one woman

from Kosovo said at the Hague Conference, Peace workers need to be at the right place at the right time before violence escalates. Otherwise, we are

just counting our mistakes.

Deployment decisions would be made by the Steering Committee. Make up of

the particular teams deployed will depend upon the needs of the given situation. Criteria considered for involvement would include:

1. Invitation by a local organization working for peaceful

change/resolution.

2. Clear role and contribution that the force could make.

3. Reasonable chance of success.

4. Organizational and logistical backup.

5. Media backup.

6. Evidence that combatants and/or governments are sensitive to

international pressure.

7. Sufficient funding and commitment for duration.

8. Analysis that deployment would enhance local peace efforts.

STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

A clear mandate with a specific strategy and precise objectives tailored

to the conflict area will be established before deployment. Strategies and

tactics will be designed to lessen violence or its potential, create space for peaceful and just resolution and empower local peace and justice activists. The strategies will be flexible and focus on these outcomes, not

just on providing witnesses or documenting human rights abuses.

While in the area the Peace Force will also serve as international eyes,

ears and conscience. The tactics, developed and carried out in conjunction

with local nonviolent activists, will be decided upon by the Peace Force leadership team in the area in consultation with the Peace Force Steering Committee. Strategies and methods could include:

1. Accompanying (activists, leaders, returning refugees)

2. Facilitating communication between conflicting parties

3. Monitoring (elections, cease fires, treaties)

4. Training and training trainers in conflict transformation

5. Patrolling (borders etc.)

7. Interpositioning between conflicting sides

8. Nonviolent direct actions including demonstrations and strikes

9. Capacity building for local nonviolent groups.

10. Modeling alternatives to violent behavior.

Each engagement as well as the overall operation of the Peace Force will

require considerable logistical support including business managers, public

relations specialists, medical workers, conflict resolvers, team builders,

travel coordinators, cooks, fund raisers, regional experts and governmental and organizational liaisons. While we will attempt to have volunteers fluent in the local languages in the conflict areas, we will also employ language interpreters for each engagement. This may seem like a lot of people but as one activist pointed out, the military employs ten support staff for every soldier in the field.

DECISION MAKING

This process will have to be democratic, inclusive, efficient and possess legitimate authority. At the beginning, ten to fifteen people with experience in peace team work, conflict transformation, organizing, training, fund raising, organizational development and the media will form the core group to develop and initiate the project. Each person will have an active commitment to the goal of the Peace Force as well as to nonviolence and intercultural peacemaking. A variety of ethnicity, nationality, gender, spirituality and age will be essential. This group will develop the concept of the Peace Force, answer key questions and create and help implement a recruitment, fund raising, media and training plan. This will take about 24 months. (Note: Should adequate funding become available sooner this timetable could be accelerated.)

At the end of this period, the Core Group will appoint a Steering Committee that may include some members of the Core Group. The Steering Committee will be charged with implementing the plan as well as overseeing the operation and making budgetary, personnel and deployment decisions. Like the Core Group, the steering committee will also embody the principles of nonviolence and intercultural peacemaking as well as be inclusive, efficient, representative and accountable. Another possibility for governance could be a coalition or federation of existing peace team organizations.

A variety of decision making structures for the peace teams in the field will be analyzed by the Core Group including affinity group models.

During the planning stages an advisory board made up of prominent international peacemakers such as Nobel Peace Prize laureates will be developed to advise on major questions, increase visibility of the Peace Force and assist with fund raising. Later this advisory board will help strengthen the moral authority of the Peace Force.

TRAINING

Complex conflict situations require highly qualified competencies. Active members of the Peace Force will take part in a two month general nonviolence training that focuses on history, theory, cultural sensitivity,

listening, mediation skills and conflict transformation.

Physical, spiritual

and artistic training will also be available at this time.

A more specific training of up to two months duration will follow focusing on the local area of deployment including language, culture, analysis of the conflict and discussion of appropriate means of peaceful engagement. All or part of this phase will be done in the deployment area in

conjunction with local nonviolent leaders.

An advanced training will also be offered in various specialty tactics including accompaniment, conflict transformation, mediation and direct action.

Research on the state of the art of nonviolent activities needs to be carried out. The International Fellowship of Reconciliation is currently circulating a proposal to undertake such research. Results will be included in the training.

Nonviolent training resources are well developed and plentiful. The Peace Force will contract with existing trainers to carry out the training.

Reserves who will be called up because of the need for their particular skills in a specific region will take part in the advanced training.

COMMUNICATIONS

Good media and public relations will be vital. We will need to document and communicate the hope and promise of our work to a world that can be cynical and skeptical yet hungers for new approaches to dealing with and stopping violence.

We will need to create a transcendent image that communicates strength, hope and effectiveness to the general public in meaningful symbols as well as concrete action.

Credible media relationships will have to be forged. They could prove to be the lifeline to teams once they are deployed. In the wake of the Kosovo/Yugoslavia war, we will need to begin projecting this alternative approach into the media in the next few months.

Our communications plan will have to include a recruitment package which encourages people in a variety of countries to participate at all three levels: active, reserve and supporter.

A professional Web Page will be developed and maintained to:

1. Communicate the mission and work of the Peace Force
2. Recruit members
3. Raise money
4. Give live reports from the field
5. Inform members of support activities that they can do
6. Discuss new developments in nonviolent strategies and

interventions.

We will need a proactive media strategy to transform images and

messages

from individuals and organizations who will oppose the project. Transnational weapons producers, combatants in a particular region and military alliances like NATO are possible examples.

FUND RAISING

An operation of 2,000 active members with a full compliment of reserves and supporters would cost about \$40 - 50 million a year. This is about the same amount that the world spends on military operations in each half hour of every day this year. Remember, an attractive element of nonviolence is that it is much less expensive than war. This cost, however, geometrically eclipses the total amount spent on peace team work in the world today and presents a strong argument for eventual U.N. and/or other governmental support.

Exploratory and developmental costs will be about \$150,000 annually for the first two years. We will seek this money from a few foundations, major donors and religious organizations.

We will need \$5 million, about 4 minutes worth of global military expenditures, to begin operation of the Peace Force with 200 active members, 400 reserves and 500 supporters. This will come from foundations, religious and spiritual institutions and individuals. We will also have raised \$50,000 from our first 500 supporters for the first year of operation.

INTERACTION WITH GOVERNMENTS

Controversy surrounds this topic. The Core Group will explore if, how and to what extent the Peace Force will interact with governments at all levels recognizing that deployment will often require some type of governmental cooperation. These considerations will include:

1. Possible support and/or sponsorship with the United Nations and/or other multilateral organizations
2. Financial support from friendly governments
3. Governments adding Peace Force participation to their universal service requirements
4. Direct work with government sponsored nonviolent organizations like the German Civilian Peace Service
5. Government sponsored scholarships and retirement credits for active members of the Peace Force
6. Governments providing information about and assistance in gaining entry to certain countries.

TIME LINE

(NOTE: Should adequate funding become available sooner, this time line could be accelerated.)

2000- 2002 Exploration and development.

Year 1 - Develop concept, meet with experienced activists

throughout the world, gather information, write and

distribute opinion pieces, review status of research, develop

budget, identify core group, decide on whether to proceed

or not, establish office and operation, core group meet,

develop and implement media plan, fund raise for first two

years, develop long term fund raising plan, develop Web

Page, develop data base for all levels of members.

Year 2 - Implement fund raising and media plans, maintain Web

page, develop screening process, recruit all three levels of

members, identify site for base and training, identify and

contract with trainers, develop training agenda, digest and

make available state of the art knowledge for training and

leadership, analyze possible sites of deployment,

create steering committee, hire key staff, communicate with

governmental officials.

2003-2006 Begin training, continue media, recruitment and fund

raising, first, second and/or third deployment, evaluate

operation and publish results, continue liaising with U.N.

and other international organizations.

2010 Build to strength of 2,000 active members, 4,000 reserves

and 5,000 supporters, consider possible adoption by U.N.

and/or other international organizations such as the

Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

KEY QUESTIONS

1. Should we proceed in exploring this proposal?
2. What are your greatest hopes for such a peace force? Fears?
3. How can we address those fears and concerns?
4. Is it possible to have a decision making process that is inclusive, representative and yet efficiently decisive when necessary?
5. What should be the type and extent of governmental involvements?
6. Is an invitation from a local nonviolent/peacemaking group required

for deployment of the Peace Force?

7. Should the Peace Force always be unaligned?
8. Is there an existing organization that would be willing and capable

of taking on the development and deployment of a Peace Force or do we

need to create a new organization?

9. To make this a truly multinational effort who are the key individuals

and groups around the world that could be potential allies for this

project?

10. How could the Peace Force support other groups doing nonviolent peacemaking?

11. How long should the training be?

12. Should there be a spiritual base to the training and operation?

13. Should members be compensated?

14. If significant new funding is available for a peace force should

it

go to creating a new organization or should it be made avail

able to

existing nonviolent intervention organizations?

15. What do we name this operation?

16. If our goal is to have nonviolent peacemaking, peacekeeping and peace building accepted by the international community, should we

focus

on strengthening small scale nonviolent interventions or should we

attempt to build a larger scale nonviolent international peace force?

CONCLUSION (The Start actually)

The use of active nonviolence is on the rise throughout the world. We can build on the experiences of nonviolent peace teams and others to bring this activity to a dramatic new level, a level required by conflicts around

the globe. We have reached a level of maturity where this is possible. We

have the capacity to make it happen in our lifetimes. The ingredients abound: there are many veterans of nonviolent movements, thousands of citizens have demonstrated their willingness to courageously stop violence and oppression, hard lessons have been analyzed and learned, our

organizational abilities have increased, highly qualified trainers are available, the World Wide Web, already used to advance the campaigns for banning land mines and establishing an International Criminal Court, is available as an organizing tool, funders are expressing an interest, and, most importantly, people are demanding an alternative to the highly militarized responses to conflict.

Profound questions remain. Yet, we live in a time when we are called to be troubled by these questions. Questions haven't stopped NATO. As evidenced last spring they are still plagued with problems of decision making, turf, logistics and effectiveness.

We need to trouble ourselves with the development of institutions that manifest hope and lead us to a world that honors all life. We need to entertain these ideas and challenge each other. So for now talk, write, reflect, pray, paint, dance, meditate. Please share your thoughts, critiques and inspirations with us as well as ideas of others with whom you share this paper.

Together we can make the Peace Force a reality. There will be no better way to commemorate the United Nations Decade of Nonviolence than to do so.

WHAT YOU CAN DO TO HELP CO-CREATE THE PEACE FORCE.

We need help with:

- *Organizational development and decision making
- *Outreach to key organizations and individuals
- *Fund raising
- *Training development
- *Identifying general and expert volunteers
- *Recruiting supporters
- *Developing a web page for the Peace Force
- *Putting an article on the Peace Force in your newsletter or on

your
Web Page.

Would you or your organization be willing to endorse the concept of the Peace Force and make a tax deductible donation to further the work?

During the darkest periods of history, quite often a small number of men and women, scattered throughout the world, have been able to reverse the course of historical evolutions. This was only possible because they hoped beyond all hope. What had been bound for disintegration then entered into the current of a new dynamism.

Brother Roger Schultz,
Prior of Taize

Mel Duncan David Hartsough
1355 Albany Ave. PEACEWORKERS
St. Paul, Mn. 55108 721 Shrader St.
U.S.A. San Francisco, Ca. 94117

(651)644-1651 U.S.A.
MnDuncan@AOL.com(415)751-0302
PEACEWORKERS@igc.org

Summary of comments on this proposal are available on request from Mel.

by Mel Duncan and David Hartsough
September 1999

September 8, 1999

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: legislative developments on the CTBT

Just after noon today (the first day that the Senate is back in regular session), Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND) made an impassioned speech calling for immediate Senate consideration and approval of the CTBT, and he threatened to "plant himself" on the Senate floor and object to the conduct of other Senate business if Majority Leader Trent Lott does not include the treaty on the list of items for Senate consideration before it adjourns later in the fall.

Dorgan's threat is consistent with earlier reports that the Democrats are readying for a battle to get the CTBT on the Senate's agenda. A copy of that earlier report is attached below.

Dorgan's remarks will be posted on the Coalition's site <<http://www.crnnd.org>> when they are available tomorrow.

DK

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>>

To: Interfaith Group for the CTBT

From: Howard Hallman

In case you haven't seen it, here is the latest report of what Senator Dorgan intends to do for the CTBT.

Forwarded:

>September 8, 1999

>

>TO: CTBT supporters

>FR: Daryl Kimball

>

>RE: legislative developments on the CTBT

>

>Just after noon today (the first day that the Senate is back in regular
>session), Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND) made an impassioned speech calling
>for immediate Senate consideration and approval of the CTBT, and he
>threatened to "plant himself" on the Senate floor and object to the conduct
>of other Senate business if Majority Leader Trent Lott does not include the
>treaty on the list of items for Senate consideration before it adjourns
>later in the fall.

>

>Dorgan's threat is consistent with earlier reports that the Democrats are
>readying for a battle to get the CTBT on the Senate's agenda. A copy of
>that earlier report is attached below. [Not included.]

>

>Dorgan's remarks will be posted on the Coalition's site
><<http://www.crnd.org>> when they are available tomorrow.

>

>DK

>

>

September 8, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: more pro-CTBT editorials

Attached below are excerpts from additional pro-CTBT editorials published over the last month. The tally since September 1997 is: 96 for Senate consideration/ratification; 3 against.

See the Coalition's CTBT Site <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>> for the full text of these and other CTBT- related editorials.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF

"America's Editors Back Test Ban Treaty Pt. 5)
As Senators Ready to Push for Vote"

VOL. 3, NO. 10, September 8, 1999

THE CALL FOR action by the Senate on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) has grown louder in recent weeks. On top of the overwhelming support from the public for Senate approval of the treaty (82% according to June, 1999 Mellman/Wirthlin survey), a July call for action from Senate Democrats and some of their Republican colleagues, and the recent endorsement of the treaty by several former nuclear weapons scientists, more and more newspaper editors are calling for action on the CTBT.

These editorials come as pro-test ban Senators are "threatening to bring the Senate to a standstill" unless Republicans agree persuade Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC) to end his 713 day-long refusal to hold hearings on the treaty, according to the August 30 editions of The New York Times.

In The Dallas Morning News' column, editors compare Senator Helms failure to schedule hearings on the CTBT to the actions of the insane general who trips a chain of destructive events that lead to a global nuclear holocaust in the 1964 movie, Dr. Strangelove. Most of the editorials, like The New York Times', appeal to Majority Leader Lott and other Republicans to "show greater responsibility" and "leadership" on the issue.

Other editorials, such as The Washington Post's, question the logic of those few Senate Republicans "desiring to use [the test ban] as a hostage for a national missile defense of their particular design." The Post argues that this presents a false, "either-or choice." and that those in the Senate who are blocking the CTBT "owe it to the country to explain why we cannot employ them both." Several other editorials, like The Miami Herald's, correctly point out that "though he now wants to push the issue,

Mr. Clinton also shares the blame for the delay. He didn't push ratification [of the test ban] soon enough or forcefully enough."

Since the CTBT was transmitted to the Senate on September 23, 1997, over 96 editorials have expressed support for the CTBT and/or for prompt Senate action, while only 3 have opposed. The following are excerpts from some of the more recent editorials:

The Washington Post, September 7, 1999: "Why A Test Ban Treaty?"

"This treaty would put an end to underground nuclear tests everywhere; tests above ground already are proscribed either by treaty or by political calculation. Its merits shine through. Testing is the principal engine of nuclear proliferation. Without tests, a would-be nuclear power cannot be sure enough the thing would work to employ it as a reliable military and political instrument. Leaving open the testing option means leaving open the proliferation option -- the very definition of instability. The United States, which enjoys immense global nuclear advantage, can only be the loser as additional countries go nuclear or extend their nuclear reach. No nation possibly can gain more than we do from universal acceptance of a test ban that closes off others' options."

Seattle Post-Intelligencer, September 7, 1999: "Stop the stalling on test ban treaty"

"The best interests of the United States are being subverted by Senate Republican opposition to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Senate Republicans should pressure Helms and Senate Majority Leader Lott to get off the dime and bring this popular and necessary measure to a vote."

The New York Times, September 5: "Damaging Delay on a Test Ban"

"The test ban treaty, endorsed by America's top military commander and the directors of the nation's nuclear weapons laboratories, should be ratified promptly on its own merits. The Republican leadership needs to show greater responsibility on this issue. Senator Trent Lott, the majority leader, should insist that Mr. Helms put ratification on the Foreign Relations Committee's calendar early this month. That would give the full Senate a chance to act in time for the United States to take part in an important review conference scheduled for October. Russia and China, the other nuclear powers that have not yet ratified, are more likely to do so once Washington does. Ratifying the test ban treaty would reduce nuclear dangers around the world. Senator Helms and his fellow Republicans should stop holding it up."

The Atlanta Constitution, September 1, 1999, "Renew push to affirm test ban treaty"

"Three years after Clinton signed the [test ban] treaty and two years after he dispatched it to the Senate for its consideration and ratification, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's imperious poobah, Jesse Helms, hasn't seen fit to even set a hearing True Clinton is partly to blame. Only recently has he summoned the gumption to challenge Helms and the rest of

the Senate GOP leadership to take up the treaty. Clinton's fresh interest comes not a moment too soon. China's presumed leap forward with stolen warhead technology and the saber-rattling between India and Pakistan are two compelling reasons to reach a prompt worldwide ban on nuclear weapons tests."

"Whichever way Clinton and his Senate allies go about it — either by whipping up public support or by threat of a legislative showdown — they need to force this treaty from under Helms' thumb. Once it is openly and fairly considered, it should sell itself."

Miami Herald, August 31, 1999: "Wanted: U.S. Leadership on Arms Control"

"A safer world isn't a partisan issue. For two years the [test ban] treaty has fallen hostage to Clinton administration distraction and Republican politicking. But America's political leaders owe the world, and themselves, more than another partisan fistfight. Ratification of the test-ban treaty is long overdue and too important to be held hostage to bickering. Treaty supporters include the Pentagon, top scientists, arms-control experts and, indeed, some of the leading politicians in both parties. The only question is whether America's politicians can overcome partisanship and demonstrate true leadership."

Newsday, August 31, 1999: "For Safer World, U.S. Should OK Nuclear Test Ban"

"A Senate Republican plan to block consideration of a nuclear test-ban treaty unless the Clinton administration commits at the same time to build a national missile defense system could hamper, not help, the effort to control the spread of nuclear weapons. Congress should consider the two issues separately, allowing each to rise or fall on its own merits. ...The United States should ratify the test-ban treaty, without entanglements."

Detroit Free Press, August 15, 1999: "For World's Sake, U.S. Must Sign Test Ban Treaty"

"Clinton signed the [test ban] 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. 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 [and ratify] the treaty until it does so."

San Diego Union-Tribune, August 5, 1999: "End the Senate Delay: It's time to ratify the nuclear test ban treaty"

"For two years, Republican leaders in the Senate have refused to bring the [test ban] 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."

Without the CTBT the NPT [Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty] collapses. 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.

Dallas Morning News, August 4, 1999: "Nuclear Test Ban: Senate must flank Helms' blocking maneuver"

"Today, one obstinate lawmaker, Jesse Helms, blocks a Senate vote on a treaty that would make the world safer by forever banning nuclear arms tests. Mr. Helms' senatorial colleagues should seize the script and write an ending that critics may judge moral and just. If Mr. Helms continues to refuse to allow hearings and a vote in his Foreign Relations Committee, then Majority Leader Trent Lott should bypass the committee and present the treaty for a vote by the full Senate. That would constitute a rare breach of senatorial courtesy. However, it would be warranted. One idiosyncratic senator should not be able to block consideration of a treaty that would make nuclear Armageddon less likely."

The Salt Lake Tribune, August 3, 1999: "Debate Test Ban Treaty"

"Enough is enough. It is time for the U.S. Senate to break Jesse Helms' stranglehold on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. A worldwide test ban treaty would slow the spread of nuclear weapons to nations that do not have them already, and nations that already have them would have greater difficulty developing more sophisticated weapons."

Raleigh News and Observer, July 30, 1999: "Nukes -- Not Fun and Games"

"Evidently Senator Jesse Helms is so weary of hearing about nuclear proliferation that he's begun playing word games just to keep himself awake when the issue comes up. Maybe he ought to use the time spent looking up 29-letter humdingers to research just how much damage detonation of a single nuclear warhead could do to the planet. Recently all 45 Democratic senators wrote Helms to urge action on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Helms' response to the Democrats' letter doesn't indicate a change of heart, but it does show off our senior senator's high-falutin' vocabulary. He described his stance toward the treaty as "floccinaucinihilipilification." It means he thinks it's worthless."

"Most Americans -- more than 80 percent -- disagree, and with good reason. The test-ban treaty offers the best chance we've got to stem the nuclear arms race, and thus to make the world safer for everyone. Senate endorsement is especially urgent now.... Senator Helms' recent playful response to supporters of the treaty underscores his failure to take any of those concerns seriously. That's a very unbecoming and dangerous attitude to have toward the serious problem of nuclear proliferation."

Casper Wyoming Star Tribune, July 27, 1999: "At the Helm of Test Ban Treaty"

It has been almost three years since President Clinton signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which has the potential to make the world safer by limiting nuclear weapons proliferation through the simple strategy of banning testing worldwide. 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.

#

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>>

Roche, Douglas: SEN wrote:
Press Release

A Motion calling on the Government of Canada to urge all nuclear powers to de-alert their nuclear weapons as soon as possible was introduced in the Senate of Canada September 7, 1999 by Senator Douglas Roche.

There are currently 5,000 nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert, meaning they could be fired within minutes. Taking these weapons off alert status would be done by physically separating the warheads from the delivery vehicles.

The motion is aimed at the five declared nuclear weapons States, the United States, Russia, the U.K., France and China and the three nuclear weapons capable States, India, Pakistan and Israel.

"These powerful States could make a great gift to humanity for the new Millennium by removing the possibility of nuclear accidents," Senator Roche said.

Senator Roche noted growing concern that the failure of computers to recognize the year 2000 date change could infect command, control, communication and intelligence systems of nuclear forces. However, he said, "the Motion is not directly dependent on the Y2K problem. The year 2000 date change highlights the existing danger to the world because of the ongoing alert status of nuclear forces."

Several incidents of 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.

Russia and the United States are now discussing a proposed joint center in the U.S. which would seat a handful of U.S. and Russian officers side-by-side for a few days during the 2000 date switch to monitor blips on nuclear screens. The officers would be in direct touch with their respective national command authorities to alleviate any concern about blips that may occur on the date change.

"This shows that the U.S. and Russia are concerned about a possible problem," Senator Roche said, "but their response is inadequate. The world needs the safety that de-alerting would ensure -- not just on New Year's Eve but throughout every day of every year."

Senator Roche noted that the U.K. government has relaxed the notice to fire its nuclear weapons from minutes to days. Also, the Government of Canada, following the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, supports the concept of de-alerting and other measures which contribute to the safety and security of nuclear arsenals and the stability of U.S.-Russian strategic nuclear relations.

Senator Roche's Motion reads: "That the Senate recommends that the Government of Canada urge the nuclear weapons States plus India, Pakistan and Israel to take all of their nuclear forces off alert status as soon as possible."

In Disarmament News Today:

- 1) Washington Post on Clinton's approach to ABM changes
- 2) Washington Times "Ban the Test Ban": If you've been wondering how CTBT opponents are reacting to the upsurge in CTBT support, here's a great article for you.
- 3) A note from Daryl Kimball of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers on Dorgan's threat to "plant himself" on the Senate floor until a CTBT vote is scheduled.

Washington Post
September 8,
1999 Pg. 13

U.S. To Go Slowly On Treaty

Quick ABM Overhaul Rejected by Clinton

By Bradley Graham, Washington Post Staff Writer

Rejecting calls from Republican lawmakers to overhaul the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty all at once, President Clinton has decided to ask Russia to agree initially to relatively modest changes in the 27-year-old agreement, administration officials said yesterday.

The decision follows months of debate within the administration over whether to seek wholesale changes in the treaty immediately or take a two-step approach as the United States attempts to build a nationwide defense against missiles.

Administration officials said the gradual approach would improve the chances of reaching an agreement before presidential elections next year in both countries.

The first set of changes sought by the administration would permit the United States to place 100 interceptor missiles in Alaska, which is the Pentagon's latest plan for defending the country against, at a bare minimum, a few incoming warheads from a state such as North Korea, Iraq or Iran.

As the missile threat is perceived to grow and as U.S. technologies improve, officials said, the United States would seek further treaty amendments to permit more than 200 interceptors, at least two launching sites, advances in radar and the use of space-based sensors.

But congressional Republicans attacked the strategy, accusing the administration of squandering

an opportunity to alter the treaty substantially now and arguing that the phased approach would only prolong tensions with Russia. They said that Moscow, which has long opposed U.S. defenses against long-range missile attack, likely would reject even the limited proposal for modifications. They also predicted trouble in Congress.

"The administration is very clear on what would be acceptable, and the minimalist approach is not acceptable," one senior Senate Republican staff member said.

Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, the administration's top Russia expert, flew to Moscow yesterday to begin discussions on the phased negotiation plan. Other high-level exchanges are due next week when Defense Secretary William S. Cohen visits Moscow and Russia's deputy foreign minister, Georgi Mamedov, comes to Washington.

European allies also were being informed of the U.S. plan this week, officials said. Concern that the Europeans might take issue with a more aggressive U.S. approach was a major factor in the decision to proceed in steps, according to officials involved in the decision.

"We also have to get the concurrence of our allies in order to make an effective anti-missile system," Cohen said in an interview yesterday. "They still look on the ABM Treaty as being one of the stabilizing factors in the relationship with Russia. It's important for us to proceed in a responsible fashion."

Some senior defense officials reportedly argued within the administration for a broader negotiation with Moscow. But Cohen insisted that he and Clinton's other top national security aides were unanimous in their support for the phased approach.

"This first phase will give us the kind of protection we'll need for the immediate missile threat," he said.

At the same time, Cohen stressed that the Russians would be told of longer-term U.S. plans to expand the anti-missile system and to seek further treaty changes in a second set of negotiations at a future date.

While Clinton has yet to approve the deployment of any national missile defense system, he has come closer in the past year to a decision to build one under pressure from Republican lawmakers and amid evidence that a growing number of nations are acquiring ballistic missiles.

In January, Clinton pledged \$6.6 billion over the next six years for construction of a network of radars and interceptor missiles. The administration also announced then that it would ask Russia to renegotiate the ABM Treaty to permit a limited system of missile defenses. Months of debate ensued over how to structure the talks.

The ABM Treaty, signed by President Richard Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev, strictly limits the number, type and placement of missiles that Washington or Moscow can deploy to shoot down incoming missiles. Its fundamental premise, which held throughout the Cold War, was that

limiting missile defense would discourage development of more offensive nuclear weapons and make each side confident that it had a credible deterrent against attack.

Despite mounting calls by Republican lawmakers to scrap the treaty as a Cold War relic, the Clinton administration has opted to preserve it as a cornerstone of nuclear strategy, essential to avoiding a new nuclear arms race.

U.S. officials have urged the Russians to view the deployment of a limited U.S. antimissile system not as a threat to the strategic balance between the two nations, but rather as a weapon against attack from "rogue states." But the Russians regard the scaled-down plan as a forerunner to reviving the more ambitious "Star Wars" system proposed by President Ronald Reagan in 1983--a space-based shield to protect the entire country from thousands of incoming nuclear missiles.

To entice Moscow into a deal, U.S. officials plan on trying to couple a new ABM Treaty agreement with a new strategic arms reduction treaty, START III, that the Russians want and that could reduce each side's nuclear arsenal to 1,500 warheads from about 6,000.

There are still enormous technological and financial obstacles to a national missile defense system. Chief among them: The Pentagon has yet to prove it can build a system that works. Clinton faces a decision next summer over whether to authorize deployment, but many experts predict the deadline will slip because of testing delays.

To permit the initial system that the Pentagon envisions, U.S. officials said they need agreement from Russia to designate a new site, substituting Alaska in place of Grand Forks, N.D., which was picked in the mid-1970s when the United States briefly activated an antimissile system.

The treaty allows a single site for protecting either a set of strategic missiles, as was the case in North Dakota, or a nation's capital. But it specifically bans an antimissile system to protect all national territory. This prohibition also will have to be renegotiated, officials said.

Other similarly contentious provisions restricting radar locations and basing as well as the use of space-based sensors would be postponed under the U.S. plan until a later phase of talks.

Washington
Times Sept. 8,
1999

Ban The Test Ban

By Helle Bering, The Washington Times

Displays of French arrogance do not usually get rounds of applause around here. Yet, there was a moment, back in the fall of 1995, when the French defied the world and proceeded with a set of nuclear tests beneath a remote Pacific atoll, when one felt like clapping. At the time, President Jacques Chirac defied the collective indignation of the governments of Europe, the United States, Australia and New Zealand. French exports like red wine, camembert and ladies' bloomers suffered serious setbacks.

Then there was the flotilla of protesters to be faced surrounding the atoll of Mururoa, led by Rainbow Warrior II, a ship owned by the environmental group Greenpeace, whose predecessor, the original Rainbow Warrior, had been blown up by French agents in the harbor of New Zealand in 1985. That incident generated a fair amount of negative publicity, and 10 years later the French navy merely hauled away the motley crew so testing could go ahead. The French government argued very reasonably that the tests were needed for new generations of nuclear warheads.

These fond thoughts of French élan were prompted by a New York Times report last week that congressional Democrats are getting ready for a major push, initiated by the White House, to achieve Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in the first weeks of the new session. The Clinton administration is ambitiously trying to pull a 'three-fer' tying the CTBT with other arms-control treaties, i.e., U.S. Senate ratification of revisions to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) and Russian Duma ratification of the second Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START II).

The urgent push for ratification is dictated by the calendar. As suggested by the president's above comment, the CTBT and the other arms-reduction and nonproliferation efforts are all part of a final push for the Clinton legacy project. Time is running out as Mr. Clinton becomes more and more of a bit player on the political scene. Furthermore, an international conference to evaluate the CTBT is coming up in October. If the United States has not ratified the document by then, the U.S. administration, which has pushed it harder than anyone, will look pretty foolish.

But at least we will not be alone. Of the major nuclear powers, only England and France (having completed its own tests) have ratified the treaty, neither Russia nor China, our most likely adversaries, have ratified.

The administration's strategy is to apply maximum pressure to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Sen. Jesse Helms, who fortunately is not a man who responds well to pressure. So far, Mr. Helms has wisely refused to hold hearings on the CTBT. The next few weeks could see a battle royal reminiscent of the fight over the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) during which Mr. Helms staunchly manned the ramparts, only to find that Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott had struck a deal with the White House to let the treaty come to a vote.

The difference is that the criticism leveled at Mr. Lott from conservative Republican quarters over the CWC was so stinging that he reportedly has no inclination to repeat the experience. Both Mr. Helms and Mr. Lott would do us all a favor if they allow the CTBT to remain in whatever back room it happens currently to be collecting dust.

In essence, what we have here are two opposed views of the national security of the United States, falling roughly into a Democratic and a Republican position -- and they relate to a lot of the different arms-control treaties stuck in Senate ratification limbo. Democrats tend to believe that security is a collective international concern, to be settled through the signing of treaties. By voluntarily giving up the right to nuclear tests, for instance, the United States would encourage others to follow suit, staunch the production of such weapons in rogue states and bring down the level of danger and tension worldwide.

From a Republican point of view this is wrong-headed, dangerous even. The belief is here that treaties do not stop other countries from acquiring nuclear weapons or developing new generations of weapons -- and while we tie our hands, China, Iran or Russia may proceed to test in secret. Indeed, even if we detected all tests, we would still not be able to prevent them. Security, therefore, lies in keeping up a credible nuclear deterrent and producing a missile shield to render other countries' weapons ineffectual against us. This view is often derided by Democrats as "isolationist," which it is not, since we might well choose to share missile defense technology with friendly and allied nations.

It may be, as the administration likes to point out, that 80 percent of Americans favor the CTBT -- but did the pollsters actually ask them if they know what it is? It would be particularly egregious to sacrifice American national security to the dictates of the election calendar. Republican Senate leaders have no justification for bending to Democratic pressure this time.

September 8, 1999

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: legislative developments on the CTBT

Just after noon today (the first day that the Senate is back in regular session), Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND) made an impassioned speech calling for immediate Senate consideration and approval of the CTBT, and he threatened to "plant himself" on the Senate floor and object to the conduct of other Senate business if Majority Leader Trent Lott does not include the treaty on the list of items for Senate consideration before it adjourns later in the fall.

Dorgan's threat is consistent with earlier reports that the Democrats are readying for a battle to get the CTBT on the Senate's agenda. A copy of that earlier report is attached below.*

Dorgan's remarks will be posted on the Coalition's site <<http://www.crnd.org>> when they are available tomorrow.

DK

*Check yesterday's Disarmament News for this article.

-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: <sdormody@peace-action.org>
From: "Sheila Dormody" <sdormody@peace-action.org>
To: <kathy@fcnl.org>, <>wand@wand.org>, <laura@2020vision.org>, <ctbt@2020vision.org>, <disarmament@igc.org>, <mupj@igc.org>, <dculp@igc.org>, <jsmith@clw.org>, <dkimball@clw.org>, <ieer@ieer.org>, <btiller@psr.org>, <cdavis@clw.org>, <cpaine@nrdc.org>, <tcollina@ucsusa.org>, <rachel@fcnl.org>, <syounge@clw.org>, <epank@peacenet.org>, <maureene@earthlink.net>
Subject: Local Contacts for Day of Action September 14th
Date: Thu, 9 Sep 1999 12:38:25 -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: sdormody@peace-action.org

To push Senator Helms into allowing a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Peace Action affiliates are organizing actions in 11 states at Senators' offices on September 14th.

The states and their contacts follow. Please pass this information along to your activists in these states

Sheila

Jesse-ocracy or Democracy?!
Nuclear Test Ban Now
September 14th, 1999 National Day of Action
Peace Action Affiliate Actions

IL Senator Fitzgerald Action at his office in Chicago
Kevin Kintner, Illinois Peace Action, 312.939.3316

MA Senators Kennedy and Kerry action at offices
Shelagh Foreman, Massachusetts Peace Action, 617.354.2169

ME Senator Snowe actions at her Portland and Bangor offices
Scott Miller, Peace Action Maine, 202.772.0680

MI Senator Abraham Demonstration at Southfield office
Brad van Guilder, Peace Action of Michigan, 248.548.3920

NC Senators Helms action at Sen. Helms' office
Bill Towe, NC Peace Action, 919.851.5596

NH Senator Greg action at his office in Concord
Lois Gibbs, NH Peace Action, 603.228.0559

NM Senator Domenici Action at Santa Fe office

Peggy Prince, NM Peace Action, 505. 989.4812

OH Senator Voinovich Media action at Cleveland office
Francis Chiappa, Cleveland Peace Action, 216.321.1670

PA Senator Santorum Action at Philadelphia office
Phyllis Gilbert, Peace Action Delaware Valley, 215.386.4322

RI Senator Chafee Media action at his office
Karina Wood, RI Peace Action, 401.751.8172

WA Senator Gorton Action at his Bellevue office
Scott Carpenter, Peace Action of Washington, 206. 527.8050

.....

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

.....

To: dkimball@crnd.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: News conference
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Daryl,

While our conversation about a news conference is fresh in my mind, let me throw out an idea.

What about a news conference with representatives of religion and science and a few senators (bipartisan)? In the case of religion, it could be Jerry Powers for the U.S. Catholic Conference, Jay Lintner for the National Council of Churches (Protestant and Orthodox), David Saperstein for the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and possibly Joe Volk for the historic peace churches. The scientists could come from UCS, FAS, and PSR. Each organization would have a letter addressed to all senators. Lintner could have a package from Protestant denominations, and Volk could have letters from other peace churches. With fairly short notice, the denominational letters would probably be from heads of Washington offices rather than heads of communion (which could be saved for the time of a floor vote).

Would it be appropriate to add in the Nobel Peace laureates or do they want to go on their own?

Another addition could be retired military leaders to make the combination religion-science-military. But I suggest not going any farther, such as bringing in lawyers and environmentalists, for instance. Religion and science are traditionally viewed as rivals (incorrectly), so there is a slight news element when religion and science agree.

This wouldn't be the hardest news, but it might work if Senator Dorgan and others are interested.

Shalom,
Howard

September 9, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Dorgan speech and Daschle statement on CTBT, 8/8

As reported yesterday, Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-ND) yesterday issued a threat to hold up Senate business until the leadership agreed to begin consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. He told the Senate if Majority Leader Lott and Senator Helms continue to block action, "I intend to plant myself on the floor like a potted plant and object. I intend to object to other routine business of the Senate until this country decides to accept the moral leadership that is its obligation and bring this treaty to the floor for a debate and a vote . . . this is going to be a tough place to run if you do not decide to bring this issue to the floor of the Senate and give us the opportunity to debate a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty."

Yesterday, Minority Leader Senator Tom Daschle (D-SD) also said the following about the CTBT in his "Stakeout Press Briefing" at the Capitol:

"Finally, let me say that it is an embarrassment, an absolute embarrassment for this country, to know that within one month countries from all over the world are going to be meeting in Europe to talk about a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and the United States will not be there. We will be absent. Why? Because the Senate has failed to take up that treaty in the time that it has been given. That is an embarrassment, and we will address that matter over and over until it is addressed properly and successfully here in the Senate.

So this is going to be an interesting year. I've talked to Senator Lott and hope -- expressed the hope that we could work together on an array of issues. I hope that is the reality. But clearly, we will fight and we will aggressively pursue this agenda and use whatever vehicles we have available to us to make sure that the Senate debates them in due course."

The full text of the Dorgan statement of September 9 is below:

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, on October 6, 7, and 8, there will be a meeting in Vienna, Austria. It will be among countries that have ratified something called the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. That treaty is embodied in this document I hold in my hand.

Now, what is the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty? It is a treaty negotiated by a number of countries around the world; 152 countries, in fact, have signed the treaty and 44 countries have ratified the treaty. It is a treaty designed to prohibit any further explosive testing of nuclear weapons anywhere in the world, at any time, under any condition.

This treaty ought to be an easy treaty for this country and this Senate to ratify. But we have not done so. At a time when India and Pakistan explode nuclear weapons literally under each other's chins--these are two countries

that don't like each other--at a time when we have evidence of more proliferation of nuclear weapons into the hands of countries that want access to nuclear weapons with which to, in some cases, defend themselves, perhaps in other cases to terrorize the rest of the world, this country ought to be exhibiting leadership. It is our moral responsibility to provide leadership in the world on these issues. This country ought to provide leadership on the issue of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

We have not ratified this treaty. At the meeting in Vienna, countries that have ratified it will participate in discussing the implementation of this treaty, and this country will not be an active participant. Great Britain, Belgium, Germany, Canada, Italy, Norway, Poland, and France will be but we will not. We are the largest nuclear superpower on Earth and we have not ratified this treaty.

What about nuclear weapons and nuclear war? I was in the presence of a nuclear weapon recently at a military installation. If you stand a foot or two away from a nuclear weapon and look at it, it is a relatively small canister-looking device that, upon explosion, will devastate portions of our Earth.

Going back nearly 40 years to an address by John F. Kennedy, he said something about nuclear weapons. In fact, he quoted Nikita Khrushchev:

Since the beginning of history, war has been mankind's constant companion. It has been the rule, not the exception. Even a nation as young and as peace-loving as our own has fought through eight wars. A war today or tomorrow, if it led to nuclear war, would not be like any war in history. A full-scale nuclear exchange, lasting less than 60 minutes, with the weapons now in existence, could wipe out more than 300 million Americans, Europeans, and Russians, as well as untold numbers elsewhere. And the survivors, as Chairman Khrushchev warned the Communist Chinese, 'the survivors would envy the dead.' For they would inherit a world so devastated by explosions and poison and fire that today we cannot even conceive of its horrors.

This country and Russia have 30,000 nuclear weapons between them. Other countries want nuclear weapons, and they want them badly. To the extent that any other country cannot test nuclear weapons, no one will know whether they have a nuclear weapon that works. No one will have certainty that they have access to nuclear weaponry. That is why the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is so critical.

Now, where is it? Well, it is here in the Senate. It has been here 716 days, with not even 1 day of hearings. Not one. Virtually every other treaty sent to the Senate has been given a hearing and has been brought to the Senate floor and debated and voted upon. The issue of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the stopping of explosive testing of nuclear weapons is not important enough to be brought to the Senate floor for a debate. It has been over 700 days. Not 1 day of hearings.

In October, this country, which ought to be the moral leader on this issue, will not be present as a ratified member at the implementing meetings for this treaty. Shame on us. We have a responsibility to do this. There are

big issues and small issues in this Congress. This is a big issue and cannot be avoided.

Now, I am not here to cast aspersions on any Member of the Senate. But I waited here this morning to have the majority leader come to the floor--and he was not able to come to the floor--to describe the agenda this week. When he comes to the floor, I intend to come to the floor and ask him when he intends to bring this treaty to the floor. If he and others decide it will not come to the floor, I intend to plant myself on the floor like a potted plant and object. I intend to object to other routine business of the Senate until this country decides to accept the moral leadership that is its obligation and bring this treaty to the floor for a debate and a vote.

In a world as difficult as this world is, when countries such as India and Pakistan are detonating nuclear weapons, it is inexcusable, when so many other countries are trying to gain access to nuclear weapons for themselves, that this Senate, for over 2 years, has not been willing or able to allow a debate on a treaty as important as is this treaty. The banning of nuclear explosive testing all around the world at any time, anyplace, anywhere is critically important for our future, for our children, and for their children.

Now, my colleagues know--at least I hope some know--that I am fairly easy to work with. I enjoy the Senate. I enjoy working with my colleagues. I think some of the best men and women I have had the privilege of working with in my life are here on both sides of the aisle. I have great respect for this body. But this body, in some ways, is very frustrating as well because often one or two people can hold up something very important. In this circumstance, I must ask the majority leader--and I will today when given the opportunity when he is on the floor--when will we have the opportunity to debate this Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

That meeting in October should not proceed without this country providing a leadership role. The only way that can happen is for us to have ratified the treaty. China and Russia have not ratified the treaty; that is true. They are waiting on this country. India and Pakistan are now talking about detonating more nuclear weapons; that is true. They are asking others to implore one or the other to ratify this treaty. Both countries are waiting for this country's leadership. What kind of credibility does this country have to go to India and Pakistan and say to them, 'You must ratify this treaty,' and when they turn to us to say, 'Have you?' we would say no? Somehow, the Senate could not, in 700 days, even hold 1 day of hearings on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

We have to do better than that. I am sorry if I am going to cause some problems around here with the schedule. But frankly, as I said, there are big issues and there are small issues. This is a big issue. And I am flat tired of seeing small issues around this Chamber every day in every way, when the big issues are bottled up in some committee and the key is held by one or two people. Then we are told: If you do not like it, tough luck; you don't run this place. It is true, I don't run this place, but those who do should know this is going to be a tough place to run if you do not decide to bring this issue to the floor of the Senate and give us the opportunity to debate a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban

Treaty. This will not be an easy road ahead for the Senate if you decide that this country shall not exercise the moral leadership that is our responsibility on these matters.

John Isaacs

Council for a Livable World Education Fund

110 Maryland Avenue, NE - Room 201

Washington, D.C. 20002

(202) 543-4100 x.131

FAX (202) 543-6297

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505

Washington, DC 20002

(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970

website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

September 10

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Lott-Dorgan colloquy on CTBT earlier today

Majority Leader Trent Lott and Senator Byron Dorgan briefly debated the test ban issue on the floor today and engaged in a discussion on the matter of when the Senate might schedule it for consideration. Lott said he will discuss the matter with Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms "next week" and have a reply for Sen. Dorgan then. Dorgan stated that it was his interpretation that the Majority Leader has agreed to encourage Sen. Helms to hold hearings on the CTBT.

Stay tuned.

DK

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Dear Dick:

The 18th chapter of Luke records a parable Jesus told of the widow who kept coming to a judge until she received justice. That's the way we are with our advocacy of Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We keep coming to senators and ask them to act. We also keep going to you and other supporters around the country and encourage you to be persistent, even if it means going to the same senators over and over again.

I can report that momentum has shifted to our side in this campaign. On July 20 nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT. President Clinton has increased his public advocacy for the treaty. Senator Dorgan (D-ND), with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, is committed to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. This is forcing Senator Lott to deal with the CTBT in some manner. It also makes the CTBT a topic of conversation among other senators.

In this dialogue Senator Stevens is a key person because of his respected leadership and the power he exercises as chair of the Appropriations Committee. Therefore, we ask that you and other Alaskans go to him once again. Tell him the importance of the CTBT. Ask him to speak out on the Senate floor in favor of scheduling a vote on treaty ratification. Ask him to encourage Senator Helms to hold public hearings on the CTBT.

In case you don't have it handy, our information is that the phone numbers for Senator Stevens's district offices in Alaska are as follows:

Anchorage 907 271-5915
Fairbanks 907 456-0261
Juneau 907 586-7400
Kenai 907 283-5808
Ketchikan 907 225-6880
Wasilla 907 376-7665

It would be great if these offices could receive 100 or more calls within the next two weeks in support of the CTBT. Thanks for your help. If you need further information, please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
Date: Mon, 13 Sep 1999 09:42:05 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news: Dorgan-Lott on CTBT; USA Today op-ed by Dorgan & Specter

September 13, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Lott-Dorgan exchange; Dorgan-Specter in USA Today; Reuters on CTBT

As reported on Friday, 9/10, Majority Leader Trent Lott and Senator Byron Dorgan briefly debated the test ban issue on the floor and engaged in a discussion on the matter of when the Senate might schedule it for consideration. Lott said he will discuss the matter with Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms "next week" and have a reply for Sen. Dorgan then. Dorgan stated that it was his interpretation that the Majority Leader has agreed to encourage Sen. Helms to hold hearings on the CTBT.

While today's promise from Senator Lott to meet with Chairman Helms on the CTBT is positive, it likely does not represent the breakthrough that will lead to Senate consideration and a VOTE on the treaty. It could easily allow the Majority Leader and the Chairman to:

- 1) agree to hearings that are not balanced or useful; and
- 2) allow the Majority Leader to make the claim that he has addressed the Democrats concern about consideration of the CTBT, leaving us well short of the all important objective of securing a commitment to a vote by a date certain, no later than early next year.

Attached below is the full text of:

- * the Lott-Dorgan exchange;
- * today's USA Today opinion editorial from Senators Dorgan and Specter in support of the CTBT;
- * a Reuters article from last week describing the brewing debate on the CTBT.

DK

USA Today
Sept. 13, 1999
Pg. 27

U.S. Wants, Needs Nuclear Test Ban Pact

By Byron Dorgan and Arlen Specter

Most Americans have heard that China may have obtained secret information about U.S. nuclear weapon designs. What they haven't heard is that China may not be able to do much with that information -- if the U.S. Senate does the right thing.

A nation that wishes to build or improve a nuclear weapon needs more than blueprints and computer codes. It needs to test, and China already has signed the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. The treaty imposes testing restrictions that make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to build or improve a nuclear weapons systems.

The problem is, even though China has signed the treaty, it will not go into effect until it is ratified by all 44 countries that have nuclear programs, ours included. However, the treaty has languished in the Senate for almost two years, for political reasons that have little to do with the merits of the treaty itself. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has yet to hold a single hearing and has no plans to do so, despite the importance of this treaty to our children and grandchildren.

Americans deserve better. This delay has to stop.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, as the name implies, would ban test explosions used for creating nuclear weapons. Without such tests, developing a nuclear weapon is extremely difficult, especially for countries without much experience in the field. For example, we conducted 1,036 nuclear-test explosions to develop our current arsenal. By comparison, China has conducted approximately 45 nuclear explosive tests.

The treaty has been signed by 152 nations, including the United States, Russia and China, and ratified by 21 of the 44 countries that must do so before it can go into effect. The major nuclear powers have adhered to self-imposed moratoriums on nuclear testing. Russia stopped testing in 1990; the United States and Great Britain in 1992; and France and China in 1996.

Unfortunately, as the treaty waits in the Senate for a ratification vote, the world may be getting the wrong message from the United States: that agreements concerning nuclear non-proliferation do not matter. It might even suspect that we are using the delay to gain an advantage.

Last year's nuclear weapons tests by India and Pakistan only made the matter more urgent. It is imperative that these nations -- which are in conflict in the border region of Kashmir -- do not further develop their nuclear forces. India and Pakistan have signaled that they may join the treaty, but the United States must lead by example in order to persuade them to do so.

The United States has the most advanced nuclear arsenal the world, and it is unlikely that the other nuclear powers of the world will ratify this treaty, or abide by it, while we let it molder in the Senate.

Public support for this treaty is high. A new bipartisan opinion poll

commissioned by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers found that 82% of Americans now want the Senate to ratify and only 14% do not.

As senators from different parties, we can say that such a treaty has never been a partisan issue. Republican President Dwight Eisenhower first proposed such a treaty four decades ago. President Clinton recently joined a bipartisan group of senators calling for Senate hearings. Today, it enjoys the support of the current Joint Chiefs of Staff, four former chairmen of the joint chiefs and the directors of the three nuclear weapons testing laboratories. We believe it would get the two-thirds approval necessary for ratification if the Foreign Relations Committee allowed the Senate to vote on it.

Some critics suggest the treaty would weaken our own nuclear capability. But our own nuclear scientists assure us that they no longer require the test explosions to ensure the safety and reliability of our nuclear arsenal.

The longer the Senate waits to ratify the treaty, 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. Given the unstable world that faces us in the next century, abandoning this treaty makes no sense at all.

Byron Dorgan is a Democratic senator from North Dakota. Arlen Specter is a Republican senator from Pennsylvania.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 10, 1999

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

[Page: S10721]

Mr. DORGAN. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I would like to make a couple of inquiries of the majority leader.

I ask the majority leader about the issue of scheduling the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty for debate in the Senate. While I have asked that, let me make an observation. The majority leader just described the difficulties the leadership has, both the majority leader and the minority leader, in scheduling business before the Senate. I respect that. I do not think he is crying wolf. It is a difficult problem.

I once saw a juggler juggle a potato chip, a bowling ball, and a chain saw that was running. It occurred to me that one was light, one was heavy, and one was dangerous. That is probably the kind of juggling act Senator Lott and Senator Daschle are required to do weekly and monthly.

The distinction of understanding what is light and heavy and what is dangerous, for that matter, is a very important distinction. Let me describe something I think is very heavy in terms of a public issue and public policy. That is the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty signed by 152 countries and sent to this Senate 718 days ago without one hearing.

I believe so strongly--and I know the Senator from Mississippi knows I spoke earlier this week on the floor about it --that we have a responsibility to provide leadership in the world on the issue of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. This treaty is a baby step in that direction.

So far, we have not been able to get even 1 day of hearings on this treaty. I believe very strongly that this is one of those heavy public policy issues which is important for our country and important for the world. I want very much to have some assurance that we are going to have an opportunity to debate and vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty at some point.

I inquire of the majority leader where we are with respect to that treaty, why we have not been able to have hearings, and when we might expect some action on the floor of the Senate with respect to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, first of all, I emphasize, obviously this is a very important issue. I think it is an extremely dangerous issue in a dangerous time. We see now uncertainty with regard to Russia and their economic condition and what is happening with loans that have been made to them I guess through the IMF. We are concerned about their continuing nuclear capability. So it is an uncertain time. They have not ratified SALT II in the Duma of Russia.

And we have not determined what we are going to do about revisiting the ABM Treaty.

I talked to the President's National Security Adviser, Sandy Berger, this past week about that event. I believe very strongly we are going to have to take another look at the ABM Treaty.

Then, in addition to that, you have the very dangerous situation with Iraq. In today's newspaper, we have an indication that Iran may have the capability to deliver nuclear weapons beyond what most people are aware. And there is the 'scary,' I believe is the way it was described in the newspaper today, situation with regard to North Korea.

The countries that have signed that treaty, for the most part, are countries that do not have nuclear capability, so they are perfectly happy to sign it. But when you look at Russia, Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, and India, the world is still very dangerous.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has indicated very strongly there are a number of treaties that are necessarily tied together; what is going to be the situation with regard to the ABM Treaty; what is the situation with regard to Kyoto, the global warming issue; and the third leg

of this stool is the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

I think the chairman has indicated he is willing to get into these three areas. He will be taking a look at hearings. I have encouraged him to do so, but I think everybody needs to understand that it would involve all three of these issues. And they are going to be dealt with.

I commend for the reading of the Senate today's editorial page article by Charles Krauthammer. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that article be printed in the Congressional Record.

[Page: S10722]

Mr. LOTT. It is a very good article. He basically says that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is disarmament, unilateral nuclear disarmament by the United States, because we would not be testing our aging nuclear weapons and saying to the rest of the world: We have been good guys, so we're going to have faith that you're going to be good. I am not prepared to put my grandson's future at risk in this way.

So that is how I wanted to respond. I do think hearings could be and should be scheduled in a variety of ways. I hope the chairman will be working on that. I will be talking to him about it, one. Two, I do think this is a dangerous time to rush to judgment on such an important issue. Three, I do think it is the wrong thing to do. And four, if it is called up preemptively, without appropriate consideration and thought, it could be defeated.

I think that the advocates need to weigh the ramifications and the implications of such an action.

So I know the interest of the Senator. I have already talked with him about it. I will be glad to work with him and to work with the chairman to see what an appropriate time is and what an appropriate process is for having hearings of these critical areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I do want to respond to a couple of the comments that were made. We should not rush into this. No one would ever accuse the Senate of speeding on an issue such as this--718 days. It is very unusual that we have not had an opportunity to act on this treaty after 718 days without even 1 day of hearings. So no one will accuse the Senate of rushing to judgment on this issue.

It is an uncertain and difficult world. That is precisely why it is important to address this issue. This country has no moral standing, or very little moral suasion to be going to India and Pakistan and saying to them: Do not detonate additional nuclear weapons. Sign and ratify this treaty. The fact is Russia and China, and others, wait on us.

The majority leader talked about a piece in today's newspaper written by

Charles Krauthammer.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a much better piece on this same subject that appeared two days ago in the Washington Post in the form of an editorial supporting the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and reserve the right later to ask at some time to include an even better piece that will be in response to today's Krauthammer article this morning that I and some others will try to write for the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Mr. DORGAN. I guess I heard the majority leader indicate the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is tied up with several other treaties, and he equated it to a stool that has a bunch of legs to it--at least three legs. But I say this: this is not a stool and not legs that connect. There is no connection between the Kyoto treaty and the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. The U.S. has already decided we are not testing nuclear weapons. We have not tested since the early 1990s.

I would love to have a long debate about this. I feel strongly that the treaty is needed in order to prevent others from testing and in order to prevent others from believing they have acquired nuclear weapons that work, because you cannot believe they work unless you have tested them. If we have a regime in which the world decides, through leadership from this country and others, that it will not test nuclear weapons any longer, we will have taken a step to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

We can have that debate and should have that debate. But we have not even had the first day of hearings. What I heard the Senator from Mississippi say, I think, is that he has encouraged the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to hold hearings, to hold hearings on this treaty.

The reason I ask the question is I don't want to add to your burdens--you have plenty--but I indicated earlier this week I certainly will be prepared to add to your burdens and the burdens of Senator Daschle when you try to schedule this place because this is one of those heavy issues, important issues. We ought to have the opportunity to consider this issue as a Senate.

So I ask the Senator from Mississippi, will we be able to expect hearings will be held in the Foreign Relations Committee

on this subject, and, if so, when?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could respond, who has the time now? Is this under a reservation?

Mr. DORGAN. It is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate majority leader has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, at least Dr. Charles Krauthammer signed his editorial. We do not know who wrote the editorial in the Washington Post.

But I would be willing to guess that Dr. Krauthammer knows more about the subject than whoever at the White House wrote the article for the Washington Post editorial page.

If we want to compare capabilities and knowledge, I would be glad to get into that. I put my money with Krauthammer against anybody who writes an editorial in the Washington Post.

Having said that, I have done what I can do at this point in terms of suggesting that hearings be in order.

[Page: S10723]

Mr. DORGAN. You have suggested.

Mr. LOTT. I have suggested that to the chairman. He has indicated, while he understands and will be working toward that, he has these other issues into which he wants hearings.

But I expect next week to get some feel from him exactly what the schedule would be. When I do talk to him, which will be, I presume, early next week, I will be glad to get back to Senator Dorgan and give him that information.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate that.

Let me say I have great respect for the chairman of the committee. We might have disagreements about the policy, but he is the chairman. I have respect for him and in no way denigrate his efforts and his beliefs on these issues.

This is a very controversial matter but very important and one I believe the Senate ought to be entitled to debate. Based on the majority leader's response, I will look forward to further discussing with him next week.

Let me say I appreciate the fact he has initiated an effort to ask that we have some hearings held in the Senate. I think that is movement, and that is exactly what should happen.

Mr. LOTT. I cannot wait to hear how Jim Schlesinger describes the CTBT treaty. When he gets through damning it, they may not want more hearings.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. Schlesinger will be standing in a mighty small crowd. Most of the folks who are supporting this treaty are the folks who Senator Lott and I have the greatest respect for who have served this country as Republicans and Democrats, and military policy analysts for three or four decades, going back to President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the time just consumed during the leader's presentation of consent items not count against the Coverdell morning business time.

Reuters 09/08/99

Fight in US Senate looms over nuke test ban treaty

By Christopher Wilson

WASHINGTON - Setting the stage for a fiercely partisan confrontation, Democratic Senator Byron Dorgan on Wednesday threatened to hold up all business in the U.S. Senate unless the Republican leadership agrees to debate approval of a global treaty banning nuclear testing.

Although 152 nations have already signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Washington has taken the lead in trying to persuade India and Pakistan to join the signatories, the United States itself has not yet ratified it because the treaty is bogged down in a complicated dispute between Democrats and Republicans in Congress.

"At a time when we have evidence of more proliferation of nuclear weapons...it is our moral responsibility to provide leadership in the world on these issues," said Dorgan, a North Dakota Democrat, in a speech on the Senate floor.

Dorgan, who has previously hinted he might resort to guerrilla tactics, warned he would "plant myself on this floor like a potted plant and begin objecting" if Senate Republican leader Trent Lott of Mississippi fails to place the test ban treaty on the Senate agenda for debate.

"I intend to object to other routine business of the Senate until this country decides to accept the moral leadership that is its obligation and bring this treaty to the floor for debate," said Dorgan. "I don't run this place, but those that do should know this is going to be a tough place to run if you don't decide to bring this issue to the floor of the Senate..."

TOP FOREIGN POLICY GOAL

Although ratification of the test ban treaty has been stalled in Congress for nearly three years, it remains one of President Bill Clinton's top foreign policy goals, receiving fresh impetus from the dangers posed by India and Pakistan's nuclear ambitions, warnings from North Korea that it plans to test a new long-range ballistic missile and China's recent admission that it has upgraded its nuclear capability.

Senate Republicans, including Sen. Jesse Helms of North Carolina, the powerful chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are opposed to moving forward with a new treaty banning nuclear tests until they are convinced that the Clinton administration will build at least a limited defence for the United States against long-range missile attacks.

The idea that the nuclear test ban treaty is being held hostage to domestic political squabbles, does not sit easily with many nations looking to Washington for leadership.

"It will be a scandal if President Clinton leaves office at the end of next year with the treaty unratified," Thailand's Bangkok Post declared in a recent editorial. "The U.S. president must rescue the test-ban treaty from petty politics. He must place it back on the table in its proper context."

And he must ensure that the U.S. Congress ratifies the treaty as a matter of national, and international, importance.

Ratification of the test ban treaty, however, is complex because to appease Congressional Republicans, Washington may be forced to renegotiate the Cold War-era Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972 with Russia to gain a provision to allow the United States to build a limited ballistic missile shield.

This is difficult since Russia wants the United States to reduce its nuclear capability before it will agree to any treaty modification that would allow the United States such a national defence system. The whole issue is also bound up in larger arms reductions negotiations between the United States and Russia, notably the Start II and Start III treaties.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Return-Path: <syoun@clw.org>

X-Sender: syoun@[209.8.25.194]

Date: Thu, 09 Sep 1999 09:21:47 -0400

To: washofc@aol.com, (Ann Delorey) adelorey@erols.com,
(Heather Nolen) hnolen@igc.org, (Tom Hart) tom.hart@ecunet.org,
(Jere Skipper) jmskipper@aol.com, (Mary Miller) epf@igc.apc.org,
(Clayton Ramey) crramey@igc.org, (Kathy Guthrie) kathy@fcnl.org,
(Rachel Phillips) rachel@fcnl.org, (Joe Volk) joe@fcnl.org,
(Mark Brown) mark.brown@ecunet.org,
(Jay Lintner) jay.lintner@ecunet.org,
(Terence Miller) mknolldc@igc.apc.org,
(Daryl Byler) mccwijdb@erols.com, (Howard Hallman) mupj@igc.org,
(Lisa Wright) lwright@igc.org, (Jean Sammon) network@igc.apc.org,
(Dave Robinson) dave@paxchristiusa.org,
(Walter Owensby) Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org,
(L. William Yolton) lwyolton@prodigy.net,
(Gerald F. Powers) gpowers@nccbuscc.org,
(Adina Rosenbaum) arosenbaum@uahc.org, (Lawrence Egbert) uuawo@aol.com,
(Marijke Haworth) jpmc@ucc.org, (Jay Lintner) lintnerj@ucc.org,
(Robin Ringler) Dringler@umc-gbcs.org

From: Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>

Subject: Sign-on ltr to Clinton on START

September 9, 1999

To: Interfaith Working Group

Fm: Stephen Young, Deputy Director, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

Re: Sign-on ltr to Clinton on START

I thought you might be interested in signing onto the following Coalition letter.

In an effort to break the deadlock on nuclear reductions, below is a Coalition sign-on letter to President Clinton on START III. It advocates four actions:

1. Agreement on START III before President Yeltsin leaves office, or sooner;
2. Lower warhead ceilings, of 1,000-1,500, than agreed in Helsinki;
3. Agreement on START III regardless of whether the Duma has acted on START II; and
4. No proposals on the ABM Treaty that would encourage Russia or China to maintain or build-up their arsenals.

This letter is a Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers effort, and will go out on our letterhead. Thus, I regret that I can't make any further changes to the letter at this time.

Please reply directly to me by email, or call me on 202-546-0795, ext. 102. Please include name, title and organization.

The deadline for signature is noon on Friday, September 10.

Stephen

+ + + + +

Dear President Clinton,

We welcome the renewal of discussions between the United States and Russia on further strategic nuclear weapons reductions. In our view, it is critical to reach agreement before President Yeltsin leaves office, and sooner if possible. Your personal leadership and intervention will be vital to achieving this crucial and historic step toward much lower numbers of nuclear weapons and a safer world.

We strongly believe that START III should achieve reductions below those outlined in the 1997 Helsinki framework agreement. At last month's discussions in Moscow, Russian officials proposed ceilings of no more than 1,500 strategic warheads for each nation. We urge you to accept the Russian-proposed level and consider further reductions down to a ceiling of 1,000 strategic warheads. That level would leave the U.S. and Russia with arsenals well in excess of what is needed to deter attack.

We expect that agreement on START III, particularly at levels lower than Helsinki, will also increase the likelihood that the Russian Duma will ratify START II. For this reason, agreement on START III should not be contingent on Duma action on START II.

As you have stated, the ABM Treaty remains the "cornerstone of strategic stability." Russian officials have repeatedly made clear that maintaining this Treaty is essential to the START process. We recommend that the United States not suggest any changes to the ABM Treaty that might prompt Russia to slow or reverse reductions in its nuclear arsenal, or push China to accelerate or expand its nuclear weapons modernization program.

Thank you for your consideration of our views. We wish you all success in breaking the seven year-long impasse on U.S.-Russian nuclear arms reductions. We would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you and your senior advisors to discuss this matter.

Sincerely,

Spurgeon Keeny
President
Arms Control Association

Martin Butcher
Senior Visiting Fellow
British American Security Information Council

Lindsay Matison
Director
The International Center

Gordon Clark
Executive Direction
Peace Action, Peace Action Education Fund

Thomas B. Cochran, PhD
Director, Nuclear Program and
Wade Greene Chair for Nuclear Policy
Natural Resources Defense Council

David Culp
Legislative Director
Plutonium Challenge

John Isaacs
President
Council for Livable World

Susan Schaer
Executive Director
Women's Action for New Directions

Robert K. Musil, PhD
Executive Director
Physicians for Social Responsibility

James K. Wyerman
Executive Director
20/20 Vision

Ambassador Jonathan Dean
Advisor on International Security Issues
Union of Concerned Scientists

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: Stephen Young <syoun@clw.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Re: Sign-on ltr to Clinton on START
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

At 09:21 AM 9/9/99 -0400, you wrote:

>September 9, 1999

>

>To: Interfaith Working Group

>Fm: Stephen Young, Deputy Director, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

>

>Re: Sign-on ltr to Clinton on START

>

>I thought you might be interested in signing onto the following Coalition

>letter.

>

Steve,

If it's not too late, I'll sign the letter to Clinton on START.

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

Ann:

I would like to attend the session on federalism on October 1.

Howard Halalman

Howard, I just received your letter and paper given at your conference in Japan. Frankly, I had lost your phone number since I had sent all the materials to Tides and had not kept a copy. (I e-mailed Daryl today asking me for your number.) I wanted to report that I had talked to Ellen Friedman about ten days ago, following up your proposal. She said the staff would formally review it, along with other recent requests, at the end of this month to see whether they thought there was a match between the proposal and a donor who had "parked" money at Tides. This is a little earlier than the November date mentioned in your letter. We'll see.

My current interest in participatory democracy deals with young people. They know almost nothing of the great pillars of this society - the Declaration of Independence, Bill of Rights, Constitution, etc. Without that base how can there be intelligent discussion of the great issues facing us? Schools don't and maybe can't help because they cannot deal with anything controversial. That's what has my attention at the moment.

Richard W. Boone

rwboone@silcom.com

September 14, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends

FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Dole Opposes CTBT; Lott promises hearings

Defying the support of 82% of the electorate, the support of the JCS, scientists and many others, this afternoon the Associated Press reports that Elizabeth Dole has issued a statement urging the Senate to reject the CTBT. (See below.)

In addition, Majority Leader Trent Lott said, in an answer to a question from a reporter in his "stakeout briefing," that CTBT hearings would be held this year to show that the CTBT is tantamount to "unilateral nuclear disarmament."

Also, candidate George W. Bush is expected to release a statement/document outlining his views on defense/foreign policy as early as tomorrow.

More details on the Lott statement when they are available. Be prepared for plenty of CTBT work in the days ahead.

-- Daryl Kimball

September 14, 1999

Dole Opposes Test Ban Treaty

Filed at 3:17 p.m. EDT

By The Associated Press

WASHINGTON (AP) -- Republican presidential candidate Elizabeth Dole urged Congress on Tuesday to reject President Clinton's pleas for a global ban on nuclear test explosions.

She called the long-stalled Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty "ill-conceived" and a threat to national security.

"With Russia in turmoil, with North Korea and other threats, with other rogue nations moving forward, I think the U.S. will need -- for the foreseeable future -- a credible deterrent," the former American Red Cross president said in a telephone interview. "A credible deterrent means you have to have confidence in that deterrent -- and that means testing."

Dole, who lags well behind Republican front-runner George W. Bush in presidential polls, also released a statement opposing the pact. Clinton wants the treaty approved by a Sept. 23 deadline.

The 1996 treaty has been signed by 152 nations but so far ratified by only 18 of the 44 nations with nuclear capabilities. The nuclear powers must approve the pact for it to take effect.

Russia and China are among the nations that have not ratified it.

Supporters of the treaty say it would lock in U.S. superiority gained in over 1,000 nuclear tests during the Cold War, while failing to ratify the pact could open the door to nuclear tests by other nations.

Opponents argue it could threaten America's ability to deliver an effective nuclear strike, if one is ever needed. The treaty is bottled up in the Republican-led Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The United States has not conducted a full-fledged nuclear test since 1992. Mrs. Dole said a long period of non-testing could create "potential defects" in the U.S. arsenal. "Why the rush" to sign a treaty? Mrs. Dole asked.

Copyright 1999 The New York Times Company

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Dear Colleagues:

You can see from the e-mail messages that Daryl Kimball is sending that the CTBT campaign is intensifying. Rumors include (a) Senator Helms suddenly reporting the CTBT with the expectation that a quick vote will defeat it, (b) a short set of hearings followed by a vote this session, (c) hearings but no further action, (d) hearings and a date certain for a vote in 2000, and (e) nothing at all happening. We have to be prepared for any of these scenarios.

This underscores the importance of our current efforts to get calls and letters to key senators from their constituents. Please keep up what you are doing and step up the pace of your outreach.

We will discuss the situation more fully at the next meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT on Tuesday, September 21 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the FCNL Conference Room, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, D. C. See you then.

Shalom,
Howard

At 01:52 PM 9/15/99 -0400, you wrote:

>To: Howard Hallman

>From: J. Daryl Byler

>Date: 9/15/99 1:50:59 PM

>Subj: Fwd: (Fwd) Y2K Nuclear Weapons Off Alert

>

>Hi Howard:

>

>Do you have any council on this? I know that de-alerting has been an important
>issue to you. To what extent to you connect that concern to Y2K issues?

>

Daryl

>

Daryl,

I believe that is legitimate to connect dealerting with Y2K. I signed an appeal on this theme to Clinton and Yeltsin developed by an Australian group, asking for dealerting in December and January just to be sure. I think that's what the fax to Clinton and Yeltsin is about.

We favor permanent dealerting, but the Y2K situation is a good way to bring the issue into focus. I'm not a fearmonger and would not predict catastrophic results if the arsenal isn't dealarted by midnight, December 31. But being cautious is prudent.

For its part the U.S. government has invited representatives of Russia and China to be at the command center in Colorado Springs over the New Year to be certain that false alarms don't occur or are misinterpreted. We can ask for dealerting as a further saftey measure.

Shalom,

Howard

To: Howard Hallman
From: J. Daryl Byler
Date: 9/15/99 1:50:59 PM
Subj: Fwd: (Fwd) Y2K Nuclear Weapons Off Alert

Hi Howard:

Do you have any council on this? I know that de-alerting has been an important issue to you. To what extent to you connect that concern to Y2K issues?

Daryl

----- Forwarded Message Follows -----

From: Marilyn Houser Hamm <mhhamm@confmenno.ca>
To: "J. Daryl Byler" <mccwash@igc.apc.org>
Cc: "John K. Stoner" <jkstoner@prolog.net>
Subject: Y2K Nuclear Weapons Off Alert
Date: Tue, 14 Sep 1999 11:47:38 -0500

Hi Daryl, John,

I am needing discernment help today. I passed on to our office executive the feature from the New Internationalist on the need for action with regard to taking nuclear weapons and got a lukewarm response to Y2K agenda-items.

Being a newcomer to my office, I felt that I would not press for further conference action until I received yesterday a FAX from MCC Saskatchewan and Project Ploughshares Saskatchewan urging immediate action and faxes to President Clinton and Preseident Yeltsin.

How are you advising Mennonite congregations/constituency on this matter?

Your words may help my case if it is time for the Canadian Mennonite Church to make an official statement.

Thanks much.

Grace and Strength for your journies today,

Marilyn

John K. Stoner
728 Fulton St
Akron PA 17501
(717) 859-1958

"A nation which makes resistance to nuclear weapons illegal is probably making reliance on personal weapons inevitable, because violence begets violence."

John K. Stoner

[End of Original Text]

The following letter was sent last week to President Clinton:

September 7, 1999

The Honorable William J. Clinton
President of the United States
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr President,

At our recent annual meeting in Chicago, the American Medical Association House of Delegates, citing our conviction that "the threat that existent nuclear weapons represent is truly an urgent public health issue," voted to ask that you, "urgently develop policies with other countries to minimize the accidental deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction."

As you know, nearly 10 years after the end of the Cold War, there remain in the arsenals of the world some 35,000 nuclear weapons. 2500 of these, on missiles in the Russian arsenal, are on hair-trigger alert. They can be fired in 15 minutes, and reach their target cities in less than 30 minutes, destroying the world as we know it. They are, arguably, the greatest threat to the health and safety of the American people existing today.

A study published in the New England Journal of Medicine in April 1998 estimated that an accidental launch from a single Russian Delta IV submarine, even if it did not lead to a wider nuclear war, could kill 6,838,000 people from the direct effects of blast and firestorm, with another six to twelve million people dying from radiation sickness over the following two months. Such an accident would be a disaster without parallel in human history.

This is not simply a theoretical danger. As you are aware, on the morning of January 25, 1995, a US weather rocket launched from Norway was initially interpreted by the Russian military as a possible attack on the Russian Federation. President Yeltsin and his advisors were given minutes to decide whether to launch a retaliatory attack on the United States. We were extremely lucky that morning. We can not rely on luck to prevent a future catastrophe.

At a similar moment of great nuclear danger, just before the break up of the Soviet Union in 1989, your predecessor, President Bush, acted decisively to lessen the peril of nuclear war. He unilaterally removed a small number of tactical nuclear weapons from the US arsenal, and, when President Gorbachev reciprocated, he quickly reached an agreement with the Soviets to withdraw the vast majority of these weapons on both sides.

The present danger demands similar visionary leadership today. Your former commander of all strategic nuclear forces, General George Lee Butler, has called for the US and Russia to remove all of their nuclear missiles from

hair-trigger alert as the single most important step to prevent an accidental nuclear war.

As physicians charged with the protection of public health, we call on you to take the lead in developing such policies to minimize the danger of a nuclear catastrophe. Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

E Ratcliffe Anderson, Jr., MD
Executive Vice President, CEO
American Medical Association

Lachlan Forrow, MD
President
The Albert Schweitzer Fellowship
Promoting Reverence for Life in Action
since 1940
www.schweitzerfellowship.org
617-667-5111; 617-667-7989 (fax)

"Nuclear weapons are against international law and they have to be abolished...All negotiations regarding the abolition of nuclear weapons remain without success because no international public exists which demands this abolition."

--Dr. Albert Schweitzer

Sec. 1501(a) of the FY2000 DOD authorization bill says (in part) "(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), funds available to the Department of Defense may not be obligated or expended for retiring or dismantling, or for preparing to retire or dismantle, any of the following strategic nuclear delivery systems below the specified levels: (A) 76 B-52H bomber aircraft. (B) 18 Trident ballistic missile submarines. (C) 500 Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles. (D) 50 Peacekeeper intercontinental ballistic missiles."

Paragraph (2) then goes on to describe the Presidential certification that permits the reduction of the Trident submarine force, and paragraph (3) gives the dates when the number of Tridents can be reduced if the certification is made.

I do not see anything in this section that prohibits de-alerting. We have been very clear for a long time that de-alerting is not "retiring" delivery systems and it is not "dismantling" delivery systems. Likewise, de-alerting is not "preparing to retire or dismantle" delivery systems. Thus, I propose that we assert with confidence that this section has nothing to do with de-alerting, because this prohibits retiring or dismantling. We should not agree with the interpretation that this section prohibits de-alerting.

(I should mention that the accompanying conference report also does not mention de-alerting in discussing Section 1501.)

What do you think?

Shalom,
Bob Tiller

Bob, et al,

Thanks for a valiant attempt, but unfortunately its too good to be true.

The FY2000 DOD Authorization modifies large parts of Section 1302 a) and b) of the 1998 bill. However, it is section c that contains the language prohibiting dealerting, and that section was updated slightly but remains in force.

Stephen

At 05:40 PM 09/15/1999 -0400, Bob Tiller wrote:

>Sec. 1501(a) of the FY2000 DOD authorization bill says (in part) "(1)
>Except as provided in paragraph (2), funds available to the Department
>of Defense may not be obligated or expended for retiring or dismantling,
>or for preparing to retire or dismantle, any of the following strategic
>nuclear delivery systems below the specified levels: (A) 76 B-52H bomber
>aircraft. (B) 18 Trident ballistic missile submarines. (C) 500 Minuteman
>III intercontinental ballistic missiles. (D) 50 Peacekeeper
>intercontinental ballistic missiles."

>
>Paragraph (2) then goes on to describe the Presidential certification
>that permits the reduction of the Trident submarine force, and paragraph
>(3) gives the dates when the number of Tridents can be reduced if the
>certification is made.

>
>I do not see anything in this section that prohibits de-alerting. We
>have been very clear for a long time that de-alerting is not "retiring"
>delivery systems and it is not "dismantling" delivery systems.
>Likewise, de-alerting is not "preparing to retire or dismantle" delivery
>systems. Thus, I propose that we assert with confidence that this
>section has nothing to do with de-alerting, because this prohibits
>retiring or dismantling. We should not agree with the interpretation
>that this section prohibits de-alerting.

>
>(I should mention that the accompanying conference report also does not
>mention de-alerting in discussing Section 1501.)

>
>What do you think?

>
>Shalom,
>Bob Tiller

>
>

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>>

Dear Abolitionists,

In the growing campaign to get all nuclear forces de-alerted before 31 December, I thought I should share with you two items, relating to the alert status of French and Chinese nuclear forces, which I have not seen given any recent prominence:

1) In the final report by the Tokyo Forum, page 37 paragraph 12: "...the UK AND FRANCE EACH maintain only one ballistic missile-carrying submarine at sea, at launch readiness MEASURED IN DAYS. CHINA IS BELIEVED TO MAINTAIN ITS NUCLEAR FORCES AT A SOMEWHAT LOWER LEVEL."

2) In the September/October issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, page 53, an oped piece by Ming Zhang called "What Threat?" states: "The DF-5 missiles... (the primary threat) are silo-based, non-mobile, and liquid-fuelled. They are deployed WITH THEIR TANKS EMPTY AND THEIR WARHEADS DETACHED AND STORED." [My emphasis in both quotes]

These claims about China's forces being de-alerted are consistent with a report given to me by a Chinese General over a year ago at a conference in Oxford. He explained that this was because China didn't believe in Western-style nuclear deterrence doctrine (ie threat of first use for coercion or deterring CB or even conventional attacks against vital interests), and didn't trust the reliability of its nuclear systems. This is corroborated by Ming Zhang.

What this means is that we are correct in focusing our efforts on the US and Russia. However, we need to mobilise China, the UK and France in support of our cause.

Best wishes,
Rob Green
Chair, World Court Project UK

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

Disarmament & Security Centre
PO Box 8390
Christchurch
Aotearoa/New Zealand

Tel/Fax: (+64) 3 348 1353

Email: robwcpuk@chch.planet.org.nz

[The DSC is a specialist branch of the NZ Peace Foundation]

September 15, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends of the CTBT

FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: CTBT state of play, 9/15/99

Recent efforts of CTBT supporters in the Senate and in the NGO community have finally pushed the CTBT question to the forefront in the Senate. In particular, the threat delivered by Senator Byron Dorgan (D-ND) last week that he would "plant myself on the floor like a potted plant and object" if opponents continue to block the treaty, has led Majority Leader Lott, Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Helms, and the handful of other CTBT opponents to perk up. It has also caught the attention of some Clinton administration officials who now recognize that they cannot afford to delay an all out push for the CTBT any longer.

For the moment, key Republican leaders are sending mixed messages about how they might respond. Lott seems to be leaning towards hearings. On Friday, September 10, he told Senator Dorgan on the floor of the Senate that he would meet with Helms to urge that hearings on the CTBT be scheduled and warned that "if it is called up pre-emptively, without appropriate consideration and thought, it could be defeated." And, as reported late yesterday, Majority Leader Trent Lott indicated to a group of reporters at his "stakeout" briefing following the weekly Republican caucus luncheon that:

"I presume that there are going to be hearings before the year is out to point out the very bad timing of such a treaty, the flaws of such a treaty. There are a lot of experts that would like to come up here and tell the Congress: Don't do this. It is unilateral disarmament. And -- but the chairmen of the committees, both Armed Services -- John Warner and Chairman Helms -- determine their hearings schedule"

In other words, for the time being, Lott is suggesting that he doesn't like the CTBT, he might like to see hearings, but it is up to Helms to decide what to do.

For his part, Senator Helms has signaled through aides that he would rebuff the request for hearings, and if Dorgan persists, he might hold additional Democratic priority issues hostage. Helms, in other words, would rather stick to his "no CTBT until ABM protocols and Kyoto" mantra.

Based on meetings and conversations with key Democratic Senators today, Dorgan has the support of his colleagues for his effort "[to] object to other routine business of the Senate until this country decides to accept the moral leadership that is its obligation and bring this treaty to the floor for a debate and a vote." How and when they pursue this approach will become apparent in the coming days and weeks.

WHAT'S NEXT:

The specific course of developments in the Senate on the CTBT is hard to predict. Possibilities include:

- * early hearings (with the possibility that those hearings are unbalanced and unproductive) with no further action;
- * agreement on CTBT hearings that lead to a resolution of ratification reported out of SFRC and a vote early next year (which would provide additional time for the administration to solidify needed support for the treaty);
- * no hearings and no commitment to a vote;
- * no hearings and no commitment to a vote and legislative gridlock in the Senate.

WHAT TO DO:

Whatever scenario becomes reality, NOW is the time for all good people to throw their energy into the effort for the CTBT. Our successful efforts to create favorable media coverage since July are now leading to a predictable counter-attack from opponents on and off Capitol Hill. We need to be able to rebut these arguments to maintain the advantage.

Undecided Senators are now starting to look more closely at the CTBT issue and are forming opinions. We must redouble our efforts to get our message through to the President and his advisors, get favorable CTBT media coverage, publicize the broad public support for the test ban, and -- most importantly -- let Senators know how the public feels through personal calls and letters.

What follows is:

- 1) an updated CTBT calendar of events and anniversaries;
- 2) a summary of NGO activities planned for September-October; and
- 3) a short list of CTBT-related resources.

If your organization is engaged in or is planning any CTBT-related work that you feel others should be aware of, please inform us.

Thanks for your hard work,

Daryl Kimball

1. CTBT CALENDAR: September-November 1999

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 16 Cato Institute debate on CTBT, 11am

September 24 3rd anniversary of the signing of the CTBT; 36th anniv. of LTBT approval by Senate

October 6-8 First Article XIV Special Conference on CTBT Entry Into Force, Vienna

October 7-8 President Clinton in Ottawa for bilateral meetings w/P.M. Chretien

October 9-12 Senate Columbus Day recess (estimate)

October 16 35th anniversary of the first Chinese nuclear test, Lop Nor, 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

2. NGO Public Education, Media and Outreach on the CTBT

SEPTEMBER

* Individual meetings for Coalition member group representatives with key Senate CTBT aides

* Speaking invitation for Sandy Berger on CTBT (awaiting response - Carnegie/Coalition)

* Green Group meetings with Hill staff in support for the CTBT (Proposed)

* Meetings with key Clinton Administration officials, being coordinated by John Isaacs and other NGOS. Contact John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org> for more information.

* Ongoing editorial board advisory work on CTBT and follow-up calls (NSNS); and editorial board advisory fax- blast by the Coalition

* Seismological Society of America/American Geophysical Union statement on CTBT verification. Release date not set.

* Background briefing for reporters on Article XIV Special Conference, week of September 27 (Coalition)

* Ongoing Issue Briefs and News Releases as necessary (Coalition)

* CTBT "Call-In" to the Senate on September 14 and beyond, being coordinated by Peace Action, Peace Links, PSR, 20/20 Vision, WAND, and Disarmament Clearinghouse

* Pro-CTBT Demo and photo-op on Capitol Steps on September 14, 1-2pm (Peace Action and others)

* 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.

* 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. Release date not yet set.

* Womens Action for New Directions/Womens Legislators Lobby Natl. Conf. & Lobby Day, Sept. 26-28

OCTOBER-NOVEMBER

* Coalition delegation to Article XIV Conference on EIF scheduled for October 6-8 in Vienna.

* LAWS/LWV conference on nuclear issues including the CTBT in Seattle, November 4.

3. 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, news, analysis, statements and documents related to the test ban treaty and nuclear testing.

Council for a Livable World Legislative Action Center (See <<http://congress.nw.dc.us/clw>>)

September 14 CTBT Day of Action flyers (See <http://www.webcom.com/peaceact/ctb_day.html>)

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.) Now available — call 546-0795 x137

"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 their 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 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 <msugg@cdi.org> or 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 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

At 11:45 AM 9/16/1999 +1200, Rob Green wrote:

>1) In the final report by the Tokyo Forum, page 37 paragraph 12: "...the UK
>AND FRANCE EACH maintain only one ballistic missile-carrying submarine at
>sea, at launch readiness MEASURED IN DAYS.

While I agree that the report makes this claim, I will confess that it is not apparent to me that this is a true fact. While submarines do not have launch-under-attack hair-trigger requirements, I am not immediately able to understand why it would take days to prepare UK and French SLBMs for launch, since it is in the nature of such solid-fueled solid-state systems that they require no more than minutes to launch.

>2) In the September/October issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, >page 53, an oped piece by Ming Zhang called "What Threat?" states: "The >DF-5 missiles... (the primary threat) are silo-based, non-mobile, and >liquid-fuelled. They are deployed WITH THEIR TANKS EMPTY AND THEIR >WARHEADS DETACHED AND STORED."

It is generally believed that the DF-5 missiles that are stored horizontally in tunnels are kept unfueled, given the difficulty of hoisting a fully-fueled missile to an upright position for launch. There is no corresponding physical reason that the DF-5 missiles in vertical silos would need to be kept unfueled.

The DF-5 is generally poorly characterized in the open literature, which may reflect some underlying uncertainty on the part of the US intelligence community. But I would have to view the assertion that the entire DF-5 force is unfueled with warheads stored separately as an interesting claim rather than an established fact.

@@

John Pike <http://www.fas.org/>
Federation of American Scientists 202-675-1023
307 Massachusetts Ave NE Washington, DC 20002
"It is by will alone I set my mind in motion"

ABOLITION 2000 AT THE YEAR 2000

by David Krieger *

Abolition 2000 is rapidly approaching the year 2000, a moment of truth for the global Network. General Lee Butler, a powerful advocate of abolition, offered these observations: "Turning specifically to the agenda, tactics and timetable of the abolition community, I see a widening gulf between its aspirations and their prospects, especially in the near term. That disparity is most immediately obvious in the disjunction between the name of the umbrella organization, "Abolition 2000," and the self-evident reality that its implied goal is not yet in sight, much less in hand. That is a real Y2K problem that must be addressed to ensure that the vitality of the ongoing work of the organization is not diminished by the intimations of a failed strategic objective."

When Abolition 2000 was initiated in 1995, it seemed reasonable to set as our primary goal a treaty by the year 2000 calling for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons. The goal was never to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, but rather to achieve an international treaty leading to the total elimination of these weapons by early in the 21st Century.

Abolition 2000 was born at the 1995 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review and Extension Conference. It came about as a result of disappointment by many NGOs with the apparent blank check given to the nuclear weapons states when the treaty was extended indefinitely. The extension was given without regard for the widely perceived failure of the nuclear weapons states to act on their Article VI obligations for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Abolition 2000 sought in some respects to be the conscience of the international community by demanding that Article VI obligations be upheld in the aftermath of the indefinite extension.

Abolition 2000 began with the drafting of a common Statement by some 60 peace and disarmament NGOs at the 1995 NPT Conference. Supporters of the Statement quickly expanded to about 300 NGOs. Over the past nearly five years, the number of supporters has expanded to 1,358 organizations in 88 countries. As the year 2000 approaches, questions arise as to what will become of Abolition 2000 and its global Network. If an international treaty to ban nuclear weapons is not achieved by the end of the year 2000, will the Network have failed? Will it lose its credibility? Will the Network continue after the year 2000?

The Network made a bold decision at the outset by adopting the name Abolition 2000. It was prepared to press the issue of moving forward with a nuclear weapons abolition agenda, setting a timeframe for tangible progress. It was not content to leave the timeframe open-ended. It refused to accept vague declarations by the nuclear weapons states that they were for the "ultimate" goal of eliminating their nuclear arsenals. While it may be perceived that it would have been safer for the Network to choose a name that did not force a timeframe for success, the choice of the name serves an important function by making clear that an agreement to abolish nuclear weapons is a matter of urgency. Abolition cannot be put off to some indefinite future time whenever the nuclear weapons states decide they are

ready to act.

Inherent in the name Abolition 2000 is the understanding that we should not cross the threshold into a new century and millennium without a clear commitment to the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Abolition 2000 has taken a stand on the side of morality, legality, and democracy, and has given a voice to the opinion of most of the world's nations. Abolition 2000 has spoken truth to power.

The problem is that power, in the form of the governments of the nuclear weapons states, have responded by stonewalling and a continuation of business as usual. These governments seem locked into a Cold War mentality based on the theory of deterrence, despite the fact they can no longer identify who it is they are deterring or from what they are deterring them.

Since the initiation of Abolition 2000, the Network has opposed continued nuclear testing of all kinds, including sub-critical and laboratory testing. It has called for ending the nuclear threat by taking specific steps such as de-alerting nuclear forces and agreeing to policies of No First Use. It has not only called for a treaty to ban nuclear weapons, but has participated in drafting a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention which Costa Rica has introduced in the United Nations. Abolition 2000 has also mobilized citizen actions throughout the world in favor of abolishing nuclear arms, including the gathering of over 13 million signatures in Japan alone. The Network has also encouraged prominent individuals and municipalities to declare themselves committed to the abolition of nuclear weapons.

After nearly five years, Abolition 2000 remains committed to the only outcome that can safeguard humanity's future. But it faces powerful opposing forces in the form of the governments of the nuclear weapons states, the wall of secrecy that surrounds their nuclear policies, and the wall of complacency that engulfs large segments of the public throughout the world.

Abolition 2000 can help to remind the people of the world that they have choices. They don't need to leave the fate of humanity in the hands of a small number of leaders of nuclear weapons states. They do not need to sit by while countries such as India and Pakistan test and deploy nuclear weapons, repeating the mistakes made by the five declared nuclear weapons states. They do not need to continue to feed the defense contractors and politicians that remain eager to develop and deploy the Ballistic Missile Defenses - defenses that have little likelihood of working and will actually make the world far more dangerous as other nuclear armed countries respond with stronger offensive capabilities.

With such dangers as the deployment of Ballistic Missile Defenses on the horizon in the United States, Abolition 2000 is needed more than ever. The year 2000 will be a year of focused actions for the Network throughout the world. The Network has set as goals for itself to grow to 2000 organizations; to identify 2000 prominent supporters of abolishing nuclear weapons; to engage in a week of education and advocacy from March 1-8, 2000; to have a strong and vocal presence at the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference; and to join in millennial events throughout the world.

Abolition 2000 will not simply fade away. Its international symbol is the sunflower. Like the sunflower, it has given birth to a thousand seeds of peace, which will be carried by the wind, take root and grow in many places. These seeds will be borne by the winds of change. They will cross

boundaries and will be carried over walls of indifference. Abolition 2000 may not fulfill its goal of a treaty to ban nuclear weapons in the year 2000. But it is critical that this grassroots movement stay the course and continue to grow until its goal is achieved.

* David Krieger is the president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. He can be reached at dkrieger@wagingpeace.org
ABOLITION 2000 AT THE YEAR 2000 by David Krieger

-
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: <j2000-usa-news-return-3-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
From: "Jubilee 2000/USA" <coord@j2000usa.org>
To: <j2000-usa-news@egroups.com>
Date: Fri, 17 Sep 1999 00:00:12 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
Subject: [j2000-usa-news] Special Update, 9/16/99

Jubilee 2000 Campaign Update, 9/16/99

==> 100 days to the Millennium -- Local Jubilee 2000 supporters are planning conferences, teach-ins and Human Chains!

Congregations across the state of OREGON are declaring Sunday September 19th a "Jubilee Sunday", with special services planned, to be followed by a lecture Oct. 2nd in PORTLAND on Jubilee 2000 by Latin American J2000 campaigner and Nobel Prize winner Adolfo Perez Esquivel. For info call 503-221-1054 or email <Pjrbike@cs.com>. NASHVILLE (TN) Jubilee 2000 has a concert and rally planned for September 21 kick off the campaign there. Activists are promoting a 24 fast for debt relief. Speakers will include Naomi Tutu (at Fisk Univ; daughter of Bishop Desmond Tutu) and with numerous country and pop artists lending their talents. Send comments or ideas to <maura-lee@gurlmail.com>. The COLORADO Jubilee 2000 Campaign is planning a Drop the Debt day of action September 25th, Auraria Campus, DENVER CO. The day will include workshops, speakers and a "human chain" protest to break the chains of debt in which hundreds will surround the around the U.S. Mint (yes, where the money is made) in downtown Denver. Questions, comments, good wishes can be directed to Mara at(303) 623-3464; <jubileecolo@afsc.org>. Also on Sept. 25th Jubilee 2000 PASADENA, CA has an all day interfaith conference planned. For info email <wfpla@igc.org> or call 719-990-6603. Other upcoming events include an impressive Jubilee 2000 teach-in planned in BERKELEY, CA for October 2nd -- Info available from <welesher@aol.com>

Do you have friends in these areas? Be sure to pass the word and urge them to attend these great events!

What do you have going on in your area to promote Jubilee 2000?? Whether its big or small, let us know by emailing us at <coord@j2000usa.org> :-)

==> The Rolling Fast -- in solidarity with the millions made hungry by crushing debt -- is getting underway next week (info at www.religiouswg.org).

With Oxfam America's Fast for a World Harvest a part of the action, we count over 15,000 participants, with community, university and religious groups fasting in just about all 50 states. It's not too late for you or your group to sign up! Call 202-588-1471 or 202-832-1780 for organizing

materials. (Note: we will have an announcement next week about a supporter from Washington state who's already showing an extraordinary commitment to justice for indebted countries...stay tuned...)

Idea: Why not call a radio or TV call-in program (like CNN's Washington Journal) to say that one way people are marking 100 days to the Millennium is by taking part in this incredible nationwide solidarity fast? Help us spread the word. Mention the importance of Congress taking action to fund real debt relief, using the debate over the federal spending priorities as the "news hook" to link your comment to current news coverage.

==> Next Thursday, Bono, Jeffrey Sachs, Puerto Rican salsa star Willie Colon, and R&B legend Quincy Jones will meet with the Pope about debt cancellation.

The announcement was made in New York during the launch of NetAid - a UN initiative comprising 3 live concerts on October 9th and a global website (www.netaid.org). Bono, an avid supporter of Jubilee 2000, will be travelling to Rome on September 23rd, 100 days to the millennium - along with Bob Geldof; Quincy Jones; Willie Colon, salsa artist and political activist; Jeffrey Sachs, Professor of Economics at Harvard University; Julian Filochowski, Director of CAFOD; Randall Robinson, Director of US NGO TransAfrica; and Ann Pettifor, Director of Jubilee 2000 (UK). Bono said the delegation will be "seeking the blessing and wisdom" of the Pope, whom, he said, has called "frequently for the Jubilee year (2000) to be celebrated by the cancellation of the debts of the poorest countries." Bono said: "The millennium is the moment, and debt is the domino at the head of the line. Knock over that domino and the other pillars of poverty - refugees, the hungry, environmental degradation and human rights abuses - come tumbling down." Do you subscribe to a diocesan newspaper? Make sure they know about this important meeting.

==> Jubilee 2000 Coalition (UK) releases new report!
Cost of Canceling Third World Debt a Fraction of Official Estimates

A new report by the British Jubilee 2000 campaign, "Unfinished Business", uses new data to argue that the cost of canceling third world debt is only a fifth of official estimates.

Using research by Harvard economist Jeffrey Sachs, the report argues that writing off the \$354 billion owed by 52 of the world's poorest countries would cost the richer countries only \$71 billion if canceled at market rates. This amounts to about one third of one percent of the annual income of the richest countries. Spread out over 20 years, says the report, this would cost each person in the industrialized world less than \$4 a year, or about one US cent a day. The report draws on internal IMF and World Bank analyses to show that, under the terms of the G-7 Cologne Debt Initiative announced in June -- which claims to offer much more debt relief than under the current HIPC program -- one country, Mali, will pay more in debt service than before. For info on how to get a copy of the report see www.jubilee2000uk.org

Announcements:

==> The Jubilee 2000 campaign is preparing for a crucial final year of action to press for an end to crushing debt. Activists and organizational leaders who have made the campaign a top priority in their work are invited to a special training and planning session for key local organizers, October 15-17, Washington, DC. For more info call 202-783-3566

==> Do you know someone with a talent for organizing people for social change? Jubilee 2000/USA is seeking to hire three grassroots organizers, one based in New York City (Northeast regional organizing), one in Atlanta GA (Southeast regional organizing), and one based in Washington DC whose task it will be to mobilize Jubilee 2000 supporters to attend the April 16, 1999 mobilization in DC (pls put that on your calendar). Persons interested in reviewing the job descriptions should send an email to <coord@j2000usa.org>

==> Did you receive the blue and white Jubilee 2000/USA Newsletter a few weeks ago, entitled "Drop the Debt"?? If not, you are not on our mailing list! To remedy this situation send us your street address pronto. Then you'll get the next issue delivered right to your door. (If you did get the newsletter, do you have comments or suggestions on it? Let us know.)

=====

BETTER THAN EVER: 250 HOURS FREE on AOL! Find out why 18 MM people have chosen AOL as their ISP! Click here NOW! for 250 Free HOURS <http://clickhere.egroups.com/click/914>

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

Hi everyone,

We are trying to set up a get together at the Montgomery Grill where Mike and Roger will give us the low down on their visit to LA recently.

I suggest we set it for one evening next week ie. week beginning Sept 27th.
Let me know what evenings suit you and we will try to make it an evening that suites everyone.

David

At 11:23 AM 9/19/99 EDT, you wrote:

>Hi everyone,

>

>We are trying to set up a get together at the Montgomery Grill where Mike and

>Roger will give us the low down on their visit to LA recently.

>

>I suggest we set it for one evening next week ie. week beginning Sept 27th.

>Let me know what evenings suit you and we will try to make it an evening that

>suites everyone.

>

>David

>

>

David,

Monday or Wednesday, September 27 or 29 would be my preference. I can't meet on Tuesday evening, September 28.

Howard

Dear Colleagues:

Here is the agenda for the meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT on Tuesday, September 21 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the FCNL conference room. Hope to see you then.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Meeting of Interfaith Group for the CTBT
1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, September 21, 1999
FCNL Conference Room, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Status of CTBT
 - a. Congress
 - b. Administration
3. Campaign activities
 - a. Grassroots
 - i. Reports from faith-based organizations
 - ii. Efforts of other organizations
 - iii. Commitments for further activities
 - b. In Washington
 - i. Activities underway
 - ii. What to do in next six weeks
4. Other

Next meeting: Tuesday, October 19, 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., same place.

--

Welcome to the islam-infonet mailing list!

Please save this message for future reference. Thank you.

If you ever want to remove yourself from this mailing list, you can send mail to <Majordomo@cair-net.org> with the following command in the body of your email message:

unsubscribe islam-infonet

or from another account, besides mupj@igc.apc.org:

unsubscribe islam-infonet mupj@igc.apc.org

If you ever need to get in contact with the owner of the list, (if you have trouble unsubscribing, or have questions about the list itself) send email to <owner-islam-infonet@cair-net.org> . This is the general rule for most mailing lists when you need to contact a human.

In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful

As a media professional, you are being offered a trial subscription to the ISLAM-INFONET mailing list. ISLAM-INFONET is a journalist's window to the American Muslim community. As a subscriber, you will receive news releases from the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR), a leading Washington-based Islamic advocacy group.

News releases are generally sent to the list no more than once or twice a week. They deal with subjects such as Islamic religious accommodation in the workplace, Muslim positions on issues of importance to the American public and announcements related to Islamic religious events like the month-long fast of Ramadan and the pilgrimage to Mecca. (To view past releases, go to <http://www.cair-net.org>.)

ISLAM-INFONET is what is called a READ-ONLY list, meaning there is no posting by members of the list.

If you wish to remain on ISLAM-INFONET, do nothing.

If you would like to be removed from the list, send the message "unsubscribe islam-infonet" (without the quotation marks) to majordomo@cair-net.org.

If you ever need to contact the owner of the list, send a message to cair1@ix.netcom.com.

--

Keep for future reference:

TO JOIN ISLAM-INFONET

- o Send a message to majordomo@cair-net.org.
- o Leave the subject line blank.
- o Type "subscribe ISLAM-INFONET" in the body of your message.

TO LEAVE ISLAM-INFONET

- o Send a message to majordomo@cair-net.org.
- o Leave the subject line blank.
- o Type "unsubscribe ISLAM-INFONET" in the body of your message.

FOR INFORMATION

Send a message to cair1@ix.netcom.com

--

_____ Council on American-Islamic Relations
/____| ^ | _ _ | _ \ 1050 17th Street N.W., Suite 490
|| / \ ||| |_) | Washington, D.C. 20036
|| / ^ \ ||| _ / Tel: (202) 659-CAIR (2247)
|____/____ _|_||\ \ Fax: (202) 659-2254
____/ / \ _____|_| \ \ E-mail: cair1@ix.netcom.com
URL: <http://www.cair-net.org>

To join CAIR-NET, CAIR's read-only mailing list: Send "subscribe
cair-net" in the body of a message to majordomo@cair-net.org

September 20, 1999

Dear CTBT colleagues:

Senator Byron Dorgan has invited members of the group that met with him on August 5 to meet with him again to discuss CTBT strategy this week, Wednesday at 2:15 in his Hart 713 office.

In preparation for our meeting with Senator Dorgan (Wednesday at 2:15), we will have a short pre-meeting meeting in advance at 1:30 in Conf. Room #3 of the Methodist Building (100 Maryland Ave. NE).

BECAUSE OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MEETING, YOUR ATTENDANCE AT THE PRE-MEETING IS STRONGLY ENCOURAGED.

The main goal of the pre-meeting is to agree on a common set of recommendations for Dorgan as he moves ahead in his CTBT effort. There is justified concern that one possible response from the GOP to Dorgan's pressure will be to move quickly to hearings and a vote before the Administration has a chance to fully engage. If this were to happen, given Lott's opposition to the CTBT, there is a good chance that the Senate would reject the CTBT. Clearly, this is the last thing we want.

On the other hand we do not want to discourage Dorgan from continuing and increasing his pressure tactics on Lott. Thus we propose the following strategy:

1. Urge Sen. Dorgan to continue his crusade to force action on CTBT. We believe that the CTBT will be approved by a 2/3 majority if there are balanced hearings, serious and substantial debate, and a scheduled date for a vote that allows the executive branch time to put together a "full court press" effort for the Treaty.
2. Urge Sen. Dorgan and his colleagues to pursue hearings and a vote under the best circumstances possible:
 - * If necessary, work with Daschle to prevent a unanimous consent agreement from passing on the Senate floor that includes a vote sooner than one month away.
 - * Work with the Administration to convey the urgency of the situation and the need for immediate, high-level engagement on the CTBT effort.
3. Urge Dorgan, Daschle and others to take steps to increase the chances that we can win a vote if held 1-2 months from now:
 - * Daschle or Podesta could meet with Lott soon -- while there is maximum leverage -- to try to strike a deal on hearings and a date for a vote that gives enough time for pro-CTBT forces to rally more support.
 - * Meet with Clinton and Gore to impress upon them the political benefits of success and the political costs of failure.
 - * Meet with GOP moderates to ask them to speak with Lott about bringing up the treaty.

4. Dorgan et al might consider using opportunities such as the Nuclear Waste Policy Act to force Senate action on the CTBT.

Beyond this, we think it best to leave the details to Dorgan et al. There is too much uncertainty to plan further. While Helms claims to have 34 votes against ratification--and he may have them--we need to push the process further and see where it goes and to test Helm's claim, as long as we have a viable exit strategy.

Please bring your comments on this plan to the pre-meeting on Wednesday, or call Tom or Daryl.

=====

Tom Z. Collina
Director, Arms Control and International Security Program
Union of Concerned Scientists
1616 P St, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 332-0900 x107
fax (202) 332-0905
tcollina@ucsusa.org
www.ucsusa.org

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

At 02:28 PM 9/20/99 -0400, Daryl Kimball wrote:

>September 20, 1999

>

>Dear CTBT colleagues:

>

>Senator Byron Dorgan has invited members of the group that met with him on

>August 5 to meet with him again to discuss CTBT strategy this week,

>Wednesday at 2:15 in his Hart 713 office.....

Daryl, Tom:

I'll be at both meetings on Wednesday.

You have excellent suggestions for tactics. I have one further suggestion.

In case that Senator Helms schedules brief, biased hearings with relatively few witnesses with the intent of moving to a rapid vote, I suggest that we stage a parallel set of citizens hearings. Witnesses can include bishops, scientists, retired military officers, physicians, civil rights leaders, environmentalists, women's representatives, etc. to show broad support for the CTBT. The hearing panel can consist of a bipartisan group of retired senators. If we can't get a room in a Senate office building, the hearings could be squeezed into the dual conference room of the Methodist Building for convenience of Capitol Hill reporters, a nearby church, or even a hotel.

We can combine this with all-out grassroots mobilization. Well publicized citizens hearings in Washington would be an energizer for grassroots mobilizers.

Shalom,

Howard

At 03:37 PM 9/20/99 -0400, you wrote:

>Hi to Ann Freeman Price, Carol Walker, Linda Sabin, Howard Hallman and Rich

>Aronson,

>

>You all agreed last spring at our Coordinators' meeting to serve on a task

>force to help plan the PwJ Breakfast at Gen'l Conf. - did you remember

>that???!!!

>

>I'd like to schedule a conference call soon to do some planning and propose

>the following dates & times. Please let me know ASAP which of these are

>good for you. Please give me as many options as fit your schedule. I look

>forward to hearing from you soon! Thanks for everything you do.

>

>Wed., Sept. 29 - 10 a.m. or 2 p.m. (these are all eastern times)

>Fri., Oct. 1 - 10 a.m. or 2 p.m.

>Mon., Oct. 4 - 2 p.m.

>Tues., Oct. 5 - 10 a.m. or 2 p.m.

>

>Robin:

At the moment I am clear for all of these times except Friday morning, October 1.

Howard

>

>

Friends - I look forward to seeing many of you at the meeting with Sen. Dorgan.

As food for thought for the pre-meeting, I want to respectfully disagree with one conclusion stated by my wonderful colleague Daryl. I do not think that having the CTB lose in a sooner-than-anticipated vote is the last thing we would want. We believe that the LAST thing we want is for this treaty to drift, meaning not come up until 2000, which means not come up until 2001 or 2002 because 2000 is a Presidential election year, which means maybe never come up because who knows who is going to be President and who is going to be in Congress and what 100 other things would have happened between now and then. We are in high gear right now, mobilized to work on this with all cylinders, and we may never be able to get back to this level again if we lose a vote for the next year to year and a half.

I think drift is the supreme enemy of this treaty right now, because if we allow it to be killed by drift - without even a fight - we never have our full chance to debate the subject in public, and everything on arms control/disarmament would just slip even further into inaction or harmful regression than it has already. (And if I'm not mistaken, the small group that stayed after the last Coalition meeting to discuss this also agreed that drift is worse than possible defeat on a vote.)

I say we urge Sen. Dorgan to do everything in his power to get a vote scheduled, whether that vote happens in 4 days or 4 months. The biggest, most public struggle is exactly what we need to have on this issue right now, and this may also be our last, best chance to actually get the damn treaty. - Gordon

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Daryl Kimball [mailto:dkimball@clw.org]

> Sent: Monday, September 20, 1999 12:18 PM

> To: dkimball@clw.org

> Cc: tcollina@ucsusa.org; jdi@clw.org; bmusil@psr.org;

> graham@lawsens.org; Joe Volk, FCNL; Marie Rietmann; Kimberly Robson;

> mkrepon@stimson.org; Susan Shaer; Spurgeon Keeny;

> gclark@peace-action.org; David Culp; jimwyerman@2020vision.org;

> mupj@igc.org

> Subject: Mtg. w/Sen. Dorgan Wed., 9/22 -- PLZ REPLY

>

>

> September 20, 1999

>

> Dear CTBT colleagues:

>

> Senator Byron Dorgan has invited members of the group that met with him on

> August 5 to meet with him again to discuss CTBT strategy this week,

> Wednesday at 2:15 in his Hart 713 office.

>

> In preparation for our meeting with Senator Dorgan (Wednesday at 2:15), we

> will have a short pre-meeting meeting in advance at 1:30 in Conf. Room #3

> of the Methodist Building (100 Maryland Ave. NE).

>
> BECAUSE OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE MEETING, YOUR ATTENDANCE AT THE
> PRE-MEETING IS STRONGLY ENCOURAGED.

>
> The main goal of the pre-meeting is to agree on a common set of
> recommendations for Dorgan as he moves ahead in his CTBT effort. There is
> justified concern that one possible response from the GOP to Dorgan's
> pressure will be to move quickly to hearings and a vote before the
> Administration has a chance to fully engage. If this were
> to happen, given Lott's opposition to the CTBT, there is a good
> chance that
> the Senate would reject the CTBT. Clearly, this is the last
> thing we want.

>
> On the other hand we do not want to discourage Dorgan from continuing and
> increasing his pressure tactics on Lott. Thus we propose the following
> strategy:

>
> 1. Urge Sen. Dorgan to continue his crusade to force action on CTBT. We
> believe that the CTBT will be approved by a 2/3 majority if there are
> balanced hearings, serious and substantial debate, and a
> scheduled date for
> a vote that allows the executive branch time to put together a "full court
> press" effort for the Treaty.

>
> 2. Urge Sen. Dorgan and his colleagues to pursue hearings and a
> vote under
> the best circumstances possible:

>
> * If necessary, work with Daschle to prevent a unanimous consent
> agreement
> from passing on the Senate floor that includes a vote sooner than
> one month
> away.

> * Work with the Administration to convey the urgency of the situation and
> the need for immediate, high-level engagement on the CTBT effort.

>
> 3. Urge Dorgan, Daschle and others to take steps to increase the chances
> that we can win a vote if held 1-2 months from now:

>
> * Daschle or Podesta could meet with Lott soon -- while there is maximum
> leverage -- to try to strike a deal on hearings and a date for a vote that
> gives enough time for pro-CTBT forces to rally more support.

> * Meet with Clinton and Gore to impress upon them the political benefits
> of success and the political costs of failure.

> * Meet with GOP moderates to ask them to speak with Lott about
> bringing up
> the treaty.

>
> 4. Dorgan et al might consider using opportunities such as the Nuclear
> Waste Policy Act to force Senate action on the CTBT.

>
> Beyond this, we think it best to leave the details to Dorgan et al. There
> is too much uncertainty to plan further. While Helms claims to have 34

> votes against ratification--and he may have them--we need to push the
> process further and see where it goes and to test Helm's claim, as long as
> we have a viable exit strategy.

>
> Please bring your comments on this plan to the pre-meeting on
> Wednesday, or
> call Tom or Daryl.

>
> =====

>
> Tom Z. Collina
> Director, Arms Control and International Security Program
> Union of Concerned Scientists
> 1616 P St, NW
> Washington, DC 20036
> (202) 332-0900 x107
> fax (202) 332-0905
> tcollina@ucsusa.org
> www.ucsusa.org

>
>
> _____

>
> Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
> Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
> 110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
> Washington, DC 20002
> (ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
> website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

> _____
>

Dear Friends:

I have received your User's Guide and CD-ROM so that I can shift from IGC to MindSpring. Before I install your system I have a question.

Under Eudora Lite, which I am using, I can filter messages by sending certain ones directly to trash. This is important because I am part of a large list-serve that frequently has messages from persons who stray from the topic of the list-serve or on certain issues that I'm not dealing with. In your User's Guide there is no mention of filtering in your Outlook Express. Is there such a system?

If not, can I continue to use Eudora Lite as an alternative? If so, how do I install it within your system?

Thanks for your help,
Howard Hallman

Dear Carlee:

I hope you do not mind my answering via e-mail. It is just so much easier and faster!

I thought your poetry was beautiful and would be pleased to include two of them in our January 2000 issue. "A Matter of Privacy", and "Finders Keepers". You will receive a complimentary copy in which your work appears. Thank you for submitting to Beginnings. I do not think you will be an amateur writer for long!

Since you enclosed an SASE, I will send back your other poems via snail mail unless otherwise indicated.

Thank you again, Carlee--and please, pass the word along to other aspiring writers you may know!

Jenine Boisits
Editor
Beginnings Publishing

Kevin Martin (of Fourth Freedom Forum) said that he recently spoke with Ken Myers, who reported that:

-Lugar is still undecided about CTBT, largely because he doesn't know if Stockpile Stewardship can do the job.

-The Administration is not doing its job in selling CTBT to Republicans. Myers himself has not heard from the Administration for months on CTBT.

Shalom,
Bob T.

Hi you all!

Thanks for responding. It looks like the best time to talk will be Wed., Sept. 29, 10:30 a.m. eastern time (sorry, Linda! Will your boss let you?). Please put that on your calendar. I will contact the conference call company and **YOU WILL BE CALLED BY THEM**, then plugged into the conversation. Please let me know ASAP at what number we should call you! Or, let's do it this way. I'll list your numbers below. If there's a different number for you that morning, please e-mail me the correct number ASAP. Thanks!

Howard - 301/896-0013
Carol - 210/366-2083
Rich - 440/871-7381
Linda - 937/426-0615
Ann - 914/353-7522

Rich has talked with Bread for the World about their exec. director, David Beckman, speaking at the breakfast. One of our big discussion items needs to be speaker/s. We need to invite people right away. I'm working on the location and will tell you about that on the call. Carol raised questions about the menu, music, displays, budget, amount of time, etc. Let's talk about as much of this as we can given your time. Can you all afford 30 mins.?

If I don't talk with you before them, we'll talk on the 29th! Thanks very much!

At 03:06 PM 9/23/99 -0400, Robin Ringler wrote:

>Hi you all!

>

>Thanks for responding. It looks like the best time to talk will be Wed.,

>Sept. 29, 10:30 a.m. eastern time....

Hello everyone,

On the matter of speakers, in previous years we looked at the General Conference agenda and chose speakers who would deal with issues coming before the Conference. We dealt with UM positions on public policy issues and not internal matters of the UMC. Not that latter lack justice implications but rather in a short time we can't deal with everything.

Because Methodists United for Peace with Justice was the sponsor and we were focusing on nuclear disarmament issues, we always had somebody touch on that. But except for the first one in 1988 the P/J Breakfasts have always been broader in their coverage of topics.

In 2000 we will be making a fresh start with dual sponsorship, so these precedents don't have to prevail. But I want to share experience of 1988, 1992, and 1996 as background for our conference call.

Shalom,

Howard

Dear Colleagues:

Here is a status report on the CTBT ratification campaign for those of you who missed Tuesday's meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, and a further update for those who were there.

Senator Dorgan continues his commitment to press Senator Lott for a commitment for a vote on the CTBT. He is awaiting a response from Senator Lott on his promise to discuss the possibility of hearings with Senator Helms. Senator Dorgan remains willing to halt Senate business at an appropriate time. He has the backing of Senate Democratic leadership.

The most important thing we can do is continue getting our contacts in 16 states with key senators and moderates to call and write their senators, urging them to speak out for hearings and a vote on the CTBT. As a refresher to your memory, the list is attached. Senator Chafee of Rhode Island is now publicly committed to the CTBT, so contacts with him can thank him and urge him to speak out.

Many of you have sent out alerts, either to your entire list or to these states. Would you please follow through by making phone calls to your key contacts, asking them to reach out further to their own contacts? Perhaps you could make five calls a day (or more) amongst the other activities on your busy agenda. Senate Republicans are now talking about the CTBT, so we want these senators to be hearing from their constituents.

If we continue to press along with our colleagues in secular organizations, and along with the White House (which we hope will be doing more), we have an excellent chance of getting a time-certain set for a vote on the CTBT. It may be next February or March, but if we can get a vote set, we'll be in a position to work on another 20 or so senators to vote "yes" for the treaty. That's down the road. For now, let's continue concentrating on the 22 on the attached list.

Shalom,
Howard

Key Senators on the CTBT

ALASKA: Stevens
INDIANA: Lugar
KANSAS: Brownback, Roberts
MAINE: Collins, Snowe
MISSISSIPPI: Lott

NEBRASKA: Hagel
NEW HAMPSHIRE: Gregg
NEW MEXICO: Domenici
OHIO: DeWine, Voinovich
OREGON: G. Smith

RHODE ISLAND: Chafee
TENNESSEE: Frist, Thompson
UTAH : Bennett, Hatch.
WASHINGTON: Gorton
VIRGINIA: Warner

WYOMING: Thomas, Enzi

Thank You for the email

I will send you detailed instructions on the multiple email account's. The filtering is very different in outlook express compared Eudora. You don't have to use outlook express if you would prefer eudora. To change the application that opens with the email button go to the configure button at the bottom center of your Mindspring desktop and then go to the toolbar tab. click on the email button then on the find button go to the eudora directory under the C drive and then double click on eudora.exe (it will have a mailbox to the left hand side of it). This will make it where you will open eudora instead of outlook express.I hope this helps.

Thank you for using Mindspring
Brian H.

Mindspring Tech Support

If you continue to have questions please feel free to call us at
1-800-719-4660

> At 09:37 AM 9/24/99 -0400, you wrote:

> >Hello,

> >
> >How to create multiple folders and filters to sort multiple e-mail
> >accounts in Outlook Express 5:

> >
>
> Dear Support:

>
> Thanks for the instructions about filtering. I'm willing to try it, but it
> sounds complicated compared to the simple system of Eudora Light.
>
> I'm comfortable with Eudora. I notice that you offer it as freeware. Can
> I just use my already installed Eudora from IGC with your system? If so,
> how do I make the connection when I install MindSpring.

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

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

> -----
> From mupj@igc.org Fri Sep 24 10:08:59 1999
> Received: from pop.internal.mindspring.com
> by dragonfly (fetchmail-4.2.9 POP3 run by h-support)
> for <root@localhost> (single-drop); Fri Sep 24 10:08:59 1999
> Return-Path: <mupj@igc.org>
> Received: from smtp6.mindspring.com ([207.69.200.74])
> by mx7.mindspring.com (Mindspring Mail Service) with ESMTP id run0u1.153.37kbi15
> for <h-support@mindspring.com>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 09:59:29 -0400 (EDT)
> Received: from mx9.mindspring.com (mx9.mindspring.com [207.69.200.39])
> by smtp6.mindspring.com (8.8.5/8.8.5) with SMTP id JAA12699
> for <h-support@mindspring.com>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 09:59:44 -0400 (EDT)

> X-MindSpring-Loop: support@mindspring.com
> Received: from igc7.igc.org ([192.82.108.35])
> by mx9.mindspring.com (Mindspring Mail Service) with ESMTP id run0tu.a02.37kbi17
> for <support@mindspring.com>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 09:59:25 -0400 (EDT)
> Received: from igce.igc.org (igce.igc.org [192.82.108.49])
> by igc7.igc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with ESMTP id GAA23066
> for <support@mindspring.com>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 06:58:41 -0700 (PDT)
> Received: from default (PPPa38-Washington7-4R103.saturn.bbn.com [4.11.1.100])
> by igce.igc.org (8.9.3/8.9.3) with SMTP id GAA26007
> for <support@mindspring.com>; Fri, 24 Sep 1999 06:57:39 -0700 (PDT)
> Message-Id: <3.0.3.32.19990924095607.0068ffec@pop2.igc.org>
> X-Sender: mupj@pop2.igc.org
> X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.3 (32)
> Date: Fri, 24 Sep 1999 09:56:07 -0400
> To: support@mindspring.com
> From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
> Subject: Re: Installing MindSpring (990922-6992927)
> In-Reply-To: <199909241337.JAA28913@mail.mindspring.com>
> Mime-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

MindSpring Technical Support, MindSpring Enterprises, Inc.
support@mindspring.com <http://help.mindspring.com>
404.815.9111 in Atlanta 800.719.4660 everywhere else

How to create multiple folders and filters to sort multiple e-mail accounts in Outlook Express 5:

1. Open Outlook Express. Click the File menu.
2. Select New, then Folder. Select Local Folders.
3. Choose a name for this new folder. It is recommended that you name the folder the same name as the mailbox. (For example: If your e-mail address is support@mindspring.com, enter Support for the folder name).
4. Click the Tools menu. Select Message Rules, then Mail. Select the Conditions option "where the message is from the specified account".
5. In Account, select the option "move it to the specified folder".
6. In Rule Description, click the highlighted word "specified" and select your account.
7. In Rule Name, substitute your e-mail address for "move email for my email address".
8. Click OK the entire way out.

Repeat steps 1-6 until you have rules and folders for all of your mailboxes.

If you have additional questions or problems, please contact us via Java support or email, or call our Tech Support dept at 800-719-4660 or 404-815-9111. We are open 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Thank you,

MindSpring Technical Support
support@mindspring.com
<http://help.mindspring.com/support/> Online Help Documents
<http://help.mindspring.com/support/javasupport.php3> Online Technical Support

Article Last Revised: 9/21/99

September 24, 1999

To: Coalition members and friends
Fm: Stephen Young

Re: New Issue Brief on START/ABM

Below, and in an attached Word Perfect file, is a new Coalition issue brief on the START III and ABM Treaty discussions. Not pasted below (but described in the text) is the graphic of the results of a polling question the Coalition recently sponsored. It revealed that 70% of Americans support eliminating (44%) or reducing (26%) nuclear arsenals as the goal of U.S. nuclear policy.

The brief largely tracks the line taken in the recent Coalition letter to President Clinton, calling for rapid agreement on START III at lower warhead levels than set in Helsinki in 1997. It suggests that agreement on START III should not wait for Duma ratification of START II, and that any changes the U.S. proposes to the ABM Treaty should not encourage Russia or China to maintain or increase their arsenals.

+ + + + +

Re-START Nuclear Weapons Reductions:
Strong Public Support for Deep Cuts

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
ISSUE BRIEF

VOL. 3, NO. 13, September 23, 1999

The Clinton Administration will have to move quickly and decisively to reach agreement with Russia if it wants to achieve real progress on reducing the massive nuclear arsenals built up during the Cold War. Following an agreement at the June 10 meeting of Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin, the United States and Russia have resumed discussions on START III, as well as parallel talks on possible modifications to the ABM Treaty. 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 reach an accord before President Yeltsin leaves office next summer, or the opportunity may be lost for years.

The Clinton Administration would have the backing of the public in pushing for START III, and even deeper nuclear arms reductions. The most recent opinion survey shows Americans believe that reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons should be the goal of U.S. nuclear policy. More than 4 in 10 Americans (44%) believe that the complete elimination of nuclear weapons should be the U.S. policy goal, up from 36% in 1997. Another 26% say that reduction of these weapons should be the goal. The 1999 poll, commissioned by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, reveals that support for the elimination and reduction crosses partisan lines with 62% of Republicans in favor of elimination (35%) or reduction (27%) and 75% of Democrats in favor of elimination (49%) or reduction (26%). (The

Mellman Group, 1997 and 1999.)

Even with strong public support, it will take a focused U.S. effort to reach agreement on START III. For six years, the nuclear disarmament process has been stuck; the Clinton Administration does not have a nuclear arms reduction treaty with Russia to its credit. While circumstances have made progress difficult, this outcome reflects a lack of will in the Clinton Administration, as well as in Congress. Most importantly, the Clinton Administration has unwisely refused to begin full-scale negotiations on START III until the Russian Duma ratifies START II.

>From the other side, Congress has frozen nuclear force levels at dangerously high levels by mandating that the United States maintain START I force levels and alert status until the Duma ratifies START II. This provision, originally intended to encourage Duma ratification, has now locked in both U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenal levels. As a result, both nations still possess over 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 4,000 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 to a START III treaty as soon as possible, preferably early in 2000. The Treaty should achieve reductions below the 2,000-2,500 levels set in the 1997 Helsinki framework agreement. At last month's discussions in Moscow, Russian officials proposed ceilings of no more than 1,500 strategic warheads for each nation. Even further reductions, down to a ceiling of 1,000 strategic warheads, would still leave the U.S. and Russia with arsenals well in excess of what is needed to deter attack.

Agreeing on a 1,000 warhead ceiling would have other benefits, including helping prospects for Duma ratification of START II. China, the United Kingdom, and France would be more willing to join multi lateral nuclear disarmament negotiations with U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear arsenals at that level.

The ABM Treaty and Nuclear Reductions

Both Clinton Administration and Russian officials have repeatedly stated that the ABM Treaty remains the "cornerstone of strategic stability." Russian officials have made clear that maintaining this Treaty is essential to the START process, and have adamantly opposed changing it. Grigory Berdennikov, head of the Russian Foreign Ministry's security department, was quoted in the August 20 Washington Post saying modifying the ABM Treaty could force Russia "to raise the effectiveness of its strategic nuclear armed forces." Thus, the United States should not suggest any changes to the ABM Treaty that might prompt Russia to slow or reverse reductions in its nuclear arsenal, or push China to accelerate or expand its nuclear weapons modernization program. China's current strategic arsenal consists of fewer than two dozen, single-warhead land-based missiles that are not fueled. However, it is slowly developing more advanced missiles with multiple warheads.

START III and US Interests

Reaching agreement on START III is critical for US security, and should not be held up by START II. As former Senator Sam Nunn, Bush-era national security advisor Brent Scowcroft, and former Under secretary of State Andrew Kanter write in the September 13 Boston Globe: "It is time to move forward, whether or not the Duma ratifies START II." The three argue persuasively that the US has "an interest in being freed from the increasingly anachronistic and expensive strategic nuclear forces dictated by the START I agreement (and related congressional requirements that these higher levels be maintained)."

They go on to state clearly: "Strategically, U.S. foreign policy ought to proceed on the premise that while Russia may be down, it is not out: Sooner or later, Russia will again be a great power. We should not yield to the temptation to exploit its short-term weakness at the expense of reaping its enduring enmity, for if we do, then history indicates that our children will pay the price."

If for that reason only, the US should reach agreement with Russia on further reductions in both countries' nuclear arsenals. Whether Russia will become friend or foe, it is hard to argue with the fact that the verified destruction of its nuclear arsenal is in American 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 weapons of mass destruction. The views and analysis expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of every member of the Coalition.

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\BRIEF-V3#13-091599prnt.WPD"

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>>

Dear Friends:

I am seeking an agent to represent me in marketing three screenplays. Would you be interested?

A description of each screenplay is attached. Super Wednesday is a romance comedy with an element of mystery. It takes place in a suburban supermarket on a day shortly before Halloween. Sunday Box is a family drama of conflict among three generations of head-strong men. Through creative and loving intervention of women in the family, forgiveness and reconciliation occurs in the course of the grandfather's 75th birthday celebration. Lead, Kindly Light is a Christmas story in which some earthy, querulous, irreverent travelers are stranded in a little country church during a raging blizzard. Intertwined sets of conflict among them come to resolution during the presentation of the Christmas pageant.

I have complete scripts of the three screenplays if you would like to see one or more of them. All are registered with the Writers Guild of America.

These stories come out of my life experience and observance of people in different situations. To help me become a screenwriter, I took a course on television production at American University. I participated in a nine-week workshop on a feature film writing at the Writer's Center in Bethesda, Maryland where I presented sections of Super Wednesday for review by the class and received critique from the instructor on two successive drafts of the script. An experienced screenwriter read two drafts of Lead, Kindly Light and offered me suggestions for improvement. I have read a variety of books on screenwriting, studied scripts, and watched movies and television analytically. An earlier version of Lead, Kindly Light received five performances as a three act stage play, though I have substantially reshaped in as a screenplay.

I am semi-retired from a career in public service, working mostly for nonprofit organizations. In that career I wrote nine books published by social science and university presses and more than 250 articles, papers, and reports. I am able to travel to confer with prospective producers and directors as necessary.

Please let me know by return e-mail if you would like to review my scripts.

Sincerely yours,
Howard W. Hallman
6508 Wilmet Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
Phone: 301 897-3668; fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

SUPER WEDNESDAY

Super Wednesday is a romance comedy with an element of mystery and a bit of a sting. It takes place in the course of a day in a suburban supermarket.

Threat. At pre-dawn on Wednesday just before Halloween Callahan's Supermarket receives a faxed warning: "Look out for a super calamity on Super Wednesday" (the day of weekly specials). Awakened at home Larry, the general manager, rushes to the store. The Police Department assigns Christine from the Detective Division to the case.

Suspects. Although Christine doesn't tell Larry initially, the police reacted quickly because this is the fourth year in a row that an all-night establishment has been threatened on the day of the hunter's moon. Vandalism occurring in the previous years remains unsolved. She alerts the cult squad and gets three undercover officers to work in the store. She starts a probe of disgruntled employees and customers, of suppliers and rival merchants, even the bowling league where the Callahan squad was victorious the previous evening.

Incidents. As the day unfolds, incidents with calamitous possibilities (and some with an element of slapstick) occur in the store: a swarm of high school students coming in before school; a four year old boy with a runaway cart during "mothers' hour"; a farmer who smashes pumpkins on the loading dock after the store refuses to buy them; "senior hour" when an old man chokes on a grape he sampled and other seniors display their peculiarities; a false bomb threat involving a high school youth at noon hour; a gaggle of "witches" performing in front of the store; a homeless man who builds a shelter next to the outdoor pumpkin pile; workmen with a jackhammer who start to dig up the customer loading lane; a fake farmer trying to pass off rotten apples hidden in the bottom of his boxes; middle school boys at the store to pick out pumpkins who clamber over a concrete truck parked at the curb and almost release wet concrete onto the customer loading area; a motorcycle gang wearing weird Halloween masks; a tremendous thunderstorm. None of these occurrences, though, proves totally disastrous.

Romance. Larry's first contact with Christine is when she cuts her SUV in front of his car at the time of arrival. In the store they immediately clash over who's in charge. Their conflict continues as Christine seeks information Larry won't disclose and tries to install security measures that he won't allow. In the store Larry has created a world of his own, and he doesn't want it disrupted. But as the day goes by, Larry and Christine see another side of one another. Larry mourns his wife who died "18 months and nine days" ago. Christine carries wounds from her divorce three years earlier. Larry is proud of his college-age son and daughter, and Christine adores her two teenagers. Their developing rapport, however, is broken off when Christine leaves around four o'clock because her shift is over. Larry is shocked that she can depart so easily. She does, though, promise to check out Gambello's, the rival supermarket, on her way home.

Solution. After the thunderstorm passes Larry, the lonely widower, hangs around the store into the evening, wondering what might happen next. Unexpectedly Christine shows up with a hot meal and the solution to the mysterious threat. She assembles some of the characters who have been in the store during the day and produces confessions about an elaborate practical joke. As these folks leaves, Christine persuades Larry to go with her to the world beyond his store and have the best cheesecake in town.

SUNDAY BOX

Three generations of the Franklin family gather to celebrate the 75th birthday of Vincent, the family patriarch. It doesn't take long for long-standing conflict between Vincent and his eldest son, Chester, to break into the open. Chester in turn is shunned by his own son, Gene, who harbors deep resentment for past wrongs. Conversation reveals that Vincent himself still holds a grudge against his own father, who was killed in auto accident more than 60 years ago.

The women of the family are determined that this has gone on long enough. Individually and collectively they spend the day seeking reconciliation between these three head-strong men. Moreover, Gene's wife, Angela, seven months pregnant with a baby boy, is determined that father-son alienation won't continue for another generation. Ginger, Chester's mate (though unmarried), works on him, and Vincent's wife, Becky, offers encouragement.

Ginger and Angela in particular want to know the causes of the men's grievances with one another. They are aided by memories of others evoked by photograph albums and by the great-grandmothers journal (Vincent's mother), recently available ten years after her death. Flashbacks reveal incidents in Vincent's childhood, moments of stress and conflict between Vincent and Chester, and turning points in the relationship of Chester and Gene.

Competitive volleyball and croquet give the men opportunities to release some of their emotions. A cantilever bridge, which thirteen-year old twin granddaughters build out of Tinkertoys, offers a hint to Chester about the vital importance of the middle link. Vincent encourages Gene, as the youngest and most flexible, to take the initiative. But Gene's mother, Elise (Chester's ex-wife), suggests to Vincent that he may be starting at the wrong end. She draws this thought from the Sunday Box puzzle given Vincent by a granddaughter (27 linked cubes that have to be twisted until they form a compact cube), which he solved only by starting from the opposite end he had been working on.

Chester's birthday present to his father is a DVD of generations of the Franklin family, put together from photographs, home movies, and videotapes. When Vincent sees his own father on the screen, he realizes that he can finally release his father from what he had held against him. This sets in motion a process of reconciliation and forgiveness between

Vincent and Chester and then between Chester and Gene. The men are able to go beyond their macho, never-say-sorry approach and apologize for past actions that caused enduring conflict. Vincent concludes, "It's been the happiest birthday of my life."

LEAD, KINDLY LIGHT

Lead, Kindly Light is ensemble piece. It takes place on the day before Christmas in small church near the interstate highway in central Nebraska where some earthy, querulous, and irreverent travelers are stranded in a ranging blizzard.

What's their reaction to this predicament? The more vociferous complain while quiet ones are glad to be safe and warm. In the tight confines of fellowship hall conflict among them seems unavoidable. A rancher discovers a BLM (Bureau of Land management) official and renews the long-standing land use dispute of the West. Members of a female rock band scoff at the flirtatious advances of the ranch hand, who in turn picks a fight with the rancher's teenage son. The band's singer, advanced in pregnancy, presses her roadie boyfriend for a lasting commitment. An Air Force major brags of his military prowess. Goaded by the roadie and another musician, he endorses use of nuclear weapons. This shocks a Japanese astronomer, who as a boy witnessed the death and destruction of the Hiroshima bomb. An Air Force lieutenant, uncertain of his career, sides with the Japanese. An MIT scientist accepts bombs, missiles, and all other manifestations of high technology, but his colleague rolls out all the arguments for low-tech approaches. The highway patrol officer who brought them there helps the pastor keep peace, but she bemoans separation from her own family on Christmas eve.

What's the pastor to do? First he and two septuagenarian church members get the travelers settled and call town folks to bring in food and bedding. Just the day before the elderly pair had lamented the demise of the annual Christmas pageant ten years ago as a result of declining membership. The pastor, with all the optimism of one still in his first year at this little church, looks around at his unexpected guests and sees the cast for a pageant. As he quietly broaches the subject, hardly anyone agrees, not even his two parishioners. Indeed the skeptical scientist, the irreverent roadie, and a couple of others are outright hostile to the idea. However, the leader of the rock band, a self-styled impresario, joins the pastor to chip away at their resistance. Little by little they assemble the cast through persuasion, reconciliation, and a bit of pressure.

The blizzard eases enough for town folk to make their way to church for this unusual performance. With plenty of time available the players present the Christmas pageant in three acts, based upon the three separate versions of the story found in Luke, Matthew, and John. Yes, John, with its symbolism of light coming out of darkness. The reconciliation that occurred in bringing together a congenial cast combines with the players' serious engagement in the essence of the Christmas story to achieve life-changing consequences for the most alienated travelers. The players are radiant, some in tears as they conclude by singing (with subtitles on the screen):

"Lead, Kindly Light, amid th'encircling gloom; Lead Thou me on!
The night is dark, and I am far from home; Lead Thou me on!....

I was not ever thus, nor prayed that Thou shouldst lead me on....
I loved the garish day, and, spite of fears,
Pride ruled my will; remember not past years.

So long Thy power hath blest me, sure it will lead me on;
O'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till the night is gone,
And with the morn, those angel faces smile,
Which I have loved long since and lost awhile!

September 26, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Daschle on CTBT in Congressional Record, 9/23

In his most recent statement on the CTBT, Senator Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD) criticizes Republican inattention to the issue and calls on them to "give the CTBT a fair hearing and a vote." He adds: "That effort must begin today."

Expect more from other Senators on the CTBT later this week. Look for updates in our "congressional statements" section
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctcong.htm>> of the Coalition's CTBT Site
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>.

DK

THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY (Senate - September 23, 1999)

[Page: S11354]

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, two years ago today, on September 23, 1997, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was read for the first time and referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Unfortunately, instead of coming to the Senate floor to commend the Senate for ratifying the CTBT or for taking steps toward that end, I must come to point out the Senate has done absolutely nothing on CTBT. Not a hearing, not a vote. And I must confess up front, I do this with a sense of confusion, disappointment, and profound regret over the Republican majority's inaction on this important treaty since its submission to the Senate.

The Republican majority's unwillingness to permit the Senate to take even a single step forward on a treaty to ban all nuclear testing has me and many observers confused for a variety of reasons. First, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has been enthusiastically and unequivocally endorsed by our senior military leaders, both current and former. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, General Hugh Shelton, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated `the Joint Chiefs of Staff support ratification of this treaty.' The current chairman and fellow service chiefs are not alone in their support for CTBT. In fact, the four previous occupants of the chairman's seat have endorsed this treaty. Former Chairmen General John Shalikashvili, General Colin Powell, Admiral William Crowe, and General David Jones issued a statement on the treaty and the additional safeguards proposed by the President. Their statement concluded `with these safeguards, we support Senate approval of the CTB treaty.'

Second, several Presidents, both Republican and Democratic, have supported a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing. In fact, Presidents as far back as President Eisenhower have worked to make this prohibition a reality. On May

29, 1961, President Eisenhower said the failure to achieve a test ban 'would have to be classed as the greatest disappointment of any administration, of any decade, of any party.' Similar statements have been made by Presidents in every subsequent decade. And if this Congress fails to act, Presidents in the next millennium unfortunately will be uttering comparable remarks.

Third, the overwhelming majority of the American people, approximately 82 percent, have indicated they endorse immediate Senate approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Although opponents of the treaty argue support is limited to just Democrats or liberals, opinion polls point to a different conclusion. CTBT support spans the entire political spectrum. For example, among those who identify themselves as Republicans, 80 percent support the treaty and 79 percent of those who characterize themselves as 'conservative Republicans' believe the Senate should ratify the CTBT. As far as geographic limitations, the polls show CTBT support knows no boundaries. From coast to coast and all points in between, the vast majority of Americans support this treaty. Let me provide the Senate with a few examples that back up this statement. In Tennessee, 78 percent support the treaty. In Kansas, 79 percent. In Washington, 82 percent. In Oregon, 83 percent. The story is similar in every other state in the Union.

With these facts as a backdrop, I think it is easy to understand why I and many others are confused that, in the two years since the President submitted the CTBT treaty, the Republicans have chosen to do nothing. CTBT is vigorously endorsed by our most senior military leaders, past and present. Senate Republicans are unmoved. Republican and Democratic Presidents since Eisenhower have strongly backed the CTBT. Yet, Senate Republicans choose to do nothing. Finally, over 80 percent of our constituents, from all parts of the political spectrum and all regions of the country, have asked us to ratify the CTBT. And the response of Senate Republicans? Not a hearing, not a vote. Nothing but silence and inaction.

I mentioned at the outset that I am also disappointed by the course Senate Republicans have pursued. The reason for my disappointment is that Senate Republicans have permitted a small number of members from within their ranks to manipulate Senate rules and procedures to prevent the Senate from acting on the CTBT. I recognize these few members are well within their rights as Senators to use the rules in this manner. Under Senate rules, a small group can thwart or delay action on even the most vital pieces of legislation. This has been proven time and again since the Senate's founding. In more recent times, we have seen the same handful of Senators on the far right of the political spectrum repeatedly resort to these tactics to prevent the Senate from acting expeditiously on arms control treaties.

However, in many of these previous instances, a number of Republicans eventually decided to call an end to the political gamesmanship of their more conservative colleagues. They decided that this nation's national interests superseded the political interests of a few Senators at the far end of the political spectrum. They decided that the full Senate should be allowed to work its will on matters of national security. In short, they decided that politics stopped at the water's edge. I am disappointed that in this particular instance, two years have elapsed and I see no such

movement within the Republican caucus. Two years is too long. I would hope we would soon see some leadership on the Republican side of the aisle to break the current impasse and allow the full Senate to act on the CTBT.

Finally, I also indicated I deeply regret the Senate's failure to act. While waiting for the United States Senate to ratify the CTBT, we have seen nearly 40 other nations do so. We have witnessed two additional countries test nuclear weapons while the intelligence community tells us several others continue developing such weapons. And in a few short weeks, we will observe the nations that have ratified the treaty convene a conference to discuss how to facilitate the treaty's entry into force --a conference that limits participation only to those nations that have ratified the treaty. If the United States is to play a leadership role on nuclear testing, convince others to forgo nuclear testing, and actively participate in efforts to implement the treaty, the United States Senate must exercise some leadership itself and give the CTBT a fair hearing and a vote. That effort must begin today.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

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

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

To: ritag@aport.ru

Date: Mon, 9 Aug 1999 05:52:51 -0700 (PDT)

Subject: Greetings

Dear MR. and MRS Hallman:

I come home safe. And in time.

I was happy to visit your nice house and enjoyed your warm family.

I recieved your copy of the paper, and I like it very much, especialy picture with you.

I invite you to visit and stay at my place in S-Petersburg.

Thank you very much for all your kind care.

Yours,

Rita

>

>

Abolition 2000 - Time to Come of Age

"Revolution is but thought carried into action"

Emma Goldman

Abolition 2000 is a space. Within this space is the room to become inspired by the feeling of comm-unity with others, to comm-unicate with others, who share a vision of a nuclear free world. This vision is what unites us, in the form of a statement that lays down the principles of what we share, and gives us a name to hold up to the world.

The word "abolition" signifies the unwillingness, the non-volition, of accepting anything less than the complete banning and destruction of, the doing away of, the nuclear institution. The word carries the history of other movements, such as that of the abolition of slavery. It signifies the rejection of a practice that is wrong and harmful, despicable in its violence on human nature and all life.

The date 2000 shows the need for immediate action, the pressing of time, the desire for a new century without the nuclear threat.

The idea of Abolition 2000 has caught/captured the imagination of many thousands of people, who have adopted it into their programmes of work and into their lives. Inside its space there is room for direct action, publicity campaigns, education, lobbying, publication of books, magazines, videos, and for discussion. Most politicians and diplomats working in the nuclear disarmament field know the name "Abolition 2000". Some have even taken up the idea themselves.

In the last five years of Abolition 2000's existence, a real network has been born, without government and laws. Its structure is self-defining, and self-correcting. It consists of free groupings linked to one another. Each grouping decides for itself how they wish to act to realise the common vision. Some groups act alone, others are networked into larger groupings within the global network, by region or country or just common interest in a subject. There are some individuals who inspire others. There are also some who run amok. The network is large and strong enough to accommodate all of these.

A group of people is mandated every year to help coordinate the global network. This group does not govern, nor can it make rules. No such government would be acceptable to a heterogenic network like Abolition 2000 which thrives on its diversity (which includes a variety of cultures as well as ways of organising ourselves and working together). This group of volunteers are entrusted with the task of looking at the whole network, while each of us concentrate on the parts.

The area of greatest importance to maintain the feeling of comm-unity and strength is to look after the lines between the groupings

that connect the network together. These lines are formed by communication. We don't mean a mailing from a central office every now and again. It is essential that every group takes responsibility for its lines to other groups. An e-mail list serve does not fulfil this need adequately, although it is one resource we can use. Each group should decide for itself how best to keep in touch with its community. Personal contact is vital, and we don't mean being physically in the same room, but we mean that the emphasis is on the personal. Person to person contact is essential for building trust, which is necessary for working together.

A feeling of isolation comes, not because others have excluded you, but because you let your connection to others get loose or even break. Maybe it was never strong in the first place. Sometimes we need to reach out to groups who are distanced by circumstance or difficulty. We need a "tight" not a "loose" network. It takes work to weave the net.

The biggest complaint of a network that is not listening to itself and its parts, and not feeling its connecting lines, is to say that "nothing is happening". And yet there are activities happening all the time, all over the world, under the name of Abolition 2000. You only have to listen carefully and you will begin to hear the noise we are making, that is getting louder day by day.

Another complaint is that we do not focus enough. Some think all of us should be doing the same thing at one time. Again, if your lines of connection are healthy and strong, and you have a good idea - put it out there. If it speaks to people's imaginations they will pick up the idea and join with you in implementing it. But looking for positions of power over others to take majority decisions that are intended to force ideas on others results in a mirroring of the institution we wish to abolish. The reason we have structured ourselves differently is because we want a different world.

There are those who throw ideas around and wait for others to pick them up. They become frustrated when people say it's a good idea and walk away. But if you like your own idea then you will start acting upon it yourself. When others see you that you like your idea enough to act upon it then they think about acting upon it too.

Coming of age is a process everyone must go through. It is the transition from the unformed and liquid to the solid and contoured. It is the moment when independent steps are taken towards the goal in life. For many it is the age of rebellion against the dominating institution that has confined our thought. In some cultures it is the time to take your place as a member of the community, to take on responsibility.

We need to trust that others in the community will take the responsibility they have, just as we do. We need to act upon our ideas and not wait for the whole network to agree with us. We need to be respectful of each others space; there is enough room for all of us. We need to be welcoming to new neighbours. We need to be

nice to each other. We need to make friends. If we are to speak truth to power, then we need also to be truthful to one another. If we have something to shout about, we need to make sure we are shouting in the right direction and not in our neighbour's ear.

Abolition has gone from a thought, to an idea, to a group of people acting together, to an organised network with resources and skills. In order to act in a "concerted" manner we do not all need to do the same thing, but we do need to use all the resources and skills of all parts of the network to achieve the vision that unites us.

Xanthe Hall
Pamela Meidell

September 27, 1999

PS: The Concise Oxford Dictionary lists the following words in this order:

abolish, abolition, A-bomb, abominable, abominate, abomination, aboriginal, aborigines

September 27, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Issue Brief on CTBT Verification Tools

The following Coalition Issue Brief by Trevor Findlay and Oliver Meier of the Verification, Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC) in London covers key issues relating to various technologies and systems that will be available to verify the CTBT. Not until the CTBT is ratified and has entered into force will the U.S. and other states fully benefit from its unique verification capabilities.

This Issue Brief is available on the Web at
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n14.htm>> as are other CTBT-related resources on the Coalition's CTBT Site
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF

VOL. 3, NO. 14, September 27, 1999

"U.S. Security Benefits from Test Ban Monitoring & On Site Inspections:
But Test Ban Treaty Verification Tools Depend on Ratification and Entry
Into Force"

FROM OCTOBER 6-8, 1999, those states that have ratified or signed the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) will meet in Vienna to debate and take action on steps to accelerate ratification by key states to allow for the entry into force of the Treaty. Since the signing ceremony on September 24, 1996, 154 nations have signed the Treaty. But for the Treaty to fully enter into force, a specific set of 44 states must ratify. Thus far, a total of 45 states have ratified, including Britain, France, Japan, Australia, and many other U.S. allies, but only 21 of the 44 key states have ratified. While the entry into force requirement is substantial, it is within reach. Forty-one of the 44 states have signed the CTBT, and non-signers, India and Pakistan, have pledged to do so. (1)

Until the CTBT enters into force, signatory states are bound by Article XVIII of the Vienna Convention on Treaties not to take actions that violate the "purpose or intent" of the Treaty, which in this case means they cannot conduct a nuclear test explosion. But the longer it takes to fully implement the CTBT, the greater the chance that some nation might conduct a nuclear test and set off a dangerous political and military chain reaction of testing and renewed nuclear arms competition. Therefore, there is nothing to gain by waiting. Not until all 44 states on the entry into force list ratify the CTBT and it formally takes effect will the U.S. and the international community gain the full benefits of the Treaty's verification

system. The CTBT verification system consists of several elements:

- * The Treaty establishes a far-reaching International Monitoring System (IMS) and an International Data Center (IDC) to detect, locate and identify nuclear explosions;
- * The Treaty allows for short-notice, on-site inspections to clarify ambiguous events; and
- * The Treaty also creates new confidence-building measures to improve transparency.

In addition to the official CTBT verification mechanism, two other means of detecting nuclear explosions are in place and may be utilized to request on-site inspections when the Treaty enters into force:

- * The U.S. will monitor test ban compliance with its own satellites and other national intelligence gathering tools, which are the most sophisticated in the world; and
- * Thousands of high-quality civilian seismic stations worldwide provide further detection capabilities.

With this far-reaching array of verification tools fully in place, the "zero-yield" CTBT is effectively verifiable. No would-be violator could be confident that a nuclear explosion would escape detection.

The International Monitoring System and the International Data Center:

The establishment of a verification system for the CTBT is proceeding so that it will be fully operational by the time the Treaty enters into force. Since the Provisional Technical Secretariat (PTS) of the Preparatory Committee of the CTBT Organization (CTBTO) was founded in November 1996, steady progress has been made in setting up the International Monitoring System. The IMS will consist of 321 monitoring facilities and at least 16 radionuclide laboratories located in some 90 countries. The IMS will be a principal tool for detecting possible treaty violations. Four types of stations are to be established: seismic, infrasound, hydroacoustic, and radionuclide. Approximately one-third (104) of the planned monitoring stations are already reporting to the Prototype International Data Center (PIDC) in Arlington, Virginia.

In many cases, IMS stations use existing infrastructure. Existing facilities to monitor seismic activities are being upgraded and certified for use by the IMS. While IMS monitoring facilities will be operated by the states on whose territory they are based, the costs are shared internationally. To permit the integration of all contributing stations into the IMS, host countries are required to sign facility agreements or 'arrangements' with the CTBTO PrepCom. Permanent facility agreements have been concluded, with Canada, New Zealand and South Africa. Letters of agreement have been exchanged to allow work at other installations, including those in the U.S.

The Seismic Network: The principal and most mature verification technique for the CTBT is seismology. It will be used to detect nuclear explosions underground (and sometimes even those in the atmosphere). Fifty primary and 120 auxiliary seismic stations, distributed world-wide, will be used to

detect seismic waves generated by earthquakes or explosions. Establishment of the seismic network has had a head start, being based on an earlier network established by the Group of Scientific Experts (GSE) at the Conference on Disarmament from 1976 onwards. Nearly half (74) of the planned seismic stations are already transmitting data to the PIDC. Thirty-six of these are primary stations and 38 are auxiliary stations.

Radionuclide Stations: Eighty radionuclide stations will measure radioactive particles in the atmosphere from atmospheric nuclear tests or underground tests that vent. At least forty of these will also be capable of detecting relevant noble gases, such as argon-37, xenon-133 and krypton-85. Sixteen radionuclide laboratories will analyze filters from these stations. Certification will depend largely on their capability for high sensitivity gamma spectroscopy. In analyzing samples, the CTBTO may co-operate with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which is located in the same complex in Vienna. The (IAEA) is developing its radionuclide sampling capabilities as part of its program to strengthen nuclear safeguards. Twenty-two radionuclide stations are already collecting samples.

Hydroacoustic Network: Eleven hydroacoustic stations are being established to detect explosions under water or in the atmosphere at low altitude. Six of these will use underwater hydrophones, which have three microphones at each end of 100 km fibre-optic cables. Most will be located in the Southern hemisphere, which has extensive oceanic areas. "T-phase" seismic stations will also be available to detect the seismic waves caused when hydroacoustic waves strike a steep-sided island. Four hydroacoustic stations are currently running, three of which are operated by the U.S.

Infrasound Stations: Sixty land-based infrasound stations will use microbarographs (microphones with large, sound-sensing membranes) to detect and measure air pressure changes that are caused by low-frequency sound waves from atmospheric nuclear explosions. They may also detect some underwater and shallow underground events. Although at present infrasound is the least developed of all the IMS technologies, the broader frequency ranges now available make it potentially very sensitive. Four infrasound stations are currently reporting, three of which are in the US and one in Australia.

The International Data Center: The IDC, which is being progressively developed at CTBTO PrepCom headquarters in Vienna, will receive and process data from all the monitoring facilities included in the IMS. In September 1998 a \$70 million contract was signed with Hughes Olivetti Telecom, Ltd. to establish the global communications infrastructure for the system and to maintain it over the next ten years. The network will use very small aperture terminals (VSATs) to ensure the swift and secure transport of up to 11.4 gigabytes of data between facilities, the IDC and States Parties to the Treaty. In July and August 1999 the second of four releases of applications software from the prototype IDC in Arlington, Virginia was installed in Vienna and tested. As of September 1999, the IDC is operating seven VSATs at seven IMS stations and five National Data Centers. Eight more installations are planned.

The IDC will make both raw and processed data available to all States

Parties through regular bulletins. The extent to which the IDC will make judgements about events will likely depend on the specific circumstances of the event. States Parties without significant national technical and analytical means to analyze the data will naturally look to the IDC for more precise information when and if a suspicious event is detected. States with more sophisticated data analysis capabilities, like the U.S., will also review IMS data (and data collected from other sources) on its own to determine whether a "clarification" or "on-site inspection" is needed.

On-Site Inspections and Confidence-Building Measures:

When implemented, the United States will gain an unprecedented new tool to detect and deter nuclear test explosions: the ability to request short-notice, on-site inspections of suspicious events. Without prejudice to the right of any State Party to request an on-site inspection, Article IV of the Treaty provides for a timetable and process for consultation and clarification to resolve any matter regarding non-compliance, which, whenever possible, are to be used before an on-site inspection is requested. However, if data from the IMS or from other national technical means (i.e. intelligence gathering tools like satellites and national monitoring stations) or scientific data sources (see below) suggests a possible nuclear test explosion, a request for an on-site inspection can be made.

The inspection can take place on the territory of any State Party or in areas beyond the control of any state (i.e. open oceans). Its purpose is to determine whether there is a violation of the Treaty and which State Party may have conducted a nuclear test explosion. The 51-member CTBT Executive Council has no more than 96 hours after a request for an on-site inspection is made to decide whether an event is suspicious enough to warrant an on-site inspection. Preparations for the inspection could begin before a decision is made. The Executive Council consists of representatives of States Parties from six geographic regions. The U.S. will likely have a continuous membership on the Council. A three-fifths majority of the Council is required to order an inspection by a team designated by the Director-General of the CTBTO Technical Secretariat.

In addition, Article IV of the Treaty also provides for "Confidence-Building Measures" to resolve possible misinterpretation of data relating to chemical high explosions of 300 metric tons or greater (which are often employed by the mining industry) and to maintain the proper calibration of monitoring stations in the IMS. These confidence-building measures involve notification of chemical high-explosions and visits to related sites and monitoring stations by CTBTO personnel. Such measures may also be useful in distinguishing between "subcritical" nuclear experiments (which are allowed by the Treaty) and prohibited nuclear explosions.

The Role of "National Technical Means" and Civilian Seismic Networks:

The IMS is not the only international system capable of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions. Data from the United States' own intelligence gathering tools, including seismic and radionuclide monitoring stations, radionuclide-sniffing reconnaissance aircraft, and satellites can

also be used as a basis for on-site inspections.

In addition, global networks of stations built for scientific purposes to detect and analyze earthquakes and other natural phenomena have been in place for decades. There are thousands of these monitoring stations across the globe and they can also be used to detect nuclear test explosions. In fact, many IMS contributing stations are "dual use," because they are fulfilling scientific functions while being used to verify the CTBT.

Data from non-IMS networks can significantly increase the capability of the IMS to detect small nuclear explosions. The IMS is designed to detect explosions anywhere on earth with a yield of 1 kiloton TNT equivalent (which is similar to an earthquake of magnitude 4.0 on the Richter scale), and test explosions of lower yields in many areas of concern. The IMS has already proven that it is able to detect smaller explosions under many circumstances, and data from civilian networks of seismic stations have been very useful in further clarifying the nature and size of seismic events. For example, in August 1997, Russia was suspected of conducting a nuclear test explosion at its nuclear testing site at Novaya Zemlya. The combined data from the Prototype IDC and civilian scientific stations were able to clarify the event and determine that the initial accusations that a nuclear test explosion had been conducted were wrong. In fact, the event turned out to be a magnitude 3.5 earthquake located at least 80 kilometers from the Russian test site. Data from scientific stations was also important in providing more detailed data about the Indian and Pakistani nuclear test explosions of May 1998. (2)

It is very likely that data from non-IMS stations will be used to strengthen the verification regime of the CTBT. Paragraph 27 of Article IV of the CTBT opens up the possibility for States Parties to "separately establish cooperative arrangements with the Organization, in order to make available to the International Data Center supplementary data from national monitoring stations that are not formally part of the International Monitoring System."

Conclusion:

Since the CTBTO PrepCom was established in November 1996, good progress has been achieved in establishing the IMS, the Treaty's main verification tool. However, more needs to be done in and continuing financial support from CTBT signatories and ratifiers is needed to complete the rest of IMS and other CTBT verification tools. If entry into force is further delayed, the international community should consider ways to ensure that any possible violations of the non-testing norm can be detected by the IMS. It will be up to the states meeting in Vienna this October to increase the pressure on those which have not signed or ratified the treaty in order to capitalize on the unique and invaluable nuclear non-proliferation verification capabilities of the CTBT. U.S. leadership through ratification of the CTBT — not continued ignorance and inaction — is essential to achieve this goal.

* This Issue Brief was written by Trevor Findlay, Executive Director of the Verification, Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC) and Oliver Meier, VERTIC's Arms Control and Disarmament Researcher. Tel: +44

Notes:

(1) For further details, see: Coalition Issue Brief Vol.3, No.12, "Non-Proliferation & Test Ban Efforts in Jeopardy on Anniversary of Treaty Signature," (Sept. 22, 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n12.htm>>; and George Bunn, Rebecca Johnson, and Daryl Kimball, "Accelerating the Entry Into Force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: The Article XIV Special Conference," (May 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/SpecConfRep0599.htm>>.

(2) Hans. E. Hartse, "The August 16 1997 Novaya Zemlya Seismic Event as Viewed From GSN Stations KEV and GBS," *Seismological Research Letters* 69, 3 (May/June 1998): 206-215, and Gregory van der Vink, et al, "False Accusations, Undetected Test And Implications for the CTB Treaty," *Arms Control Today* (Washington, D.C.) (May 1998); and Trevor Findlay, "The Indian and Pakistani Tests: Did Verification Fail?," *Trust & Verify* (London), 80 (May 1998), pp. 1-4.

#

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is a non-partisan alliance of 17 nuclear non-proliferation organizations based in Washington, D.C. *The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of every member organization of the Coalition. For more information on the CTBT, see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Let me introduce myself - I am Maureen Shea and am in the Office of Public Liaison at the White House. I do outreach to the religious community. Gerry Powers gave me your name when I asked who was most active on the CTBT. If you could let me know which denominations and the contacts names (and numbers if you have them!) for the coalition, that would be very helpful. Many thanks.

Dear Friends,

As further background for our conference call on the Peace with Justice Breakfast at the 2000 General Conference, I am providing a list of speakers at the similar event at the 1992 and 1996 General Conferences. For 2000 we aren't bound by what went before, but it useful to know the approach taken previously.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Speakers at Peace with Justice Breakfasts at United Methodist General Conference

1992

Invocation by Bishop Judith Craig

"Seeking Peace, Justice and World Order" by Bishop William W. Dew, Jr. (last minute substitute for Bishop C. Dale White, who was in ill health)

"Dealing with Drugs and Violence" by Bishop Felton E. May

1996

Bishop Hae-Jong Kim: Invocation and Benediction

Bishop Sharon Zimmerman Rader: Issues related to families, children, women; Bishop's Children Initiative, Children's Sabbath; Stand for Children event

Bishop Charles Wesley Jordan: concerns of inner city, Shalom Zones, Drug Initiative; matters of racial justice; Bishops' African Initiative

Bishop Kenneth L. Carder: Peace issues, including nuclear abolition, United Nations, other global concerns; Peace with Justice Sunday

Bishop Ruedger R. Minor: peace and justice issues from perspective of emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe and elsewhere

On both occasions opportunities for questions and comment from the floor

Presiding: Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Sherman W. Harris in 1992, Howard W. Hallman in 1996

To: Maureen_T._Shea@who.eop.gov
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: CTBT and the faith community
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <852567F9.007878B2.00@lmgate3.eop.gov>
References:

At 05:57 PM 9/27/99 -0400, you wrote:

>Let me introduce myself - I am Maureen Shea and am in the Office of Public
>Liaison at the White House. I do outreach to the religious community.
>Gerry Powers gave me your name when I asked who was most active on the
>CTBT. If you could let me know which denominations and the contacts names
>(and numbers if you have them!) for the coalition, that would be very
>helpful. Many thanks.
>
>
>Dear Maureen,

I am happy to provide you information about denominations and religious associations working to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. I serve as chair of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which has brought together persons from the faith community since June 1997. We have an extensive grassroots network that is working for the CTBT.

The first attachment lists (a) organizations actively involved in the Interfaith Group for the CTBT and (b) denominations and religious associations expressing support for the CTBT. The latter we hope to mobilize in the final push for ratification when a vote is scheduled. The second attachment provides names, addresses, and phone numbers for the principal contacts for the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

If you plan to increase White House outreach to the faith community in behalf of the CTBT, we would be pleased to work with you. Last spring we had a meeting with Robert Bell of the national security staff. We have requested meetings with John Podesta and Vice President Gore or his representative, but have not succeeded so far. We would welcome your assistance in obtaining such meetings.

If you wish further information, please call me at 301 896-0013. Also, I would be interested in getting your phone number.

Shalom,
Howard

Interfaith Support for the CTBT

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT formed in June 1997 to work for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Active participants include representatives of the following denominational offices and religious associations.

Church of the Brethren, Washington Office
Church Women United
Episcopal Church, Washington Office
Episcopal Peace Fellowship
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Mennonite Central Committee
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

National Council of Churches
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby
Presbyterian Church (USA), Washington Office
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
Unitarian Universalist Association
United Church of Christ, Office for Church in Society
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society
U.S. Catholic Conference

Other faith-based organizations have shown support for CTBT ratification by signing letters, attending a strategy meeting with Senator Jeffords, circulating an interfaith petition, and asking to be kept informed. They include:

Denominations

African Methodist Episcopal Church
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
American Baptist Churches USA
American Friends Service Committee
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
Friends General Conference
Friends United Meeting
Moravian Church, Northern Province
National Missionary Baptist Convention
Orthodox Church in America
Progressive National Baptist Convention
Seventh Day Adventist Church, General
Conference
Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch,
Eastern Archdiocese

Religious Associations

Alliance of Baptists
Baptist Peace Fellowship
Buddhist Peace Fellowship
Catholic Conference of Major Superiors of
Men's Institutes
Columban Fathers Justice and Peace Center
Evangelicals for Social Action
Fellowship of Reconciliation
Jewish Peace Fellowship
Leadership Conference of Women Religious
Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office
Methodist Federation for Social Action
Muslim Peace Fellowship
New Call to Peacemaking
Orthodox Peace Fellowship
Pax Christi USA
The Shalom Center
Sisters of Mercy of America
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace
Sojourners
Washington Ethical Society

September 22, 1999

Contacts for the Interfaith Group for the CTBT

Jim Matlack
American Friends Service Committee
1822 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009
Tel: 202 483-3341
Fax: 202 232-3197
E-mail: denhartz@erols.com

Pam Genise
Church of the Brethren,
Washington Office
337 North Carolina Ave., SE
Washington, DC 20003
Tel: 202 546-3202
Fax: 202 544-5852
E-mail: washofc@aol.com

Ann Delorey
Church Women United
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202 544-8747
Fax: 202 544-9133
E-mail: ann_d.parti@ecunet.org

Heather Nolen
ChurchWorld Service
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202 543-6336
Fax: 202 546-6232
E-mail: heathern@nccusa.org

Tom Hart, Jere Skipper
Episcopal Church, Washington Office
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202 547-7300
Fax: 202 547-4457
E-mail: tom.hart@ecunet.org
jmskipper@aol.com

Mary H. Miller
Episcopal Peace Fellowship
P.O. Box 28156
Washington, DC 20039-8156
Tel: 202 783-3380
Fax: 202 393-3695
E-mail: epf@igc.apc.org

Clayton Ramey
Fellowship of Reconciliation
Box 271
Nyack, NY 10960
Tel: 914 358-4601
Fax: 914 358-4924
E-mail: disarm@forusa.org

Joe Volk, Kathy Guthrie, Rachel Phillips
Friends Committee on National Legislation
245 Second Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202 547-6000
Fax: 202 547-6019
E-mail: [joe\[kathy, rachel\]@fcnl.org](mailto:joe[kathy, rachel]@fcnl.org)

Mark Brown
Lutheran Office of Governmental Affairs
122 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: 202 626-7932
Fax: 202 783-7502
E-mail: mark.brown@ecunet.org

Daryl Byler
Mennonite Central Committee
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202 544-6564, x. 2
Fax: 202 544-2820
E-mail: J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org

Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office
401 Michigan Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202 832-1780
Fax: 202 832-5195
E-mail: mknolldc@igc.apc.org

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

Lisa Wright
National Council of Churches
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: 202 543-6336
Fax: 202 543-1297
E-mail:

Jean Sammon
NETWORK: A National Catholic
Social Justice Lobby
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, #460
Washington, DC 20003
Tel: 202 547-5556, x.17
Fax: 202 547-5510
E-mail: jsammon@networkloby.org

Dave Robinson
Pax Christ USA
532 W. 8th Street
Erie, PA 16502
Tel: 814 453-4955, x.235
Fax: 814 452-4784
e-mail: dave@paxchristiusa.org

Walter Owensby
Presbyterian Church (USA)
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202 543-1126
Fax: 202 543-7755
E-mail: Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org

L. William Yolton
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
3825 Gibbs Street
Alexandria, VA 22309-2252
Tel: 703 360-3657
Fax: 703 360-1992
E-mail: lwyolton@prodigy.net

Joshua Noble
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202 387-2800
Fax: 202 667-9070
E-mail: jnoble@uahc.org

Lawrence Egbert
Unitarian Universalist Association
2026 P Street, NW, Suite 3
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202 296-4672
Fax: 202 296-4673
E-mail: uuawo@aol.com

Jay Lintner
United Church of Christ
Office for Church in Society
110 Maryland Avenue, NE

Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202 543-1517
Fax: 202 543-5994
E-mail: lintnerj@ucc.org

Robin Ringler
United Methodist General Board
of Church and Society
100 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202 488-5647
Fax: 202 488-5639
E-mail: Dringler@umc-gbcs.org

Gerard F. Powers
U.S Catholic Conference
3211 4th Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017
Tel: 202 541-3196
Fax: 202 541-3339
E-mail: gpowers@nccbuscc.org

September 23, 1999

From: Carol Walker <cwalker@umcswtx.org>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Cc: "DRingler@umc-gbcs.org" <DRingler@umc-gbcs.org>,
"Lsabin1313@aol.com" <Lsabin1313@aol.com>,
"pwjp@juno.com" <pwjp@juno.com>,
"ANNFPRICE@aol.com" <ANNFPRICE@aol.com>
Subject: RE: General Conference speakers
Date: Tue, 28 Sep 1999 09:02:00 -0500

Howard, and friends,
I assume that it makes budgetary sense to invite a bishop- already there and probably glad to have the opportunity. I notice that Bishop Joe Wilson has not been asked - he was given a Peacemaker award by the GBCS last March. Also Bishop Joel Martinez has seen trial by fire - would it be politic to ask him to talk about hate crimes? Or "issues that divide us?"
I see that Bishop Jack Meadors hasn't done it before, and since the Children and Poverty Initiative will be in effect for the next quadrennium, it seems that he would be another sure-thing.
I still don't know how much time we have.
Carol Walker my new e-mail address will be: walkeraustin@yahoo.com

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 1999 7:06 AM
To: DRingler@umc-gbcs.org; Lsabin1313@aol.com; pwjp@juno.com; cwalker@umcswtx.org; ANNFPRICE@aol.com
Subject: General Conference speakers

Dear Friends,

As further background for our conference call on the Peace with Justice Breakfast at the 2000 General Conference, I am providing a list of speakers at the similar event at the 1992 and 1996 General Conferences. For 2000 we aren't bound by what went before, but it useful to know the approach taken previously.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Speakers at Peace with Justice Breakfasts at United Methodist General Conference

1992

Invocation by Bishop Judith Craig
"Seeking Peace, Justice and World Order" by Bishop William W. Dew, Jr.
(last minute substitute for Bishop C. Dale White, who was in ill health)
"Dealing with Drugs and Violence" by Bishop Felton E. May

1996

Bishop Hae-Jong Kim: Invocation and Benediction
Bishop Sharon Zimmerman Rader: Issues related to families, children, women;

Bishop's Children Initiative, Children's Sabbath; Stand for Children event
Bishop Charles Wesley Jordan: concerns of inner city, Shalom Zones, Drug
Initiative; matters of racial justice; Bishops' African Initiative
Bishop Kenneth L. Carder: Peace issues, including nuclear abolition, United
Nations, other global concerns; Peace with Justice Sunday
Bishop Ruedger R. Minor: peace and justice issues from perspective of
emerging democracies in Central and Eastern Europe and elsewhere

On both occasions opportunities for questions and comment from the floor

Presiding: Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Sherman W. Harris in 1992, Howard W. Hallman in 1996

To: Carol Walker <cwalker@umcswtx.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: General Conference speakers
Cc: "DRingler@umc-gbcs.org" <DRingler@umc-gbcs.org>, "Lsabin1313@aol.com" <Lsabin1313@aol.com>, "pwjp@juno.com" <pwjp@juno.com>, "ANNFPRICE@aol.com" <ANNFPRICE@aol.com>
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <01BF0990.20A220E0@station037.umcswtx.org>
References:

At 09:02 AM 9/28/99 -0500, Carol Walker wrote:

>Howard, and friends,
>.....I still don't know how much time we have.....

Friends,

In 1996 we started serving breakfast at 6:30, had the invocation and speeches start at 7:00, and adjourned at 8:00. If my memory serves me correctly, a worship starts at 8:30 each day and business commences at 9:00. Delegates, especially those in leadership positions such as bishops, want to be there on time. They accept getting up early for these events. The reality is that the start of speeches can slip a little in time but adjournment has to be punctual.

Howard

From: Maureen_T._Shea@who.eop.gov
X-Lotus-Fromdomain: EOP
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Tue, 28 Sep 1999 16:12:21 -0400
Subject: Re: CTBT and the faith community

Thank you so much for all the very helpful information.

My phone number is 456-2721.

I am not sure yet of exactly what outreach we will be doing - as soon as I do know I will give you a call.

X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R6.01.01
Date: Tue, 28 Sep 99 14:22:06 -0500
From: "JPMDC"<jpmdc@ucc.org>
Subject: Justice and Peace Ministry News
To: "undisclosed-recipients:;"

September 28, 1999

Dear Justice and Peace Ministry Member:

The United Church of Christ Justice & Peace Ministry membership has grown steadily over the past few months. But there is room for improvement. I'd like to take this opportunity to enlist your help in a few areas.

We would like to ask you to recruit new members to the Peace and Justice Ministry. As an incentive, we are offering you a Jubilee 2000 pin for each new member you enlist. Please print your name on the bottom margin of the sign up portion of the brochure.

We are starting a resource listing of churches that are model peace and justice churches and will agree to serve as a resource to other churches. We ask you to identify and share a brief description of any church that you would recommend.

The JPM has enlisted the help of regional consultants:

Middle Atlantic	Peter Wells [302] 737-4711
New England	Diana Burdett [401] 789-7467
Great Lakes	Pura Calo [773] 267-6430

We are still seeking consultants for the West Central [Dakotas, Minnesota, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas-Oklahoma, and Missouri Conferences] and the Southern Regions [Southern, Southeast, Florida and South Central Conferences]. If you are interested, please let me know.

Shalom,

Steve Ito
JPM Coordinator
700 Prospect Avenue
Cleveland OH 44115-1100
[216]736-2178

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Wed, 29 Sep 1999 15:28:10 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Issue Brief: Summary of the Case for the CTBT

September 29, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball
RE: Summary of the case for the CTBT w/references for further info.

The following Coalition Issue Brief is essentially the text version of our new brochure "For A Safer America: the Case for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty," with the addition of references to more detailed Web-based material and documentation. The Issue Brief covers:

- * chief reasons for the Treaty
- * who supports the Treaty
- * rebuttals to arguments against it
- * what might happen if the U.S. does not ratify
- * etc.

A nicely formatted version text version of this Issue Brief is available on the Web at <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n15.htm>>

For copies of the 3-color brochure version, contact Jenny Smith in our office (202) 546-0795 x137.

Also available (for those of you don't quite have enough) is the Council for a Livable World's updated, 76-page "Briefing Book on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty." Contact John Isaacs (202-543-4100) for more information.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF

VOL. 3, NO. 15, October 1, 1999

"For a Safer America:
A Summary of the Case for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty"*

A GLOBAL HALT to nuclear weapons test explosions has been a central objective of the United States since it was proposed by President Dwight Eisenhower in 1958. After forty years of bipartisan effort, President Bill Clinton became the first world leader to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on September 24, 1996, calling it "the longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control." The Treaty is supported by the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 82 percent of the American public and over 150 nations, including Russia,

China, Great Britain and France.

Why is the test ban so popular? It is simple. The Test Ban Treaty will make America and the world safer for our children and grandchildren. The Treaty will strengthen our security by helping to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations, now among the greatest threats to the United States. And it will help prevent the renewal of a superpower nuclear arms race.

But our nation cannot enjoy its full benefits until the Test Ban Treaty is approved by the U.S. Senate. Failure to approve the Treaty would undermine American leadership to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons and set back efforts to control the spread of terror weapons worldwide, endangering American security for years to come.

How does the Test Ban Treaty make America safer?

The Test Ban Treaty strengthens the United States' ability to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations and helps prevent a new nuclear arms race from starting. It reduces the nuclear danger to the American people.

* The Test Ban Treaty makes it much harder for the countries with advanced nuclear weapons, including Russia and China, to produce new and more threatening types of nuclear warheads. And it helps prevent nations with smaller arsenals — like India and Pakistan — and nations seeking nuclear arms--like Iran and Iraq--from making advanced nuclear warheads, which are more easily deliverable by ballistic missiles. This Treaty helps block dangerous nuclear competition and new nuclear threats from emerging, thereby enhancing U.S. and global security.

* U.S. ratification of the Test Ban Treaty will strengthen international support for the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the bedrock of all efforts to stop the spread of the atomic bomb. In 1995, the U.S. and the other nuclear powers promised to deliver the Test Ban in exchange for the permanent extension of the NPT — a good deal that must be honored.

* The U.S. has not conducted a nuclear weapon test explosion since 1992, when President Bush announced the U.S. would halt development of new types of nuclear warheads and Congress mandated a 9- month moratorium on nuclear tests. Each year since then, the U.S. has renewed the moratorium and the nuclear weapons laboratories have certified that the existing weapons will work as designed. With or without the Treaty, it is unlikely that the U.S. will ever conduct another nuclear explosive test. Thus, it is in America's interest to ensure that other nations are not conducting nuclear tests. U.S. ratification will encourage other nations to ratify the Treaty, and our nation's capability to detect cheating by others will be far better with the Treaty in force than without it.

What would happen if the U.S. Senate failed to approve the Test Ban?

We would miss an historic opportunity to make the world safer for future generations.

* The U.S. would weaken the effectiveness of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, since some key member nations would feel swindled if the Test Ban faltered due to U.S. inaction. This would undermine efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons worldwide.

* Failure by the Senate to honor our commitment to the Test Ban--a U.S.-led, internationally supported initiative--would undercut the status of America as a world leader, with far-reaching implications.

* The Treaty would never enter into force, since U.S. ratification is a legal requirement and U.S. leadership is a political requirement for moving ahead.

* Military and political pressure would build to resume nuclear testing. It would be more difficult to verify compliance with the Test Ban Treaty, because the monitoring system would not be fully in place. Allegations of cheating might arise that could not be resolved in the absence of inspections provided for under the Treaty. Leaving the Treaty unratified would increase uncertainty and reduce U.S. security.

* U.S. Senate inaction or rejection of the Test Ban Treaty would undermine global efforts to rein in India and Pakistan's dangerous nuclear arms competition. After a gap of 24 years, India conducted nuclear tests in May 1998, provoking Pakistan to conduct its own nuclear tests. Further testing by either country would accelerate their nuclear arms race and increase the risk of nuclear war. (1)

U.S. Senate inaction or rejection of the Treaty would leave open the possibility that China may be able to create a more threatening nuclear force, and slow momentum toward reducing the still enormous stockpiles of U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons. (2)

Who supports the Test Ban Treaty?

Presidents of the United States past and present, the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the vast majority of the American public, and over 150 nations, as well as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), all support the Test Ban Treaty.

* Presidents Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Jimmy Carter, and Bill Clinton, among others, have all endorsed and worked hard for a ban on nuclear weapons test explosions. (3)

* Current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Henry Shelton and former chairmen, Generals John Shalikashvili, Colin Powell, David Jones and Admiral William Crowe, all endorse the Treaty. These military leaders served under Presidents Clinton, Bush, Reagan and Carter. (4)

* The Test Ban Treaty is supported by an overwhelming majority of the American public. This support has remained high since the early days of the Cold War. A June 1999, bipartisan poll by Wirthlin Worldwide and The Mellman Group reveals that 82 percent of all Americans support Senate approval of the Test Ban Treaty, with only 14 percent opposed. Support cuts across party lines with 86% of Democrats and Treaty, 80% of

Republicans supporting the Treaty, including 79% of self-identified "conservative Republicans" in support. (5)

* Since the Treaty was opened for signature in September 1996, the United States and over 153 other nations have signed, including the other major nuclear powers (Russia, China, France and Great Britain). (6) The NATO alliance has endorsed the Treaty and called on all states to "sign and ratify the Treaty without delay."

Can the U.S. maintain its current nuclear arsenal without nuclear explosive tests? Yes.

* The United States does not need nuclear explosive tests to maintain its current arsenal. The arsenal will be sustained through non-nuclear tests and evaluations. Worn out parts will be replaced. A nationwide infrastructure of production sites and laboratories will be maintained and enhanced for this purpose. The directors of the three national nuclear weapons laboratories — Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandia — as well as leading nuclear weapons scientists, have determined that America's nuclear arsenal can be maintained without nuclear testing through their nuclear weapons "stockpile stewardship" program.

"We remain confident that the U.S. stockpile stewardship program, as conceived and as being executed, is able to perform the task under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and its safeguards. Recent concerns over losses of U.S. nuclear stockpile information have not changed this assessment in any way," the directors said in a June 10, 1999 joint statement. (7)

Can the Treaty be verified? Yes.

* The Treaty establishes a far-reaching global verification system to detect, locate and identify nuclear explosions. In addition, the U.S. will monitor the Treaty with its own satellites and other national intelligence means, which are the most sophisticated in the world. Thousands of other high-quality civilian seismic stations around the world provide further detection capabilities. Finally, the Treaty allows for short-notice, on-site inspections to clarify ambiguous events. Leading experts in seismology and test ban verification have determined that no would-be violator could be confident that a nuclear explosion of sufficient yield to possibly threaten U.S. security would escape detection. (8)

Why should the Test Ban Treaty be approved now?

There is nothing to gain by waiting. This Treaty strongly serves the interests of the United States. All of the major concerns about the effectiveness of the Treaty and its impact U.S. security have been well-addressed. (9) It is regrettable that some Senators have chosen to delay a vote on the CTBT on this vital initiative. For America to gain the full benefits of the Treaty, including complete operation of the verification system, it must be in legal force. If the U.S. leads, other nations will follow.

* While 154 states have signed the Test Ban Treaty, it cannot enter into

force until approved by 44 specific nations, 23 of which have thus far failed to do so thus far. This is a challenging hurdle. But it is within reach: 41 of the 44 required states have signed, and hold-outs India and Pakistan have pledged that they will join the Treaty. World-wide pressure on India and other hold-out states will increase if the vast majority of nations, including the U.S., ratify the Treaty. As in the case of the 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention, the U.S. cannot be an effective leader if it has not itself approved the Treaty.

* Until all 44 states ratify the Test Ban and it enters into force, a special conference of nations that have ratified may be held every year to seek ways to accelerate the process. The first such conference, held on October 6-8, 1999, shows that global support for rapid implementation of the Treaty is stronger than ever. Prompt U.S. Senate approval for ratification of the Treaty will encourage other key nations to join and accelerate its implementation. Until the U.S. ratifies the Treaty, it does not have a vote at special conferences on accelerating Test Ban implementation — weakening America's leadership and influence in the struggle to stop nuclear proliferation. (10)

The choice is clear: a world without nuclear testing is a safer world. The United States stands to lose nothing and to gain an important constraint on the ability of other nations to threaten America's security. The time for the Test Ban Treaty is now.

Notes:

* This Issue Brief is based on the Coalition's booklet, "For a Safer America: The Case for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty," by Tom Collina, Union of Concerned Scientists, with Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, and the Coalition's CTBT Working Group (October 1999).

(1) See: Coalition Issue Brief, Vol 2. No. 14, "Senate Inaction on Test Ban Undercuts Effort to Address South Asia Crisis," (June 4, 1998)
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/brief14.htm>>

(2) See: Coalition News Release, "Congressional Leaders Cite Test Ban Treaty as Next Step to Dealing with Chinese Espionage," (May 27, 1999)
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/rel052799.htm>>; and Scientists Letter to Senator Lott on "Chinese Espionage and the CTBT," (July 30, 1999)
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/uclstr073099.htm>>

(3) For an overview of Kennedy/Eisenhower & the test ban, see: Coalition Issue Brief Vol. 3, No. 15, "On 35th Anniversary of JFK Address, World Still Waits for Nuclear Test Ban," (June 10, 1998)
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/brief15.htm>>; and Proposal by President Eisenhower for a CTBT (February 11, 1960)
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/eis0260.htm>>

(4) See: Coalition Backgrounder, "Test Ban Treaty Backed by Leading Military, Scientific Leaders and the Vast Majority of American Voters," (September 14, 1999)<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/bkgrsupprt0999.htm>>

(5) For a detailed analysis of this survey on the CTBT, see:

<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/mellmanwirthlin0799.htm>>

(6) For up-to-date information on Treaty signers and ratifiers, see:

<http://www.ctbto.org/ctbto/sig_rat.shtml>

(7) "Nuke Test-Ban Treaty on Shaky Ground," Albuquerque Journal, June 11, 1999. For more information on the stockpile stewardship program and the CTBT, see: Richard L. Garwin, "The Future of Nuclear Weapons Without Nuclear Testing," Arms Control Today (November/December 1997)

<<http://www.armscontrol.org/ACT/novdec97/garwin.htm>>

(8) For further details, see: Coalition Issue Brief Vol. 3, No. 14, "U.S. Security Benefits from Test Ban Monitoring & On Site Inspections," (September 27, 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n14.htm>>

9) For a detailed rebuttal of CTBT opponents, see: Christopher Paine, "Facing Reality: Resuming Nuclear Test Explosions Would Harm U.S. and International Security — A Reply to CATO Policy Analysis "The CTBT: The Costs Outweigh the Benefits," by Kathleen C. Bailey. Natural Resources Defense Council (February 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/nrdc0299.htm>>

10) For further details, see: Coalition Issue Brief Vol.3, No.12, "Non-Proliferation & Test Ban Efforts in Jeopardy on Anniversary of Treaty Signature," (Sept. 22, 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n12.htm>>

###

The Coalition is an alliance of 17 of the nation's leading nuclear arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers. For more information on the CTBT, see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Date: Wed, 29 Sep 1999 20:46:57 -0500

From: Vic and Jeanette Hallman <vhall110@southwind.net>

Reply-To: vhall110@southwind.net

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0C-WorldNet (Win95; U)

To: MMBruegg@aol.com, MMBruegg@aol.com, Lynette Mehall <LMEHALL@ibm.net>, mupj@igc.apc.org, Ellen Burns <EAABurns@aol.com>, halledee@aol.com, EDBruegge@aol.com, halledee@aol.com, Diane Kniadek <Dibaby911@aol.com>, DKNUTSONR@aol.com, DKNUTSONR@aol.com, cpepper@towerhill.org

Subject: (no subject)Up-date

Finally, Vic has had his last test so I can give you all a report. He has been taking test after test since he had his last bladder opeation, which showed that what they scrapped was not cancer so the bladder as of now is clear of cancer but when they took a chest x-ray before the operation it showed that he had cavitated nodules on both lungs. No Symptoms of any kind so that is when they took all these tests which didn't seem to show anything. The last test which was a biopsy into one of the nodules in the lung showed cancer. He doesn't have lung cancer but has cancer of the bladder in the lung. So he started chemo yesterday (2 hours) for bladder cancer. Tomorrow (Thursday)he goes in for another chemo but only an hour. Then in three weeks repeat. The one yesterday didn't bother but probably the more he takes may work on him. We are very positive of the outcome. Praying a lot and many others are doing the same. Will try and keep you posted. His spirits are high and that will help. He has many appointments in between treatments (lab etc.) He just gets in the car and it just automatically goes to the clinic.

Weather is nice and cool. Love Jeanette Vic says Hi to all

To: vhall110@southwind.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Wishes for good health
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <37F2C111.9F1@southwind.net>
References:

At 08:46 PM 9/29/99 -0500, you wrote:
>Finally, Vic has had his last test so I can give you all a report...

Dear Vic,

Thanks for the report that you're doing okay on the bladder and have your lungs under control. We're praying for you.

I'm joining the Hallman cousins in surgery on October 26 to have a tendon re-attached to the rotator cuff in my left shoulder. As far as I can find out, it is a product of aging, years of twisting from playing my viola, other uses such as swimming and swinging a sledge hammer to split logs, and senior softball. It's a minor operation.

We're all into our fall schedule full of activities. Instead of traveling this year, we're remodeling our kitchen. It's designed, cabinets are ordered, but work hasn't started yet.

With best regards,
Howard

From: Robin Ringler <DRingler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>
To: "walkeraustin@yahoo.com" <walkeraustin@yahoo.com>,
"Lsabin1313@aol.com" <Lsabin1313@aol.com>,
"pwjp@juno.com"
<pwjp@juno.com>,
"ANNFPRICE@aol.com" <ANNFPRICE@aol.com>,
"mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: notes from our conf. call
Date: Thu, 30 Sep 1999 10:38:10 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

Hi you all,

Thanks very much for a good conference call yesterday about the Gen'l Conf. PwJ breakfast. Linda, sorry you had to go off. We have scheduled our next call for Friday, Oct. 29, 1 p.m. eastern time. Please let me know if the number where we can reach you that day is different from the number we used yesterday.

Here are my notes from our phone call:

- 1) The breakfast is Wed., May 3, probably from 6:30 - 8:00 a.m.
- 2) Gary Bowen of GCFA will provide me with schedule, location and menu information next week which I will share with you all on the 29th.
- 3) In 1996, the ticket cost was \$10 per person; actual cost of the buffet was \$6.50. The difference was used to pay for a sound system.
- 4) In 1996, 180 people were guaranteed and paid for by Methodists United. There were 140 actual attendees.
- 5) 2 mailings to all Gen'l Conf. delegates went out, one in Jan., one about a month later with the actual reservation form. We have to pay (GCFA?) to get these labels. Rich said that the E/OH PwJ Project might be able to receive the reservations and checks so we can use their tax exempt number. We can also sell tickets during registration on Monday and Tuesday.
- 6) At this time, possible locations are the Convention Center, the Sheraton and the Marriott.
- 7) For the program we talked about a number of possible speakers. When we decided that we really only had about 45 mins. of actual program, we zeroed in on 2 speakers. Here's a possible line up:

Bishop Charles Jordan - presiding
Bishop Susan Morrison - invocation
Bishop Dale White - 10-12 mins. on domination systems
Bishop Jack Meadors - 10-12 mins. on the children & poverty initiative,
Jubilee 2000
If time, Q&A from audience
Bishop Katembo - benediction

Ann was going to think about music. Maybe even a PwJ Coordinators Choir???
We will need a piano.

- 8) We will have printed programs and a display table with materials.
- 9) Rich has volunteers willing to help us. Carol suggested some Coordinator spouses might also be volunteers.

10) Carol has already talked with the SW/TX Gen'l Conf. delegation about the breakfast. She suggested we each try to talk with our Gen'l Conf. delegations, and ideally, our the delgation heads in our Jurisdictions. She will do a promo mailing about the breakfast to the South Central and Western Jurisdiction delegation heads.

I think this covers everything. Did I miss anything? We'll talk again in a few weeks and I'll have more info on locations, menus and prices. Thanks to you all!

Robin

To: Robin Ringler <DRingler@UMC-GBCS.ORG>, "walkeraustin@yahoo.com" <walkeraustin@yahoo.com>, "Lsabin1313@aol.com" <Lsabin1313@aol.com>, "pwjp@juno.com" <pwjp@juno.com>, "ANNFPRICE@aol.com" <ANNFPRICE@aol.com>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: notes from our conf. call
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <619BD1E95646D311B69D0008C79FE32DD09D@CHURCH2>
References:

At 10:38 AM 9/30/99 -0400, Robin Ringler wrote:

>Hi you all,
>
>Thanks very much for a good conference call yesterday about the Gen'l Conf.
>PwJ breakfast....

Robin,

Thanks for your notes. I would like to provide a brief supplement.

You wrote:

>3) In 1996, the ticket cost was \$10 per person; actual cost of the buffet
>was \$6.50. The difference was used to pay for a sound system.

The mailing costs and purchase of labels for the delegates also came out of the ticket cost. We pretty much broke even.

You wrote:

>4) In 1996, 180 people were guaranteed and paid for by Methodists United.
>There were 140 actual attendees.

We sold 180 tickets, so we didn't lose money from the no-shows. In 2000 we can guarantee for all the tickets sold by a cut-off time for the hotel (such as 24 hours in advance) but still sell a few more tickets, knowing that there will be some no-shows.

You wrote:

>10) Carol has already talked with the SW/TX Gen'l Conf. delegation about the
>breakfast. She suggested we each try to talk with our Gen'l Conf.
>delegations, and ideally, our the delgation heads in our Jurisdictions. She
>will do a promo mailing about the breakfast to the South Central and Western
>Jurisdiction delegation heads.

I'll talk with Jim and Char Hipkins from our board, living in Tennessee, about helping out with contacts in the Southeastern Jurisdiction. I can help out in Northeast or Southeast if needed.

Shalom,
Howard

To: EDBruegge@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Surgery, etc.
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Ed:

Thanks for the article on senior softball. Those middle-aged guys in their 50s masquerading as seniors are much more aggressive than we true seniors, who are just glad that we can still play. I'm drawing on my experience to write a screenplay dealing with senior softball. The story line is that the characters played by Jack Lemon and Walter Matthau in Grumpy Old Men (or somebody else like them) get thrown out their houses for their drunken behavior on New Year's Eve and end up in Florida where they become managers of rival 70+ softball teams. Whether I'll be able to sell it is uncertain, but it's fun to work on it.

Good luck on your surgery on October 5. I hope you have a quick and successful recovery.

I'm joining you, so to speak, on October 26 to have a tendon re-attached to the rotator cuff in my left shoulder. I've had some soreness there in recent years while playing the viola (with arm twisted). It's bothered me some playing softball and volleyball and has hurt while swimming. Probably the attrition of aging, tendonitis from usage, perhaps some tearing finally led to separation this summer while playing softball. I was playing left field, and it really hurt on follow-through of a throw. The rest of the day swinging my arm while running hard on the bases was quite painful. But I played several more games to complete the season and have kept playing the viola. I had a couple of cortisone shots. When it still wasn't better, I had an MRI, which revealed the separation. Interestingly it's not my throwing arm or my racket arm in tennis. I recall that Bob had orthoscopic surgery on his left shoulder, needed probably because of his violin playing. C'est la vie!

I'm still pressing for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Next time you see Senator Gregg, please ask him to push Senator Helms to hold hearings. If you're at a rally for Gore or Bradley, urge them to speak out for the CTBT.

Carlee joins me in sending greetings to Lu Ann and you.

Shalom,
Howard

To: phil
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Ploughshare funds
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Phil,

I want to spend all the Ploughshare grant, so assign a phone bill (or part of one) to the balance. I filed a "final report" in July with the hope that they might want to give a supplemental grant, which they didn't. I reported all funds spent, so bring our books in line.

Thanks,

Howard

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Final push for CTBT
Cc: ctbt
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

To: Interfaith Group for the CTBT

Dear Colleagues:

I assume that all of you have seen the message from Daryl Kimball about Senator Lott's offer to have a vote on the CTBT on Wednesday, October 6 and the Democratic response to seek a later date in October for the vote. A date hasn't been chosen, but it is most likely to happen before the end of the month.

This is the challenge we've been waiting for. To work out our tactics the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers has scheduled an emergency meeting at 3:00 p.m. tomorrow, Friday, October 1 at the Stimson Center, 11 Dupont Circle. 9th Floor. You are invited to participate. If you can't attend, I'll let you know the results.

Meanwhile, you can begin to gear up for intensive and extensive grassroots mobilization. For this final push, we want to double the number of Republican senators and states we will work on. All Democrats and Republican Senators Chafee, Jeffords, and Specter have announced support for the treaty. We should work on the 40 senators in thirty states on the attached list, which also shows denominational affiliation. Particularly strong efforts are needed to get Senators Domenici (New Mexico), Lugar (Indiana), and Stevens (Alaska) to make a public committee to vote for the CTBT, for they are quite influential with other senators. But we should simultaneously work on the other 37 on the list.

We can win the vote if we utilize our full strength in October.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Swing Votes on the CTBT

New England

Maine Collins Catholic
Snowe * Eastern Orthodox
New Hampshire Gregg United Church of Christ

Middle Atlantic

Pennsylvania Santorum * Catholic
Delaware Roth * Episcopal

Southeast

Virginia Warner Episcopal
South Carolina Thurmond Baptist
Georgia Coverdell United Methodist
Florida Mack Catholic
Mississippi Lott Baptist
Tennessee Frist * Presbyterian
Thompson Protestant
Kentucky Bunning Catholic

McConnell Baptist
 Great Lakes
 Ohio DeWine * Catholic
 Voinovich Catholic
 Michigan Abraham * Eastern Orthodox
 Indiana Lugar * United Methodist
 Illinois Fitzgerald Catholic
 Great Plains
 Minnesota Grams * Lutheran
 Iowa Grassley Baptist
 Missouri Ashcroft * Assembly of God
 Bond Catholic
 Nebraska Hagel Episcopal
 Kansas Brownback United Methodist
 Roberts United Methodist
 Mountains
 Montana Burns Lutheran
 Wyoming Enzi Presbyterian
 Thomas * United Methodist
 Colorado Allard Protestant
 Campbell Native American
 New Mexico Domenici Catholic
 Arizona McCain Episcopal
 Utah Bennett Latter Day Saints
 Hatch Latter Day Saints
 Idaho Crapo Latter Day Saints
 West
 Oregon Smith Latter Day Saints
 Washington Gorton * Episcopal
 Alaska Murkowski Catholic
 Stevens Episcopal
 * Up for reelection in 2000

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 1999 15:05:57 -0400
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: FLASH!! likely vote on CTBT final passage - maybe next week
To: dkimball@clw.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igcb.igc.org id MAA24708
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id MAB25229

September 30, 1999

To: All CTBT supporters
Fm: Daryl Kimball, Stephen Young, Jenny Smith

Re: URGENT ALERT! CTBT VOTE POSSIBLE NEXT WEEK; Emergency mtg. tomorrow at 3pm

Ready or not the time is now on the CTBT.

After a sudden change of position by the Senate Republican leadership, there may be a ratification vote on the CTBT as soon as next Wednesday. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott came to Senate Democrats this morning and offered to have two hearings on Tuesday, followed by a vote on Wednesday, October 6.

The initial Democratic response was to decline the specific offer, but press for a later date, probably still in October. At this moment, negotiations are on-going, but they may set a date for a vote as soon as today or tomorrow.

Thus, NOW is the time for action. Anything and everything you can do, do it.

We have scheduled an emergency meeting to discuss our next steps:

Tuesday, October 1
3:00pm
Henry L. Stimson Center
11 Dupont Circle NW
9th Flr

Bring your ideas, your capabilities, and your inspiration!

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE: Sept. 30, 1999
CONTACTS: Daryl Kimball, (202) 546-0795, ext. 136; Adam Eidinger,
(202)-547-3577

"Senate Forced to Reckon with Its Failure to Act on Nuclear Test Ban Treaty: Vote on Treaty Possible in Early October"

(WASHINGTON, DC) In a bid to press for Senate action on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), Senate treaty supporters have pressed the Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS) and Senator Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-NC) to finally engage in a discussion about when and how to consider the Treaty.

Senator Helms and Senator Lott argued on the Senate floor today that the Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings in which the Treaty has been mentioned and offered a unanimous consent resolution for a vote on final passage of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on October 7, 1999. The proposal was not accepted, but discussions continue about a schedule for hearings, terms of a resolution of ratification, time for debate and a date for a vote on final passage.

"Despite repeated calls for action on the Treaty, Senate leaders Trent Lott (R-MS) and Jesse Helms (R-NC) have defied public opinion and blocked the Senate from considering the CTBT," said Daryl Kimball, Executive Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. "Senator Lott's and Senator Helms' suggestion of holding a vote in days would contradict Lott's earlier advice about not "rushing to judgement," he added. "Senate leaders on both sides of the aisle should move ahead on test ban consideration and they should take the time necessary for balanced hearings, a fair resolution of ratification, and a thorough debate."

The effort by Senate Democrats including, Senator Joseph Biden (D-DE), Senator Byron (D-ND), was intended to begin the process of Senate approval of the CTBT, which has been delayed for over two years by Senator Jesse Helms' obdurate refusal to hold a single hearing on this vital treaty.

John Isaacs, the president of Council for a Livable World argued: "The question for internationalist Republicans — Sens. Lugar (IN), Stevens (AK), Domenici (NM), Hagel (NE), Smith (OR), Snowe and Collins (ME), Frist and Thompson (TN), Voinovich and Dewine (OH), McCain (AZ) and others — is whether they will follow neo- isolationists like Jesse Helms who would like to resume nuclear testing or pursue practical strategies for preventing nuclear proliferation, like the test ban treaty." For more than two years, these and other Senators have used Helms opposition as an excuse to avoid taking a stance on this critical treaty.

"The American people overwhelmingly support the comprehensive test ban treaty," said Gordon Clark, Executive Director of Peace Action, the nation's largest peace organization. "Further opposition to the test ban treaty puts Senators on the wrong side of American public, expert, and world opinion," noted Clark.

The American people overwhelmingly support Senate approval of the CTBT.

According to a June 1999 poll, over eight in 10 Americans (82%) want the Treaty approved. Only 14% say the Treaty should not be approved. An overwhelming majority of both self-identified Republicans (80%) and Democrats (86%) support approval of the Treaty. (The Mellman Group/Wirthlin

Worldwide, June 1999.) Dozens of military and scientific experts, including President Reagan's former arms control negotiator Paul Nitze and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Colin Powell.

"The American people want their Senators and the President to work together to ratify and implement the nuclear test ban treaty to help make the world safer for future generations," said Kimball of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, an alliance of 17 nuclear non-proliferation organizations.

#

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is a non-partisan alliance of 17 nuclear non-proliferation organizations based in Washington, D.C. For more information on the CTBT, see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 1999 15:49:14 -0400
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: clarification on date of emergenc CTBT mtg.
To: dkimball@clw.org
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]

September 30, 1999

To: All CTBT supporters
Fm: Daryl Kimball, Stephen Young, Jenny Smith

Re: CORRECTION ... Emergency mtg. on CTBT tomorrow at 3pm

A clarification of the date for the meeting listed in my earlier message:

We have scheduled an emergency meeting to discuss our next steps:

FRIDAY, October 1
3:00pm
Henry L. Stimson Center
11 Dupont Circle NW
9th Flr

Bring your ideas, your capabilities, and your inspiration!

DK

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Date: Thu, 30 Sep 1999 16:26:03 -0400
From: "Joan Wade" <disarmament@igc.org>
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: ABSOLUTELY URGENT!!!!
To: <ctbt-organize@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

<x-html><!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>Dear CTBT Activists,</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>This morning, Republicans offered a unanimous consent agreement to vote on the Treaty on October 6 -- yes, you read it correctly -- OCTOBER 6. Democrats are trying to work out a compromise to consider the treaty later on, following balanced hearings, but it appears that later will most likely be later this month! An all-out grassroots effort is needed to get the necessary support for ratification. I urge all of you to call your Senators now and spread the word! The following is a list of Senators requiring your special attention. Action details are also listed below.</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Alabama: Shelby</DIV>

<DIV>Alaska: Stevens and Murkowski</DIV>

<DIV>Arizona: McCain</DIV>

<DIV>Arkansa: Hutchinson</DIV>

<DIV>Colorado: Campbell and Allard</DIV>

<DIV>Delaware: Roth</DIV>

<DIV>Georgia: Coverdell</DIV>

<DIV>Idaho: Crapo</DIV>

<DIV>Illinois: Fitzgerald</DIV>

<DIV>Indiana: Lugar</DIV>

<DIV>Iowa: Grassley</DIV>

<DIV>Kansas: Brownback and Roberts</DIV>

<DIV>Kentucky: McConnell and Bunning</DIV>

<DIV>Mack: Florida</DIV>

<DIV>Maine: Snow and Collins</DIV>

<DIV>Michigan: Abraham</DIV>

<DIV>Minnesota: Grams</DIV>

<DIV>Mississippi: Lott</DIV>

<DIV>Missouri: Bond</DIV>

<DIV>Montana: Burns</DIV>

<DIV>Nebraska: Hagel</DIV>

<DIV>New Hampshire: Gregg</DIV>

<DIV>New Mexico: Domenici</DIV>

<DIV>Ohio: DeWine and Voinovich</DIV>

<DIV>Oklahoma: Nickles</DIV>

From: J._Daryl_Byler@mail.mcc.org
X-Lotus-FromDomain: MCC
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 30 Sep 1999 16:58:03 -0400
Subject: Re: Final push for CTBT

To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj @ igc.org>
From: J. Daryl Byler
Date: 9/30/99 4:57:33 PM
Subj: Re: Final push for CTBT

Hi Howard:

I can't be at the meeting tomorrow, but will appreciate an update. This is exciting news!

Warm regards,
Daryl Byler

To: dkimball@crnd.org, kathy@fcl.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Citizens Hearing on CTBT
Cc: mupj
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Daryl, Kathy, Tom:

Even before we meet this afternoon, I want to propose a one day Citizens Hearing on the CTBT on Monday, October 11, Columbus Day when the Senate is in recess (I believe). I would like to discuss this idea with you by phone this morning and, if you agree it's worth further discussion, bring it up at the afternoon meeting.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Proposal for a Citizens Hearing on the CTBT
by Howard W. Hallman

Date: Monday, October 11, 1999
Columbus Day (Senate in recess?)

Time: 10 a.m. to 12 noon, 1:00 to 3:00 p.m.

Place: Capitol Hill, such as:
a room in a Senate Office Building (obtained by a retired senator)
Methodist Building
Church of the Reformation, 222 East Capitol (basement)
a hotel

Cosponsors: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers & Interfaith Group for the CTBT

Hearing panel
Senator Dale Bumpers
Senator Mark Hatfield
Possibly other retired senators

Testimony by eight panels (30 minutes each), such as (order to be determined):
Interfaith (Catholic, Protestant, Jewish)
Scientists, physician
Verification specialists (seismologists, etc.)
Pollsters
Women
Environmentalists
Victims perspective (persons affected by past testing)
Human rights (including international perspective)

Media coverage
C-Span II (Senate in recess)

CNN

Other television and radio

Print media

Taping by CDI for edited use

Related appearances on Jim Lehrer's News Hour, Larry King's show, etc.

Publicity

E-mail to grassroots networks to watch

Other

Printed record

Verbatim record or reporter's summary

Distributed to members of the Senate

X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R6.01.01

Date: Fri, 01 Oct 99 15:00:56 -0500

From: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>

To: <ograbc@aol.com>, <denhartz@erols.com>, <washofc@aol.com>, <ann_d.parti@ecunet.org>, <heathern@nccusa.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>, <jsammon@networklobby.org>, <network@igc.org>, <dave@paxchristiusa.org>, <Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org>, <lwyolton@prodigy.net>, <uuawo@aol.com>, <jnoble@uahc.org>, <Dringler@umc-gbcs.org>, <gpowers@nccbuscc.org>, <mupj@igc.org>, <mupj@igc.org>

Cc: <btiller@psr.org>, <fteplitz@peace-action.org>, <>wand@wand.org>, <ctbt@2020vision.org>, <dkimball@clw.org>, <jsmith@clw.org>, <disarmament@igc.org>

Subject: Re: Final push for CTBT

In case vote IS this Wed, I got out 2000 action alerts to UCC network in nine key states this morning, putting it in the same envelop I had ready to go today on campaign finance (swing list is the same). Heather and I also got out five sheets of material to the State Councils of Churches, alerting them.

Assuming Daschle will win extension (which I hope has already happened), we need to concentrate. Heather and I already have two alerts which you can have electronically, but need updating. Heather and I will both be updating these, me for the UCC and Heather for the 25 or so denominational social action staff who don't have Washington offices.

I'll attach some of this here, if it is useful to you.

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\910ctbta.wpd"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\910cfctb.wpd"

From: "Heather Nolen" <heathern@nccusa.org>
To: "howard hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: CTBT
Date: Fri, 1 Oct 1999 17:12:21 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Hi Howard,

I wasn't able to make the CTBT emergency meeting, but as you probably saw from Jay's email, we were able to contact virtually all the state councils of churches. I'll fax a copy of what was sent out--it's about 5 pages.

Let me know the outcome of your meeting today.

In faith,
Heather

National Council of Churches/Church World Service
110 Maryland Ave., NE
Box 45
Washington, DC 20002
ph: 202-543-6336
fax: 202-546-6232
email: heathern@nccusa.org

From: owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
Bcc:
Date: Fri, 1 Oct 1999 12:57:52 -0600

THE SUNFLOWER

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

ISSUE NO. 29, October 1999
NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

The Sunflower is a free, monthly e-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
=====

RADIATION ACCIDENTS AND HAZARDS
Significant Nuclear Accident at MOX Plant in Japan
Glow-in-the-Dark Rhubarb Downwind from Ontario Plant
Hanford Radiation Study Results Similar to Chernobyl
Storing Potassium Iodide
Radioactive Scrap Metal Sold for Household Use
Challenges of Dismantling Soviet Nuclear Subs

RECENT TESTS
US Ballistic Missile Defense Program Tests
China Tests Long-Range Missile
Recent Subcritical US Nuclear Test in Nevada

AGREEMENTS
North Korea Agrees to Refrain from Testing Ballistic Missiles
Y2K Colorado Center Now Operational
Calls For De-Alerting

ACTION ALERT
US Arms Used Against East Timor Prompts Legislation

EVENTS

RESOURCES

=====
RADIATION ACCIDENTS AND HAZARDS
=====

Significant Nuclear Accident at MOX Plant In Japan
Residents were evacuated for 6 miles (10 km) around a MOX plant that makes

fuel for atomic reactors on Sept. 30th in Tokaimura, central Japan. Japan relies on nuclear power for about one-third of its electricity. The JCO Inc. facility leaked radiation into the atmosphere at 3,000 to 10,000 times usual background levels. Many were hospitalized from radiation exposure and several workers are in critical condition from this significant nuclear accident. A worker put 35 pounds instead of 5 pounds of uranium nitrate solution into a tank, ignoring control limits. The uranium, which went critical, was imported from France in the form of UF₆ fluoride gas. Workers say they saw a blue light and then became ill. The surrounding township was notified 58 minutes after the accident. According to continuing reports, many residents are at risk of contamination and have been instructed to close their windows and remain inside. (Associated Press, CNN and www.sfgate.com, Sept. 30, 1999. For further information go to the Nuclear Information and Resource Service site at <http://www.nirs.org>)

Glow-in-the-Dark Rhubarb Downwind From Ontario Plant

Rhubarb with significant levels of radioactivity has been found in commercial fields near a Pembroke, Ontario factory that makes glow-in-the-dark signs from nuclear waste. The rhubarb is grown downwind from SRB Technologies (Canada) Inc., and contains about 1,000 times the radioactive tritium found either in rain water in Ottawa or in a rhubarb sample taken from a garden about 45 km (28 miles) away. Tritium is a radioactive form of hydrogen used mainly in making thermonuclear bombs, but it can also be used in glow-in-the-dark signs. Tritium, a byproduct of Canadian-designed nuclear reactors, is a carcinogen and can cause genetic damage. SRB makes its signs using tritium both from Ontario Power Generation Inc. and from recycled glow-in-the-dark signs. Canada has no standards for tritium contamination in food. (The Globe and Mail, Toronto, Sept. 28, 1999)

Hanford Radiation Study Results Similar to Chernobyl

The Hanford Infant Mortality, Fetal Death and Pre-term Birth Study has found that mothers exposed to the highest amounts of airborne radiation, released from Hanford, Washington during 1945-46, were more likely to give birth to premature babies. The federal study also found a 30 percent rise in infant death rates for mothers in the highest exposure group. The study did not link the increased number of premature births to Hanford radiation exposure. Between 1945-46 the largest airborne releases of radioactive iodine occurred from the process of extracting plutonium from nuclear fuel rods at the Hanford plant. Winds carried the radioactive material for miles, contaminating fruits, vegetables, and milk produced by cows that ate radioactive grass. Trisha Pritikin, a Berkeley attorney and downwinder activist, says that the federal study results echo problems found among European babies exposed to fallout from the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear disaster. (Tri County Herald, Pasco Washington, Sept. 20, 1999)

Storing Potassium Iodide

According to World Health Organization studies done after Chernobyl, taking potassium iodide can prevent thyroid cancer in people exposed to radiation if taken within ten hours of exposure. Last year the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission agreed to purchase potassium iodide for any state that wanted to

stockpile it. To date, only three states -- Tennessee, Alabama and Arizona -- store the inexpensive pills in counties near nuclear-power plants. Japan, Canada, France and Russia all have stockpiled potassium iodide. In addition, physicians from the National Institutes of Health and the American Thyroid Association support stockpiling. (<http://www.nrc.gov/OPA/gmo/nrarcv/98-109.htm>)

Recycled Radioactive Scrap Metal Sold for Household Use

The DOE has contracted with BNFL Inc., the US subsidiary of British Nuclear Fuels Limited, a nuclear technology corporation, to remove, clean and recycle nickel from the Oak Ridge Laboratory in Tennessee. Scrap metal from the Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Paducah, Kentucky, which has 60,000 tons of scrap, will also be handled by BNFL. Deals have allegedly been made in secret and rushed through to avoid environmental activists making a fuss. BNFL will be creating consumer products with the nickel, such as stainless steel orthodontics, forks, and knives. DOE and BNFL say that the radiation left after decontamination is negligible, but the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER) disagrees. "A very small quantity of radioactivity could cause significant damage," says Arjun Makhijani, president of the Maryland-based IEER. During October the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will consider whether or not it is possible to set a national standard on radiation levels in metals recycled from commercial nuclear facilities. Currently there are no federal regulations governing the recycling of radioactive scrap. (US News and World Report, Sept. 20, 1999)

Challenges of Dismantling Soviet Nuclear Subs

The former Soviet Union had 244 nuclear submarines. Nearly 180 have now been decommissioned, but Russia says it can only dismantle three to six subs a year. Additional delays come from waiting for the construction of facilities to filter and store the contaminants from the radioactive wastes. Radioactive reactor coolant waste previously was dumped at sea. Now canisters of coolant sit in open, unshielded areas, i.e., the middle of a field.

Over 110 of the decommissioned subs still have operating nuclear reactors, usually two per vessel. Large amounts of highly enriched uranium (HEU) and plutonium, key ingredients of nuclear weapons, are contained in their fresh and spent fuel. This is an enormous stockpile of fissile material with very little protection. Most international assistance goes to the dismantlement of ballistic missile submarines, but not much to dismantle decommissioned nuclear-powered attack submarines. (For more info read "Dismantling Russia's Nuclear Subs: New Challenges to Non-Proliferation" by James Clay Moltz and Tamara C. Robinson in Arms Control Today, Vol. 29 #4, June 1999.)

=====

RECENT TESTS

=====

US Ballistic Missile Defense Program Tests

Components of the US Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) program are currently being tested at considerable expense. Since the Reagan Administration, the

cost for the BMD system has totaled \$120 billion. In August The High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) was tested by intercepting another missile at White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico. Six test failures, non-interceptions, preceded this test. The Pentagon announced that it would wait until the missile managed three successful interceptions before advancing the project beyond its current "demonstrative-validation" phase of development. On Oct. 2nd the National Missile Defense (NMD) component of the BMD will be tested at Vandenberg Air Force base in California with plans to intercept a missile sent from the US Army Kwajalein Missile Range in the Marshall Islands. This summer President Clinton signed legislation that will permit the deployment of the NMD system "as soon as technologically feasible." Instead of wasting billions testing technology that can be easily overcome by decoys and offensive development, the defense efforts could concentrate on the enforcement of treaties to reduce the nuclear threat and fulfill existing obligations. (Associated Press, Aug. 3, 1999)

China Tests Long-Range Missile

During August 1999 China tested its Dongfeng-31 ground-to-ground missile within Chinese territory. The Dongfeng-31 has a striking distance of 5,000 miles and presently can hold a nuclear warhead weighing up to 1,500 pounds. Deployment could begin within three years. China may be trying to find ways to outfit the missile with up to three warheads. Later this year China plans to test-fire a new submarine-based missile, the Jilang II, with a range similar to that of the Dongfeng-31. (LA Times, Aug. 3, 1999)

Recent Subcritical Nuclear Test In Nevada

On Sept. 27th the US conducted the "Oboe" Subcritical Weapons Test underground at the Nevada Test Site, 85 miles northwest of Las Vegas. In a subcritical test, chemical high explosives blow up nuclear materials, including plutonium-239, a main ingredient of nuclear weapons. The tests allow scientists to increase their understanding of nuclear reactions. Subcritical nuclear tests are designed not to reach criticality, i.e., sustain a nuclear chain reaction. These tests violate the spirit, if not the letter, of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty which calls for no nuclear explosions. Each subcritical experiment costs about \$20 million in direct costs, plus the additional cost of maintaining the Nevada Test Site. (For more info on the costs go to Center for Defense Information site at <http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/nukecost.html>)

=====

The Hypocrisy Knows No Boundaries Award goes to Richard N. Haass, Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution for this statement on May 14, 1998. "Indeed discrimination is at the heart of the entire non-proliferation regime ... Double standards -- and triple standards if need be -- are what a realistic and successful foreign policy is all about."

=====

=====

AGREEMENTS

=====

North Korea Agrees To Refrain From Testing Ballistic Missiles

North Koreans have announced the cessation of missile testing while diplomatic talks continue with the United States on lifting economic sanctions. The North Koreans have been readying an intercontinental ballistic missile called the Taepo Dong Two, with an estimated-range of 3,700 to 5,000 miles, far enough to carry nuclear, chemical or biological warheads to Japan, Hawaii, or Alaska. The US economic concessions include lifting a ban on trade between the US and North Korea and allowing American airlines to land in North Korean airports. At a press conference in Tokyo on Sept. 24th, former US Defense Secretary William Perry, who is the Presidential Special Advisor on North Korea, described the missile test moratorium and easing of American sanctions as initial gestures in what promises to be a long road toward ending the Cold War on the Korean peninsula.

In March 1999 eight missile-producing factories were confirmed in North Korea. The country is building two additional missile launch sites to add to the ten it already has. Further, North Korea is capable of producing more than 100 Scud-type missiles a year. Both the ballistic and Scud missiles are produced for sale in the international arms market. Since 1996, North Korea has refused to participate in the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), which limits the risks of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (i.e. nuclear, chemical and biological weapons), by controlling transfers that could make a contribution to delivery systems (other than manned aircraft) for such weapons. (NY Times and LA Times, Sept. 23, 24, 25, 1999)

=====
"We do not ever want to have a confrontation with North Korea. We are willing to reward Pyongyang accordingly when it ceases production of weapons of mass destruction and stops pursuing military conflict with us. When and if North Korea decides to take a course toward peace, first, there will be a guarantee of North Korea's security. Second, its economic reconstruction will be actively supported. Third, it will be treated as a respected member of the international community." - President Kim Dae-jung, Republic of (South) Korea
=====

Y2K Colorado Center Now Operational

US Defense Secretary William Cohen and Russian Defense Minister Igor Sergejev signed a formal agreement establishing the Joint Center for Y2K Strategic Stability at Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado Springs, designed to detect false missile attack alarms caused by the year 2000 computer bug. Military officers will watch for any sign of a nuclear missile launch warning, glitches in early warning radar systems or power grid failures in either nation. The center will remain operational until March 2000. Permanent warning centers are still under discussion. (CNN Sept. 22, 1999)

Calls For De-Alerting

On Sept. 7th the American Medical Association sent a letter to President Clinton requesting him to "urgently develop policies with other countries to minimize the accidental deployment of nuclear weapons and other weapons

of mass destruction." The Australian Senate has passed a resolution urging the US and Russia to take their nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert before the Y2K rollover period. A motion calling on the Government of Canada to urge the big five nuclear powers - US, Russia, UK, France, and China -- to de-alert their nuclear weapons as soon as possible was introduced in the Senate of Canada on Sept. 7th by Senator Douglas Roche who stated, "The year 2000 date change highlights the existing danger to the world because of the ongoing alert status of nuclear forces... The world needs the safety that de-alerting would ensure, not just on New Year's Eve but throughout every day of every year." (Washington Post Sept. 11 and 29, 1999)

=====
ACTION ALERT
=====

US Arms Used Against East Timor Prompts Legislation

The people of East Timor voted overwhelmingly for independence on August 30th, but leading up to the elections and following, militia forces aided by the Indonesian military have been slaughtering the supporters of East Timorese independence. Indonesia has been aided by the sale and transfer of arms from major western countries, including the United States. The US has supported Indonesia's military and political regimes for several decades. In 1997 commercial exports of weapons to Indonesia were \$3.3 million; and in 1998 that amount rose to \$16.3 million. When President Clinton finally announced the suspension of US military ties with Indonesia, this temporarily eliminated US military aid to Indonesia, including training programs, government arms transfers and commercial arms sales. Senate Bill S1568 and House Bill HR 2809 call for the immediate suspension of all US military and economic assistance to Indonesia until the results of the August 30 ballot have been implemented. Also, House Bill HR 1063 would close a loophole and specifically ban all combat training to the armed forces of any country that is violating human rights. Contact your Congressional representative to urge passage of these bills. (More info at <http://www.cdi.com>; locate your rep by zipcode at <http://congress.nw.dc.us/physicians/congdir.html>)

=====
"Now we must work to deny weapons of mass destruction to those who would use them." -Remark by President Clinton to the United Nations 54th General Assembly, Sept. 21, 1999 [Mr. President, does that include the one country that has used nuclear weapons in war?- Ed.]
=====

=====
EVENTS
=====

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

Oct. 1-6: State of the World Forum, San Francisco. For information go to

<http://www.worldforum.org>

Oct. 2: A Day Without The Pentagon. War Resisters League organizing local actions at military recruiting stations to protest US militarism. For info call Chris Ney at (212)228-0450.

Oct. 2: Demonstration to protest ballistic missile test launch at Vandenberg Air Force Base. At VAFB main gate off Hwy 1, near Lompoc, California, 1 p.m.

Oct. 8-11: Fall Gathering at the Nevada Test Site. For more information contact Healing Global Wounds heal@kay-net.com

Oct. 6-8: CTBT Conference in Vienna.

Oct. 9-11: US Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons National Meeting and Campaign Launch in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Teach-ins will precede the meeting Oct. 4-9. For more info contact Carah Ong at (805)965-3443.

Oct. 9-10: French Mouvement de la Paix campaign for a moratorium on nuclear lab testing and modernization of nuclear weapons. Demonstrations on Oct. 9 at the Barp near Bordeaux; and on Oct. 10 at l'Ile Longue.

October 10-15: The 1999 Seoul International Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). 5,000 participants are expected. The Seoul website for the conference is <http://www.ngo99korea.org>

Oct. 14-16: Middle Powers Initiative Meeting, New York. Website is <http://www.middlepowers.org/>

Oct. 14-17: World Federalist Association Fall Assembly, Dallas.

Oct. 21-26: The NGO Committee on Disarmament holds its annual Disarmament Week seminar at the UN in New York. Discussions of critical disarmament issues, such as Code of Conduct for Outer Space, Depleted Uranium, Tokyo Forum, and Verifying a Nuclear Weapons Convention. For program updates and further details go to <http://www.peacenet.org/disarm/>

Oct. 23: Fourth Annual Worldwide Action Day to support full funding of the UN. Organized by the NGO Millennium Forum at the UN. Call your representative and urge Congress to pay up. Go to the Global Policy Forum at <http://www.globalpolicy.org>

Oct. 23: Make a Difference Day. Roll up your sleeves and volunteer your time on this day (and anytime) to make a positive difference in the world.

Oct. 24: United Nations Day and the beginning of Disarmament Week

Nov. 4-6: International Law Weekend 1999 in New York City. For info contact Kelly Askin by email at kaskin@wcl.american.edu

Nov. 9: Tenth Anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall.

=====

RESOURCES

=====

A chronology of nuclear accidents is available online at the Nuclear Files website, a site which is an encyclopedic compendium on the Nuclear Age. The Nuclear Files is a project of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation with support from the W. Alton Jones Foundation and Project Ploughshares.

<http://www.nuclearfiles.org>

Preventing An Accidental Armageddon by Dean Babst is now available online. The 5,000 nuclear weapons that Russia and the U.S. have set for hair-trigger release present the world with its greatest danger, an enormous overkill, the potential for an accidental Armageddon. Go to

<http://www.wagingpeace.org>

The Nuclear History of Micronesia and The Pacific by Richard Salvador from the Republic of Belau is now available online at <http://www.wagingpeace.org>

The recent Waging Peace Worldwide Journal, Summer 1999 (9:2) has a Special Report section on Nuclear Weapons Abolition Strategy for the 21st Century. \$5.00. Click on The Peace Store at <http://www.wagingpeace.org>

Read General George Lee Butler speaking on the need for the global elimination of nuclear weapons in the Waging Peace Series booklet #40 "Ending the Nuclear Madness" available for \$4.00 from the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. Click on The Peace Store at <http://www.wagingpeace.org>

The Institute for Energy and Environmental Research (IEER) is dedicated to increasing public involvement in and control over environmental problems through the democratization of science. They've lobbied the National Academy of Sciences BEIR VII panel set up to study the impacts of low level radiation exposure. The IEER website is <http://www.iier.org>

Confused by all the acronyms used in the National Missile Defense Program, such as BMDO, BMD, THAAD, TMD, NMD, SMTS? For an explanation, go to www.acq.osd.mil/bmdo/html/ccc.html

The US Defense Dept. confirmed that US weapons fired armor-piercing ammunition made of depleted uranium (DU) in Kosovo. DU fact sheets and more at European Network Against Depleted Uranium. Their website is <http://enadu.i.am>

Manifesto 2000 seeks to transform the global culture of war and violence into a culture of peace and non-violence. Website is <http://unesco.org/manifesto2000>

Join the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation. We invite you to join the growing worldwide movement of individuals and citizen organizations working for a peaceful future. Members receive Waging Peace Worldwide journal, Waging Peace Series booklets, invitations to hear outstanding speakers and to attend special events, and discounts on books and tapes. Go to <http://www.wagingpeace.org>

SUNFLOWER READER SURVEY

We'd like to know your thoughts on how you rate the Sunflower overall and how we can improve this newsletter. Please cut and paste the questions below into your e-mail, respond, and send to wagingpeace@napf.org. Thanks!

1. How would you rate The Sunflower overall?
2. What sections of The Sunflower do you like best?
3. Do you read through The Sunflower completely?
4. Do you find The Sunflower to be a useful resource?
5. What would you like to see added to the Sunflower?
6. What would you like to see left out of the Sunflower?
7. The Sunflower is too long, too short, just about right
8. Comments:

=====

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.

Date: Sat, 2 Oct 1999 08:52:53 +1200
From: "Alyn Ware" <alynw@ibm.net>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Nuclear Weapons Convention at UN
To: "abolition caucus" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

<x-html><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>

<META content=text/html;charset=iso-8859-1 http-equiv=Content-Type>
<META content="MSHTML 4.72.3110.7" name=GENERATOR>
</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=#ffffff>

<DIV>5 Countries have made written statements to the UN Secretary-General in response to the request in the 1998 UN resolution 53/77W, which calls for the implementation of the World Court advisory opinion through the commencement of negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention.</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>The most interesting was from India which supported early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention, called for the inclusion of nuclear weapons use as a crime in the Statute of the International Criminal Court, supported negotiations in the CD on a treaty banning the production of fissile material, declared that India would not be the first to use nuclear weapons and criticized the NATO Alliance nuclear doctrine, contrasting it with the Indian nuclear doctrine, released in August 1999.</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Progress on the nuclear weapons convention, including copies of statements such as those made to the UN Secretary-General, are posted on the A2000 Nuclear Weapons Convention Working Group email server.

If you are not on and wish to be, please contact me at alynw@ibm.net</DIV>

<DIV> </DIV>

<DIV>Alyn</DIV></BODY></HTML>

</x-html>

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Fri, 01 Oct 1999 20:21:31 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Test Ban Treaty vote Oct. 12

October 1, 1999

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers;
John Isaacs, Council for a Livable World

RE: Vote on CTBT set for October 12

It is official.

The vote is coming and we have a lot of work to do.

The full Senate will now scheduled a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on Tuesday, October 12 (by-passing any vote in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee).

Debate will begin on Friday, October 8. Under the ground rules that have been set up, there can be up to 14 hours of general debate.

Then there could be a Democratic amendment debated up to four hours and a Republican amendment also debated up to four hours. The final vote is expected on October 12.

The Senate Armed Services Committee under Senator John Warner will hold three hearings before the vote. The intelligence community will testify at one hearing; Defense Secretary William Cohen and the Joint Chiefs will testify at another, and the lab directors and Energy Secretary Bill Richardson at a third. There will be second panels on two of those days at which critics (such as former Secretary James Schlesinger) and prominent supporters will testify.

Thus, we all have 11 days in which to do anything anyone can to encourage Republican Senators to vote for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Now is the time to pour all resources into the effort!

Further resources are listed below, including "A Summary of the Case for the CTBT:"

If you want to contact Senators by e-mail -- and want to encourage others to do so -- the address for the Council's Legislative Action Center is:
<http://congress.nw.dc.us/>

Direct link to a sample test ban letter on the Legislative Action page is:
<http://congress.nw.dc.us/cgi-bin/alertpr.pl?dir=clw&alert=clw7>

Information on Senators and their 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 online from the
Coalition's CTBT site
<<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctedit.htm#editorials>>

20/20 Vision-produced action alert postcards (See
<<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbt.html>> for more information.)

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>>

Go forth and ratify!

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n15.htm>>

VOL. 3, NO. 15, October 1, 1999

"For a Safer America:
A Summary of the Case for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty"*

A GLOBAL HALT to nuclear weapons test explosions has been a central objective of the United States since it was proposed by President Dwight Eisenhower in 1958. After forty years of bipartisan effort, President Bill Clinton became the first world leader to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on September 24, 1996, calling it "the longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control." The Treaty is supported by the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 82 percent of the American public and over 150 nations, including Russia, China, Great Britain and France.

Why is the test ban so popular? It is simple. The Test Ban Treaty will make America and the world safer for our children and grandchildren. The Treaty will strengthen our security by helping to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations, now among the greatest threats to the United States. And it will help prevent the renewal of a superpower nuclear arms race.

But our nation cannot enjoy its full benefits until the Test Ban Treaty is approved by the U.S. Senate. Failure to approve the Treaty would undermine American leadership to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons and set back efforts to control the spread of terror weapons worldwide, endangering American security for years to come.

How does the Test Ban Treaty make America safer?

The Test Ban Treaty strengthens the United States' ability to stop the

spread of nuclear weapons to other nations and helps prevent a new nuclear arms race from starting. It reduces the nuclear danger to the American people.

* The Test Ban Treaty makes it much harder for the countries with advanced nuclear weapons, including Russia and China, to produce new and more threatening types of nuclear warheads. And it helps prevent nations with smaller arsenals — like India and Pakistan — and nations seeking nuclear arms—like Iran and Iraq—from making advanced nuclear warheads, which are more easily deliverable by ballistic missiles. This Treaty helps block dangerous nuclear competition and new nuclear threats from emerging, thereby enhancing U.S. and global security.

* U.S. ratification of the Test Ban Treaty will strengthen international support for the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the bedrock of all efforts to stop the spread of the atomic bomb. In 1995, the U.S. and the other nuclear powers promised to deliver the Test Ban in exchange for the permanent extension of the NPT — a good deal that must be honored.

* The U.S. has not conducted a nuclear weapon test explosion since 1992, when President Bush announced the U.S. would halt development of new types of nuclear warheads and Congress mandated a 9- month moratorium on nuclear tests. Each year since then, the U.S. has renewed the moratorium and the nuclear weapons laboratories have certified that the existing weapons will work as designed. With or without the Treaty, it is unlikely that the U.S. will ever conduct another nuclear explosive test. Thus, it is in America's interest to ensure that other nations are not conducting nuclear tests. U.S. ratification will encourage other nations to ratify the Treaty, and our nation's capability to detect cheating by others will be far better with the Treaty in force than without it.

What would happen if the U.S. Senate failed to approve the Test Ban?

We would miss an historic opportunity to make the world safer for future generations.

* The U.S. would weaken the effectiveness of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, since some key member nations would feel swindled if the Test Ban faltered due to U.S. inaction. This would undermine efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons worldwide.

* Failure by the Senate to honor our commitment to the Test Ban--a U.S.-led, internationally supported initiative--would undercut the status of America as a world leader, with far-reaching implications.

* The Treaty would never enter into force, since U.S. ratification is a legal requirement and U.S. leadership is a political requirement for moving ahead.

* Military and political pressure would build to resume nuclear testing. It would be more difficult to verify compliance with the Test Ban Treaty, because the monitoring system would not be fully in place. Allegations of cheating might arise that could not be resolved in the absence of inspections provided for under the Treaty. Leaving the Treaty unratified

would increase uncertainty and reduce U.S. security.

* U.S. Senate inaction or rejection of the Test Ban Treaty would undermine global efforts to rein in India and Pakistan's dangerous nuclear arms competition. After a gap of 24 years, India conducted nuclear tests in May 1998, provoking Pakistan to conduct its own nuclear tests. Further testing by either country would accelerate their nuclear arms race and increase the risk of nuclear war. (1)

U.S. Senate inaction or rejection of the Treaty would leave open the possibility that China may be able to create a more threatening nuclear force, and slow momentum toward reducing the still enormous stockpiles of U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons. (2)

Who supports the Test Ban Treaty?

Presidents of the United States past and present, the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the vast majority of the American public, and over 150 nations, as well as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), all support the Test Ban Treaty.

* Presidents Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Jimmy Carter, and Bill Clinton, among others, have all endorsed and worked hard for a ban on nuclear weapons test explosions. (3)

* Current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Henry Shelton and former chairmen, Generals John Shalikashvili, Colin Powell, David Jones and Admiral William Crowe, all endorse the Treaty. These military leaders served under Presidents Clinton, Bush, Reagan and Carter. (4)

* The Test Ban Treaty is supported by an overwhelming majority of the American public. This support has remained high since the early days of the Cold War. A June 1999, bipartisan poll by Wirthlin Worldwide and The Mellman Group reveals that 82 percent of all Americans support Senate approval of the Test Ban Treaty, with only 14 percent opposed. Support cuts across party lines with 86% of Democrats and Treaty, 80% of Republicans supporting the Treaty, including 79% of self-identified "conservative Republicans" in support. (5)

* Since the Treaty was opened for signature in September 1996, the United States and over 153 other nations have signed, including the other major nuclear powers (Russia, China, France and Great Britain). (6) The NATO alliance has endorsed the Treaty and called on all states to "sign and ratify the Treaty without delay."

Can the U.S. maintain its current nuclear arsenal without nuclear explosive tests? Yes.

* The United States does not need nuclear explosive tests to maintain its current arsenal. The arsenal will be sustained through non-nuclear tests and evaluations. Worn out parts will be replaced. A nationwide infrastructure of production sites and laboratories will be maintained and enhanced for this purpose. The directors of the three national nuclear weapons laboratories — Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandia — as well as

leading nuclear weapons scientists, have determined that America's nuclear arsenal can be maintained without nuclear testing through their nuclear weapons "stockpile stewardship" program.

"We remain confident that the U.S. stockpile stewardship program, as conceived and as being executed, is able to perform the task under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and its safeguards. Recent concerns over losses of U.S. nuclear stockpile information have not changed this assessment in any way," the directors said in a June 10, 1999 joint statement. (7)

Can the Treaty be verified? Yes.

* The Treaty establishes a far-reaching global verification system to detect, locate and identify nuclear explosions. In addition, the U.S. will monitor the Treaty with its own satellites and other national intelligence means, which are the most sophisticated in the world. Thousands of other high-quality civilian seismic stations around the world provide further detection capabilities. Finally, the Treaty allows for short-notice, on-site inspections to clarify ambiguous events. Leading experts in seismology and test ban verification have determined that no would-be violator could be confident that a nuclear explosion of sufficient yield to possibly threaten U.S. security would escape detection. (8)

Why should the Test Ban Treaty be approved now?

There is nothing to gain by waiting. This Treaty strongly serves the interests of the United States. All of the major concerns about the effectiveness of the Treaty and its impact U.S. security have been well-addressed. (9) It is regrettable that some Senators have chosen to delay a vote on the CTBT on this vital initiative. For America to gain the full benefits of the Treaty, including complete operation of the verification system, it must be in legal force. If the U.S. leads, other nations will follow.

* While 154 states have signed the Test Ban Treaty, it cannot enter into force until approved by 44 specific nations, 23 of which have thus far failed to do so thus far. This is a challenging hurdle. But it is within reach: 41 of the 44 required states have signed, and hold-outs India and Pakistan have pledged that they will join the Treaty. World-wide pressure on India and other hold-out states will increase if the vast majority of nations, including the U.S., ratify the Treaty. As in the case of the 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention, the U.S. cannot be an effective leader if it has not itself approved the Treaty.

* Until all 44 states ratify the Test Ban and it enters into force, a special conference of nations that have ratified may be held every year to seek ways to accelerate the process. The first such conference, held on October 6-8, 1999, shows that global support for rapid implementation of the Treaty is stronger than ever. Prompt U.S. Senate approval for ratification of the Treaty will encourage other key nations to join and accelerate its implementation. Until the U.S. ratifies the Treaty, it does not have a vote at special conferences on accelerating Test Ban implementation — weakening America's leadership and influence in the

struggle to stop nuclear proliferation. (10)

The choice is clear: a world without nuclear testing is a safer world. The United States stands to lose nothing and to gain an important constraint on the ability of other nations to threaten America's security. The time for the Test Ban Treaty is now.

Notes:

* This Issue Brief is based on the Coalition's booklet, "For a Safer America: The Case for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty," by Tom Collina, Union of Concerned Scientists, with Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, and the Coalition's CTBT Working Group (October 1999).

(1) See: Coalition Issue Brief, Vol 2. No. 14 , "Senate Inaction on Test Ban Undercuts Effort to Address South Asia Crisis," (June 4, 1998)
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/brief14.htm>>

(2) See: Coalition News Release, "Congressional Leaders Cite Test Ban Treaty as Next Step to Dealing with Chinese Espionage," (May 27, 1999)
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/rel052799.htm>>; and Scientists Letter to Senator Lott on "Chinese Espionage and the CTBT," (July 30, 1999)
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ucsltr073099.htm>>

(3) For an overview of Kennedy/Eisenhower & the test ban, see: Coalition Issue Brief Vol. 3, No. 15, "On 35th Anniversary of JFK Address, World Still Waits for Nuclear Test Ban," (June 10, 1998)
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/brief15.htm>>; and Proposal by President Eisenhower for a CTBT (February 11, 1960)
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/eis0260.htm>>

(4) See: Coalition Backgrounder, "Test Ban Treaty Backed by Leading Military, Scientific Leaders and the Vast Majority of American Voters," (September 14, 1999)<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/bkgrsupprt0999.htm>>

(5) For a detailed analysis of this survey on the CTBT, see:
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/mellmanwirthlin0799.htm>>

(6) For up-to-date information on Treaty signers and ratifiers, see:
<http://www.ctbto.org/ctbto/sig_rat.shtml>

(7) "Nuke Test-Ban Treaty on Shaky Ground," Albuquerque Journal, June 11, 1999. For more information on the stockpile stewardship program and the CTBT, see: Richard L. Garwin, "The Future of Nuclear Weapons Without Nuclear Testing," Arms Control Today (November/December 1997)
<<http://www.armscontrol.org/ACT/novdec97/garwin.htm>>

(8) For further details, see: Coalition Issue Brief Vol. 3, No. 14, "U.S. Security Benefits from Test Ban Monitoring & On Site Inspections," (September 27, 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n14.htm>>

9) For a detailed rebuttal of CTBT opponents, see: Christopher Paine, "Facing Reality: Resuming Nuclear Test Explosions Would Harm U.S. and International Security — A Reply to CATO Policy Analysis "The CTBT: The

Costs Outweigh the Benefits," by Kathleen C. Bailey. Natural Resources Defense Council (February 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/nrdc0299.htm>>

10) For further details, see: Coalition Issue Brief Vol.3, No.12, "Non-Proliferation & Test Ban Efforts in Jeopardy on Anniversary of Treaty Signature," (Sept. 22, 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n12.htm>>

###

The Coalition is an alliance of 17 of the nation's leading nuclear arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers. For more information on the CTBT, see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crn.org>>

From: tcollina@ucsusa.org
X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R8.20.00.25
Date: Fri, 01 Oct 1999 10:52:04 -0500
To: <mupj@igc.org>, <dkimball@crnd.org>, <kathy@fcnl.org>
Cc: <mupj@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re:Citizens Hearing on CTBT

Dear Howard: thanks for bringing this up. but I think we should hold off on this idea until we know more about the actual hearings to be held. if they are clearly one-sided, then this idea may make sense. but it is too soon to tell.
see you at 3, tom

=====
Tom Z. Collina
Director, Arms Control and International Security Program
Union of Concerned Scientists
1616 P St, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 332-0900 x107
fax (202) 332-0905
tcollina@ucsusa.org
www.ucsusa.org

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Sat, 02 Oct 1999 08:21:11 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: News on CTBT, 10/2

October 2, 1999, 7:30am

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Today's news reports on CTBT ratification

The following are the latest and the best news reports on the upcoming, October 12 Senate vote on ratification of the CTBT:

- * Reuters, 10/1, "White House seizes chance to push test ban treaty"
- * New York Times, 10/2, "Senate Will Debate Treaty Banning Nuclear Testing"
- * AP, 10/2, "Nuclear Test-Ban Vote Set for Oct. [12]"

Some quotes originate from the Coalition's 10/1 press briefing on CTBT with Undersecretary of State designate John Holum, the Monterey Institute's Lawrence Schienman, and the Council for a Livable World's John Isaacs.

Please keep in mind that published vote estimates are not likely to reflect the real situation, which is very fluid. Do not be discouraged by inflated estimates of strength from Treaty opponents. Nevertheless, we are, as of today, short of the 67 votes needed -- John Isaacs' estimate (see Reuters) is most accurate.

DK

Reuters 10/01 1639

White House seizes chance to push test ban treaty

By Jonathan Wright

WASHINGTON - The Clinton administration Friday seized an opening offered by Senate Republicans and predicted that given time it could muster the 67 votes needed for the Senate to ratify a treaty banning nuclear tests.

President Clinton will lead the campaign for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), which he signed in 1996, said National Security Council spokesman David Leavy.

Skeptical Senate leaders have blocked ratification for two years by linking CTBT with other treaties. But a breakthrough came Thursday when Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, a Mississippi Republican, suddenly offered a vote next week.

"The president is expected to be involved, very active," Leavy said. "He's expecting to have a number of events in the days ahead. Unfortunately we're not going to have much time."

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has told her staff to do everything possible to win Senate approval of the treaty, seen as a test of Washington's commitment to arms control.

"The secretary has decided that she wants to pull out all the stops here at the department in the coming weeks to try to make the case for this treaty on national interest grounds," said State Department spokesman James Rubin.

"We are confident that once the case is made in a serious, sustained, and analytical way, that sufficient support will be there for this treaty to be ratified," he added.

Lott's initial offer gave the administration less than a week to mobilize support but on Friday, Senate leaders agreed on a slightly more extended timetable, seen as favorable to treaty supporters. The debate will start next Friday and continue Oct. 14, culminating in a vote on ratification.

But Rubin said that those three or four days of debate would not be enough and that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should hold hearings in advance so that senators can hear experts explain the intricacies of the treaty.

Under Secretary of State John Holum, who specializes in arms control, said earlier that ratification depended on whether senators understood the implications of their votes.

"If this is considered as a national security issue, as it should be, and as an issue of U.S. standing internationally, then I think we will prevail, if there is sufficient time for the senators to focus on the issue," he told reporters.

But the administration is worried that the vote could become a test of partisanship. "Then of course it would be problematic. It would be a denial of U.S. national security and of the bipartisan tradition in arms control," he said.

On Capitol Hill, Sen. Joseph Biden, a Delaware Democrat and a strong advocate of arms control, said CTBT was a promise the United States made to the world in exchange for other countries signing other arms control agreements.

He predicted that Republicans would eventually come around to ratification. "Faced with having to deal with their political constituents versus the United States' national interests, they will step up to the ball," he said.

John Isaacs, arms-control advocate and president of the Council for a Livable World, predicted a quick vote would probably end in defeat for the treaty.

All 45 Democratic senators are expected to vote in favor, plus a handful of Republicans, leaving the pro-treaty lobby about 15 votes short of the 67 they need, he told reporters.

But he added: "Very few Republican senators have taken a position on test ban or feel strongly either for or against the treaty. We think that given sufficient time, a few weeks, given the leadership of the president and the administration, we can in fact get that two-thirds majority."

"No major international treaty has been defeated in the U.S. Senate since the Treaty of Versailles (in 1920) and that defeat caused immeasurable consequences over the next decade and helped eventually to lead to World War Two," he added.

Supporters say the CTBT is a powerful deterrent to small states that might want to develop nuclear weapons. It provides for an international seismic monitoring network and would give the international community a strong basis for action against any country found to have conducted tests.

The United States has already done more tests than any other country and does not plan to develop new types of nuclear weapons for the foreseeable future.

"The nuclear arms race is over," Holum said. "Nuclear arsenals are shrinking.... We don't need tests. Proliferators do and the longer we go without the CTBT fully enforced, the greater the risk that proliferators will get what they want."

The CTBT requires ratification by 44 named countries, of which only 23 have so far taken the step.

Other countries such as China and Russia would probably ratify soon after the United States, accelerating the process of bringing the treaty into effect, Holum added.

But U.S. ratification will not be possible in time for next week's conference in Vienna on how to accelerate the process of bringing the treaty into force. The United States will attend that meeting only as an observer.

October 2, 1999

"Senate Will Debate Treaty Banning
Nuclear Testing"

By ERIC SCHMITT

WASHINGTON -- Senate leaders agreed Friday to begin debate next Friday on a landmark treaty banning nuclear testing, and in a sign of the Clinton administration's uphill fight to ratify the accord,

Defense Secretary William Cohen cut short by a day his trip to Asia to return here and prepare strategy with the White House.

The Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, R-Miss., and his Democratic counterpart, Thomas Daschle of South Dakota, agreed to begin 14 hours of general debate on Oct. 8 and resume on Oct. 12, with a vote taking place that day or soon thereafter. Lott had originally offered to start the debate on Oct. 6, but Democrats balked.

Senate Republicans expressed confidence Friday that they have more than 40 "hard" votes in their ranks against the treaty, more than the 34 necessary to block ratification of one of President Clinton's top foreign policy goals. It takes the approval of two-thirds of the Senate, or 67 votes if all 100 senators are present, to ratify a treaty.

Sen. Arlen Specter, R-Pa., one of two Republicans who openly support the test ban, expressed hope that a concerted White House campaign and classified briefings for senators might change some critics' minds, but he voiced doubt. "I am very much concerned that the votes are there to pass," he said.

Democrats heaped scorn on the Foreign Relations Committee's continuing refusal to hold hearings on a treaty that falls under its jurisdiction. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was signed by Clinton in 1996, and hearings have never been held. But Sen. John Warner, R-Va., a treaty opponent who heads the Armed Services Committee, said Friday that his panel would hold three days of hearings beginning next Tuesday.

Warner said in an interview that he expected the witnesses to include former secretaries of defense and chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who will be asked to assess the future safety and reliability of America's nuclear arsenal if testing is banned. The United States has not conducted nuclear tests since 1992.

Democrats also attacked Senate Republicans for scheduling a quick vote without adequate time for hearings and analysis of a weighty foreign policy issue, even though Democrats on Capitol Hill and the

administration have been clamoring for a vote for months.

A spokesman for the National Security Council, David Leavy, said the White House would intensify its lobbying campaign next week with a Rose Garden ceremony featuring Clinton, Cabinet members, congressional supporters and Nobel laureates who back the treaty.

"The president is going to work aggressively to make his case to the people," Leavy said

Meantime, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright has told her staff to do everything possible to win Senate approval of the treaty, seen as a test of Washington's commitment to arms control.

Administration officials stepped up their offensive Friday morning, with Undersecretary of State John Holum, a top arms control expert, arguing that a test ban would lock in American nuclear superiority and curb the growth of nuclear states.

"We have no need to test and no plans to test," Holum said. With the treaty in effect, he said, it will be "very difficult for new countries to develop nuclear weapons."

But opponents say the treaty would undermine the country's ability to insure the safety and reliability of the nuclear stockpile. In the past few weeks, Senate critics have quietly lined up a stable of national security experts who oppose the treaty to advise senators, aides said.

Democrats who have fought to free the stalled treaty say they had no choice but to push for a vote, even against steep odds.

"Our choice is either let it die by attrition and have no one be held accountable, or take a shot at it and have the president and all of us make the strongest case we can," said Sen. Joseph Biden, a D-Del.

October 2, 1999

Nuclear Test-Ban Vote Set for Oct.

Filed at 1:10 a.m. EDT

By The Associated Press

WASHINGTON (AP) -- The Clinton administration is promising an intense, if brief, campaign for Senate ratification of a nuclear test ban treaty, suggesting defeat could set back nuclear nonproliferation efforts around the world.

But supporters are not optimistic the campaign will produce the 67 Senate votes needed for ratification.

Senate leaders of both parties on Friday agreed to begin debating the 152-nation Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty next Friday, with a vote set for the following Tuesday, Oct. 12, setting aside 18 hours for debate.

Democrats reluctantly agreed to vote this month, after Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., suddenly announced he would schedule a vote -- after the treaty had remained bottled up for two years in the Foreign Relations Committee.

After first balking, Democrats took Lott's take-it-or-leave-it offer after he agreed to delay the vote to Oct. 12 from Oct. 6, and agreed to eight more hours of debate than the 10 he initially proposed.

"We feel we have no choice," said Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, D-S.D. "This may be the best that we can get. ... We'll take it."

State Department spokesman James P. Rubin stressed the importance of ratification, saying, "The eyes of the world are on us."

"We will be in a far stronger position to insist that other countries do not go down the nuclear testing road if we ratify the treaty," Rubin said.

Once the treaty's case is made in "a serious, sustained, and analytical way," there will be enough support to ratify it, he said.

But Senate supporters of the treaty were a less sanguine about the pact's

chances of passage.

Sen. Joseph Biden of Delaware, the senior Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, suggested the outlook appeared bleak, but that at least the vote would force senators to go on the record.

``The question is: If you are going to die, do you want to die with no one knowing who shot you or do you want to go at least with the world knowing who killed you?" Biden said.

Although the administration has said the test ban treaty should be nonpartisan, support for it in the Senate is almost entirely Democratic.

All 45 Democratic senators are expected to support it, but only two Republicans -- Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania and James Jeffords of Vermont -- have endorsed it publicly.

The treaty, which calls for an outright ban on all nuclear testing, has been signed by 152 nations, including the United States. But it has been ratified by only 18 of the 44 countries with nuclear capabilities that must ratify it for it to take effect.

Conservatives contend the pact -- which also has not yet been ratified by Russia or China -- could threaten the U.S. ability to modernize its arsenal if necessary.

Supporters say the United States already has a vast superiority in nuclear weapons, thanks to more than 1,000 nuclear tests during the Cold War, and the treaty would lock in that advantage.

Meanwhile, Sen. John Warner, R-Va., said the Armed Services Committee, which he chairs, will hold hearings on the treaty next week.

Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C., has refused to do so.

``I am confident that the Senate will vote to reject this dangerous arms control pact," Helms said Friday. ``The effect of this treaty would be to forever forbid the United States from testing its nuclear arsenal, while allowing the rogue nations of the world to proceed with their nuclear

plans."

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Sat, 02 Oct 1999 09:31:29 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: critical CTBT action steps, 10/2

October 1, 1999

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers;
John Isaacs, Council for a Livable World

RE: Vote on CTBT set for October 12 -- See action resources below

It is official.

The vote is coming and we have a lot of work to do.

The full Senate will now scheduled a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on Tuesday, October 12 (by-passing any vote in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee).

Debate will begin on Friday, October 8. Under the ground rules that have been set up, there can be up to 14 hours of general debate.

Then there could be a Democratic amendment debated up to four hours and a Republican amendment also debated up to four hours. The final vote is expected on October 12.

The Senate Armed Services Committee under Senator John Warner will hold three hearings before the vote. The intelligence community will testify at one hearing; Defense Secretary William Cohen and the Joint Chiefs will testify at another, and the lab directors and Energy Secretary Bill Richardson at a third. There will be second panels on two of those days at which critics (such as former Secretary James Schlesinger) and prominent supporters will testify.

Thus, we all have 11 days in which to do anything anyone can to encourage Republican Senators to vote for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Now is the time to pour all resources into the effort!

Keep checking your e-mail and the Coalition Web Site (<http://www.crnd.org>) for further updates.

D. Kimball

RESOURCES: Further CTBT action resources are listed below.

"A Summary of the Case for the CTBT" with references for further details
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n15.htm>>

To contact Senators by e-mail -- and want to encourage others
to do so -- the address for the Council's Legislative Action Center is:
<http://congress.nw.dc.us/>

Direct link to a sample test ban letter on the Legislative Action page is:
<http://congress.nw.dc.us/cgi-bin/alertpr.pl?dir=clw&alert=clw7>

Sample letter/call information and action steps on the CTBT
<<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbt.html>>

Information on Senators and their staff responsible for CTBT
<<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbtsenate.html>>
and their state contact information <<http://www.2020vision.org/ctbtfield.html>>

****NOTE:** Contact the Coalition or other organizations' offices in DC for up
to date information on status of individual Senators.

Library of CTBT-related editorials are available online from the
Coalition's CTBT site
<<http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/ctedit.htm#editorials>>

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>>

Information on White House/exec. branch activities in support of the Treaty
<<http://www.acda.gov/ctbtpage/ntbpage.htm>>

Go forth and ratify!

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n15.htm>>

VOL. 3, NO. 15, October 1, 1999

"For a Safer America:
A Summary of the Case for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty"*

A GLOBAL HALT to nuclear weapons test explosions has been a central
objective of the United States since it was proposed by President Dwight
Eisenhower in 1958. After forty years of bipartisan effort, President Bill
Clinton became the first world leader to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban
Treaty (CTBT) on September 24, 1996, calling it "the longest-sought,
hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control." The Treaty is
supported by the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 82
percent of the American public and over 150 nations, including Russia,

China, Great Britain and France.

Why is the test ban so popular? It is simple. The Test Ban Treaty will make America and the world safer for our children and grandchildren. The Treaty will strengthen our security by helping to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations, now among the greatest threats to the United States. And it will help prevent the renewal of a superpower nuclear arms race.

But our nation cannot enjoy its full benefits until the Test Ban Treaty is approved by the U.S. Senate. Failure to approve the Treaty would undermine American leadership to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons and set back efforts to control the spread of terror weapons worldwide, endangering American security for years to come.

How does the Test Ban Treaty make America safer?

The Test Ban Treaty strengthens the United States' ability to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations and helps prevent a new nuclear arms race from starting. It reduces the nuclear danger to the American people.

* The Test Ban Treaty makes it much harder for the countries with advanced nuclear weapons, including Russia and China, to produce new and more threatening types of nuclear warheads. And it helps prevent nations with smaller arsenals — like India and Pakistan — and nations seeking nuclear arms--like Iran and Iraq--from making advanced nuclear warheads, which are more easily deliverable by ballistic missiles. This Treaty helps block dangerous nuclear competition and new nuclear threats from emerging, thereby enhancing U.S. and global security.

* U.S. ratification of the Test Ban Treaty will strengthen international support for the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the bedrock of all efforts to stop the spread of the atomic bomb. In 1995, the U.S. and the other nuclear powers promised to deliver the Test Ban in exchange for the permanent extension of the NPT — a good deal that must be honored.

* The U.S. has not conducted a nuclear weapon test explosion since 1992, when President Bush announced the U.S. would halt development of new types of nuclear warheads and Congress mandated a 9- month moratorium on nuclear tests. Each year since then, the U.S. has renewed the moratorium and the nuclear weapons laboratories have certified that the existing weapons will work as designed. With or without the Treaty, it is unlikely that the U.S. will ever conduct another nuclear explosive test. Thus, it is in America's interest to ensure that other nations are not conducting nuclear tests. U.S. ratification will encourage other nations to ratify the Treaty, and our nation's capability to detect cheating by others will be far better with the Treaty in force than without it.

What would happen if the U.S. Senate failed to approve the Test Ban?

We would miss an historic opportunity to make the world safer for future generations.

* The U.S. would weaken the effectiveness of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, since some key member nations would feel swindled if the Test Ban faltered due to U.S. inaction. This would undermine efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons worldwide.

* Failure by the Senate to honor our commitment to the Test Ban--a U.S.-led, internationally supported initiative--would undercut the status of America as a world leader, with far-reaching implications.

* The Treaty would never enter into force, since U.S. ratification is a legal requirement and U.S. leadership is a political requirement for moving ahead.

* Military and political pressure would build to resume nuclear testing. It would be more difficult to verify compliance with the Test Ban Treaty, because the monitoring system would not be fully in place. Allegations of cheating might arise that could not be resolved in the absence of inspections provided for under the Treaty. Leaving the Treaty unratified would increase uncertainty and reduce U.S. security.

* U.S. Senate inaction or rejection of the Test Ban Treaty would undermine global efforts to rein in India and Pakistan's dangerous nuclear arms competition. After a gap of 24 years, India conducted nuclear tests in May 1998, provoking Pakistan to conduct its own nuclear tests. Further testing by either country would accelerate their nuclear arms race and increase the risk of nuclear war. (1)

U.S. Senate inaction or rejection of the Treaty would leave open the possibility that China may be able to create a more threatening nuclear force, and slow momentum toward reducing the still enormous stockpiles of U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons. (2)

Who supports the Test Ban Treaty?

Presidents of the United States past and present, the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the vast majority of the American public, and over 150 nations, as well as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), all support the Test Ban Treaty.

* Presidents Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Jimmy Carter, and Bill Clinton, among others, have all endorsed and worked hard for a ban on nuclear weapons test explosions. (3)

* Current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Henry Shelton and former chairmen, Generals John Shalikashvili, Colin Powell, David Jones and Admiral William Crowe, all endorse the Treaty. These military leaders served under Presidents Clinton, Bush, Reagan and Carter. (4)

* The Test Ban Treaty is supported by an overwhelming majority of the American public. This support has remained high since the early days of the Cold War. A June 1999, bipartisan poll by Wirthlin Worldwide and The Mellman Group reveals that 82 percent of all Americans support Senate approval of the Test Ban Treaty, with only 14 percent opposed. Support cuts across party lines with 86% of Democrats and Treaty, 80% of

Republicans supporting the Treaty, including 79% of self-identified "conservative Republicans" in support. (5)

* Since the Treaty was opened for signature in September 1996, the United States and over 153 other nations have signed, including the other major nuclear powers (Russia, China, France and Great Britain). (6) The NATO alliance has endorsed the Treaty and called on all states to "sign and ratify the Treaty without delay."

Can the U.S. maintain its current nuclear arsenal without nuclear explosive tests? Yes.

* The United States does not need nuclear explosive tests to maintain its current arsenal. The arsenal will be sustained through non-nuclear tests and evaluations. Worn out parts will be replaced. A nationwide infrastructure of production sites and laboratories will be maintained and enhanced for this purpose. The directors of the three national nuclear weapons laboratories — Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandia — as well as leading nuclear weapons scientists, have determined that America's nuclear arsenal can be maintained without nuclear testing through their nuclear weapons "stockpile stewardship" program.

"We remain confident that the U.S. stockpile stewardship program, as conceived and as being executed, is able to perform the task under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and its safeguards. Recent concerns over losses of U.S. nuclear stockpile information have not changed this assessment in any way," the directors said in a June 10, 1999 joint statement. (7)

Can the Treaty be verified? Yes.

* The Treaty establishes a far-reaching global verification system to detect, locate and identify nuclear explosions. In addition, the U.S. will monitor the Treaty with its own satellites and other national intelligence means, which are the most sophisticated in the world. Thousands of other high-quality civilian seismic stations around the world provide further detection capabilities. Finally, the Treaty allows for short-notice, on-site inspections to clarify ambiguous events. Leading experts in seismology and test ban verification have determined that no would-be violator could be confident that a nuclear explosion of sufficient yield to possibly threaten U.S. security would escape detection. (8)

Why should the Test Ban Treaty be approved now?

There is nothing to gain by waiting. This Treaty strongly serves the interests of the United States. All of the major concerns about the effectiveness of the Treaty and its impact U.S. security have been well-addressed. (9) It is regrettable that some Senators have chosen to delay a vote on the CTBT on this vital initiative. For America to gain the full benefits of the Treaty, including complete operation of the verification system, it must be in legal force. If the U.S. leads, other nations will follow.

* While 154 states have signed the Test Ban Treaty, it cannot enter into

force until approved by 44 specific nations, 23 of which have thus far failed to do so thus far. This is a challenging hurdle. But it is within reach: 41 of the 44 required states have signed, and hold-outs India and Pakistan have pledged that they will join the Treaty. World-wide pressure on India and other hold-out states will increase if the vast majority of nations, including the U.S., ratify the Treaty. As in the case of the 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention, the U.S. cannot be an effective leader if it has not itself approved the Treaty.

* Until all 44 states ratify the Test Ban and it enters into force, a special conference of nations that have ratified may be held every year to seek ways to accelerate the process. The first such conference, held on October 6-8, 1999, shows that global support for rapid implementation of the Treaty is stronger than ever. Prompt U.S. Senate approval for ratification of the Treaty will encourage other key nations to join and accelerate its implementation. Until the U.S. ratifies the Treaty, it does not have a vote at special conferences on accelerating Test Ban implementation — weakening America's leadership and influence in the struggle to stop nuclear proliferation. (10)

The choice is clear: a world without nuclear testing is a safer world. The United States stands to lose nothing and to gain an important constraint on the ability of other nations to threaten America's security. The time for the Test Ban Treaty is now.

Notes:

* This Issue Brief is based on the Coalition's booklet, "For a Safer America: The Case for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty," by Tom Collina, Union of Concerned Scientists, with Daryl Kimball, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, and the Coalition's CTBT Working Group (October 1999).

(1) See: Coalition Issue Brief, Vol 2. No. 14, "Senate Inaction on Test Ban Undercuts Effort to Address South Asia Crisis," (June 4, 1998) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/brief14.htm>>

(2) See: Coalition News Release, "Congressional Leaders Cite Test Ban Treaty as Next Step to Dealing with Chinese Espionage," (May 27, 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/rel052799.htm>>; and Scientists Letter to Senator Lott on "Chinese Espionage and the CTBT," (July 30, 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/uclstr073099.htm>>

(3) For an overview of Kennedy/Eisenhower & the test ban, see: Coalition Issue Brief Vol. 3, No. 15, "On 35th Anniversary of JFK Address, World Still Waits for Nuclear Test Ban," (June 10, 1998) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/brief15.htm>>; and Proposal by President Eisenhower for a CTBT (February 11, 1960) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/eis0260.htm>>

(4) See: Coalition Backgrounder, "Test Ban Treaty Backed by Leading Military, Scientific Leaders and the Vast Majority of American Voters," (September 14, 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/bkgrsupprt0999.htm>>

(5) For a detailed analysis of this survey on the CTBT, see:

<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/mellmanwirthlin0799.htm>>

(6) For up-to-date information on Treaty signers and ratifiers, see:

<http://www.ctbto.org/ctbto/sig_rat.shtml>

(7) "Nuke Test-Ban Treaty on Shaky Ground," Albuquerque Journal, June 11, 1999. For more information on the stockpile stewardship program and the CTBT, see: Richard L. Garwin, "The Future of Nuclear Weapons Without Nuclear Testing," Arms Control Today (November/December 1997)

<<http://www.armscontrol.org/ACT/novdec97/garwin.htm>>

(8) For further details, see: Coalition Issue Brief Vol. 3, No. 14, "U.S. Security Benefits from Test Ban Monitoring & On Site Inspections,"

(September 27, 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n14.htm>>

9) For a detailed rebuttal of CTBT opponents, see: Christopher Paine, "Facing Reality: Resuming Nuclear Test Explosions Would Harm U.S. and International Security — A Reply to CATO Policy Analysis "The CTBT: The Costs Outweigh the Benefits," by Kathleen C. Bailey. Natural Resources Defense Council (February 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/nrdc0299.htm>>

10) For further details, see: Coalition Issue Brief Vol.3, No.12, "Non-Proliferation & Test Ban Efforts in Jeopardy on Anniversary of Treaty Signature," (Sept. 22, 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n12.htm>>

###

The Coalition is an alliance of 17 of the nation's leading nuclear arms control and non-proliferation organizations working for a practical, step-by-step program to reduce nuclear dangers. For more information on the CTBT, see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

X-Mailer: ccMail Link to SMTP R6.01.01

Date: Sat, 02 Oct 99 13:39:16 -0500

From: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>

To: <vruthman@aol.com>, <jpmdc@ucc.org>, <HeatherN@NCCCUSA.ORG>, <wowensby@ctr.pcusa.org>, <marierietman@2020vision.org>, <kathy@fcnl.org>, <marsusab@aol.com>, <washofc@aol.com>, <thart@dfms.org>, <ograbc@aol.com>, <jhanson@umc-gbcs.org>, <mupj@igc.org>, <ali_nebot_at_uchwm-ny@smtp.ucc.org>, <mccolloc@ucc.org>

Subject: TEXT OF CTBT ACTION ALERT

On Saturday I put together this action alert for the UCC, editing (copying) materials put out by Kimball on Friday night. Given the tight timeline, this text might be helpful if and as you do alerts.

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\910ctbaa.wpd"

From: Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>
To: "daryl kimball" <dkimball@clw.org>
Cc: Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>, "howard hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: CTBT -- Costs for FCNL Emergency Action
Date: Sat, 2 Oct 1999 15:42:35 -0400
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF62812C8@local.fcnl.org>
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

10-2-99

Daryl,

FCNL has begun extraordinary and unbudgeted initiatives for emergency work on the upcoming Senate vote on CTBT ratification. We expect to spend up to \$ between now and the October 12th Senate vote, depending upon available funding. These unbudgeted FCNL initiatives do not have sources of funding at this time, but we feel it necessary to move ahead. My rough estimates of these costs are below:

The FCNL initiatives will focus on

A. in cooperation with the CTBT Religious Leaders Working Group and WISC (Washington Interreligious Staff Community), mobilizing eminent Religious leaders, especially those most likely to influence undecided Republican senators; we have hired Tim Barner, former director of World Federalist Association, to work fulltime for 8 to 10 days to lead this work. We hope to generate:

-- National Press Club Press Conference this Wednesday of eminent religious leaders; we can promise who we'll get; we going for national figures like

Billy Graham, Fr. Heshberg, Arch Bishop McCarrick, Rev. Joan Brown Campbell, NCC, Bishops of other Mainline Protestant Churches,

and then Rabbis of national councils; hope to end up with two to five eminent persons.

-- prompt and support denominations to rapidly contact, carefully brief, and mobilize their heads of communions to call or come to Washington to visit swing Senators in their offices.

Costs estimate:

In Kind FCNL provides rent, occupancy, workstation (phone and computer), office support - no cash -

Senior Legislative Director for CTBT Emergency (Tim Barner)
\$250/day x 10 days = \$2,500

Support to Phone Banks and materials to mobilize denominations
\$500/denomination x 5 denominations \$2,500

Subsidize roundtrip airfares and out of pocket expenses for bishops, rabbis, other heads of communions

10 Religious Leaders \$500@ =
\$5,000

Subtotal \$10,000

B. updating, Senate Drop, and reissuing the Religious Leaders Letter
for the ratification of CTBT;

Costs estimate:
Duplication of letter for Senate Drop
\$ 30
Costs of Hill Drop to Senate
\$ 40

Subtotal \$ 70

C. mobilizing FCNL constituents in selected states of swing Republican
Senators to get their Republican friends, neighbors, university officers,
business leaders,
and leaders of civic organizations to immediately
communicate to swing senators appeals to vote for the CTBT;

FCNL long distance phone bills
\$ 500 +
FCNL hourly wage callers \$12/hour x 4 callers x 8
hours@ = \$ 384

Subtotal \$ 884

D. daily additions of information and sample text of letter to the
"Capitol Whiz" feature of FCNL's website page on the CTBT (the easy email or
print out of
letter to the senator)

Extra hours for webmaster \$15/hour x 10 hours =
\$ 150

F. Religious Leaders Letter placed as ad in Roll Call
(will do only if we get prior funding)

one page ad fee ??? (I don't know what this costs; I'm gonna guess)
\$ 5,000

Total:
\$16,105.00

This is a very quick effort to describe what we want to do. We may modify
in light of opportunities and consultations. I suspect I've under estimated

what we'll spend.

FCNL has not had time to consult carefully with the interfaith working group or our Washington Interreligious Staff Council partners. Nevertheless, I think what I have outline will fit into whatever plans we put together. It would be helpful to have some flexibility in use of funds.

Joe

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\CTBT -- Costs for FCNL Emergenc"

From: Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>

To: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>, ograbc@aol.com, denhartz@erols.com, washofc@aol.com, ann_d.parti@ecunet.org, heathern@nccusa.org, tom.hart@ecunet.org, jmskipper@aol.com, epf@igc.org, disarm@forusa.org, Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>, Kathy Guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>, Rachel Phillips <rachel@fcnl.org>, Sara Bradbury <sara@fcnl.org>, mark.brown@ecunet.org, J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org, mknolldc@igc.org, jsammon@networklobby.org, network@igc.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org, Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org, lwyolton@prodigy.net, uuawo@aol.com, jnoble@uahc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org, mupj@igc.org, mupj@igc.org

Cc: btiller@psr.org, fteplitz@peace-action.org, wand@wand.org, ctbt@2020vision.org, dkimball@clw.org, jsmith@clw.org, disarmament@igc.org, "jim matlack" <jmatlack@erols.com>

Subject: RE: Final push for CTBT

Date: Sun, 3 Oct 1999 08:49:18 -0400

X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2448.0)

10/3/99

FYI: FCNL action plan

Jay and all,

FCNL will take extraordinary, unbudgeted, and as yet unfunded emergency initiatives for this Oct. 99 push for senate ratification of the CTBT.

These initiatives will be over and above our ongoing CTBT work. Our ongoing CTBT work is carried out by Kathy Guthrie, Sara Bradbury, Jessica Piekielek, and me. We've worked through the CTBT coalition and the CTBT religious leaders working group to do public education, mobilization of Quaker and other community-based grassroots, and direct lobbying on the Hill. To this effort will add seven to ten days fulltime, senior level lobbyist, Tim Barner. Tim began yesterday. He will work, in cooperation with our WISC colleagues and others, to get eminent American religious leaders to take a high public profile in support of ratification, to get the CTBT Religious Leaders letter (of April 98) updated and re-issued, and, if we get the funding, to run that letter in Roll Call.

Meanwhile, our ongoing CTBT team will work with our Quaker and other community-based contacts to "lobby" community-based leaders and clergy -- especially those who have contributed to Republican campaigns and who support Republican senators -- to lobby their senators to vote for ratification. We will concentrate our efforts in the swing states. I suspect we will be doing some phone bank work during evenings.

We will also maintain an updated letter on the "Capitol Whiz" (emails or printed letters to senators) function of our website.

We will cooperate with the CTBT religious leaders working group to make appointments with offices of swing senators for lobby visits. We hope to facilitate travel of clergy and lay people from swing states to do visits.

My description (above) is a "quick and dirty" report to you of our plans which are just shaping up. We are certainly in a time of flux and will try to adapt to the changing situation.

Joe

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

From: JAY LINTNER [mailto:lintnerj@ucc.org]

Sent: Friday, October 01, 1999 4:01 PM

To: ograbc@aol.com; denhartz@erols.com; washofc@aol.com;
ann_d.parti@ecunet.org; heathern@nccusa.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; jsammon@networklobby.org;
network@igc.org; dave@paxchristiusa.org; Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org;
lwyolton@prodigy.net; uuawo@aol.com; jnoble@uahc.org;
Dringler@umc-gbcs.org; gpowers@nccbuscc.org; mupj@igc.org; mupj@igc.org
Cc: btiller@psr.org; fteplitz@peace-action.org; wand@wand.org;
ctbt@2020vision.org; dkimball@clw.org; jsmith@clw.org;
disarmament@igc.org
Subject: Re: Final push for CTBT

In case vote IS this Wed, I got out 2000 action alerts to UCC network in nine key states this morning, putting it in the same envelop I had ready to go today on campaign finance (swing list is the same). Heather and I also got out five sheets of material to the State Councils of Churches, alerting them.

Assuming Daschle will win extension (which I hope has already happened), we need to concentrate. Heather and I already have two alerts which you can have electronically, but need updating. Heather and I will both be updating these, me for the UCC and Heather for the 25 or so denominational social action staff who don't have Washington offices.

I'll attach some of this here, if it is useful to you.

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Sun, 03 Oct 1999 12:00:30 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news: W. Post on verifiability & rebuttal points

October 3

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Incomplete W. Post article on verification; rebuttal points

Today's Washington Post reports that there is a new CIA assessment that essentially says it is not exactly sure about the nature of Russian activities at its nuclear test site. (See article below.)

The story misses the bigger picture on test ban verification and U.S. security:

1) test ban verification does not rely on the CIA's capabilities alone and that only with CTBT ratification and entry into force will the U.S. FULLY benefit from the other verification tools such as the CTBT's international monitoring system, on-site inspections, the CTBT "confidence building measures," and civilian seismic monitoring networks (some of which are already available but are not mentioned by the Post's not-well informed writer). In combination, these verification tools would provide the U.S. with test ban verification capabilities that are sufficient to make the Treaty effectively verifiable. See the attached Coalition Issue Brief for a summary of those other tools.

and, 2) if the Senate fails to approve the CTBT, a dangerous military and political chain reaction of testing by other nations (Russia, China, India, others) may ensue and the global nuclear non-proliferation regime would suffer a severely damaging blow that would undercut U.S. national security for years to come. The CIA would have no problem detecting the kinds of nuclear explosions that might begin again if the U.S. and other nations reject the test ban.

The bottom line is that the United States would be more secure and would be much more capable of detecting and deterring possible nuclear test explosions by other states with the CTBT than it could without.

DK

CIA Is Unable to Precisely Track Testing

By Roberto Suro
Washington Post Staff Writer
Sunday, October 3, 1999; Page A1

In a new assessment of its capabilities, the Central Intelligence Agency has concluded that it cannot monitor low-level nuclear tests by Russia precisely enough to ensure compliance with the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which the Senate will begin debating this week, senior officials said yesterday.

Twice last month the Russians carried out what might have been nuclear explosions at its Novaya Zemlya testing site in the Arctic. But the CIA found that data from seismic sensors and other monitoring equipment were insufficient to allow analysts to reach a firm conclusion about the nature of the events, officials said.

The Russian government has assured the Clinton administration that the tests involved only conventional explosives and that it has not broken promises to abide by the unratified treaty, which prohibits nuclear tests.

Senior congressional staffers were briefed on the new CIA assessment before Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) last Thursday abruptly scheduled a vote on the test ban treaty after having refused to bring it to the floor since President Clinton sent it to the Senate for ratification two years ago.

Lott vowed to defeat the treaty because it endangers U.S. security. Clinton has promised an all-out fight for ratification of what he calls a landmark arms control pact.

Republicans and Democrats predicted yesterday that the CIA's ability to monitor low-level tests will be a major issue in the debate leading up to a vote that could take place as early as Oct. 12. Senior intelligence officials, including possibly Director of Central Intelligence George J. Tenet, will begin briefing senators on the monitoring issue Monday, sources said.

Ratification of a treaty requires a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and by all accounts the Democrats, who hold 45 seats, are far short of the required 67 votes. The treaty has been signed by 154 nations, including the United States, but it has been ratified by only 47 countries, most recently Bulgaria on Wednesday. More significant, the treaty has been ratified by only 23 of the 44 nuclear-capable countries that must confirm it for the treaty to take effect.

Although the U.S. intelligence community has a long-standing concern about the difficulty of gathering data on low-level nuclear tests, the recent Russian tests – and others like them earlier this year – prompted the CIA reevaluation. As a result, the agency formed a new assessment that these events fall into a gray area where it cannot reliably distinguish between a conventional explosion and a low-level nuclear test or even natural seismic activity, officials said. U.S. officials said that assessment is not a dramatic departure from earlier CIA positions but rather a refined judgment about its ability to deal with a subject that is inherently uncertain.

"Without the treaty, the problem of assessing these kinds of events undoubtedly exists, but the question you have to ask is whether the treaty

would leave us better off or worse, and inarguably we would be better off," national security adviser Samuel R. "Sandy" Berger said in an interview yesterday. Under the treaty, an international monitoring system would be put in place with capabilities exceeding those that the United States and its allies can field today, and signatories would have the right to request on-site inspections of testing facilities, ensuring that compliance can be verified, he said.

While the administration argues that the treaty would provide new tools to detect testing that would help remedy the weaknesses in U.S. capabilities, Republican leaders contend that the treaty is worthless unless the United States can ensure compliance on its own, because Russia, China and other nations have a history of denial and deception on nuclear testing.

During a speech to the Senate on Friday declaring his opposition to the treaty, Armed Services Committee Chairman John W. Warner (R-Va.) said that the recent history of Russian testing activity had to be taken into account. "There is a body of fact developed over the past 18 months that it will be imperative for every senator to examine before deciding how to vote," Warner said in an interview. That information would be made available to the Senate during briefings and hearings this week, Warner said.

According to a military intelligence assessment that has circulated widely at the Pentagon and in the intelligence community, over the past 18 months Russia has conducted tests in the granite caverns of Novaya Zemlya to develop a low-yield tactical nuclear weapon that is the linchpin of a new military doctrine to counter U.S. superiority in precision guided munitions.

In monitoring Novaya Zemlya, U.S. surveillance satellites have repeatedly observed the kind of activity that usually precedes and then follows a low-level nuclear test; in between, seismic data that are gathered have been insufficient to allow a clear assessment of what transpired, officials said.

"We do not have any data that indicates a nuclear explosion during those events," said a senior administration official.

The administration's position is that Russian President Boris Yeltsin has stood by his 1997 promise to conduct only "subcritical" tests, in which conventional explosives are detonated in the presence of nuclear materials as a way of testing existing nuclear weapons without creating a nuclear chain reaction. The United States, which stopped nuclear testing in 1992, also has used subcritical tests to evaluate weapons.

Although some officials at the CIA and other intelligence agencies believe that Russia has repeatedly conducted nuclear tests in violation of Yeltsin's promise, the CIA does not claim to have conclusive data one way or the other. Indeed, it is uncertainty about what is happening rather than an accusation of Russian misbehavior that is the key point of the CIA assessment, officials said.

"Tests at these kinds of levels are difficult to characterize in an exacting manner, and that is a major challenge to the intelligence community," a

senior U.S. official said.

The administration is prepared to argue that the difficulty of monitoring low-level tests is a major factor in favor of the treaty and its new global monitoring system, but administration officials are concerned that their message will take longer to get across than the stark suspicions of Russian motives that lie behind many Republican arguments.

"It is unfortunate that after two years of inaction we now get a 12-day rush to judgment," Berger said.

"We don't think this is a good treaty," Lott said Friday. "We think it would put us in a weakened position internationally, but since there have been all these calls and demands for a vote, we have offered to vote."

© 1999 The Washington Post Company

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- ISSUE BRIEF

VOL. 3, NO. 14, September 27, 1999

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

"U.S. Security Benefits from Test Ban Monitoring & On Site Inspections: But Test Ban Treaty Verification Tools Depend on Ratification and Entry Into Force"

FROM OCTOBER 6-8, 1999, those states that have ratified or signed the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) will meet in Vienna to debate and take action on steps to accelerate ratification by key states to allow for the entry into force of the Treaty. Since the signing ceremony on September 24, 1996, 154 nations have signed the Treaty. But for the Treaty to fully enter into force, a specific set of 44 states must ratify. Thus far, a total of 45 states have ratified, including Britain, France, Japan, Australia, and many other U.S. allies, but only 21 of the 44 key states have ratified. While the entry into force requirement is substantial, it is within reach. Forty-one of the 44 states have signed the CTBT, and non-signers, India and Pakistan, have pledged to do so. (1)

Until the CTBT enters into force, signatory states are bound by Article XVIII of the Vienna Convention on Treaties not to take actions that violate the "purpose or intent" of the Treaty, which in this case means they cannot conduct a nuclear test explosion. But the longer it takes to fully implement the CTBT, the greater the chance that some nation might conduct a nuclear test and set off a dangerous political and military chain reaction of testing and renewed nuclear arms competition. Therefore, there is nothing to gain by waiting. Not until all 44 states on the entry into force list ratify the CTBT and it formally takes effect will the U.S. and the international community gain the full benefits of the Treaty's verification system. The CTBT verification system consists of several elements:

- * The Treaty establishes a far-reaching International Monitoring System (IMS) and an International Data Center (IDC) to detect, locate and identify nuclear explosions;
- * The Treaty allows for short-notice, on-site inspections to clarify ambiguous events; and
- * The Treaty also creates new confidence-building measures to improve transparency.

In addition to the official CTBT verification mechanism, two other means of detecting nuclear explosions are in place and may be utilized to request on-site inspections when the Treaty enters into force:

- * The U.S. will monitor test ban compliance with its own satellites and other national intelligence gathering tools, which are the most sophisticated in the world; and
- * Thousands of high-quality civilian seismic stations worldwide provide further detection capabilities.

With this far-reaching array of verification tools fully in place, the "zero-yield" CTBT is effectively verifiable. No would-be violator could be confident that a nuclear explosion would escape detection.

The International Monitoring System and the International Data Center:

The establishment of a verification system for the CTBT is proceeding so that it will be fully operational by the time the Treaty enters into force. Since the Provisional Technical Secretariat (PTS) of the Preparatory Committee of the CTBT Organization (CTBTO) was founded in November 1996, steady progress has been made in setting up the International Monitoring System. The IMS will consist of 321 monitoring facilities and at least 16 radionuclide laboratories located in some 90 countries. The IMS will be a principal tool for detecting possible treaty violations. Four types of stations are to be established: seismic, infrasound, hydroacoustic, and radionuclide. Approximately one-third (104) of the planned monitoring stations are already reporting to the Prototype International Data Center (PIDC) in Arlington, Virginia.

In many cases, IMS stations use existing infrastructure. Existing facilities to monitor seismic activities are being upgraded and certified for use by the IMS. While IMS monitoring facilities will be operated by the states on whose territory they are based, the costs are shared internationally. To permit the integration of all contributing stations into the IMS, host countries are required to sign facility agreements or 'arrangements' with the CTBTO PrepCom. Permanent facility agreements have been concluded, with Canada, New Zealand and South Africa. Letters of agreement have been exchanged to allow work at other installations, including those in the U.S.

The Seismic Network: The principal and most mature verification technique for the CTBT is seismology. It will be used to detect nuclear explosions underground (and sometimes even those in the atmosphere). Fifty primary and 120 auxiliary seismic stations, distributed world-wide, will be used to detect seismic waves generated by earthquakes or explosions. Establishment of the seismic network has had a head start, being based on an earlier

network established by the Group of Scientific Experts (GSE) at the Conference on Disarmament from 1976 onwards. Nearly half (74) of the planned seismic stations are already transmitting data to the PIDC. Thirty-six of these are primary stations and 38 are auxiliary stations.

Radionuclide Stations: Eighty radionuclide stations will measure radioactive particles in the atmosphere from atmospheric nuclear tests or underground tests that vent. At least forty of these will also be capable of detecting relevant noble gases, such as argon-37, xenon-133 and krypton-85. Sixteen radionuclide laboratories will analyze filters from these stations. Certification will depend largely on their capability for high sensitivity gamma spectroscopy. In analyzing samples, the CTBTO may co-operate with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which is located in the same complex in Vienna. The (IAEA) is developing its radionuclide sampling capabilities as part of its program to strengthen nuclear safeguards. Twenty-two radionuclide stations are already collecting samples.

Hydroacoustic Network: Eleven hydroacoustic stations are being established to detect explosions under water or in the atmosphere at low altitude. Six of these will use underwater hydrophones, which have three microphones at each end of 100 km fibre-optic cables. Most will be located in the Southern hemisphere, which has extensive oceanic areas. "T-phase" seismic stations will also be available to detect the seismic waves caused when hydroacoustic waves strike a steep-sided island. Four hydroacoustic stations are currently running, three of which are operated by the U.S.

Infrasound Stations: Sixty land-based infrasound stations will use microbarographs (microphones with large, sound-sensing membranes) to detect and measure air pressure changes that are caused by low-frequency sound waves from atmospheric nuclear explosions. They may also detect some underwater and shallow underground events. Although at present infrasound is the least developed of all the IMS technologies, the broader frequency ranges now available make it potentially very sensitive. Four infrasound stations are currently reporting, three of which are in the US and one in Australia.

The International Data Center: The IDC, which is being progressively developed at CTBTO PrepCom headquarters in Vienna, will receive and process data from all the monitoring facilities included in the IMS. In September 1998 a \$70 million contract was signed with Hughes Olivetti Telecom, Ltd. to establish the global communications infrastructure for the system and to maintain it over the next ten years. The network will use very small aperture terminals (VSATs) to ensure the swift and secure transport of up to 11.4 gigabytes of data between facilities, the IDC and States Parties to the Treaty. In July and August 1999 the second of four releases of applications software from the prototype IDC in Arlington, Virginia was installed in Vienna and tested. As of September 1999, the IDC is operating seven VSATs at seven IMS stations and five National Data Centers. Eight more installations are planned.

The IDC will make both raw and processed data available to all States Parties through regular bulletins. The extent to which the IDC will make judgements about events will likely depend on the specific circumstances of

the event. States Parties without significant national technical and analytical means to analyze the data will naturally look to the IDC for more precise information when and if a suspicious event is detected. States with more sophisticated data analysis capabilities, like the U.S., will also review IMS data (and data collected from other sources) on its own to determine whether a "clarification" or "on-site inspection" is needed.

On-Site Inspections and Confidence-Building Measures:

When implemented, the United States will gain an unprecedented new tool to detect and deter nuclear test explosions: the ability to request short-notice, on-site inspections of suspicious events. Without prejudice to the right of any State Party to request an on-site inspection, Article IV of the Treaty provides for a timetable and process for consultation and clarification to resolve any matter regarding non-compliance, which, whenever possible, are to be used before an on-site inspection is requested. However, if data from the IMS or from other national technical means (i.e. intelligence gathering tools like satellites and national monitoring stations) or scientific data sources (see below) suggests a possible nuclear test explosion, a request for an on-site inspection can be made.

The inspection can take place on the territory of any State Party or in areas beyond the control of any state (i.e. open oceans). Its purpose is to determine whether there is a violation of the Treaty and which State Party may have conducted a nuclear test explosion. The 51-member CTBT Executive Council has no more than 96 hours after a request for an on-site inspection is made to decide whether an event is suspicious enough to warrant an on-site inspection. Preparations for the inspection could begin before a decision is made. The Executive Council consists of representatives of States Parties from six geographic regions. The U.S. will likely have a continuous membership on the Council. A three-fifths majority of the Council is required to order an inspection by a team designated by the Director-General of the CTBTO Technical Secretariat.

In addition, Article IV of the Treaty also provides for "Confidence-Building Measures" to resolve possible misinterpretation of data relating to chemical high explosions of 300 metric tons or greater (which are often employed by the mining industry) and to maintain the proper calibration of monitoring stations in the IMS. These confidence-building measures involve notification of chemical high-explosions and visits to related sites and monitoring stations by CTBTO personnel. Such measures may also be useful in distinguishing between "subcritical" nuclear experiments (which are allowed by the Treaty) and prohibited nuclear explosions.

The Role of "National Technical Means" and Civilian Seismic Networks:

The IMS is not the only international system capable of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions. Data from the United States' own intelligence gathering tools, including seismic and radionuclide monitoring stations, radionuclide-sniffing reconnaissance aircraft, and satellites can also be used as a basis for on-site inspections.

In addition, global networks of stations built for scientific purposes to detect and analyze earthquakes and other natural phenomena have been in place for decades. There are thousands of these monitoring stations across the globe and they can also be used to detect nuclear test explosions. In fact, many IMS contributing stations are "dual use," because they are fulfilling scientific functions while being used to verify the CTBT.

Data from non-IMS networks can significantly increase the capability of the IMS to detect small nuclear explosions. The IMS is designed to detect explosions anywhere on earth with a yield of 1 kiloton TNT equivalent (which is similar to an earthquake of magnitude 4.0 on the Richter scale), and test explosions of lower yields in many areas of concern. The IMS has already proven that it is able to detect smaller explosions under many circumstances, and data from civilian networks of seismic stations have been very useful in further clarifying the nature and size of seismic events. For example, in August 1997, Russia was suspected of conducting a nuclear test explosion at its nuclear testing site at Novaya Zemlya. The combined data from the Prototype IDC and civilian scientific stations were able to clarify the event and determine that the initial accusations that a nuclear test explosion had been conducted were wrong. In fact, the event turned out to be a magnitude 3.5 earthquake located at least 80 kilometers from the Russian test site. Data from scientific stations was also important in providing more detailed data about the Indian and Pakistani nuclear test explosions of May 1998. (2)

It is very likely that data from non-IMS stations will be used to strengthen the verification regime of the CTBT. Paragraph 27 of Article IV of the CTBT opens up the possibility for States Parties to "separately establish cooperative arrangements with the Organization, in order to make available to the International Data Center supplementary data from national monitoring stations that are not formally part of the International Monitoring System."

Conclusion:

Since the CTBTO PrepCom was established in November 1996, good progress has been achieved in establishing the IMS, the Treaty's main verification tool. However, more needs to be done in and continuing financial support from CTBT signatories and ratifiers is needed to complete the rest of IMS and other CTBT verification tools. If entry into force is further delayed, the international community should consider ways to ensure that any possible violations of the non-testing norm can be detected by the IMS. It will be up to the states meeting in Vienna this October to increase the pressure on those which have not signed or ratified the treaty in order to capitalize on the unique and invaluable nuclear non-proliferation verification capabilities of the CTBT. U.S. leadership through ratification of the CTBT — not continued ignorance and inaction — is essential to achieve this goal.

* This Issue Brief was written by Trevor Findlay, Executive Director of the Verification, Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC) and Oliver Meier, VERTIC's Arms Control and Disarmament Researcher. Tel: +44 171 440 6960, Fax: +44 171 242 3266, email: vertic@vertic.org

Notes:

(1) For further details, see: Coalition Issue Brief Vol.3, No.12, "Non-Proliferation & Test Ban Efforts in Jeopardy on Anniversary of Treaty Signature," (Sept. 22, 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/briefv3n12.htm>>; and George Bunn, Rebecca Johnson, and Daryl Kimball, "Accelerating the Entry Into Force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: The Article XIV Special Conference," (May 1999) <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/SpecConfRep0599.htm>>.

(2) Hans. E. Hartse, "The August 16 1997 Novaya Zemlya Seismic Event as Viewed From GSN Stations KEV and GBS," Seismological Research Letters 69, 3 (May/June 1998): 206-215, and Gregory van der Vink, et al, "False Accusations, Undetected Test And Implications for the CTB Treaty," Arms Control Today (Washington, D.C.) (May 1998) <<http://www.armscontrol.org/ACT/may98/vimy98.htm>>; and Trevor Findlay, "The Indian and Pakistani Tests: Did Verification Fail?," Trust & Verify (London), 80 (May 1998), pp. 1-4.

#

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is a non-partisan alliance of 17 nuclear non-proliferation organizations based in Washington, D.C. *The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of every member organization of the Coalition. For more information on the CTBT, see <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Tasks for our final push
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

You all know the urgency of our need for a vast outpouring of calls and letters to senators this coming week. We have the list of 40 undecided senators, which I distributed earlier. Of these the greatest priority should be for 20 or so on a previous list of moderates and opinion leaders. Of the latter Senators Domenici, Stevens, and Lugar are the most important. You can use your judgment depending upon time availability and your grassroots strength.

There may be some funds available for offices that want to hire somebody for three or four days of phone calling and related mobilization tasks. If you have somebody available and would like to bring in that person, please call Daryl Kimball about the possibility of funding. Try to do it Monday morning. His number is 202 546-0795, x 136. If you work something out, please let me know for information only.

I will call around on Monday morning to see who might take on special mobilization tasks in selected states.

On Thursday afternoon, October 7 we would like to deliver to all senators a packet containing (1) a fresh version of the May 1998 sign-on letter from religious leaders, (2) the collection of denominational statements that FCNL put together, and (3) a set of letters from each denomination and religious association on your letterhead. This can be a fairly brief letter, signed by the head of the Washington Office or whoever you think is appropriate. Please deliver 105 copies of your letter to FCNL no later than 12 noon, Thursday, October 7. (I haven't cleared this with FCNL, but I assume it's all right.) Heather Nolen and I will try to get letters from denominations and associations outside Washington to add to the collection.

Thanks for all each of you is doing.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Sat, 02 Oct 1999 08:46:31 -0700
From: "James R. Hipkins" <jhipkin@mail.Lig.bellsouth.net>
Reply-To: jhipkin@mail.Lig.bellsouth.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01C-BLS20 (Win16; U)
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Peace Leaf

Howard,

It seems our focus has been getting our place, again, ready to sell. What about an issue? Should we? When? What do you think should be included? I need to get busy on things and seems I have been consumed with the house. Our daughter got through chemmo-therapy o.k. and is now in radiation treatment for seven weeks. At least one week is finished. Give our best to Carley and all.
Jim and Char

To: jhipkin@mail.Lig.bellsouth.net
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Peace Leaf
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <37F628D7.2C2@mail.Lig.bellsouth.net>
References:

At 08:46 AM 10/2/99 -0700, you wrote:

>Howard,
> It seems our focus has been getting our place, again, ready to sell.
>What about an issue? Should we? When? What do you think should be
>included?.....

Jim,

As you can imagine, I'm now absorbed in the CTBT vote for October 12. After that I'll think about Peace Leaf.

In Tennessee please call Senators Frist and Thompson and ask them to vote for the CTBT. Get others to do so.

Glad to hear that your daughter is progressing.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Sender: mupj@pop2.igc.org

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.3 (32)

Date: Sun, 03 Oct 1999 17:13:10 -0400

To: ograbc@aol.com, "Jim Matlack" <denhartz@erols.com>, washofc@aol.com, ann_d.parti@ecunet.org, heathern@nccusa.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, jsammon@networklobby.org, network@igc.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org, Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org, lwyolton@prodigy.net, uuawo@aol.com, jnoble@uahc.org, lintnerj@ucc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org, mupj@igc.org

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

Subject: Tasks for our final push

Dear Colleagues:

You all know the urgency of our need for a vast outpouring of calls and letters to senators this coming week. We have the list of 40 undecided senators, which I distributed earlier. Of these the greatest priority should be for 20 or so an a previous list of moderates and opinion leaders. Of the latter Senators Domenici, Stevens, and Lugar are the most important. You can use your judgment depending upon time availability and your grassroots strength.

There may be some funds available for offices that want to hire somebody for three or four days of phone calling and related mobilization tasks. If you have somebody available and would like to bring in that person, please call Daryl Kimball about the possibility of funding. Try to do it Monday morning. His number is 202 546-0795, x 136. If you work something out, please let me know for information only.

I will call around on Monday morning to see who might take on special mobilization tasks in selected states.

On Thursday afternoon, October 7 we would like to deliver to all senators a packet containing (1) a fresh version of the May 1998 sign-on letter from religious leaders, (2) the collection of denominational statements that FCNL put together, and (3) a set of letters from each denomination and religious association on your letterhead. This can be a fairly brief letter, signed by the head of the Washington Office or whoever you think is appropriate. Please deliver 105 copies of your letter to FCNL no later than 12 noon, Thursday, October 7. (I haven't cleared this with FCNL, but I assume it's all right.) Heather Nolen and I will try to get letters from denominations and associations outside Washington to add to the collection.

Thanks for all each of you is doing.

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.

X-Sender: mupj@pop2.igc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.3 (32)
Date: Sun, 03 Oct 1999 20:51:12 -0400
To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: (abolition-usa) CTBT
Sender: owner-abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com

Dear Abolitionists:

You will recall that in the Abolition 2000 Statement, the third item calls for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. On October 12 the U.S. Senate will decide whether the United States will ratify the CTBT. Sixty-seven votes are required for ratification. At the moment all 45 Democrats and three Republicans have announced support for the treaty. This means at least another 19 Republicans must vote for the CTBT if ratification is to occur. There are approximately 40 undecided Republicans from 30 states who should be pressed by voters in their states to vote for the CTBT. This list is attached.

If you live in one of the 30 states, please get in touch with your senator. Get your friends, relatives, and other members of your organization to contact the senator. If you know people in other states with swing-vote senators, get in touch with them.

Defeat of the CTBT would be a serious setback for the cause of nuclear abolition. It would make it much more difficult to achieve adoption of other steps leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. Please join those of us who are working hard to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

##

Swing Vote Senators on the CTBT

Address letters to the senator at:

____ Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

State	Senator	Office Building	Telephone
Alaska	Frank Murkowski	322 Hart	(202) 224-6665
	Ted Stevens	522 Hart	(202) 224-3004
Arizona	John McCain	241 Russell	(202) 224-2235
Colorado	Wayne Allard	513 Hart	(202) 224-5941
	Ben Nighthorse Campbell	380 Russell	(202) 224-5852

Delaware	William Roth, Jr.	104 Hart	(202) 224-2441
Florida	Connie Mack	517 Hart	(202) 224-5274
Georgia	Paul Coverdell	200 Russell	(202) 224-3643
Idaho	Mike Crapo	111 Russell	(202) 224-6142
Indiana	Richard Lugar	306 Hart	(202) 224-4814

Illinois Peter Fitzgerald 555 Dirksen (202) 224-2854
 Iowa Chuck Grassley 135 Hart (202) 224-3744
 Kansas Sam Brownback 303 Hart (202) 224-6521
 Pat Roberts 302 Hart (202) 224-4774
 Kentucky Jim Bunning 818 Hart (202) 224-4343
 Mitch McConnell 361-A Russell (202) 224-2541

 Maine Susan Collins 172 Russell (202) 224-2523
 Olympia Snowe 250 Russell (202) 224-5344
 Michigan Spencer Abraham 329 Dirksen (202) 224-4822
 Minnesota Rod Grams 257 Dirksen (202) 224-3244
 Missouri John Ashcroft 316 Hart (202) 224-6154
 Christopher Bond 274 Dirksen (202) 224-5721
 Montana Conrad Burns 187 Dirksen (202) 224-2644

 Nebraska Charles Hagel 346 Russell (202) 224-4224
 New Hampshire Judd Gregg 393 Russell (202) 224-3324
 New Mexico Pete Domenici 328 Hart (202) 224-6621
 Ohio Mike DeWine 140 Russell (202) 224-2315
 George Voinovich 317 Hart (202) 224-3353

 Oregon Gordon Smith 404 Russell (202) 224-3753
 Pennsylvania Rick Santorum 120 Russell (202) 224-6324
 South Carolina Strom Thurmond 217 Russell (202) 224-5972
 Tennessee William Frist 567 Dirksen (202) 224-3344
 Fred Thompson 523 Dirksen (202) 224-4944
 Texas Kay Bailey Hutchinson 284 Russell (202) 224-5922

 Utah Robert Bennett 431 Dirksen (202) 224-5444
 Orrin Hatch 131 Dirksen (202) 224-5251
 Virginia John Warner 225 Russell (202) 224-2023
 Washington Slade Gorton 730 Hart (202) 224-3441
 Wyoming Mike Enzi 290 Russell (202) 224-3424
 Craig Thomas 109 Hart (202) 224-6441

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 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.

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 4.1
Date: Mon, 04 Oct 1999 09:34:06 -0500
From: Gerard Powers <GPowers@nccbuscc.org>
To: mupj@igc.org
Subject: Tasks for our final push -Reply

Howard:

Here's the text of the Action Alert I sent out to about 100 dioceses on Friday. We'll get a letter to the Senate from +McCarrick today, which we will bring down to FCNL by Wed.

Thanks.

Jerry

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\CTBTBAC.999"

From: Maureen_T._Shea@who.eop.gov
Date: Mon, 04 Oct 1999 09:43:22 -0400
Subject: Re: CTBT and the faith community
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
X-Lotus-FromDomain: EOP

There will clearly be things I will be e-mailing out of this office on CTBT. I have an e-mail general list already, and many of those on your list are on it, but not all. I can either send you things and you can e-mail them on to the list, or, you can ask your list if they want to be on a White House list, and if so to e-mail me and I'll set one up. I don't want to just take your list and assume they would all want to be on a White House one - there must be some kind of e-mail protocol on these things and I don't want to violate it!

Many thanks - it looks to be a busy week.

To: Maureen_T._Shea@who.eop.gov
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: CTBT and the faith community
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <85256800.004B2A52.00@lmgate3.eop.gov>
References:

At 09:43 AM 10/4/99 -0400, you wrote:

>There will clearly be things I will be e-mailing out of this office on
>CTBT. I have an e-mail general list already, and many of those on your
>list are on it, but not all. I can either send you things and you can
>e-mail them on to the list, or, you can ask your list if they want to be on
>a White House list, and if so to e-mail me and I'll set one up. I don't
>want to just take your list and assume they would all want to be on a White
>House one - there must be some kind of e-mail protocol on these things and
>I don't want to violate it!

>

>Many thanks - it looks to be a busy week.

>

>

Maureen,

I appreciate your care with e-mail lists. In this case it will be all right for you to add all the e-mail addresses from the Interfaith Group for the CTBT to your mailing list on matters related to the CTBT.

Howard

From: LCNP@aol.com
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 1999 12:18:56 EDT
Subject: Re: (abolition-usa) CTBT
To: mupj@igc.org
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 for Windows 95 sub 76

Howard - thanks for posting this info - means we don't have to search for it.
- John Burroughs - Also suggest you keep updating the US abolition listserv
re what they can do

To: akimpact@mosquitonet.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Dick,

As you no doubt know, the Senate will vote on the CTBT on October 12. Senators Stevens and Murkowski are among 40 undecided Republicans who need hundreds of calls and letters from their constituents. Senator Stevens is especially important because his views influence other senators.

We hope that you can help mobilize the faith community in Alaska to produce these calls and letters. . For people who have written and called previously, you can remind them of the widow in the 18th chapter of Luke who kept going to the judge until she received justice. Persistence pays off.

Would it be possible to get a public statement from top religious leaders in the next few days, sending it to the senators and the press? Could one or more bishops try to call Senator Stevens personally?

If you need further information, please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Mon, 04 Oct 1999 08:29:09 -0900
From: Heacock <akimpact@mosquitonet.com>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.04 (Macintosh; I; PPC)
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: CTBT

Dear Howard:

Thanks for the alert! All Alaska IMPACT members with email have been alerted and background information forwarded. We are sending two excellent witnesses from Fairbanks (IMPACT members) to DC to testify for ratification with expenses paid by 20/20 Vision. I have written letters to Stevens and Murkowski. We await the good news of ratification both for national security and global health!

Dick Heacock

X-Sender: jsmith@[209.8.25.194]

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

Date: Mon, 04 Oct 1999 12:24:16 -0400

To: jwyerman@2020vision.org, ocrabc@aol.com, jmatlack@erols.com, adaction@ix.netcom.com, smk@armscontrol.org, zseldon@bens.org, joseph@ceip.org, ecarroll@cdi.org, dkimball@clw.org, syoung@clw.org, jdi@clw.org, disarmament@psr.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org, joe@fcnl.org, mkrepon@stimson.org, graham@lawscns.org, maryb@lww.org, mccwijdb@erols.com, mupj@igc.org, jparachini@stimson.org, tcochran@nrdc.org, paexec@igc.apc.org, bmsil@psr.org, dculp@igc.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org, dsaperstein@uahc.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org, lintnerj@ucc.org, wand@wand.org

From: Jenny Smith <jsmith@clw.org>

Subject: Coalition meeting with Sandy Berger and John Holum

<x-rich>COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS

Attention: Coalition Member Groups and Friends

Please join the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers in a meeting with

Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

Samuel R. Berger

and

Acting Undersecretary for Arms Control and International Security Affairs

John D. Holum

for an off-the-record briefing of NGOs on the CTBT at the White House.

The meeting may be on <bold>Wednesday, October 6 at noon</bold>, but is subject to change. We will let you know the exact time by 6:00 PM today.

There may also be a pre-meeting, which will be announced when the meeting time is announced.

In order to enter the White House, they require your date of birth and social security number. Please contact Jenny Smith at 202-546-0795 x137 or by e-mail at jsmith@clw.org to give your DOB and SSN, if your name is on the list below:

Curtis W. Ramsey-Lucas

Lt. Gen. Thomas G. McInerney

Rodger Schlickeisen

Fred Krupp

Joe Volk

Daryl Byler

Thomas Cochran

Carl Pope

James K. Wyerman

David Saperstein

Jay Lintner

Gerald Powers

Paul Warnke

Thank you.

Jenny Smith

~~~~~

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

110 Maryland Ave., NE, Suite 505, Washington, DC 20002

202/546-0795 x137 \* FAX: 202/546-7970

coalition@clw.org \* <http://www.crnd.org>

~~~~~

</x-rich>

To: bkinsey@peacemission.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Bob,

As you no doubt know, the Senate will vote on the CTBT on October 12. Senators Allord and Campbell are among 40 undecided Republicans who need hundreds of calls and letters from their constituents.

We hope that you can help mobilize the faith community in Colorado to bring this about. For people who have written and called previously, you can remind them of the widow in the 18th chapter of Luke who kept going to the judge until she received justice. Persistence pays off.

Would it be possible to get a public statement from top religious leaders in the next few days, sending it to the senators and the press?

If you need further information, please let me know.

Shalom,
Howard

To: Joe Volk <joe@fcnl.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: RE: Final push for CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <E9BA445D76C0D21182F30090273DFAF62812CB@local.fcnl.org>
References:

At 08:49 AM 10/3/99 -0400, you wrote:

>10/3/99
>
>FYI: FCNL action plan
>
>Jay and all,
>
>FCNL will take extraordinary, unbudgeted, and as yet unfunded emergency
>initiatives for this Oct. 99 push for senate ratification of the CTBT.
>
>

Joe,

You have an excellent plan of action. Thanks for all you, Kathy, and the others are doing. I have high hopes that we can win this one.

Shalom,
Howard

To: "JAY LINTNER" <lintnerj@ucc.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: TEXT OF CTBT ACTION ALERT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <9910029388.AA938887629@smtp.ucc.org>
References:

At 01:39 PM 10/2/99 -0500, you wrote:

>
> On Saturday I put together this action alert for the UCC, editing
> (copying) materials put out by Kimball on Friday night. Given the
> tight timeline, this text might be helpful if and as you do alerts.

>
Jay,

Thanks for sharing the alert. It is excellent.

The infrastructure you help put together in the petition drive is proving very useful for this final push. It pays off to prepare in advance.

Shalom,
Howard

Date: Mon, 4 Oct 1999 17:11:31 -0400
From: "Joan Wade" <disarmament@igc.org>
Sender: owner-ctbt-organize@igc.org
Subject: CTBT!!!!
To: <ctbt-organize@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

```
<x-html><!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><FONT face=Arial size=2>Dear CTBT Activists,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=Arial size=2>On Friday October 1, Senate Majority Leader Trent
Lott announced that debate on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty will begin this
Friday, October 8.&nbsp;   Following this debate, the Senate will vote on
ratification either late Tuesday or Wednesday of next week, which means THIS IS
IT!&nbsp;   <FONT color=#ff0000><STRONG>We absolutely must make as big an impact
this week as possible.&nbsp;   </STRONG></FONT>Please peruse the action
suggestions below and let us all know what you are planning to do this week to
ensure ratification.&nbsp;   If you have any questions or require assistance with
your projects, please contact Joan Wade at (202) 898-0150 or <A
href="mailto:disarmament@igc.org">disarmament@igc.org</A>.&nbsp;   Also, keep your
eye on the Disarmament Clearinghouse website for more up to date CTBT
information <A
href="http://www.disarmament.org">http://www.disarmament.org</A>.&nbsp;  
</FONT></DIV>
```

```
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><B><FONT face="Comic Sans MS" size=3>
<P><FONT size=2><FONT face=Arial>Action 1:&nbsp;</FONT><FONT
face="Comic Sans MS"><EM>Over the few days, the most important action you can
take is to call your Senators&#8217; offices and express your support for the
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). After two years of inaction, the Senate
has finally scheduled a vote on the Treaty for OCTOBER 12<SUP>th</SUP>. As all
45 Democrats have declared their support for the treaty, special attention
should be directed to Republican offices. </EM></FONT></FONT></P>
<P><FONT size=2>Senate Switchboard: (202) 224-3121</FONT></P>
<P><FONT size=2>A simple call could be something like this:</FONT></P><FONT
size=2>
<P>Receptionist:</B> "Senator X&#8217;s office, how may I help
you?"</FONT></P><B><FONT size=2>
<P>Incredible Activist:</B> "Hi, my name is [your name] and I&#8217;m calling to urge
Senator X to support ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. I know
this treaty will be coming up for a vote very soon and I want to know how the
Senator will vote. My address is [your address]. Thank you very much for passing
on my message to the Senator."</P><FONT face=Arial>
<P>Action 2:&nbsp;<nbsp;  Write a letter to the editor of your local paper.&nbsp;   A
sample letter is available at <A
```

<http://www.disarmament.org/edlet.htm> Use this sample and send in your own letter today.</P>

<P>Action 3: If your local paper has not yet editorialized in favor of the CTBT, ask the editor to do so. A list of papers that have editorialized in favor of the treaty is available at <A

<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctedit.htm></P>

<P>Action 4: Hold a press conference. Do you know prominent religious, political, or organizational leaders in your state who would be willing to speak out in favor of the treaty? Gather them together and invite the local press and VOILA! you have a press conference. For more information on how to do this, contact Joan Wade at (202) 898-0150.</P>

<P>Good luck everyone! This is the time for action! Please don't forget to share your ideas and activities with ctb-organize by sending e-mail directly to

ctbt-organize@igc.org.</P>

<P>--
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: <A

disarmament@igc.org
Web: <A

<http://www.disarmament.org></P></DIV></BODY>

</HTML>

</x-html>

From: "Fran Teplitz" <fteplitz@peace-action.org>
To: <sara@fcnl.org>
Cc: "kathy guthrie" <kathy@fcnl.org>, <joe@fcnl.org>, <maureene@earthlink.net>, <kathycrandall@earthlink.net>, <dkimball@clw.org>, <jsmith@clw.org>, <syoun@clw.org>, <ieer@ieer.org>, <mupj@igc.org>, <cpaine@nrdc.org>, <epank@peacenet.org>, "bob tiller" <btiller@psr.org>, <kroberts@psr.org>, <brian@taxpayer.net>, "marie reitmann" <ctbt@2020vision.org>, <laura@2020vision.org>, <tcollina@ucsusa.org>, <>wand@awnd.org>, <cferg@fas.org>
Subject: FW: New CTBT sample letter for impending vote
Date: Mon, 4 Oct 1999 18:04:16 -0700
X-Msmail-Priority: High
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook 8.5, Build 4.71.2173.0
Importance: High
X-Mimeole: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3
X-Mdaemon-Deliver-To: mupj@igc.org
X-Return-Path: fteplitz@peace-action.org

Here's an updated letter on the CTBT vote due soon in the Senate. There should be no reason for your newspapers not to publish this now (with the Senate vote on the CTBT scheduled for next Tuesday). The story will only get hotter with the Vienna CTBT conference opening on the 6th.

Please fax us copies if you do get it published. Let me know if you need other letters, etc. Thanks!

Ira Shorr

Sample Letter to the Editor on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

A Senate vote on the CTBT could come as early as October 12. Letters should be sent to your local newspaper as quickly as possible. Feel free to personalize this letter (without going over 250 words).

The Senate is poised to vote on the most sought after arms control treaty in history. The CTBT, first proposed by President Eisenhower in 1958, is supported by the Department of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and over 150 nations. By voting to end testing, (Your Senator) will have his/her chance to help stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

A ban on nuclear testing would severely limit the ability of new nations to acquire the bomb. And countries with advanced nuclear weapons, like Russia and China, would be inhibited from producing new and more threatening types of warheads.

The CTBT also establishes a far-reaching global verification system to detect nuclear explosions--including seismic monitoring and on-site inspections. It's clearly in the best interests of the U.S. to have as strong a verification process in place as possible.

In addition, the directors of our three national nuclear weapons laboratories have testified that America's nuclear arsenal can be maintained without the testing of nuclear weapons.

The American public has also shown overwhelming support for the test ban treaty--82% expressed support for Senate approval, in a June 1999 poll. But the fate of the treaty is still unclear. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) has called the effort to ban testing "dangerous" and wants the treaty killed.

(Your Senator) has yet to express unqualified support for a test ban. For the sake of future generations, I urge you to contact him/her and urge him/her to vote for the CTBT. Without U.S. ratification the international community will never enact the treaty. Tell (your Senator) the world is watching.

If you would like to unsubscribe from one of our email lists, please email Jim Bridgman at <mailto:jbridgman@peace-action.org>. Thank you.

James C. Bridgman
Research & Resource Coordinator
Peace Action Education Fund
jbridgman@peace-action.org
www.peace-action.org
202.862.9740x3041
fax: 202.862.9762
1819 H St., NW, #425
Washington, DC 20006

From: Maureen_T._Shea@who.eop.gov

Date: Mon, 04 Oct 1999 13:18:55 -0400

Subject: CTBT Information

To: washofc@aol.com, DenHartz@erols.com, CWU_Washington.parti@ecunet.org,
washofc@aol.com, thart@dfms.org, jskipper@dfms.org, epf@igc.apc.org,
disarm@forusa.org, joe@fcnl.org, kathytim@earthlink.net,
kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, mark.brown@ecunet.org,
J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org, mknolldc@igc.org, mupj@igc.org,
jsammon@networkloby.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org,
Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org, lwyolton@prodigy.net, uuawo@aol.com,
lintnerj@ucc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org,
mupj@igc.org, lisaw@nccusa.org

X-Lotus-FromDomain: EOP

Howard Hallman has graciously shared his e-mail list for CTBT. I have six documents which I would like to make available to you. Those of you who are already on my general e-mail list know that normally I copy the text into the e-mail in order to avoid the language problems of different computers. However, this would be rather a large amount so I am going to list the documents and attach them. For those of you who do not get them or cannot "read" them, I'll be happy to copy them into an e-mail for you. Hopefully, most will come through via the attachments.

I apologize if my own lack of computer fluency makes this unclear.

But most importantly, thank you for all the work you have been doing on CTBT - it will be a busy 10 days.

The documents are:

Chronology

Fact sheet

Safeguards

Supporting statements

Reasons

President's statement of July '99

(See attached file: chrono.doc)(See attached file: fact sheet.doc)(See attached file: potus799.doc)(See attached file: Reasons for Ratification.doc)(See attached file: safeguards.doc)(See attached file: statements.doc)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\chrono.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\fact sheet.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\potus799.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Reasons for Ratification.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\safeguards.doc"

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\statements.doc"

From: Maureen_T._Shea@who.eop.gov
Date: Mon, 04 Oct 1999 18:46:57 -0400
Subject: Presidential Statement Monday
To: washofc@aol.com, DenHartz@erols.com, CWU_Washington.parti@ecunet.org,
washofc@aol.com, thart@dfms.org, jskipper@dfms.org, epf@igc.apc.org,
disarm@forusa.org, joe@fcnl.org, kathytim@earthlink.net,
kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, mark.brown@ecunet.org,
J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org, mknolldc@igc.org, mupj@igc.org,
jsammon@networkloby.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org,
Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org, lwyolton@prodigy.net, uuawo@aol.com,
lintnerj@ucc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org,
mupj@igc.org, lisaw@nccusa.org, jnoble@uahc.org
X-Lotus-FromDomain: EOP

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release
October 4, 1999

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN PHOTO OPPORTUNITY WITH
NATIONAL SECURITY TEAM
The Cabinet Room

4:02 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Is everybody in? I'd like to make a brief statement and then I'll answer your questions.

Our national security team is about to meet to discuss the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to end nuclear weapons testing forever. This is very important for protecting our people from the danger of nuclear war. That's why so many prominent Americans, including four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff support it.

For two years, the opponents in the Senate have blocked any consideration of the treaty. Now, we have been given just eight days before the Senate vote. I will do all I can to get the treaty ratified.

Our experts have concluded that we don't need more tests to keep our own nuclear forces strong. We stopped testing in 1992, and now we are spending \$4.5 billion a year to maintain a reliable nuclear force without testing. Since we don't need nuclear tests, it is strongly in our interest to achieve agreement that can help prevent other countries, like India, Pakistan, Russia, China, Iran and others from testing and deploying nuclear weapons.

The treaty will also strengthen our ability to monitor if other countries are engaged in suspicious activities through global chains of sensors and on-site inspections, both of which the treaty provides for. This is a crucial decision the Senate is about to make that will affect the welfare of the American people well into the next century. I hope the American people will pay close attention to this, and I hope the Senate

will pay close attention and that we will have a careful debate as much as possible within the time that's been allotted.

Q Mr. President, why do you think the Republicans handled this in the way they did and just said, okay, let's go ahead and vote on it in a few days? And you've been pushing this for a long time. Why is it that you're so behind the eightball on getting the votes for it?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we've been pushing it, but there has been no consideration of it. If you look at how other treaties have been handled in the past, you have 8 days of hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee, 12 days of hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee. The Democrats in the Senate were frustrated because the whole thing had been stonewalled. And, finally, they said, okay, you can have a debate and a vote right now or no vote at all.

So we decided we would take the right now and do our very best to do it. I don't want to speculate on other people's motives. We'll have to ask them why they decided to do it this way.

Q Mr. President, you need a lot of Republicans if you're going to pass this treaty. How many do you think you have right now?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know. We don't have enough now; I hope we can get them. I think the critical thing is, if you look at all these -- anybody who expresses reservations, there can only be, it seems to me, two arguments against it. One is that we have to test and maintain our stockpile. And Secretary Richardson is here -- the people at the energy labs and many other experts say that is absolutely not true. And we are spending \$4.5 billion a year to make sure it's not true, that we can maintain the integrity of our stockpile.

The other argument that we saw a version of in the press yesterday that I think is just a missing point is that maybe somebody, somewhere, is doing a very small-scale test and we won't pick it up. Well, the point I'd like to make about that is the following: Number one, if you get the really small test, they're hard to pick up. They're hard to pick up now, they'd be hard to pick up if this treaty is ratified.

If this treaty is ratified, there are new tools to monitor the testing levels. We'll have monitoring stations, we can do on-site visits. There's the deterrent impact of a country signing and then getting caught violating it. So we'll have a lot more ability to pick up all kinds of testings at all levels and a lot more deterrent against it if we ratify the treaty than if we don't.

There is another thing the American people need to think about and the Senate needs to think about. If any of the 44 original signatories of this treaty don't sign and don't ratify it, then it cannot enter into force. For decades, the United States has lead the world against proliferation. If the United States Senate votes this treaty down, it would be a signal that the United States now wants to lead the world away from the cause of nonproliferation. We would be giving the green light to all these other people.

We're not testing anyway. That's why Britain and France and nine other of our NATO allies have already ratified this treaty. They understand this. That's why there is such overwhelming support for it. So it would be, in my judgment, a grave mistake not to ratify the treaty.

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 08:12:01 -0400
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Re: Recent messages

At 07:51 AM 10/5/99 -0400, you wrote:

>At 10:26 PM 10/4/99 -0400, you wrote:

>

>Daryl,

>

>The text of your two messages from last night -- re White House meeting and

>CTBT News -- didn't come through. Please send them again.

>

>Thanks,

>Howard

>Howard W. Hallman, Chair

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice

>1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

>Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org

>

>Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of

>laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

>

Here they are. See you around noon. -- DK

October 4, 10pm

TO: White House CTBT Meeting Attendees

FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

RE: Preview of meeting with Mr. Berger TOMORROW AT 12 NOON in the Roosevelt Room; suggested talking points

NOTE: Please arrive early (12:45 or sooner) to get clearance thru the NW gate

I hope that by now each of you have been called and invited by the White House for a meeting that is likely to involve National Security Advisor Sandy Berger and other senior officials on the topic of the CTBT. I apologize for the changes in the meeting time, but the White House has had to shift the time due to the rapid pace of events this week.

Given the very brief amount of information that you got from your invitation call, I wanted to pass on what I understand will be the general purpose and nature of the meeting. Also, given that we will not have the chance for a pre-meeting, I would like to pass on a few suggestions about what else the President and the executive branch might do in the next several days:

1) the meeting will likely involve Mr. Berger and other senior national security officials (probably John Holum) and 25-30 representatives from arms control, environmental, and religious organizations working for the CTBT.

2) Mr. Berger is likely to thank us for our work and describe (in general terms) the evolving executive branch effort.

3) We are then likely to have several minutes (not many) to exchange ideas about the work ahead, particularly about what might be done over the weekend and on Monday (a holiday) to maintain public and media focus on the issue.

4) At the appropriate time, I, along with two or three other designated initial speakers, will offer some suggestions.

To utilize our brief time with I suggest that we keep our points focused on larger strategy issues and that we refrain from reporting on the details of our activities (which will have, for the most part, already been forwarded via a memo I will have sent). Given that the White House is indeed working almost at full-tilt on CTBT lobbying efforts, we should not waste our suggestions on items we should expect are already being done. Rather we might suggest the following projects/strategies that are not underway or are not planned, such as:

* Secretary Cohen one-on-one meetings with key Senators. Secretary Cohen is probably one of the most effective advocates given that he did not originally support a test moratorium (in '92). So far he has only been making phone calls.

* President Clinton meeting with small groups Republicans. President Clinton's personal involvement in the lobbying effort could have an influence on key Senators.

* National television address by the President. A key to success is to focus greater public attention on the Senate's historic decision. Given the short time frame of this last phase of the "campaign," it is clear that the Senate will not hear from the myriad and numerous CTBT supporters from around the country. A Presidential address to the nation in prime time (on perhaps Thursday or Sunday) would significantly increase public awareness and concern about the issue. President Kennedy made such an address on July 26, 1963 at the outset of the campaign for the LTBT
<<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ken0763.htm>>

* The message that is delivered through the media and in a good part of the testimony delivered in hearings this week should focus on the national security benefits of the test ban and the severe and negative national and international security consequences of Senate rejection of the Treaty, rather than allowing criticisms relating to verification and stockpile maintenance to dominate.

* Other suggestions that others in our group wish to make.

PLEASE KEEP IN MIND that the meeting will be brief. Please make your comments and suggestion ones that count.

Thanks everyone for your extra hard work and dedication.

D. Kimball

October 4, 1999, 10:30pm

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: CTBT ratification-related news items

The following are the latest and the best news reports, speeches and editorial related to the upcoming Senate vote on ratification of the CTBT. They are good, they are bad and some are ugly:

- * REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT IN PHOTO OPPORTUNITY WITH NATIONAL SECURITY TEAM, October 4, 1999
- * STATEMENT OF VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE ON THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY, October 2, 1999
- * REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT DSCC LUNCHEON, October 1, 1999
- * CNN: White House fights to save Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, October 3, 1999
- * CNN: India indicates it will sign nuclear test ban treaty, October 4, 1999
- * New York Times October 4, 1999 Pg. 1, U.S. And Russia To Seek New Ways To Monitor Nuclear Test Ban Pact
- * September 29, 1999 Letter to Senator Jesse Helms from Kemp, Kirkpatrick, Bennett (who have obviously lost all perspective on reality)
- * The Seattle Times, Opinion/Editorials, Sunday, October 03, 1999, "The best nuclear bomb is the one never built"
- * The Charleston (WV) Gazette, Monday October 4, 1999, "Odd foot-dragging"

More tomorrow.

DK

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release
October 4, 1999

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN PHOTO OPPORTUNITY WITH
NATIONAL SECURITY TEAM
The Cabinet Room

4:02 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Is everybody in? I'd like to make a brief statement and then I'll answer your questions.

Our national security team is about to meet to discuss the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to end nuclear weapons testing forever. This is very important for protecting our people from the danger of nuclear war. That's why so many prominent Americans, including four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff support it.

For two years, the opponents in the Senate have blocked any consideration of the treaty. Now, we have been given just eight days before the Senate vote. I will do all I can to get the treaty ratified.

Our experts have concluded that we don't need more tests to keep our own nuclear forces strong. We stopped testing in 1992, and now we are spending \$4.5 billion a year to maintain a reliable nuclear force without testing. Since we don't need nuclear tests, it is strongly in our interest to achieve agreement that can help prevent other countries, like India, Pakistan, Russia, China, Iran and others from testing and deploying nuclear weapons.

The treaty will also strengthen our ability to monitor if other countries are engaged in suspicious activities through global chains of sensors and on-site inspections, both of which the treaty provides for. This is a crucial decision the Senate is about to make that will affect the welfare of the American people well into the next century. I hope the American people will pay close attention to this, and I hope the Senate will pay close attention and that we will have a careful debate as much as possible within the time that's been allotted.

Q Mr. President, why do you think the Republicans handled this in the way they did and just said, okay, let's go ahead and vote on it in a few days? And you've been pushing this for a long time. Why is it that you're so behind the eightball on getting the votes for it?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we've been pushing it, but there has been no consideration of it. If you look at how other treaties have been handled in the past, you have 8 days of hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee, 12 days of hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee. The Democrats in the Senate were frustrated because the whole thing had been stonewalled. And, finally, they said, okay, you can have a debate and a vote right now or no vote at all.

So we decided we would take the right now and do our very best to do it. I don't want to speculate on other people's motives. We'll have to ask them why they decided to do it this way.

Q Mr. President, you need a lot of Republicans if you're going to pass this treaty. How many do you think you have right now?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't know. We don't have enough now; I hope we can get them. I think the critical thing is, if you look at all these -- anybody who expresses reservations, there can only be, it seems to me, two arguments against it. One is that we have to test and maintain our stockpile. And Secretary Richardson is here -- the people at the energy labs and many other experts say that is absolutely not true. And we are spending \$4.5 billion a year to make sure it's not true, that we can maintain the integrity of our stockpile.

The other argument that we saw a version of in the press yesterday that I think is just a missing point is that maybe somebody, somewhere, is doing a very small-scale test and we won't pick it up. Well, the point I'd like to make about that is the following: Number one, if you

get the really small test, they're hard to pick up. They're hard to pick up now, they'd be hard to pick up if this treaty is ratified.

If this treaty is ratified, there are new tools to monitor the testing levels. We'll have monitoring stations, we can do on-site visits. There's the deterrent impact of a country signing and then getting caught violating it. So we'll have a lot more ability to pick up all kinds of testings at all levels and a lot more deterrent against it if we ratify the treaty than if we don't.

There is another thing the American people need to think about and the Senate needs to think about. If any of the 44 original signatories of this treaty don't sign and don't ratify it, then it cannot enter into force. For decades, the United States has lead the world against proliferation. If the United States Senate votes this treaty down, it would be a signal that the United States now wants to lead the world away from the cause of nonproliferation. We would be giving the green light to all these other people.

We're not testing anyway. That's why Britain and France and nine other of our NATO allies have already ratified this treaty. They understand this. That's why there is such overwhelming support for it. So it would be, in my judgment, a grave mistake not to ratify the treaty.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Vice President

For Immediate Release

October 2, 1999

STATEMENT OF VICE PRESIDENT AL GORE ON THE
COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

Washington, DC -- After more than two years delay, the Senate Majority Leader yesterday suddenly scheduled a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The only possible point of giving such an important Treaty so few days debate on so few days notice after so much delay is to cut the public out of the discussion. Even so, we are going to do everything we can to make sure the American people's voices are heard, and this Treaty is ratified.

Banning all nuclear tests has been a bipartisan goal of American foreign policy since Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy, and this Treaty -- simply put -- will reduce the threat of nuclear war. President Bush stopped nuclear testing in 1992. Nonetheless, today we have a safe and reliable nuclear deterrent, and we have a program to maintain that nuclear deterrent without testing. So while the Treaty will not harm our nuclear capability, it will inhibit the development of more advanced nuclear weapons by other countries. It will strengthen global efforts to halt proliferation of nuclear weapons, and constrain efforts of rogue states to develop their own nuclear arsenals. At the same time, the Treaty will make it easier for us to detect nuclear

tests worldwide.

On the other hand, if we reject the treaty, it will not enter into force for any nation. China, which has signed the Treaty, would not be constrained from testing a new generation of nuclear weapons. India and Pakistan would be far less likely to heed our calls to end testing. The consequences to our national security could be dire indeed.

The Treaty has the unanimous support of the President's National Security Team. It has been endorsed by four former Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from the Carter, Reagan, Bush, and Clinton Administrations. Most important in a democracy, it has the overwhelming support of the American people.

In October of 1963, one year after the Cuban Missile Crisis, President Kennedy signed the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty -- banning nuclear tests above ground, in the oceans, and in the atmosphere. On that day, he said: "This small step toward safety can be followed by others longer and less limited, if also harder in the taking." This fight we face today -- to ban all nuclear testing -- is one of the hard steps President Kennedy envisioned 36 years ago. With courage -- with an ear to the voice of the American people and an eye on the future of our children -- I am confident we can take this hard step together. America's security in the new century depends upon it.

###

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary
(Las Vegas, Nevada)

For Immediate Release

October 1, 1999

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT DSCC LUNCHEON

[excerpts]

Now, in every case, there are differences among the parties in this. I also have to tell you that there are differences in other areas. I'm fighting now to get the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban treaty ratified in the Senate. Virtually, all the opposition we have is coming from the other side of the aisle. A dream that was first embraced by Dwight Eisenhower, a Republican President, and proposed by John Kennedy, a Democrat, who gave us the first temporary test ban treaty.

It is profoundly important because we are trying to stop countries that do not have nuclear power now, and terrorist groups who don't not have nuclear power now, from getting it. And it will help us not only

to restrain people who have nuclear weapons from using them ever in the future, but from seeing the proliferation of these things. Every senator's vote makes a difference. The treaty has to be ratified by two-thirds of the Senate.

<http://cnn.com/US/9910/03/test.ban.treaty/>
White House fights to save Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

October 3, 1999 Web posted at: 8:53 p.m. EDT (0053 GMT)

In this story:

CIA report causes stir
White House faces uphill battle

LOS ANGELES (CNN) -- The Clinton administration launched an offensive Sunday to gain support for U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

"We're about to start a great debate on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to end nuclear testing, something (Presidents) Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy wanted," President Bill Clinton said during a fund-raising event in Los Angeles.

The White House was surprised last week when Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., unexpectedly scheduled an October 12 vote on the treaty, which had languished in committee for two years.

The treaty -- signed by 154 nations -- calls for an outright ban on nuclear testing. But only 23 of the 44 "nuclear capable" nations that signed the agreement have since ratified it.

CIA report causes stir

Republican anxieties over the treaty stem from the CIA's inability to monitor low-level nuclear tests accurately enough to ensure compliance.

The Washington Post, quoting senior U.S. officials, reported Sunday that Russia had carried out two tests last month in the Arctic, but intelligence data from seismic sensors and other monitoring equipment could not determine the exact nature of those trials.

The Clinton administration contends that those shortcomings provide reasons to ratify the treaty.

"We don't know that there was any testing going on," White House Chief of Staff John Podesta told CNN on Sunday. "This is really an argument for the treaty."

Podesta said that the treaty provides for 300 "new seismic monitoring

sites" and would give the international community a strong basis for action against any country found to have conducted tests.

Lott's spokesman, John Czwartacki, said Sunday that Lott opposes the treaty for several reasons. The "verifiability issue" is one, he said, "but that's not the primary one."

He said testing is a vital part of maintaining U.S. nuclear stockpiles at a time when "North Korea is making strides in its nuclear program, and China, through ill-gotten means, also is making progress in its program."

White House faces uphill battle

CIA Director George Tenet is scheduled to give secret briefings in Congress and testify in private hearings this week. He is likely to be questioned about low-level testing.

Struggling for the 67 votes needed for ratification, the White House has lined up dozens of retired generals, Nobel laureates and former lawmakers to lobby the Republican-controlled Senate.

Defense Secretary William Cohen, a former Republican senator from Maine, is cutting short his trip to Asia and will testify before the Senate Armed Services Committee on Wednesday. The administration hopes to convince Republicans that treaty ratification is a bipartisan issue.

After the fall of the Soviet Union, President George Bush signed a limited testing moratorium to take effect October 1, 1992, for nine months. President Clinton continued the moratorium and signed the comprehensive global treaty in 1996.

The United States conducted its last nuclear test in September 1992 and now relies on computer simulations to test its arsenal.

Correspondent Chris Black and The Associated Press contributed to this report.

CNN: India indicates it will sign nuclear test ban treaty

October 4, 1999 Web posted at: 11:21 AM HKT (0321 GMT)

NEW DELHI, India (AP) -- India will sign the sweeping nuclear test ban treaty after a new parliament is seated this month, a top aide to Indian Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee indicated Sunday.

"Consensus is building in the country about our stand on the CTBT (Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty) and after the parliament meets, we will be in a position to take concrete steps," Brajesh Mishra, India's national security adviser, told the private STAR television network.

Vajpayee announced a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing last year,

and assured the U.N. General Assembly in New York last October that India would not be the cause of any delay in the adoption of the treaty.

But his government fell earlier this year when he lost a parliament vote. According to most exit polls and voter surveys after elections ended Sunday, Vajpayee is set to return to power at the head of his 22-party alliance this month.

India has long called the treaty discriminatory, saying it would help the declared nuclear powers retain their superiority over other nations. India itself carried out nuclear tests in May last year, provoking Pakistan to launch tit-for-tat explosions.

The United States wants India and its hostile neighbor Pakistan to sign the CTBT and take steps toward reconciliation after 52 years of rivalry. India and Pakistan have fought three wars.

The treaty, which calls for an outright ban on nuclear testing, has been signed by 152 nations, including the United States.

It must be signed and ratified by the 44 countries with nuclear powers before it can go into effect. Forty-one of those 44 states have signed, while India, Pakistan and North Korea have not.

After two years of blocking the global pact, U.S. Senate Republican leaders in Washington have reversed course. The Senate is scheduled to debate ratification of the CTBT on October 6.

Copyright 1999 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

New York Times October 4, 1999 Pg. 1

U.S. And Russia To Seek New Ways To Monitor Nuclear Test Ban Pact

By Michael R. Gordon and Judith Miller

MOSCOW -- As the White House and Senate Republicans prepare for a bruising battle over a landmark treaty banning nuclear tests, top Russian and American nuclear officials said on Sunday that they had agreed to consider new ways to prevent cheating on the pact.

At the talks this weekend in Moscow, the U.S. energy secretary, Bill Richardson, said in an interview that he had proposed several measures to strengthen monitoring of the pact, including visits by American experts to Russia's closed nuclear test site at Novaya Zemlya in the Arctic.

Yevgeny Adamov, Russia's minister of atomic energy, said in a separate interview that he was willing to open talks on the proposals. But he also insisted that such measures should be part of a package deal that would also include such cooperation as access to American supercomputers in order to help Russia maintain a safe, reliable nuclear arsenal.

"We are ready to discuss the whole range of these activities," Adamov said.
"We are opposed to accepting just one measure in isolation."

The Clinton administration's decision to press Russia to strengthen verification is an urgent attempt to rebut Republican critics who say they have the votes to block Senate approval of the beleaguered treaty. It also touches on one of the most highly charged aspects of the treaty debate: whether it can be strictly monitored and verified.

President Clinton declared on Saturday that he would conduct an all-out effort to win the two-thirds majority required for Senate approval of the pact, which the administration views as an important part of its political legacy. The Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, last week abruptly scheduled a Senate vote on the pact, having previously refused to do so.

The treaty has been signed by 154 nations, including the United States and Russia. It has been ratified by only 47. Under the treaty's terms, 44 countries that can make nuclear weapons must approve it for the pact to take effect, but only 23 have done so. American ratification is widely seen as a major step that would persuade other nations to follow suit.

Republican critics insist that under the treaty, it is not always possible to tell if a country is cheating. Specifically, they argue, it is often difficult to determine if Russia is conducting experiments to insure the safety and reliability of nuclear warheads that are permitted by the treaty or conducting banned, low-level nuclear blasts.

Administration officials say that despite those verification uncertainties, the treaty would preserve American nuclear superiority and slow the spread of nuclear weapons. The administration says that America has no pressing need to test, but that without the treaty, other nations could.

In a Saturday meeting at Adamov's headquarters, Richardson, at White House instruction, suggested that the two sides open new talks to bolster "transparency" about Russian activities at Novaya Zemlya.

He proposed, for instance, that the Russians alert the United States 24 hours in advance when they carry out a "subcritical" test to determine the reliability of their nuclear warheads.

Such subcritical tests are permitted by the treaty since they involve no nuclear blasts. They are conducted underground to prevent radioactive material from being released into the atmosphere.

The United States conducts similar experiments at its underground testing site in Nevada and provides advance notice. As a gesture of good will, Richardson alerted Adamov to an coming American subcritical test.

Richardson also proposed that U.S. experts visit Novaya Zemlya to conduct seismic experiments that would enhance the American ability to distinguish between a nuclear test and, say, an earthquake.

The need for such measures was evident in August 1997, when the CIA

informed the White House that the Russians might have conducted an underground test at Novaya Zemlya.

After seismic experts challenged that assessment, the CIA said that it was wrong and that the tremor was an undersea earthquake. The episode initially caused a political furor in the United States and Russia, as Washington accused Moscow of possible cheating.

At Saturday's meeting, Adamov said he was prepared to discuss the measures proposed by Richardson. But both in the talks and a subsequent interview, he indicated that Russia wanted something in return: assistance, including simulations using high-tech supercomputers, to insure that Russia's nuclear weapons are safe and will work.

"We confirmed our readiness with Secretary Richardson to work along these lines," Adamov said. "We reminded Mr. Richardson that there are a number of activities to maintain the safety of nuclear weapons. They do not merely involve sub-critical experiments."

Russia has long sought to acquire powerful American computers, even going so far as to obtain them on the black market a few years ago.

But selling supercomputers to Russia -- or even giving Russia's nuclear weapon scientists access to them -- is still highly unlikely, administration officials said.

Apart from national security concerns, the administration does not want to be criticized by Republicans for giving the Russians technology that might be used not only to improve safety, but to design new nuclear weapons.

Adamov, however, insisted that the American attitude was shortsighted. He said the United States had not only conducted more nuclear tests than Russia, but that it also had an enormous advantage in supercomputers, which are used to simulate nuclear blasts.

He said the United States should share some of its computer techniques so that other nations can better assess the reliability of their nuclear arsenal without testing.

"Conditions should be established so that all nations possessing nuclear weapons will have the same opportunity to engage in computer simulations," Adamov said.

The Russians have long asserted that the Clinton administration promised to provide such advanced abilities to Russia if the Kremlin agreed to a test ban. The administration says that it made no specific commitments.

It is not clear what assistance Washington might be able to give Russia if supercomputers are excluded. But American officials said they would try to think of alternatives.

The meeting between Richardson and his Russian counterpart took place on the last day of a weeklong tour of closed civilian and military nuclear installations that the energy secretary said demonstrated that the Russians

were willing to provide greater access to their nuclear weapons complex despite tensions over NATO, Kosovo and reported Russian corruption.

Both Richardson and Adamov agreed that test ban treaty was in the interests of world security and should be ratified by both sides.

"We have submitted it for ratification, which means we attach great importance to it," Adamov said. "And even though it has not yet been ratified, we are fully adhering to its terms. The ball is in your court."

Recent activity at the Novaya Zemlya test site, which American conservatives suspect includes clandestine nuclear blasts, involve permitted safety experiments, he said.

"It is well known that the United States and Russia both conduct subcritical experiments each year to maintain the safety of existing armaments," Adamov said. "So when I hear there are apprehensions about such things, I am surprised by the passive approach of the American Administration. It should remind people that we are strictly complying with the terms of the treaty."

September 29, 1999

Senator Jesse Helms
Chairman
Senate Foreign Relations Committee
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510
Dear Jesse:

First we want to thank you for your outstanding work as Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Your stewardship of the Committee has provided a valuable counterweight to the often ill-conceived foreign affairs and national security policies of the Clinton Administration.

We write today to offer our support for your efforts to stop the Administration's push for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We agree that the CTBT is fundamentally flawed and would, if implemented, leave us with neither an effective deterrent nor defense against a nuclear attack. We agree with you that the United States cannot allow its nuclear deterrent to weaken under a "zero-yield" test ban. There is no substitute for periodic testing of our nuclear stockpile to ensure its reliability, despite the Administration's assertion that computer-simulated testing is adequate. The Treaty is more likely to increase nuclear proliferation around the world and would weaken the already tenuous deterrence that America's nuclear weapons provide to its allies.

We also appreciate your repeated calls to the president to submit the Koyoto Protocol, the ABM Demarcation Agreements, and the ABM Succession Accords to your Committee. The president has not yet submitted those new treaties to your committee, but he has begun implementing them on his own - to the

detriment of our national defense and economic competition.

In this fashion, the Clinton Administration has implemented the CTBT without Senate approval by unilaterally declaring a test-ban in 1992. More than just weakening our national security, the president's continued policy of implementing treaties without the constitutionally mandated advice and consent by the Senate is an affront to our constitutional government. Empower America applauds your work and will continue to support your efforts to enforce the Constitution by insisting that the president not implement treaties and agreements prior to their ratification by the United States Senate. We will do what we can to help defeat the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Warm best wishes,

William J. Bennett Jack Kemp Jeane J. Kirkpatrick

The Seattle Times
Copyright © 1999 The Seattle Times Company
Opinion/Editorials :
Sunday, October 03, 1999

The best nuclear bomb is the one never built

A Times letter writer took us to task for an editorial wondering if the Pentagon was prepared to fight a war in the 21st century. The better question, the writer said, is what the U.S. will do to promote peace in the next century?

One substantial step would be ratification of the comprehensive test-ban treaty, which has languished in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Republican Sen. Jesse Helms refused to schedule hearings without bartering on a global-warming pact and the 1972 anti-ballistic missile treaty.

On Thursday, the GOP abruptly reversed course and said it would bring it to a vote this week. The Democrats should take the challenge; the public has been behind the concept for two generations.

The test-ban treaty builds upon an idea that began in the Eisenhower administration and bore its first fruit with a halt to above-ground testing secured by President Kennedy.

The next logical advance is a comprehensive ban that prohibits all testing, which is necessary to develop a bomb or expand its lethal punch. Without testing, flaws cannot be detected and devices cannot be upgraded.

The latest version of the test-ban treaty was drafted by the Geneva Conference on Disarmament and adopted by the United Nations in 1996. President Clinton was the first chief executive to sign. He was eventually joined by 151 countries, and 47 have ratified the treaty, most recently

Bulgaria.

To take effect, the test ban must be ratified by 44 nuclear-capable members of the disarmament conference, and the U.S. must be one of them. Language in the plan calls for international monitoring, verification and inspection.

Washington's interest in the stalled treaty was revived by fears of what China might have learned from stolen American nuclear secrets, North Korea's flirtation with a long-range missile and the dueling nuclear detonations by Pakistan and India.

Five current and former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have endorsed the treaty. They know the advantages all accrue to the U.S., whose nuclear superiority is undiminished by any combination of test ban and strategic reduction.

For all the potential nuclear threats in the world, Russia is the only country with the arsenal and capacity to menace the U.S. Russia has not signed the treaty, but its interest in strategic-arms reductions make it an ally in nuclear nonproliferation. China also has not ratified the test-ban treaty.

President Bush carried forth the bipartisan nature of nuclear-arms reduction, but Republican commitment stalled there. GOP congressional leaders want to undo the ABM treaty to build a prohibited anti-missile defense system.

Helms and others held arms reductions and the test ban hostage to Russian acquiescence on an anti-missile shield. Russia, stone broke and scrambling to hold a ragged confederation together, sees such systems as the beginning of a new arms race it cannot afford, with an old enemy it does not trust.

On Capitol Hill, the Republican Senate refuses to endorse a test-ban treaty that might give Clinton or the Democratic presidential campaign any political advantage. They miss the larger point.

A test ban denies countries the opportunity to build or improve nuclear weapons. Ensuring bombs are not built remains the best defense.

The Charleston (WV) Gazette

Odd foot-dragging
Monday October 4, 1999

IN Vienna this week, the United Nations will hold a conference for countries that have adopted the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, promising to cease detonating thermonuclear bombs.

But America can't participate, because Republicans in the U.S. Senate have blocked ratification of the treaty for two years.

Foreign Relations Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C., won't even allow it to come up in his committee. Think of that - a Dixie fundamentalist who spends much of his time ranting against sex is hindering an international effort to make the world safer from nuclear weapons.

Helms is joined by many other Republicans in this obstruction. Last week, GOP presidential candidate Elizabeth Dole scoffed at the treaty, instead urging construction of President Reagan's goofy "Star Wars" missile shield. (Most experts agree that Reagan's space interceptors would cost trillions of taxpayer dollars and probably wouldn't block incoming missiles. Besides, the real danger to America is from homemade nuclear bombs smuggled in trucks by terrorists, not from intercontinental missiles.)

Last week, GOP leaders offered to allow a sudden Senate vote this week on the test ban, knowing that Democrats couldn't muster the required two-thirds majority on short notice. It was a strange power play.

President Clinton - the first head of state to sign the treaty in 1996 - repeatedly has asked the Senate to ratify it. To no avail. Helms and the GOP contend it would jeopardize U.S. security. To which Secretary of State Madeleine Albright remarked:

"They have failed to explain how our security can be damaged by asking others to end explosive testing."

National Security News Service says that both of West Virginia's senators, Robert C. Byrd and Jay Rockefeller, support ratification. We wish it was possible for them and other Senate Democrats to persuade enough moderate Republicans to help pry the stalled treaty out of the Helms committee. It's disgraceful that the GOP obstruction makes America seem to be a bully waving the nuclear threat before the world.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 08:53:22 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: News on CTBT & George W., 10/5

October 5, 1999, 8am

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: CTBT ratification-related news items

The following are the latest and the best news reports, editorials, and op-eds related to the upcoming Senate vote on ratification of the CTBT.

Note the fence-sitting and negative George W. statement in the WSJ article:

* The Wall Street Journal, October 5, 1999, "White House Woos Senate GOP To Back Global Nuclear-Test Ban"

* New York Times, October 5, 1999, "Clinton Kicks Off Campaign To Pass Nuclear Test Ban"

* New York Times editorial, October 5, 1999, "A Critical Nuclear Moment"

* "A Vote For A Safer World," By Byron Dorgan, Washington Post, October 4, 1999
Pg. 23

* The Washington Post, October 5, 1999, "Clinton Campaigns for Test Ban Treaty"

Stay tuned and keep up your great work. Reports of the death of the CTBT are premature, but it is very much up to you to keep hope alive.

DK

The Wall Street Journal, October 5, 1999

White House Woos Senate GOP
To Back Global Nuclear-Test Ban

By a WALL STREET JOURNAL Staff Reporter

WASHINGTON -- With just a week to spare, the Clinton administration has launched an intense battle to woo a large block of Republicans to support a long-sought international ban on nuclear testing.

It will be a tough fight. While the head-counting is just beginning, White

House and Senate aides say the administration must persuade 15 to 25 undecided Republican senators to back the measure.

White House officials say that to fall short of the required 67 votes would be a huge blow to U.S. arms-control efforts and would all but destroy the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which has been in the works since 1992.

Before meeting with key cabinet secretaries to discuss the treaty vote, President Clinton said that it would be "a grave mistake" and a setback to nonproliferation efforts not to ratify the treaty.

The predicament of having to sell a complex treaty to a skeptical Senate in just days is, in part, the administration's own doing. Hoping to force the issue after years of GOP foot-dragging, several Democratic senators, backed by the White House, threatened to hold up important legislation last month unless the treaty was opened to debate and a possible vote. Their aim: to embarrass those Republicans who opposed even voting on the issue.

But in a surprise move, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott jumped on the offer last week, proposing a vote be set for as early as Wednesday. Democrats then managed to push the vote to Oct. 12, setting the stage for a lobbying blitz that will decide the fate of a treaty that has languished in a Senate committee since 1997.

'Very Difficult Fight'

Arms-control advocates say they were stunned by the turn of events. Many blame the White House for failing to push hard enough to get a vote months earlier, and they fear the Democrats' gamble could bury the treaty once and for all. "Reports of the death of this treaty are premature, but it is going to be a very difficult fight," said Daryl Kimball, director of the Washington-based Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

The White House is opening a full-court press to try to build support for the treaty. Mr. Clinton is expected to speak publicly on the issue every day from now until the vote, and he is making personal calls to senators. A special team with representatives from the Defense, Energy and State departments has been assembled to cajole wavering senators. Apart from stern foes such as Sen. Jesse Helms, who has kept the measure bottled up in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Democrats say that about half of the Senate's 55 Republicans were undecided.

In a sign that many Republicans consider the treaty a political loser, GOP presidential front-runner George W. Bush is opposing ratification. A spokesman said that the Texas governor supports the current U.S. moratorium on all nuclear testing "but he doesn't support the treaty."

Asked if he had the votes for ratification, Mr. Clinton acknowledged that "we don't have enough now. I hope we can get them."

Hearings to Begin Tuesday

Despite the suddenness of the vote, the Senate is still planning to hold a series of hearings starting Tuesday. Among those expected to testify in the next three days are Defense Secretary William Cohen; U.S. Army Gen. Henry Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Secretary of State Madeleine Albright; and Central Intelligence Agency Director George Tenet. The Senate will then hold 14 hours of debate beginning Friday.

The negative signal that could be sent to countries such as India or Pakistan if the Senate rejects the treaty weighs heavily on the White House. "It absolutely does not go into effect if one of the main countries, like the U.S., doesn't ratify it," said White House spokesman Joe Lockhart.

Supporters say the treaty will help curb nuclear-weapons proliferation while leaving the country's own nuclear strength unchanged. The U.S. tested more than 1,000 nuclear devices between 1945 and 1992, when Washington agreed to a temporary test ban. Advocates also argue that failure to ratify the treaty will throw open the door to nuclear tests world-wide.

Opponents argue that signing onto the treaty would limit the country's ability to refine and develop its own arsenal. They also point to claims from the CIA that secret tests in countries such as China or Russia would be difficult to detect.

More than 150 countries have so far signed the treaty, but only 23 have ratified it by a vote of their parliaments. To become valid, the treaty needs to be ratified by all 44 countries considered to be capable of producing nuclear weapons.

New York Times
October 5, 1999
Pg. 1

Clinton Kicks Off Campaign To Pass Nuclear Test Ban

By Marc Lacey

WASHINGTON -- President Clinton on Monday opened an intense, weeklong campaign to persuade reluctant Senate Republicans to embrace one of his top foreign policy goals: a treaty that would impose a worldwide ban on underground nuclear testing. But Clinton acknowledged from the start that he lacks the votes for passage.

The president described the importance of the treaty in dramatic terms as he met with his top national security advisers in the first of a string of public events in support of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The Senate, after two years of delay, abruptly scheduled a vote on the treaty for next week.

"This is a crucial decision the Senate is about to make," Clinton said, sitting at a conference table with Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, Defense Secretary William Cohen, CIA Director George Tenet and others.

"It will affect the welfare of the American people well into the next century" the president said. "I hope the American people will pay close attention to this."

Proponents say the treaty, which has won the support of more than 150 nations, will deter the further development and refining of nuclear weapons. The United States stopped nuclear testing in 1992 and now maintains its weapons through sophisticated computer models.

"Since we don't need nuclear tests, it is strongly in our interests to achieve agreements that can help prevent other countries like India, Pakistan, Russia, China, Iran and others from testing and deploying nuclear weapons," Clinton said.

But opponents contend that the treaty will mainly serve to tie the hands of the United States and that its provisions cannot be adequately verified. Nations that want to cheat on the treaty would be able to avoid detection even by the global system of sensors mandated by the pact to monitor compliance.

"By ratifying this treaty, we would be handcuffing ourselves," said John Czwartacki, press secretary for the Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, R-Miss.

The debate comes following a string of unsettling developments on the nuclear front: tit-for-tat nuclear tests by India and Pakistan, strong evidence that China upgraded its arsenal with stolen American nuclear secrets, and the concern that North Korea appeared to be planning a test launch of a long-range missile.

In advance of the vote, American nuclear officials are attempting to reach an agreement with Russia that would increase monitoring under the pact in an effort to persuade skeptics that cheating would not go undetected.

Joe Lockhart, the White House spokesman, criticized Republican leaders for scheduling the treaty vote without the usual practice of holding hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He called the Republican approach "hit and run rather than advice and consent."

Clinton signed the treaty in 1996 and sent it to the Senate for approval in September 1997, but Senate Republicans failed to act on it.

"After not moving it for two years, not holding a single hearing, not expressing any interest in it at all, they all of a sudden say we're going to have a vote in a week," Lockhart said.

But Republicans responded that Democrats had pleaded for a vote and were now complaining that one has been scheduled. "When they got what they wanted, they didn't want what they got," said Czwartacki. "They are not willing to take yes for an answer."

Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has blocked the treaty from moving in his panel, in part because of a fight with the administration over two other treaties that he wants to kill before dealing with the test ban pact. An aide to Helms said the matter has been discussed numerous times in recent months at other hearings.

And Sen. John Warner, R-Va., a treaty opponent who heads the Armed Services Committee, plans three days of hearings that will begin Tuesday with closed-door testimony from intelligence officials.

Also on Tuesday, Clinton will hold a small dinner at the White House with undecided senators and will begin placing telephone calls to those with potential swing votes.

On another front, Sandy Berger, the president's national security adviser, will coordinate strategy with private organizations -- from the Union of Concerned Scientists to the League of Women Voters to the Environmental Defense Fund.

On Wednesday, Clinton will hold a rally at the White House with a broad array of treaty backers, including members of Congress, Cabinet members, Nobel laureates and past and present American military commanders. David Leavy, a spokesman for the National Security Council, said the treaty is the administration's top priority for the week and will be pressed at every turn.

But Clinton acknowledged that the votes were not on his side.

"We don't have enough now," he said. "I hope we can get them. I will do all I can to get the treaty ratified."

The White House needs two-thirds of the Senate, 67 votes if all 100 senators are present, to ratify the treaty. Senate Republicans have estimated that more than 40 senators oppose the test ban, more than the 34 votes necessary to block ratification.

The United States is one of the 44 nations that can make nuclear weapons and whose ratification is required for the pact to take effect. Of the 154 countries that have signed the accord, so far only 23 of those key nations have formally backed the treaty.

Senate Democrats say that only two Republicans, Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania and James Jeffords of Vermont, have openly supported the test ban. Test ban supporters say winning over more Republicans will require the involvement of the public --one of the focuses of this week's campaign.

"My Republican colleagues are being awful smug about this being a slam dunk," said Sen. Joseph Biden of Delaware, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee. "They're saying this is going to go down big. That's easy to say now but I wonder how they're going to vote against this if the vast majority of the American public wants this treaty."

New York Times
October 5, 1999

A Critical Nuclear Moment

After a two-year delay, the Senate is now racing toward a vote next week on ratifying a critically important arms control treaty. Ratification is by no means assured. But approval of the nuclear test ban treaty, which prohibits participating countries from conducting nuclear weapons tests, is manifestly in the best interests of the United States. Washington neither plans nor needs to conduct any further tests. The treaty's main effect would be to halt the programs of other countries. Since no new nuclear weapons can be reliably developed without testing, ratification of the treaty by enough countries would freeze the nuclear weapons race worldwide.

This is not just one more incremental arms control treaty. It is the capstone of more than a generation of efforts to limit the nuclear arms race that have been supported by American Presidents of both parties since Dwight Eisenhower.

All 45 Senate Democrats support the test ban treaty. Additionally, a number of enlightened Republicans either endorse the treaty or lean toward it, recognizing that this issue transcends partisanship. But within the next week, the White House must line up at least 15 more votes to reach the constitutionally required two-thirds majority. The Senate debate is likely to play out over a number of issues, beginning with the question of whether the treaty can be adequately verified.

>From the beginning, the Clinton Administration has acknowledged that the C.I.A. is not sure if it can distinguish extremely low yield nuclear blasts from conventional explosions or earthquakes. But there is no indication that Russia has violated the test ban or intends to. Further, American military commanders are confident that such low yield explosions could not produce any technological breakthroughs that could threaten America's strategic security. Moreover, once the treaty has been ratified by enough countries to take on full legal force, verification will be strengthened by more than 30 new monitoring stations to be set up on Russian soil.

Nevertheless, Washington has been trying to persuade Moscow to allow American teams to regularly visit Russian test sites to confirm Russian compliance. President Boris Yeltsin should agree to these visits, which could strengthen American confidence in Russian commitments. But Senate support should not be conditioned on his consent. Even without such an arrangement, adequate verification of the test ban is already assured.

So far, 154 countries, including the United States, Russia and China, have signed the treaty. Under international law, all these countries are now committed not to test. That means, for example, that the treaty is already restraining any possible efforts by the Chinese to develop more-sophisticated new weapons from design plans they may have stolen from the United States.

But only 47 of the signing countries have so far ratified, including only 23 of the 44 nuclear-capable nations whose approval is required to put the treaty into full legal effect. Next week's Senate vote could have major consequences on the treaty's future. If Washington ratifies, other nuclear and potential nuclear powers, India and Pakistan among them, would likely follow. If the Senate rejects ratification, the treaty and the present worldwide testing freeze could begin to unravel.

To prevent such a severe setback, the White House must energetically court additional Republican votes. It should, for example, be possible to persuade Senators Richard Lugar of Indiana, Pete Domenici of New Mexico and Ted Stevens of Alaska. Although they are counted as undecided on the test ban, they have all been important supporters of past arms control agreements. They and other undecided Republicans must now summon the courage to break party ranks and vote in the national interest.

Washington Post
October 4, 1999
Pg. 23

A Vote For A Safer World

By Byron Dorgan

More than two years ago President Clinton signed and sent to the Senate for ratification the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The majority party held no hearings and showed no interest in considering the treaty until last week. Suddenly, on Friday, Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) responded to pressure and announced that he would bring it to a vote on Oct. 12.

In his announcement, Lott also disclosed his opposition to the treaty, calling it "dangerous" for our country. He couldn't be more wrong.

It is critical that the Senate ratify this treaty. Designed to ban the testing of nuclear weapons, it has been decades in the making. Its origin is with President Dwight Eisenhower. More than four decades later, we finally have a treaty with 154 signatories that has now been ratified by 47 countries. Fifteen of our 18 NATO allies have ratified it, including our two allies that possess nuclear weapons. And the world now waits for action by the United States.

The objectives of the treaty are simple and compelling. It will allow the United States to retain a safe and reliable nuclear deterrent. But by preventing testing, it will inhibit the development of more advanced weapons by the nuclear powers, and it will establish roadblocks to the acquisition of nuclear weapons by those countries that would like to possess them.

Opponents of this treaty have alleged that it is supported by "extremists" who want to "disarm" the United States.

Let's review that list of so-called "extremists." They include four former chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including Gen. Colin Powell and Adm. William Crowe, the current chairman, Gen. Hugh Shelton, and the current secretary of defense, William Cohen. All of them strongly support the treaty. Does anyone really think they would support a treaty that would "disarm" or endanger our nation? It's an absurd argument.

In fact, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs maintains that this treaty will "inhibit the development of nuclear weapons by other countries while including safeguard provisions which will protect our country's interest." The point is, the treaty includes safeguards providing that if another nation resumes testing, the United States can also test to protect its national security.

The treaty's detractors, including Sen. Lott and others, will argue that it can't guarantee with 100 percent certainty that another country won't test nuclear weapons. Therefore, they maintain, we shouldn't even try to prevent nuclear testing. But if 100 percent certainty were the test of every human endeavor, we'd still be living in caves.

Action always involves risk--but inaction frequently involves more risk, and that is certainly the case here. Every single effort in arms control has met with a chorus of opposition from the flat-earth choir. Yet in every instance they have been wrong. Arms control agreements have successfully reduced the stockpile of delivery vehicles and nuclear weapons in the world. Because of these agreements, fewer nuclear weapons are aimed at our country, fewer countries have missile programs, and fewer countries seek nuclear weapons. But the threat of the proliferation of nuclear weapons remains, and that is why this treaty is so important.

The Senate should heed the quiet, sound advice of former senator Mark Hatfield, one of the first U.S. soldiers to walk the streets of Hiroshima after the nuclear strike on that city. He said, "It is clear to me that ratifying [the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty] would be in the national interest. 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."

The description of a nuclear war in which, as Nikita Khrushchev said, "the living would envy the dead" should motivate every American to demand that our country ratify this treaty now.

The Senate has a choice. It can pay attention to the hysteria of those who have opposed nearly every arms-control agreement in the past, or it can muster the courage to ratify this treaty and offer the world the full promise of our leadership to fight the further spread of nuclear weapons and reduce the threat of nuclear war.

The writer is a Democratic senator from North Dakota.

Clinton Campaigns for Test Ban Treaty

By Charles Babington
Washington Post Staff Writer
Tuesday, October 5, 1999; Page A5

President Clinton, suddenly given a make-or-break chance to achieve one of his administration's top priorities, yesterday launched a full-scale campaign to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in the face of extensive Senate opposition.

Clinton, who had dispatched the vice president and top aides to speak for the treaty over the weekend, personally took charge of the lobbying effort yesterday, raising the stakes for an issue likely to be recorded as a major accomplishment or keen defeat for his presidency. He spoke to reporters, assembled his national security team and said he will speak individually and in small groups with senators whose minds he needs to change if he is to gather the two-thirds majority needed when the treaty comes up for a ratification vote next week.

"This is very important to protecting our people from the danger of nuclear war," the president said at the White House. "It would be, in my judgment, a grave mistake not to ratify the treaty."

Much is riding on the outcome of next week's vote in both political and military circles. Clinton, like previous presidents, argues that the treaty would preserve U.S. nuclear superiority and prevent proliferation in other countries. A Senate rejection would mark the first defeat of a major treaty proposal since the end of World War I, signaling a new willingness by Congress to challenge the executive branch on arms control matters in the wake of the Cold War's thaw.

"A victory will be an important part of [Clinton's] positive legacy; a defeat will be an important part of his negative legacy," said John Isaacs, president of the Council for a Livable World, a prominent advocate of the treaty. "It's a long shot."

Clinton acknowledged that he lacks enough votes in the Senate right now. While their leaders say all 45 Democrats support the treaty, only seven Republicans have come out in favor, leaving the White House 15 votes shy of the number it needs.

The White House scored a small tactical victory yesterday when Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-N.C.)--who had long refused to hold hearings on the treaty--reluctantly scheduled one for Thursday, with Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright among the witnesses. The Armed Services Committee will open hearings today.

But Helms and other Senate GOP leaders made clear their antagonism

toward the treaty, accusing the administration of disinformation and arguing that the pact would prevent the United States from modernizing its nuclear arsenal.

"The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is dangerous and should be defeated when it comes to a vote in the Senate next Tuesday," said Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.).

The 1996 treaty has been signed by 154 nations, including the United States, but the U.S. Senate never ratified it. Only 47 nations have ratified it. Of the 44 nations that are capable of making nuclear weapons and whose approval is needed for the treaty to take effect, only 23 have ratified.

Russia and China are among those who haven't ratified it, and the White House said yesterday they are looking to the United States for leadership on the matter.

Treaty proponents argue that the pact would lock in the nuclear superiority of the United States, which has the world's largest nuclear arsenal and stopped testing in 1992, in part because it can simulate tests with powerful computers. Opponents say the treaty would bar the United States from updating its nuclear weaponry while enemy states might secretly test weapons undetected.

Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman John W. Warner (R-Va.) said a test ban would prevent the United States from testing the reliability of its nuclear arsenal. The treaty would thereby "induce the leader of another nation or some rogue element or some terrorists to challenge the United States." He said he was also concerned about the CIA's inability to monitor low-level nuclear tests by Russia.

The CIA recently concluded that it cannot monitor Russia's low-level nuclear tests precisely enough to ensure compliance with the treaty. Clinton yesterday dismissed such concerns, saying very low-level tests "are hard to pick up now [and] they'll be hard to pick up if this treaty is ratified. If this treaty is ratified, there are new tools to monitor the testing of others." The treaty calls for 321 monitoring sites and on-site visits by inspectors.

"Since we don't need nuclear tests, it is strongly in our interest to achieve agreement that can help prevent other countries, like India, Pakistan, Russia, China, Iran and others, from testing and deploying nuclear weapons," Clinton said. "The treaty will also strengthen our ability to monitor if other countries are engaged in suspicious activities."

Staff writer Helen Dewar contributed to this report.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002

(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 1999 15:46:22 +0200
From: "Fredrik S. Heffermehl" <fredpax@online.no>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Abolition 2000 - of Age?? (Xanthe/Pamela)
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: fredpax@mail.online.no

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igcb.igc.org id GAB09123

>From Fredrik S. Heffermehl
Oslo, Oct. 5, 1999

Dear friends,

In an email a week ago Xanthe + Pamela praised Abolition 2000 and the merits of keeping a loose network. In a long article, they wrote a.o.:

>Another complaint is that we do not focus enough. Some think all of
>us should be doing the same thing at one time. Again, if your lines >of
>connection are healthy and strong, and you have a good idea - put >it out
>there. If it speaks to people's imaginations they will pick up >the idea
>and join with you in implementing it. But looking for >positions of power
>over others to take majority decisions that are >intended to force ideas
>on others results in a mirroring of the
>institution we wish to abolish. The reason we have structured >ourselves
>differently is because we want a different world.)

If there are "Some (who) think all of us should be doing the same thing at one time", I am not one of them. And I am not "looking for positions of power over others". But I do think there should be some, many, who do very focussed, coordinated work. I can't even exclude that I will be better served by accepting the wisdom and ideas of others (in exceptional cases). Is "forcing" ideas on others or the lack of coordinated cooperation the worst problem in voluntary work?

Our loose network will, I'm afraid, take VERY long to achieve its goal, - if it will ever get there. We may dislike the way our societies are structured, but if we make the additional goal of abolishing all forms of power the first step on our way to a nuclear treaty, we should not have had year 2000 in our name.

I think everyone should continue to contribute what suits their capacity and skills, and no one should dictate anyone. But we will not succeed if the tool is blunt and a coordinated progress plan, a political (+ media) strategy, is lacking. To win support one needs to concentrate and convey a message which is easy to communicate, and which is in fact communicated heavily. (Not see professional publicity assistance as under our dignity, like one did recently!)

The need is for a tool, (a needle?). Instead of a frustrating amount of patient long term expectation in some recent emails, I would have liked an

eager insistence on real progress during this year's UNGA, a "Nuclear Negotiations Now" campaign, in order to get started well ahead of April 2000. Otherwise the risk is that the whole NPT will unravel during the 2000 Review conference.

In preparation for the Hague conference I edited a collection on peace for IPB (the International Peace Bureau). The 31 success stories in the book have been selected to spread enthusiasm and trust, by showing the possibilities of both democratic and individual action, the results achieved through New Diplomacy etc. Wishing to show that the peace movement is more than dreams, "Peace is Possible" (name of book) contains articles by ao. Rotblat, Dalai Lama, and three other Nobel laureates, Ellsberg, Vanunu and Lee Butler.

I must say that the articles on two successful CSO campaigns, on landmines and the International Criminal Court, written by Jody Williams and Bill Pace, both confirm a belief I have expressed earlier to the network. In emails in November 97, following the Nobel award to Jody W and the ICBL, I held that to succeed there is need for a much firmer organisation than the Abolition 2000 model.

The two successful campaigns had strong secretaries/secretariats, steering groups, that made decisions on approach, policy and strategy, intermediate and long term goals, organised supporters with great energy, had representatives and spokespersons (vital element!) with mandates which nations could discuss with and make deals with, cooperate with.

It takes two to tango, and if this last element, persons representative of someone or something, is lacking, it will be unnecessarily hard for the "system" to abolish nuclear weapons to move the official, government system.

The World Court Project was, I believe, much nearer such a model than Abolition 2000 is. A well organised, strong "New Diplomacy" campaign for a treaty is not necessarily in conflict with a continuing Abolition 2000, but means that some organisations must choose a much more stringent, goal-oriented approach where they can communicate with various actors in a credible way.

The NAC (New Agenda Coalition) and MPI (Middle Power Initiative) certainly are a good start on part of what is needed on the two sides (governments and CSOs).

I am sure that there are many in the network who agree with Xanthe/Pamela and wish to continue along the lines pursued so far. They should do so. At the same time I think there are persons like me who are not putting too much energy into the Abolition 2000 in its present form, but who would feel differently about an organised campaign for a nuclear treaty.

I neither will nor can organise such an effort, but would find it interesting to know of likeminded organisations or persons. Who would like to see a Coalition for a Nuclear Weapons Convention?

Best greetings,

Fredrik S. Heffermehl

* Fredrik S. HEFFERMEHL *
* President, Norwegian Peace Alliance *
* Vice President, International Peace Bureau *
* Vice Pres., I Assn. Lawyers Ag. Nuclar Arms *
* International Free Vanunu Committee *
* *
* N. Juels g. 28 A, N-0272 Oslo, Norway *
* Phone +47-2244 8003 (fax: +47-2244 7616) *
* E-mail: fredpax@online.no *

From: Maureen_T._Shea@who.eop.gov

Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 15:25:40 -0400

Subject: State Update

To: washofc@aol.com, DenHartz@erols.com, CWU_Washington.parti@ecunet.org,
washofc@aol.com, thart@dfms.org, jskipper@dfms.org, epf@igc.apc.org,
disarm@forusa.org, joe@fcnl.org, kathytim@earthlink.net,
kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, mark.brown@ecunet.org,
J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org, mknolldc@igc.org, mupj@igc.org,
jsammon@networkloby.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org,
Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org, lwyolton@prodigy.net, uuawo@aol.com,
lintnerj@ucc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org,
mupj@igc.org, lisaw@nccusa.org, jnoble@uahc.org, jsmith@clw.org,
sampsone@panet.US-STATE.gov, johnmillspaugh@hotmail.com

X-Lotus-FromDomain: EOP

The State Department will be doing updates on CTBT and I will send them on to you:

(See attached file: state1.doc)

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\state1.doc"

X-Sender: maureene@earthlink.net

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.5 (32)

Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 16:03:42 -0400

To: cdavis@clw.org, dkimball@clw.org, jsmith@clw.org, syoung@clw.org,
kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, ieer@ieer.org, mupj@igc.org,
cpaine@nrdc.org, fteplitz@peace-action.org, epank@peacenet.org,
kathycrandall@earthlink.net, 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, fellow@2020vision.org

From: maureen eldredge <maureene@earthlink.net>

Subject: Specific fax alerts

I have state specific fax alerts for TN, OH, KY, CO, and WA, if you want to use them. They include the polling data and the specific senators phone and fax numbers. If you want them, I can attach files for your use.

-M

Maureen Eldredge
Program Director
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

Ph: 202-833-4668

Fax: 202-234-9536

email: maureene@earthlink.net

To: marsusab@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Mark,

I had one two many "s" the first time. I hope the formatting comes through.

Howard

Swing Vote Senators on the CTBT

Address letters to the senator at:

____ Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

State	Senator	Office Building	Telephone
Alaska	Frank Murkowski	322 Hart	(202) 224-6665
	Ted Stevens	522 Hart	(202) 224-3004
Arizona	John McCain	241 Russell	(202) 224-2235
Colorado	Wayne Allard	513 Hart	(202) 224-5941
	Ben Nighthorse Campbell	380 Russell	(202) 224-5852

Delaware	William Roth, Jr.	104 Hart	(202) 224-2441
Florida	Connie Mack	517 Hart	(202) 224-5274
Georgia	Paul Coverdell	200 Russell	(202) 224-3643
Idaho	Mike Crapo	111 Russell	(202) 224-6142
Indiana	Richard Lugar	306 Hart	(202) 224-4814

Illinois	Peter Fitzgerald	555 Dirksen	(202) 224-2854
Iowa	Chuck Grassley	135 Hart	(202) 224-3744
Kansas	Sam Brownback	303 Hart	(202) 224-6521
	Pat Roberts	302 Hart	(202) 224-4774
Kentucky	Jim Bunning	818 Hart	(202) 224-4343
	Mitch McConnell	361-A Russell	(202) 224-2541

Maine	Susan Collins	172 Russell	(202) 224-2523
	Olympia Snowe	250 Russell	(202) 224-5344
Michigan	Spencer Abraham	329 Dirksen	(202) 224-4822
Minnesota	Rod Grams	257 Dirksen	(202) 224-3244
Missouri	John Ashcroft	316 Hart	(202) 224-6154
	Christopher Bond	274 Dirksen	(202) 224-5721
Montana	Conrad Burns	187 Dirksen	(202) 224-2644

Nebraska	Charles Hagel	346 Russell	(202) 224-4224
New Hampshire	Judd Gregg	393 Russell	(202) 224-3324
New Mexico	Pete Domenici	328 Hart	(202) 224-6621
Ohio	Mike DeWine	140 Russell	(202) 224-2315
	George Voinovich	317 Hart	(202) 224-3353

Oregon Gordon Smith 404 Russell (202) 224-3753
Pennsylvania Rick Santorum 120 Russell (202) 224-6324
South Carolina Strom Thurmond 217 Russell (202) 224-5972
Tennessee William Frist 567 Dirksen (202) 224-3344
Fred Thompson 523 Dirksen (202) 224-4944
Texas Kay Bailey Hutchinson 284 Russell (202) 224-5922

Utah Robert Bennett 431 Dirksen (202) 224-5444
Orrin Hatch 131 Dirksen (202) 224-5251
Virginia John Warner 225 Russell (202) 224-2023
Washington Slade Gorton 730 Hart (202) 224-3441
Wyoming Mike Enzi 290 Russell (202) 224-3424
Craig Thomas 109 Hart (202) 224-6441

To: scbeginnings@juno.com
From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: poetry
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Jenine:

Thank you for accepting my two poems. I look forward to receiving a complementary copy of "Beginnings." You do not need to send the other poems back, since I have copies.

I have passed the word to my critique group. How many times a year will "Beginnings" be published? Good luck. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Carlee Hallman (301) 897-3668
6508 Wilmett Rd.
Bethesda, MD 20817-2308

Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 15:05:27 -0400
From: ASlater <aslater@gracelinks.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Re: Abolition 2000 - of Age?? (Xanthe/Pamela)
To: fredpax@online.no (fredpax@online.no), abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by igc7.igc.org id MAA16050
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.0.2
X-Sender: slatera@204.141.205.3

X-MIME-Autoconverted: from 8bit to quoted-printable by igc7.igc.org id MAB16528

Dear Frederick,

I like your slogan for "Nuclear Negotiations Now". Since the negotiation of a treaty to ban the bomb is the number 1 demand of our abolition statement, we don't need to make any decisions on whether that's an appropriate action for the network. Indeed we re-affirmed at our Annual Meeting in the Hague, that this was a prime objective for the coming year. Alyn Ware has re-invigorated the Abolition 2000 Working Group for a Nuclear Weapons Convention and perhaps the coalition of focussed organizations you envision can come out of that Working Group. Regards, Alice

At 09:46 AM 10/05/1999 -0400, fredpax@online.no wrote:

>From Fredrik S. Heffermehl

>Oslo, Oct. 5, 1999

>

>Dear friends,

>

>In an email a week ago Xanthe + Pamela praised Abolition 2000 and the
>merits of keeping a loose network. In a long article, they wrote a.o.:

>

>>>Another complaint is that we do not focus enough. Some think all of
>>>us should be doing the same thing at one time. Again, if your lines >of
>>>connection are healthy and strong, and you have a good idea - put >it out
>>>there. If it speaks to people's imaginations they will pick up >the idea
>>>and join with you in implementing it. But looking for >positions of
>>power

>>>over others to take majority decisions that are >intended to force ideas
>>>on others results in a mirroring of the
>>>institution we wish to abolish. The reason we have structured >ourselves
>>>differently is because we want a different world.)

>

>

>If there are "Some (who) think all of us should be doing the same thing at
>one time", I am not one of them. And I am not "looking for positions of
>power over others". But I do think there should be some, many, who do very
>focussed, coordinated work. I can't even exclude that I will be better
>served by accepting the wisdom and ideas of others (in exceptional cases).
>Is "forcing" ideas on others or the lack of coordinated cooperation the
>worst problem in voluntary work?

>

>Our loose network will, I'm afraid, take VERY long to achieve its goal, -
>if it will ever get there. We may dislike the way our societies are
>structured, but if we make the additional goal of abolishing all forms of

>power the first step on our way to a nuclear treaty, we should not have had
>year 2000 in our name.

>

>

>I think everyone should continue to contribute what suits their capacity
>and skills, and no one should dictate anyone. But we will not succeed if
>the tool is blunt and a coordinated progress plan, a political (+ media)
>strategy, is lacking. To win support one needs to concentrate and convey a
>message which is easy to communicate, and which is in fact communicated
>heavily. (Not see professional publicity assistance as under our dignity,
>like one did recently!)

>

>The need is for a tool, (a needle?). Instead of a frustrating amount of
>patient long term expectation in some recent emails, I would have liked an
>eager insistence on real progress during this year's UNGA, a "Nuclear
>Negotiations Now" campaign, in order to get started well ahead of April
>2000. Otherwise the risk is that the whole NPT will unravel during the 2000
>Review cfrce.

>

>In preparation for the Hague cfrce I edited a collection on peace for IPB
>(the International Peace Bureau). The 31 success stories in the book have
>been selected to spread enthusiasm and trust, by showing the
>possibilities of both democratic and individual action, the results
>achieved through New Diplomacy etc. Wishing to show that the peace movement
>is more than dreams, "Peace is Possible" (name of book) contains articles
>by ao. Rotblat, Dalai Lama, and three other Nobel laureates, Ellsberg,
>Vanunu and Lee Butler.

>

>I must say that the articles on two successful CSO campaigns, on landmines
>and the International Criminal Court, written by Jody Williams and Bill
>Pace, both confirm a belief I have expressed earlier to the network. In
>emails in November 97, following the Nobel award to Jody W and the ICBL, I
>held that to succeed there is need for a much firmer organisation than the
>Abolition 2000 model.

>

>The two successful campaigns had strong secretaries/secretariats, steering
>groups, that made decisions on approach, policy and strategy, intermediate
>and long term goals, organised supporters with great energy, had
>representatives and spokespersons (vital element!) with mandates which
>nations could discuss with and make deals with, cooperate with.

>

>It takes two to tango, and if this last element, persons representative of
>someone or something, is lacking, it will be unnecessarily hard for the
>"system" to abolish nuclear weapons to move the official, government
>system.

>

>The World Court Project was, I believe, much nearer such a model than
>Abolition 2000 is. A well organised, strong "New Diplomacy" campaign for a
>treaty is not necessarily in conflict with a continuing Abolition 2000, but
>means that some organisations must choose a much more stringent,
>goal-oriented approach where they can communicate with various actors in a
>credible way.

>

>The NAC (New Agenda Coalition) and MPI (Middle Power Initiative) certainly

>are a good start on part of what is needed on the two sides (governments
>and CSOs).

>
>
>I am sure that there are many in the network who agree with Xanthe/Pamela
>and wish to continue along the lines pursued so far. They should do so. At
>the same time I think there are persons like me who are not putting too
>much energy into the Abolition 2000 in its present form, but who would feel
>differently about an organised campaign for a nuclear treaty.

>
>I neither will nor can organise such an effort, but would find it
>interesting to know of likeminded organisations or persons. Who would like
>to see a Coaliton for a Nuclear Weapons Convention?

>
>Best greetings,

>
>Fredrik S. Heffermehl

>
>
>
>
>*****

>* Fredrik S. HEFFERMEHL *
>* President, Norwegian Peace Alliance *
>* Vice President, International Peace Bureau *
>* Vice Pres., I Assn. Lawyers Ag. Nuclar Arms *
>* International Free Vanunu Committee *
>* *
>* N. Juels g. 28 A, N-0272 Oslo, Norway *
>* Phone +47-2244 8003 (fax: +47-2244 7616) *
>* E-mail: fredpax@online.no *

>*****

>
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.

X-Sender: napf@silcom.com
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 12:52:50 -0700
To: sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
From: Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <wagingpeace@napf.org>
Subject: (sunflower-napf) Action Alert - CTBT
Sender: owner-sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com
Reply-To: sunflower-napf@lists.xmission.com

ACTION ALERT - CTBT

Senate Vote Scheduled Oct. 12th on Ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
Contact Your Senators and Urge a Yes Vote

BACKGROUND

On Sept. 24, 1996 President Clinton signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), an international treaty banning nuclear weapons test explosions. A year later the CTBT was sent to the Senate for ratification. In order for the treaty to enter into force, it must be ratified by 44 nations including the US. It would be a breach of faith if the US did not ratify the treaty; yet for 22 months, Senator Jesse Helms single-handedly held back the treaty from vote on the Senate floor by not releasing it from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Last week the CTBT was discharged from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. A full Senate debate on treaty ratification begins on Thursday, October 7th. Since Oct. 11th is a federal holiday, the vote on ratification is scheduled for Tuesday, October 12th.

ACTION

Now is the time to put all your efforts into urging all senators to vote in favor of ratification. Correspondence must be received by your Senators by October 7th or October 8th in order for it to impact their decisions. When you e-mail the Senators, be sure to give your postal address so they know your constituency.

SAMPLE LETTER

Dear Senator _____ :

I urge you to vote for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Recent polls conducted by The Mellman Group and Wirthlin Worldwide concluded that 82 percent of Americans support the ratification of the CTBT. It is in the best interest of the US to ratify the CTBT. Our ratification will pressure Russia and China to follow suit. The US must set an example if India and Pakistan are to sign and ratify the treaty. The CTBT will guard against the renewal of the nuclear arms race. The CTBT will curb nuclear weapons proliferation. The CTBT will strengthen the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The CTBT is effectively verifiable. The CTBT will prohibit other nations from nuclear testing. The CTBT will protect human health and the environment. It is in the best interests of the US. Vote yes for ratification of the CTBT and urge your fellow Senators to do the same.

Sincerely,

Your Name and Address

TO LOCATE YOUR SENATOR BY ZIPCODE AND SEND A LETTER BY E-MAIL, GO TO
<http://congress.nw.dc.us/physicians/congdir.html> or to locate by state, go

to <http://www.senate.gov/>

To write to your Senators* by postal mail, the addresses to use are:

The Honorable (First Name, Last Name)

United States Senate

Washington DC 20510

* be sure to send the letter as quickly as possible, by Express Mail, FedEx,
etc.

-

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.

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 17:16:54 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: NGO activities on the CTBT, 10/5

October 5

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

The following is a brief summary of activities that the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is aware that are being pursued in support of the Test Ban Treaty. The information is somewhat incomplete due to the fluid nature of events. Please contact me if you are in need of further details — D. Kimball

OCTOBER 4-12

- * mobilization of activists networks to contact the Senate on the CTBT (dozens of organizations)
- * Individual meetings for Coalition member group representatives and expert with key Senate CTBT aides, when possible
- * 8 Key community leaders from Alaska, New Mexico, Tennessee, Ohio and other states flying in to meet with their Senators (Wednesday and Thursday)
- * Ongoing editorial board advisory work on CTBT and follow-up calls (20/20 Vision); and editorial board advisory fax-blast by the Coalition
- * DC television market ads in support of the CTBT (Council for a Livable World)
- * Media consultants working reporters and pushing CTBT experts lists
- * Religious leaders for the CTBT press conference on the Hill to release letter signed by hundreds of national and regional leaders from various denominations (Thursday at time and location tba)
- * mobilization of heads of communion to call or come to Washington to visit swing Senators in their offices.
- * Half-page Roll Call ad featuring the religious leaders letter and support for placement Thursday
- * LAWS CTBT Support Committee is circulating a letter of support from former military and national security officials for distribution to the Hill by Wed. or Thursday
- * Seismological Society of America/American Geophysical Union statement on CTBT verification. (October 6)

* phone banking designed to produce 5000-7000 contacts to the Senate (coordinated through Disarmament Clearinghouse w/cooperation from several peace, environmental and religious organizations)

* Working Assets flash activist network approx. 10,000 potential callers (Beginning October 8)

* Ongoing Issue Briefs and News Releases for distribution to press, editors, and hill offices as necessary (Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and other organizations)

* 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 Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. (Release date October 6).

* NGO delegation to Article XIV Conference on EIF (October 6-8 in Vienna)

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Wed, 06 Oct 1999 09:45:03 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news and analysis on CTBT, 10/6

October 6, 1999

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: today's early news on CTBT -- NOT OVER TILL ITS OVER ... KEEP THE PRESSURE FOR TREATY GOING

This morning's news reports underscore that there has so far been little visible movement by undecided Senators in the direction of ratification. But the campaign for the Treaty has hardly begun.

As a result of the early head-counting, some "undecided" Republicans, who are under enormous pressure from both pro-Treaty and anti-Treaty forces, are suggesting that the Treaty be withdrawn from consideration -- a solution that solves their biggest problem, which is having to commit themselves one way or the other, but fails to provide the leadership the historic opportunity demands. Some of the Rs arguing for withdrawal include Hagel and Domenici.

Some Democrats are talking about this also including Bingaman and Kerry. Though it is frustrating to see some Senators talking about withdrawal only 4 days after the vote was scheduled, it is understandable that reasonable people do not want to see the Treaty defeated after all the effort and time devoted to the Treaty and given how vital the Treaty is to U.S. and international security. Some Democratic Senators argue that if the Treaty is withdrawn, we still will have succeeded by exposing the failure of some Senators to stand up for the Treaty, the opposition of others, and securing the national media attention and White House focus that the issue has always merited.

As of this hour, my contacts at the White House say that they are continuing to push hard for the Treaty and are preparing for the vote on Tuesday the 12th.

The campaign for the Treaty has hardly begun. Senators have not yet heard from all the pro-CTBT supporters they are going to hear from; we are only moving into the second day of hearings; and the White House is only increasing its already significant level of activity.

Are our efforts wasted or should we slow up given the talk of defeat and withdrawal? DEFINITELY NO.

Furthermore, WE CANNOT LET UP IN OUR EFFORTS efforts to gain support for the Test Ban Treaty in the face of talk about withdrawing the Treaty. Why?

First, because it may not be possible to withdraw the Treaty from consideration and a vote on the 12th of October -- doing so requires another unanimous consent agreement, which may be blocked by a small group of Senators, like Jon Kyl (R-AZ) who is saying that the Treaty should be defeated because it would show that America is committed to maintaining and even improving its nuclear deterrent.

Prospects for an agreement to withdraw the Treaty at this time are around 50-50.

Second, even if it might be withdrawn, the Treaty will come up again and these Senators will remember whether or not they heard from their constituents on the issue.

Therefore we should move ahead and do our part to make the politicians hear the voices of their constituents and be prepared for the still scheduled vote on final passage on Tuesday.

Key stories and remarks attached below are:

- * "Votes Scarce for Nuke Test Ban," By Terence Hunt AP White House Correspondent, Oct. 5, 1999; 7:49 p.m. EDT
- * "Test Ban Vote May Be Set Aside," By Roberto Suro and Helen Dewar, Washington Post Staff Writers, October 6, 1999
- * "Both Parties Seek Graceful Way to Put Off Nuclear Treaty Vote," The New York Times, October 6, 1999

More updates later

DK

"Votes Scarce for Nuke Test Ban"

By Terence Hunt
AP White House Correspondent
Tuesday, Oct. 5, 1999; 7:49 p.m. EDT

WASHINGTON — A landmark treaty pushed by President Clinton to ban nuclear testing worldwide appeared doomed Tuesday as Republican opposition hardened and a senior Democrat conceded there were not enough votes to ratify it.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., offered to postpone a scheduled vote on the treaty next Tuesday – but only if the administration asserted it was seeking the delay. Lott also said he would not agree to any plan under which the treaty could be called up again before 2001.

"If we're going to vote on this issue in this Congress, it's going to be next

Tuesday or Wednesday," Lott told reporters Tuesday night. The White House continued to proceed as if the planned vote would occur. It appeared that neither Republicans nor the administration wanted to be blamed for shelving the treaty.

"As far as we're concerned, as far as we know, there is a vote scheduled for Tuesday and we intend to make every effort to succeed," National Security Adviser Sandy Berger said. However, he said there was a recognition by some senators that a mere week of debate was not a lot of time and "a cause for concern to some."

Both Lott and Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle took to the Senate floor late Tuesday to say they were trying to work out a compromise, but none had jelled yet.

"All we can do is continue to discuss the matter," Daschle, D-S.D., said as Clinton prepared to press for the treaty before a group of senators he invited to a White House dinner

Earlier, Sen. Joseph Biden of Delaware, the senior Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, predicted that the Republican leadership would "pull down the vote" within 24 hours.

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty has been signed by 154 nations but ratified by only two of the seven acknowledged nuclear powers, Britain and France.

Biden said it looked as if the treaty battle was degenerating into an almost straight party-line vote. Assuming all 45 Senate Democrats voted for the treaty, the president still would need 22 Republicans to gain the necessary 67 votes for ratification, and GOP support was disappearing.

"Republicans have vanished into the ether," Biden said. A defeat of the treaty would be a humiliating loss for Clinton, who had argued that it was vital for America's national security interests and a deterrent to the spread of nuclear weapons.

"I think for the Senate to reject it would send a terrible message," the president said at the White House. "It would say to the whole world, 'Look, America's not going to test but if you want to test, go right ahead. We're not interested in leading the world toward nonproliferation anymore.'"

The already slim prospects for ratification of the treaty declined further late Tuesday when Biden said he had told Clinton the votes were not there.

Clinton complained that Republicans were rushing consideration of the treaty. Further, he said, Republicans were "under enormous pressure" not to side with the administration.

Republicans who often agree with the administration on international issues, including Sens. Richard Lugar of Indiana, John Warner of Virginia and Pete Domenici of New Mexico, all have signaled their opposition to

the treaty.

Many prominent Republicans – including GOP presidential hopeful George W. Bush – say the treaty is not verifiable and would not stop the nuclear ambitions of North Korea and Iran. Further, they argue it would harm efforts to maintain the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

Clinton said the United States stopped testing in 1992 and has no intention of resuming.

The White House appeared surprised by the swift turn against the treaty on Capitol Hill. The president had invited a bipartisan group of senators to dinner to lobby for the pact and had defended it during two appearances – once at the White House and again at a Pentagon bill-signing ceremony. The White House also offered a briefing on the treaty with four experts.

Daryl Kimball, director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, a treaty advocacy group, said the organization still wanted to see a vote.

"It's clear that the fight for the 67 votes is difficult and there has been no movement since Friday," Kimball said. "The consequences of delay would be tremendous, but the responsibility for that would lie at the feet of those who vote against it."

The Armed Services Committee held a closed-door hearing on whether the nation's nuclear stockpiles could be maintained in the absence of testing. Participants later said there was lively discussion on whether, if the treaty were voted down, pressure would increase to resume testing.

© Copyright 1999 The Associated Press

Test Ban Vote May Be Set Aside

By Roberto Suro and Helen Dewar
Washington Post Staff Writers
Wednesday, October 6, 1999; Page A1

Senate Democrats and Republicans scrambled yesterday to avoid a high-stakes confrontation over a treaty banning the testing of nuclear weapons, as both sides appeared increasingly convinced that they would be better off politically without a vote.

After delaying consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty for more than two years, the Republican leadership surprised the White House last week by scheduling a quick vote on ratification for next Tuesday.

While Republicans clearly have enough votes to defeat the treaty, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) started backing away yesterday, saying "the timing is not right" for a decision. But he also insisted he would only consider calling off the vote if the administration and Democrats agreed not to push for ratification until after next year's elections.

Democrats suggested that Republicans had been intimidated by a White House lobbying effort that portrayed defeat of the treaty as an invitation to proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Third World and the starting bell for a new arms race with Russia and China.

Some Democratic leaders, meanwhile, concluded that they would prefer to let the issue drop rather than face certain defeat in a vote next week.

President Clinton has considered the treaty a top legislative priority since he sent it to the Senate for ratification in 1997, but as yesterday's parliamentary maneuvering unfolded, the White House seemed increasingly resigned to the prospect that he will leave office without seeing it adopted.

Democrats were considering a Republican plan to put off a vote until after a new Congress and president are elected next year, although the minority had not agreed to it, according to Senate aides who said a decision on how to proceed could be made as early as today.

Late yesterday White House aides stopped short of saying they would insist on a vote if calls for a postponement grow louder. Asked whether he thought the Senate should delay action, Clinton said, "I'm going to work and do the best I can, and we'll see what happens."

The treaty, which Clinton signed in 1996, would ban all weapons tests that produce a nuclear chain reaction. In addition, it would establish an

international monitoring system with more than 300 sensors to measure seismic activity and other indications of testing, and the treaty would allow for inspections of suspected test sites.

Although 154 nations have signed the treaty, only 47 have ratified it.

Clinton administration is most concerned about -- have indicated that they are waiting for the United States to act before they consider ratification. So far, the treaty has been ratified by only 23 of the 44 nuclear-capable countries that must confirm it before it legally takes effect.

"It will end nuclear weapons testing forever, while allowing us to maintain our military strength in nuclear weapons and helping to keep other countries out of the nuclear weapons business," Clinton said yesterday at a Pentagon ceremony.

Even as opinion in the Senate shifted toward avoiding a confrontation, Republicans and Democrats jockeyed to see who would end up taking responsibility.

Lott insisted that Clinton and the Democrats would have to take the first step. "If they would indicate some willingness to let the next administration and the next Congress consider this and vote on it, we'd entertain that," he said.

Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr. (Del.), the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, predicted that the vote would be canceled within the next 24 hours, with Democrats joining Republicans in postponing consideration of the treaty.

Ratification would require assent by two-thirds of the Senate. Republicans have the 34 votes to defeat the treaty but face the difficult choice of inviting political as well as international risk by

voting against it, or defying
their party leaders by voting for it. "It's a question of
which poison they get
to take -- arsenic or hemlock," Biden said.

He added that he did not believe any Republican would
want to run next
year having voted to "kill a treaty that said no one
could explode nuclear
weapons."

The administration argues that the treaty will inhibit
the kind of full-scale
nuclear testing that other countries need for development
of new weapons
or testing of their existing arsenals. The United States,
on the other hand,
has a \$4.5 billion-a-year program for "stockpile
stewardship" using
superior technology that, according to the
administration, ensures the
reliability of U.S. weapons without testing.

In addition, the treaty contains provisions for
inspections and monitoring
that would improve the U.S. ability to detect and analyze
foreign nuclear
tests, according to administration officials.

Republicans have raised two major objections to the
treaty. They argue
that the U.S. inventory of nuclear weapons will
deteriorate without
adequate testing. With the CIA encountering technical
difficulties gathering
information on other countries' low-level nuclear tests,
the Republicans
also contend that the treaty is impossible to verify.

Sen. John F. Kerry (D-Mass.), a member of the Foreign
Relations
Committee, said Clinton had not formally requested that
the vote be
postponed. But, he added, "I think it would be the White
House
preference not to have a vote now."

In late afternoon, Lott and Minority Leader Thomas A.
Daschle (D-S.D.)
spoke on the Senate floor and agreed to start
negotiations over a means
to postpone the vote. As the Senate session ended
yesterday evening,
Lott returned to the floor to dispel rumors of an

imminent deal. "Just calm
down and relax," he told his colleagues, adding that for
the time being the
vote was still on, but that he and Daschle were
discussing alternatives.

After his remarks on the floor, Lott told reporters that
the vote would be
held next week unless the administration agreed to forgo
consideration of
the treaty for the remainder of the 106th Congress, which
lasts through the
end of next year. "If we're going to vote on this issue
in this Congress, it's
going to be next Tuesday or Wednesday," he said.

Biden said that if the vote were postponed, Democrats
will have
accomplished "all they set out to do," including
hearings, media attention
and an "energized" president, which was not the case a
couple of days
ago. "The debate is engaged, and the Republicans are
exposed, and we
live to fight another day," he said.

Staff writer Charles Babbington contributed to this report.

October 6, 1999

Both Parties Seek Graceful Way to Put Off
Nuclear Treaty Vote

Related Articles

32 Nobel Laureates in Physics Back Atomic Test Ban
Clinton Kicks Off Campaign to Pass Nuclear Test Ban (Oct. 5, 1999)

By ERIC SCHMITT

WASHINGTON -- With both sides acknowledging that the
Senate would soundly reject a landmark treaty banning
underground nuclear testing, Democrats and Republicans Tuesday each
sought a face-saving way to put off a vote and declare victory.

Lawmakers from both parties expressed concern that defeating the
pact,
the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, would be an embarrassing
diplomatic setback, sending the wrong message to emerging nuclear
powers like India and Pakistan that are closely watching the

Senate's
action.

Senator Pete Domenici, a senior Republican from New Mexico who
opposes the treaty, said he would ask Clinton at a private White
House
dinner tonight to shelve the accord rather than have it rejected.
"There
are international ramifications for killing it," he said.

Senator Joseph R. Biden of Delaware, a top Democratic supporter of
the test ban, said withdrawing the treaty now would achieve the
Democrats' goal of holding hearings on a treaty that has been
bottled up
in the Foreign Relations Committee for more than two years, and
allow
backers to "live to fight another day."

But both sides sought to avoid being seen as caving in to
pressure. The
Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, and his Democratic counterpart,
Thomas A. Daschle, took to the Senate floor tonight to tamp down
rumors within their ranks and to announce that top aides were
working to
negotiate a graceful way out.

The initial results were not encouraging. Lott, who as majority
leader
controls what matters may come to the floor, demanded that President
Clinton request that the treaty be withdrawn, and that Democrats
wait
until after the 2000 elections to bring up the treaty with a new
Congress
and new Administration. Daschle's aides and White House officials
immediately rejected that offer and ratcheted up the brinkmanship
that
has consumed one of Clinton's top foreign policy goals.

"The President has not requested the treaty be withdrawn," said
David C.
Leavy, a spokesman for the National Security Council. "This deal may
not get done, so we're moving full steam ahead."

But the White House's confidence smacked of false bravado. Biden
said
today that he had told Clinton that treaty supporters were well
short of
the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution to ratify
the pact. All
45 Democrats are likely to vote for the treaty, but only two
Republicans
publicly support it. Opponents say they have more than 40 firm votes
against the treaty, surpassing the 34 needed to kill it.

Despite these odds, Clinton and his top national security aides lobbied for a second straight day for a treaty that supporters say will curb the development of advanced nuclear weapons. Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright and Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen called undecided Republicans. The President's national security adviser, Samuel R. Berger, talked strategy with Senate Democrats at their weekly policy lunch.

"If the Senate rejects the treaty, we run a far greater risk that nuclear arsenals will grow and weapons will spread to volatile regions, to dangerous rulers, even to terrorists," Clinton told reporters.

Sentiments on Capitol Hill shifted on the first day of hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee, and a week before the Senate is scheduled to vote on what Senator Chuck Hagel, a Nebraska Republican, said would be "one of the most important votes we'll ever cast."

Arms control experts from the Central Intelligence Agency and Department of Energy testified in a closed session about the problems of verifying low-level nuclear explosions under the treaty, which has been signed by more than 150 countries. The Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, Gen. John Gordon of the Air Force, gave a classified briefing to the Senate Intelligence Committee on similar issues.

Military officials are to testify on Wednesday and Secretary Albright on Thursday. Opponents say the treaty provisions cannot be adequately verified, and would undermine the nation's ability to insure the reliability of its nuclear arsenal. The United States stopped nuclear testing in 1992, and now maintains its weapons with a \$4.5 billion annual program that uses nonnuclear explosive experiments, including sophisticated computer models.

Critics Tuesday released a letter from the former Senate majority leader, Bob Dole, who called the treaty "an ill-conceived and misguided arms control agreement."

A spokesman for Gov. George W. Bush of Texas, the frontrunner for the

Republican presidential nomination, said Bush supports the current testing moratorium but opposes a permanent ban on nuclear testing. "He's concerned that the treaty is not verifiable and will not stop countries that pose real threats, like North Korea and Iran," said the spokesman, Scott McClellan.

In the last few weeks, Senate critics have quietly lined up a stable of national security experts who opposed the treaty to advise Senate Republicans. The experts included former Defense Secretaries Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld; a former national security adviser, Brent Scowcroft; and two former Directors of Central Intelligence under Clinton, R. James Woolsey Jr. and John Deutch.

The Senate, after more than two years of delay, last week abruptly scheduled the treaty vote for Oct. 12 or 13. The scheduled vote was prompted after Democrats threatened to tie up legislative business on the Senate floor and Republicans called their bluff, knowing that they had the votes to defeat the treaty. The gravity of the issue seemed to be sinking in today, especially for a small group of undecided Republican moderates on foreign policy like Hagel, Robert F. Bennett of Utah, and Olympia J. Snowe and Susan Collins, both of Maine.

Hagel urged that the vote be postponed, at least for the year, saying that "the issue has become captive to partisan politics." Bennett said he was torn between the treaty's geopolitical merits and its flawed provisions.

Lott said he had balanced those choices: "The safety and reliability and national security aspects of not going forward with this treaty outweigh the ramifications in the international arena."

But even some Republicans rued the situation the Senate is finding itself in. "All things being equal, we'd rather not have this fight," the aide said. "We'd rather not be voting against nuclear tests."

Related Site

This site is not part of The New York Times on the Web, and The

Times has no
control over its content or availability.

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Thu, 07 Oct 1999 01:04:17 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: late news and analysis on CTBT, 10/6

October 6, 1999

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: Report on status of CTBT from John Isaacs (pardon any multiple postings)

The following an up to date analysis of the current state of play on the CTBT from John Isaacs, President of Council for a Livable World, as well as the latest UPI report on late statements on the CTBT:

As of 7:00 P.M., Wednesday evening, there is no deal between Republicans and Democrats on postponing a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. While negotiations are continuing, if no agreement can be reached -- or Senators from either party object to a new agreement -- the Senate will begin debate on the Treaty on Friday with a vote Tuesday or Wednesday.

At this point, Republicans are insisting that Clinton not only withdraw the treaty, but eat a little crow. According to a UPI story today:

"Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., said Wednesday that he wanted Clinton to pull the treaty in writing and promise never to resubmit it during his presidency. But later, a spokesman for Senate Republican leader Trent Lott said the "minimum" would be for Clinton to agree to not return it during the current Congress, which ends in early January 2001, a few weeks before the president officially leaves office. "

Later in the same interview, Helms spoke about digging a knife in: "Now our colleagues on the other side of the aisle obviously realize they don't have the votes to ratify the CTBT, and so they are hoping to dictate the terms of their own surrender," Helms said. "And I say to them, well, that ain't going to happen."

Democrats are insisting on leaving the possibility for a vote next year. Some are pressing for a vote no matter what the odds.

The Administration is continuing full-bore with its campaign on behalf of the treaty. President Clinton told reporters today: "For now the vote is scheduled for Tuesday, and I will continue to aggressively argue to the Senate and to the American people that this is in our national interest."

Senators on both sides of the aisle, however, are calling for postponement.

From a Reuters story today, see the following quotes from Senators Hagel and Levin:

"We should not hold a vote on the CTBT this year," said Republican Sen.

Chuck Hagel of Nebraska. This is far too important of an issue to rush into what will surely be a political vote. We are talking about the future of the United States. This is not a discussion that should be hurried for political or partisan gain."

"If for whatever reason, if the fact of life is that if the treaty is voted on now it will be defeated, we should delay the vote and prevent that defeat, which would be a severe setback in the struggle against the proliferation of nuclear weapons," said Democratic Sen. Carl Levin of Michigan.

Another Reuters article quoted an Administration official as follows: "Other Clinton administration officials suggested it was just a matter of time before some form of compromise was worked out, either to withdraw the treaty entirely or for the Senate to postpone a vote on it for the time being."

That may be true, and then again, it may not be. We will all have to stay tuned.

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

"GOP Issues Ultimatum on CTBT"

WASHINGTON, Oct. 6 (UPI) _ With Democrats facing the prospect of losing a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty next week, Senate Republicans said Wednesday that President Clinton can only halt the process if he makes a formal request that the treaty be withdrawn from the Senate floor and not be considered again next year.

Sen. Jesse Helms, R-N.C., said Wednesday that he wanted Clinton to pull the treaty in writing and promise never to resubmit it during his presidency. But later, a spokesman for Senate Republican leader Trent Lott said the ``minimum" would be for Clinton to agree to not return it during the current Congress, which ends in early January 2001, a few weeks before the president officially leaves office.

The spokesman, John Czwartacki, said ``this is too important of an issue" to be considered on Capitol Hill during next year's key congressional and presidential campaigns.

Clinton promised earlier Wednesday to continue pushing hard for the CTBT. He told reporters in the Rose Garden, ``I fervently believe...that this treaty will restrain the spread of nuclear weapons while enabling us to maintain the effectiveness of our nuclear arsenal."

Later, while surrounded at the White House by members of the nation's

scientific and military elite, Clinton warned gravely of the consequences of a Senate defeat of the treaty. The president said such a move by the United States would give nations such as India, Pakistan and Russia "a green light" to go forward with nuclear testing, declaring: "We have new, serious proliferation threats that our predecessors have not faced. And it is all the more imperative that we do everything we possibly can."

The issue has spawned backroom discussions and temporary deals between the Republicans, Senate Democrats and the White House all week. The Democrats don't have the votes to pass the bill _ it requires 67, a two-thirds majority _ and the Republicans do not want to be saddled with having defeated a major treaty.

White House press secretary Joe Lockhart indicated Wednesday the White House would embrace a delay in consideration of the treaty as long as it gives senators adequate time for review and is not pegged to the election next year. Pointing out that previous arms control treaties have "taken weeks and weeks and weeks," Lockhart said it would be acceptable if senators wanted "more months" of review before voting.

Helms, who held up the treaty in the Senate for more than two years, said he would not let Democrats "call it a draw."

"Now our colleagues on the other side of the aisle obviously realize they don't have the votes to ratify the CTBT, and so they are hoping to dictate the terms of their own surrender," Helms said. "And I say to them, well, that ain't going to happen."

Helms added that he would not want the treaty simply to return to languish in his Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Helms said, "I could do that, but that would not be strong enough to suit me."

The Republican leadership agreed last week to schedule floor debate and hearings on the CTBT after initial vote-counts showed the GOP had enough to keep it from passing. The White House reacted by promising an aggressive campaign to woo GOP fence-sitters.

"After two long years of inaction, one week is very little time for considered action," Clinton said Wednesday. "But for now...I will continue to aggressively argue to the Senate and to the American people that this is in our national interest."

Republicans have stood in staunch opposition to the treaty because they say it will not allow reliable testing of the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. The GOP maintains that current computer modeling systems are not accurate enough. There are also concerns that the CTBT's proposed verification regime of more than 300 monitoring stations worldwide could affect national security.

Hearings on the treaty in the Senate Armed Services Committee began Tuesday and are scheduled to run through Thursday. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright is also expected to pitch the merits of the CTBT before the Foreign Relations Committee on Thursday.

Full debate on the Senate floor is set for Friday, and the GOP leadership has tentatively scheduled a vote on the treaty for Tuesday.

Defense Secretary William Cohen and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Henry Shelton told the Armed Services Committee today the treaty should be approved.

Cohen conceded that as a senator in 1992 he had voted against stopping U.S. nuclear testing, but said the newly developed computer simulation technologies combined with 47 years of actual test data make it possible to verify the health of nuclear weapons without underground detonations.

“A lot has changed in the past seven years than simply moving my desk across the Potomac” to the Pentagon, he said.

The question, according to Cohen, is whether the world would be a safer place with fewer nuclear weapons. “Then we have to ask how we are going to restrain other states from creating and building nuclear arsenals. The CTBT provides a compelling answer,” Cohen said.

Albright pressed the administration's case in a letter delivered to Capitol Hill Wednesday urging senators to ratify the treaty.

“Failure to ratify would be a major setback to U.S. international leadership, especially in the area of non-proliferation and arms control,” she wrote in the letter.

Albright told senators that failure by the United States to ratify the treaty would open the door for existing and aspiring nuclear powers to unleash new test blasts and foster the nuclear arms trade and weapons buildups.

“The CTBT is a fundamental roadblock in the path of this trend toward proliferation,” Albright wrote.

Albright has been calling lawmakers recently to discuss the vote and issues surrounding the treaty. But State Department spokesman James Rubin acknowledged the challenge in forging a two-thirds consensus in the Senate by next week.

“This is an uphill battle,” he said.

Earlier, Lockhart demanded more time for consideration of the treaty but stated it should not be delayed “beyond a reasonable period.”

Lockhart said Clinton had made no such request and argued that even senators agreed the time allotted for the treaty was inadequate.

“We do not know what is going to happen over the next 16 months around the world, so I think what would be in the best interest is that we do a proper process here that allows people to weigh the issues and make an informed decision,” Lockhart said.

“This is an important issue that has serious ramifications for our future

but it is complicated....To try to do this in eight or nine days is simply inadequate," he added. ``Given the historical record of other significant arms control treaties that have had dozens of days of hearings and dozens of days of debate, if that kind of time was provided, that would be adequate and I would predict that that would change minds."

Clinton signed the treaty in 1996, but Republicans, led by Helms, ignored for more than two years, largely due to a complicated disagreement related to other pending arms control measures.

The United States unilaterally agreed to stop underground nuclear testing in 1992 after conducting more than 1,000 such experiments.

The CTBT will not go into effect until the 44 nations with nuclear weapons capability have ratified it. So far, only 23 have, and many appear to be waiting for Washington to do so.

More than 150 nations have signed the treaty, and 47 total have ratified it.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

From: "bob kinsey" <bkinsey@peacemission.org>
To: <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Colorado Council of Churches
Date: Tue, 5 Oct 1999 12:23:50 -0600
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2615.200
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

The Colorado Council of Churches will consider this statement on THursday and may pass and promulgate it

The Congress of the United States will vote on ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on October 12 after about one week of debate. The vote has been scheduled set so quickly after the longest delay in history (over 3000 days) because, 1) there has finally been significant pressure to bring the Treaty to a vote, and, 2) The Republicans hope the brief debate time will enable them to maintain party discipline and thereby fulfill Jesse Helms' intention to defeat the Treaty. Thus, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has made the ratification a partisan issue (as opposed to our traditional bi-partisan foreign policy) . It also has undermined the social contract between the government and the governed. Polls show that the American people are and have been overwhelmingly (75%-85%) in favor of the Treaty. The so-called verification concerns expressed by opponents are bogus because the treaty provides for on-site inspections in case of doubt. The treaty is supported by former Joint Chiefs of Staff, by a former commander of the Strategic Air Command, General Lee Butler, and by the Secretary of State, and by Richard Butler--the UNSCOM leader who was involved in the inspections of Iraq for Weapons of Mass Destruction. These are technically and militarily competent. They are experienced and informed people dedicated to strong defense, It has been ratified by two nuclear weapons states-- Britain and France. China and Russia are reported to be waiting for US ratification before following suit. The treaty does not go into effect unless all of the nuclear weapons-capable states ratify it. The treaty would put into place robust verification machinery including world-wide seismic and other technical sites and required on site inspections. It would end nuclear explosions underground as well as above. It is in the self interest of all nations to move toward reduction and

elimination of these weapons for financial, security and moral reasons. This would be a factor increasing the likelihood of the treaty working.

The Treaty would create a world wide collective security arrangement. It would be a vehicle for trust building among nations.

It would respect the recent World Court opinion that the use and threat of use of these weapons is a crime against humanity. The only time the Senate has failed to ratify such a major treaty was the Treaty of Versailles when the participation of the US in the League of Nations would likely have established it as an effective force for international law and prevented World War II.

If the United States fails to ratify this treaty it will undermine decades of effort to create a disarmament regime. It will place US foreign policy in the hands of the people who, like the US Space Command, define their mission as "Dominance ... in the 21st Century to protect US investments and Interests abroad." (See U.S. Air Force publication "Vision for the 21st Century') These corporate and military interests have no respect for international law (the US is signatory to the UN Convention on the Peaceful Uses of Space) , perceive the world as filled with enemies rather than fellow human beings, and therefore they are in the business of forwarding such a perception with the goal of restoring Cold War defense expenditures and postures.

We are called to beat our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks. We are called to work for God's Shalom and not the domination of one group of people over others, whether that be one nation over other nations or the wealthy over the poor. We are called to understand all humanity as part of the same family to the ends of the earth. We are called to use the gifts of God to be merciful and just. We are called to be responsible for the well being of planet earth. Therefore, we call on the people of Colorado to immediately urge their two Senators to vote to ratify this treaty.

Senator Ben Campbell 303-843-4100 or 202-224-5852
Senator Wayne Allard 303-220-7414 or 202-224-5941

Bob Kinsey
Peace and Justice Task Force
Rocky Mountain Conference, United Church of Christ
bkinsey@peacemission.org
6555 Ward Road, Arvada, Colorado, 80004
"Blessed are the peacemakers for they will be called children of God" --
Jesus of Nazareth

Date: Tue, 05 Oct 1999 23:01:24 -0700

From: Jackie Cabasso <wslf@earthlink.net>

Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org

Subject: RECLAIM THE CTBT!

To: abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com, LCNP@aol.com,
johnburroughs@earthlink.net, wslf@earthlink.net,
gclark@peace-action.org, cnunc@aol.com, Jgerson@afsc.org,
kentcom@highlands.com, skent@kentcom.com, napf@wagingpeace.org,
sallight@earthlink.net, mmebane@fourthfreedom.org,
dcortright@fourthfreedom.org, pmeidell@igc.org, bmsil@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, megiddo@umich.edu,
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, bearclanpk@ezphotos.net,
enduringpeace@email.msn.com, alichterman@worldnet.att.net,
dkrieger@napf.org, 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), abolition-caucus@igc.org

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Pro Version 4.1

X-Sender: wslf@mail.earthlink.net

<x-html><html>

***** RECLAIM
THE CTBT! *****

The "Future Directions of the Nuclear Weapons Complex" working
group of the US CAMPAIGN TO ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS and its Abolition
2000 counterpart , the "Beyond the CTBT" working group are
pleased to announce the availability of a brand new button (just in
time)! The button, 1-3/4" x 2-3/4", in striking black on
white alternating with white on black text reads:

BAN THE BANG and THE BOMB

CTBT NOW!

STOCKPILE STEWARDSHIP NEVER!!

ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS!!!

The button will be available, starting this Friday, at the US CAMPAIGN TO
ABOLISH NUCLEAR WEAPONS national meeting in Ann Arbor. Contact
Western States Legal Foundation to order yours!!

<div align="center">

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</html>
</x-html>

X-Sender: mupj@pop2.igc.org

X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.3 (32)

Date: Wed, 06 Oct 1999 09:04:04 -0400

To: ograbc@aol.com, "Jim Matlack" <denhartz@erols.com>, washofc@aol.com, ann_d.parti@ecunet.org, heathern@nccusa.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, jsammon@networklobby.org, network@igc.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org, Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org, lwyolton@prodigy.net, uuawo@aol.com, jnoble@uahc.org, lintnerj@ucc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org, mupj@igc.org

From: "Carlee L. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Subject: CTBT: keep up the pressure

To: Interfaith Group for the CTBT

This relates to today's story in the Washington Post that some in the Senate want to pull the CTBT off the floor. Daryl Kimball is writing a memo on this which you should receive. Let me share what little I know.

It would take unanimous consent to cancel the vote on Tuesday. Any senator, such as Kyl on one end or Dorgan on the other, could block unanimous consent and thus require the vote.

The White House is assuming that a vote will occur. So should we.

I believe that our grassroots efforts are beginning to have an impact. Some Republican senators are realizing that they may have to choose between their loyalty to the majority leader or to their constituents.

Let's keep up and intensify our efforts. The momentum is on our side.

Shalom,
Howard

From: Maureen_T._Shea@who.eop.gov

Date: Wed, 06 Oct 1999 10:45:26 -0400

Subject: President's Remarks

To: washofc@aol.com, DenHartz@erols.com, CWU_Washington.parti@ecunet.org, washofc@aol.com, thart@dfms.org, jskipper@dfms.org, epf@igc.apc.org, disarm@forusa.org, joe@fcnl.org, kathytim@earthlink.net, kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org, mknolldc@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, jsammon@networkloby.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org, Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org, lwyolton@prodigy.net, uuawo@aol.com, lintnerj@ucc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org, mupj@igc.org, lisaw@nccusa.org, jnoble@uahc.org, jsmith@clw.org, sampsono@panet.US-STATE.gov, johnmillsbaugh@hotmail.com, marsusab@aol.com

X-Lotus-FromDomain: EOP

The following are the President's remarks regarding CTBT at yesterday's Defense Authorization bill signing:

One of the greatest threats our people face today, and our Armed Forces face, is the threat of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We have worked in a bipartisan way to diminish those threats -- passing the Chemical Weapons Convention; getting an indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We are now working to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention.

At this time, the Senate has a unique opportunity to diminish that threat by ratifying the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It will end nuclear weapons testing forever, while allowing us to maintain our military strength in nuclear weapons, and helping to keep other countries out of the nuclear weapons business.

We stopped testing nuclear weapons in 1992 in the United States. Instead, we spend some \$4.5 billion a year on programs that allow us to maintain an unassailable nuclear threat. This treaty will strengthen our security by helping to prevent other countries from developing nuclear arsenals, and preventing testing in countries that have nuclear weapons already, but have nowhere near the sophisticated program we do for maintaining the readiness of our arsenal in the absence of testing.

It will strengthen our ability to verify by supplementing our intelligence capabilities with a global network of sensors and on-site inspections, something we will not have if the treaty does not enter into force. It will make it easier for us to determine whether other nations are engaged in nuclear activity, and to take appropriate action if they are.

Obviously, no treaty -- not this one or any other -- can provide an absolute guarantee of security or singlehandedly stop the spread of deadly weapons. Like all treaties, this one would have to be vigorously enforced and backed by a strong national defense. But I would argue if the Senate rejects the treaty we run a far greater risk that nuclear arsenals will grow and weapons will spread to volatile regions, to dangerous rulers,

even to terrorists.

I want to emphasize again, the United States has been out of the testing business for seven years now. We are not engaged in nuclear testing. If we reject this treaty, the message will be we're not testing, but you can test if you want to -- with all the attendant consequences that might have in India, Pakistan, China, Russia, Iran and many other places around the world. I want to avoid a world where more and more countries race toward nuclear capability.

That's the choice we face -- not a perfect world, but one where we can restrain nuclear testing, but train the growth of nuclear arsenals.

Dwight Eisenhower and John Kennedy first advocated a comprehensive test ban treaty. Four former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, together with Chairman Shelton and our nation's leading nuclear scientists, including those who head our national weapons labs, advocate this treaty. I believe the treaty is good for America's security. I believe walking away and defeating it would send a message that America is no longer the leading advocate of nonproliferation in the world .

So, all I ask today is not a vote; the discussion just began. What I ask is that we meet this challenge in the same bipartisan fashion in which we approached the Defense Authorization bill. The stakes are exactly the same. When a young man or woman joins the United States military, they don't ask you if you're a Republican or a Democrat. And you all make it clear you're prepared to give your life for your country. We should do everything we can to ensure your safety, to give you a bright future, even as we give you the tools and the support to do the work you have sworn to do.

Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1999 16:01:38 +0100
From: "Janet Bloomfield" <jbloomfield@gn.apc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Minutes of Abolition Co-ordinating Committee Call September 30, 1999.
To: <Abolition-caucus@igc.org>,
"Abolition-Europe" <abolition-europe@vlberlin.comlink.de>,
"abolitionusa" <abolition-usa@lists.xmission.com>,
<abolition@watserv1.uwaterloo.ca>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2314.1300
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Dear Friends,
here are minutes of the latest Abolition Co-ordinating Committee conference call. If you have any questions please get back to me and I'll try to find answers for you...
Yours in peace,
Janet.

MINUTES OF ACC CONFERENCE CALL - 309/99 (ACTION ITEMS IN CAPITALS)

1. Present: Janet Bloomfield, Jackie Cabasso, John Burroughs, Alyn Ware, Alice Slater, Carah Ong, David Krieger, Ross Wilcox, Hiro Umbeyashi, David Krieger.

Apologies: Pol d'Huyvetter, , Richard Salvador

Facilitator: Jackie Cabasso

Notetaker: Janet Bloomfield

2. Financial and fundraising update.

\$17,000 is current balance. Contributions this month were \$850 including a donation from A2000 UK.

The cost of the Mailing to US groups will be covered by GRACE - thanks to GRACE. Chris has been in touch with the Mott Foundation and our proposal is in the pipeline. ALICE will follow up. DAVID will approach the Simmons Foundation and the Turner Foundation. JANET will follow up UK sources. HIRO will do the same for Japan.

It was AGREED to confirm Carah's position as a salaried employee at \$25,000 per annum. The ACC will support her travel to the US meeting in Michigan.

3. General Administration.

Carah is now managing the listserv and it is going well.

The Mailout has now gone by e-mail and hard copy to the regional distributors. The US one will go out next week. Peace Depot in Japan will be identified as a collecting point for donations in Japan. Follow up calls will be organised by ALICE in the US, JANET in the UK and HIRO in Japan. Carah will follow up with other regional contacts to see if they can organize phone follow-up in their regions. The phoners will catch the organizations up on the Network and emphasize the need for funds, enrollments, petitions, NAC resolution support where appropriate.

4. Discussion of NPT.

John Burroughs had circulated a memo which was welcomed as a good basis for discussion. The ACC felt that at the NPT we should focus as a network on our

basic demands for commencement of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention and global de-alerting, de-mating, and disabling of all nuclear forces. It was suggested that individual groups would work on more specific points in the Statement. A discussion is needed in the network about whether the best route was to call for a special conference or an NPT Amendment under Article 10 of the treaty. JOHN would send his memo to the Global Council asking for comments in preparation for a full discussion on the >caucus. We re-affirmed the aim of 2000 groups and 2000 influential people endorsing A2000 by the NPT. CARAH would send an update to the list with three key actions items:

Enrol, donate and collect petition signatures. Hiro said that 2000 names were already being collected in Japan. Alice's proposal about a celebrity presence supporting abolition at the NPT would be discussed on the next call.

5. UN Millenium Assembly.

Alice and Jackie had attended the UN DPI n.g.o conference on globalisation and were concerned that A2000 should have a presence at the big UN meetings next year. These included the UN Millenium Assembly, the Millenium Forum and the Millenium People's Assembly. JOHN would found out more details of these meetings and report back.

Any Other Business.

We expressed our deep concern about the Tokaimura nuclear accident to Hiro and asked him to tell our Japanese colleagues that whatever help and support they need was available to them.

NEXT CALL: Thursday 11th/12th November. (depending on your time zone!) at 10.00pm GMT, 5.00pm EST, 2.00pm PST.

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

Date: Wed, 06 Oct 1999 11:17:51 -0500
From: Joseph Gerson <Jgerson@afsc.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: George Bush, Jr.'s Foreign and Military Policy Doctrine
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.6 (32)
X-Sender: jgerson@mail.afsc.org (Unverified)

October 6, 1999

Friends,

Although it went largely unnoticed here in the U.S., George Bush, Jr., the current Republican front-runner for the Presidential election 13 months from now gave a major foreign and military policy speech at The Citadel, a military academy in South Carolina. Bush put forward a vision of U.S. global dominance in the tradition of the Reagan era Discriminate Deterrence doctrine, called for massive increases in U.S. military spending (a number of which he identifies,) and threw in gems like "the best way to keep the peace is to redefine war on our terms" and that nbc and "hacker terrorists...must know, if they sponsor such attacks, our response will be debastating." People doing serious education and organizing related to U.S. foreign and military policy should be familiar with it.

It runs 10 pages in length and can be found at www.georgewbush.com/speeches/92399_defense.htm. As you may have heard or read, there are also some humorous ways to find yourself into Bush's web page or its satirical competitors.

J. Gerson

Reply-To: <Jimvert@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>
From: "James R. Green" <Jimvert@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Cc: <vision@2020vision.org>
Subject: CTBT
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1999 10:11:40 -0400
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Internet Mail 4.70.1162

Howard,

Thanks for your timely letter rec'd yesterday.

20/20 Vision (Dan) had called me Sunday afternoon to press for attention on Frist & Thompson.

I gave him state Rep. Howard Kerr's name. Before I could get Howard to forewarn him, Dan had already gotten him. Howard already had flight plans to be on the Hill today. He may be part of Cohen's presentation to the Joint Chiefs.

Howard's a senior nuclear research engineer at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. He's currently with the National Security Program Office as manager of Oak Ridge's role in the U.S. Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention. His eyes were opened when, as a member of the first team to go into the USSR to verify the SALT agreements, he met "the people".

He's been hosting Russians and former Soviets in cultural exchanges and is setting up a Sister City arrangement for his home town (Maryville, Alcoa & Blount County) with Zheleznogorsk. This is one of the 60 or so "secret cities". This one is still produces plutonium daily to heat & provide electricity to the whole city. I'm doing my part to engage our United Methodists in our district with this. It does connect with the Russia Initiative the Librarian of Congress (Billington) got underway. The United Methodist Church has committed to host 1,000 of the 3,000 community leaders to be brought over here next July-October.

I called our Bishop Ray Chamberlain's office Monday morning only to learn through his secretary (whom I know well) that he's going to be so "in & out" this week it's doubtful he could give attention to Frist & Thompson. You may recall that Holston Conference passed a resolution last year urging full hearings. The Bishop did write letters to them with this message.

I called Bishop Ken Carder of Memphis (friend of ours from Holston) and chatted with his wife. She said he, too, was particularly pressed just now. The Supreme Court's refusal to take on Tennessee's death penalty cases is one of his involvements.

So I was pleased YOU wrote directly to them. Maybe they'll give a quick call....since you strategically supplied the full range of phone numbers.

Char Hipkins joins me in our Peace With Justice Committee retreat this weekend. Jim will be at the Wesley Woods Camp for the Native American Gathering happening the same time.

Two questions as I listen to NPR & TV:

We pressed for the vote with THIS Congress but it looks like we may lose. Do we only get one chance to vote or could it be revisited in the NEXT Congress? "Blaming the Republicans" adds to the denegration of this crucial matter.

Since we missed the ratification deadline before the convening of those countries that did, are we left out or will that meeting be reset? And how much does that matter? We have urged our Senators to have the full hearings in time for passage in order to be an integral part of that conference.

In August I DID get an interfaith group to go talk with Frist in Knoxville. His field officer, Carolyn Jensen (with whom I made acquaintance over a TVA power lines issue a few years ago) gave us an attentive discussion including her secretary. I presented our packet of material w/ a cover letter. No response from him. His DC staffer on CTBT, Michael Miller, was off in Africa so I didn't connect w/ him directly.

I'll check the GBCS website. 20/20Vision's is helpful.

Seeking peace with justice,
Coordinator, Holston

Carol E. Green PWJ

To: <Jimvert@postoffice.worldnet.att.net>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <19991006160335.JGRU1635@default>
References:

At 10:11 AM 10/6/99 -0400, you wrote:

>Howard,

> Thanks for your timely letter rec'd yesterday.....

>

>> Two questions as I listen to NPR & TV:

> We pressed for the vote with THIS Congress but it looks like we may
>lose. Do we only get one chance to vote or could it be revisited in the
>NEXT Congress? "Blaming the Republicans" adds to the denegation of this
>crucial matter.

> Since we missed the ratification deadline before the convening of those
>countries that did, are we left out or will that meeting be reset? And how
>much does that matter? We have urged our Senators to have the full
>hearings in time for passage in order to be an integral part of that
>conference.

>

Carol,

(1) There is a lot of talk of not having a vote on October 12. It takes unanimous consent for that to happen, and some right wing Republicans may insist on it with the expectation that they can kill the treaty. Many in the middle want to call off the vote. They are caught between loyalty to Senator Lott and loyalty to their constituents. To that extent our pressure is having its effect. Personnaly I wouldn't mind having a vote, even if we lose, in order to reveal how senators stand. Then their constituents could deal with them. Even if there is no vote, constituents can ask how would you have voted if there had been a vote. This needn't degenerate into anti-Republican but rather constituents communicating with their constituents.

Part of a deal to call off the vote could be an agreement to take it up again in this Congress. If there is a vote and the treaty is rejected, it may be possible to bring it up again in the next Congress if not in this one.

(2) The U.S. attended the conference as a non-voting observer. As such we have less influence. It was a good argument for the moment but not crucial for our advocacy.

Thanks for all you're doing. The persistence with senators from the grassroots is having its effect even though we haven't yet achieved victory. If there is a vote, I believe that a number of senators will vote with their constituents and not with Lott, but maybe not enough for ratification.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Wed, 06 Oct 1999 14:00:54 -0400
To: "Daryl" <dkimball@clw.org>
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: News: CTBT Conf.Chairman Urges Ratification of Treaty

October 6, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: First Conference on Accelerating CTBT Entry Into Force opens

Attached below is the first report on the Article XIV Conference on Accelerating CTBT Entry Into Force.

In addition, here are a few quotes from key U.S. allies:

* Joschka Fischer, Min. of Foreign Affrs, Germany, Oct. 6: "It is of the utmost urgency ... that the Treaty enters into force as soon as possible."

* H.E. Koumura, Representative of Japan and Chair of the Conference, Oct. 6: " In the three years since its opening for signature, the Treaty has been signed by 154 countries and ratified by 51 countries among them. It has been universally perceived as a framework of considerable importance in the field of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. On the other hand, it is regrettable that the requirements for the entry into force of the Treaty are far from being met. At this conference, it is imperative to issue a strong message which urges non-signatories and non-ratifiers to sign and ratify the Treaty at the earliest possible date."

DK

CTBT Meeting Chairman Urges Ratification of Treaty

OW0610123099 Tokyo Kyodo in English 1130 GMT 6 Oct 99

[FBIS Transcribed Text] Vienna, Oct. 6 Kyodo -- The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) Organization opened a three-day meeting in Vienna on Wednesday to adopt a declaration urging more countries to sign and ratify the global pact banning nuclear weapons testing.

Japanese representative Masahiko Komura, former foreign minister and chairman of the meeting, said the conference's message to the international community for early effectuation of the treaty would be important.

The conference was called because the CTBT has not yet taken effect, though three years have passed since the global pact was adopted at the UN General Assembly in September 1996.

According to a conference source, two-thirds of the countries that have ratified the CTBT agree in principle to a draft declaration, which the source said has substantial content for persuading key nuclear powers like the United States, China and Russia to abide by the treaty but does not include a revision of effectuation requirements paving the way for the pact to take effect more easily.

The declaration is expected to be adopted at the final day of the conference Friday, the source said.

Given possible voting next week by the US Senate on the proposed ratification of the CTBT, Carlos Hernandez, the chief spokesman of the treaty organization, said he hopes the conference will result in a message for Washington.

The CTBT has been signed over the past three years by 154 countries, 51 of which have ratified the treaty.

The CTBT requires the ratification of 44 countries that have nuclear facilities, only 26 of which have ratified the pact. India, Pakistan and North Korea have not even signed the treaty.

[Description of source: Tokyo Kyodo News Service in English--Japan's largest domestic and international news agency, owned by nonprofit cooperative of 63 newspaper companies and NHK]

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

To: mupj@igc.org
Date: Wed, 6 Oct 1999 13:47:04 +0100
Subject: Re: poetry
X-Mailer: Juno 3.0.11
From: Jenine A Boisits <scbeginnings@juno.com>

Hi Carlee:

Beginnings comes out in January and in June. It's the best I can do at the moment since the magazine is still so brand new. But I do anticipate publishing three times a year very soon! I hope your critique group submits.

Jenine Boisits

From: Maureen_T._Shea@who.eop.gov

Date: Wed, 06 Oct 1999 18:33:13 -0400

Subject: President's Statement

To: washofc@aol.com, DenHartz@erols.com, CWU_Washington.parti@ecunet.org, washofc@aol.com, thart@dfms.org, jskipper@dfms.org, epf@igc.apc.org, disarm@forusa.org, joe@fcnl.org, kathytim@earthlink.net, kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org, mknolldc@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, jsammon@networklobby.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org, Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org, lwyolton@prodigy.net, uuawo@aol.com, lintnerj@ucc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org, mupj@igc.org, lisaw@nccusa.org, jnoble@uahc.org, jsmith@clw.org, sampsono@panet.US-STATE.gov, johnmillsbaugh@hotmail.com, marsusab@aol.com

X-Lotus-FromDomain: EOP

This is the President's statement today - it is also available on the White House web site at www.whitehouse.gov

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

October 6, 1999

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY EVENT

East Room

3:43 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Let me begin by saying a profound word of thanks to Senator Glenn, to General Shalikashvili, to Dr. Townes and to Secretary Cohen, for what they have said. I thank General Jones and Admiral Crowe for being here. I thank all the other Nobel laureates who are here, Secretary Richardson and General Shelton and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; Mr. Berger and Mr. Podesta, the other people from the White House. And I thank Senators Biden and Dorgan for their presence here and their enormous leadership on this issue; and other committed American citizens who are in this audience.

Let me say that I was sitting here thinking two things when the previous speakers were speaking. One is, it made me very proud to be an American, to know that our country had been served by people like these four, without regard to party. (Applause.) The second is that each in their own way represent a different piece of the American experience over the last 50 years and bring a remarkable combination of intellect, knowledge, experience and humanity to the remarks that they made.

There's a reason that President Eisenhower said we ought to do this, and a reason that President Kennedy agreed. They saw World War II from slightly different angles and different ranks, but they experienced the horror of the atomic era's onset in much the same way. I think you could make a compelling argument that this treaty is more needed now than

it was when they advocated it; when there were only two nuclear powers. I think you could make a compelling argument that, given the events of the last couple of years, this treaty is more needed than it was when I signed it at the United Nations three years ago. Nuclear technology and know-how continue to spread. The risk that more and more countries will obtain weapons that are nuclear is more serious than ever.

I said yesterday -- I'd like to just stop here and go off the script. I am very worried that the 21st century will see the proliferation of nuclear and chemical and biological weapons; that those systems will undergo a process of miniaturization, just as almost all other technological events have led us to, in good ways and bad; and that we will continue to see the mixing and blending of misconduct in the new century by rogue states, angry countries and terrorist groups. It is, therefore, essential that the United States stay in the nonproliferation lead in a comprehensive way.

Now, if you look at what we're trying to do with the Biological Weapons Convention, for example, in putting teeth in that while increasing our own ability to protect our own people and protect our friends who want to work with us from biological weaponry, you see a good direction. If you look at what we did with the Chemical Weapons Convention, working in good faith for months with the Congress to ask the same question we're asking here -- are we better off with this, or without it -- and how we added safeguard after safeguard after safeguard, both generated out of the administration and generated from leaders of both parties in the Congress, that's how we ought to look at this.

But we have to ask ourselves just the same question they all presented, because the nuclear threat is still the largest one, and are we better off or not if we adopt this treaty?

I think we start with the fact that the best way to constrain the danger of nuclear proliferation and, God forbid, the use of a nuclear weapon, is to stop other countries from testing nuclear weapons. That's what this test ban treaty will do. A vote, therefore, to ratify is a vote to increase the protections of our people and the world from nuclear war. By contrast, a vote against it risks a much more dangerous future.

One of the interesting things -- I'll bet you that people in other parts of the world, particularly those that have nuclear technology, are watching the current debate with some measure of bewilderment. I mean, today we enjoy unmatched influence, with peace and freedom ascendant in the world, with enormous prosperity, enormous technical advances. And by and large, on a bipartisan basis, we've done a pretty good job of dealing with this unique moment in history.

We've seen the end of the Cold War making possible agreements to cut U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals by more than 60 percent. We have offered the Russians the opportunity of further cuts if they will ratify START II. But we know the nuclear peril persists, and that there's growing danger that these weapons could spread in the Middle East, in the Persian Gulf, in Asia, to areas where our troops are deployed.

We know that they can be present in areas where there are intense rivalries and, unlike at least the latter years of the Cold War, still very much the possibility of misunderstanding between countries with this capacity.

Now, let me say the reason I say that I think other countries will be looking at this, one of the concerns that I have had all along is

that the countries we need to get involved in this -- India, Pakistan, all the other countries will say, well, gosh, when we all get in this Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the Americans have a big advantage because they're spending \$4.5 billion maintaining the integrity of their nuclear stockpile. And I always thought that, too. And I think that's a good thing because people around the world know we're not going to abuse this responsibility we have.

But it is strange to me -- and I'm sure strange for people in foreign capitals analyzing the debate going on in Washington -- there are people against this treaty who somehow think we will be disadvantaged by it. So instead, they propose to say, well, we -- they don't, any of them, say we should start testing again. So the message of not ratifying this treaty is, okay, we're not going to test, but you guys have a green light.

Now, forgive my less than elevated language, but I think we've got to put this down where everybody can get it. And I don't think we ought to give a green light to our friends in India and Pakistan, to the Chinese or the Russians or to people who would be nuclear powers. I think that would be a mistake.

I think we ought to give them an outstretched hand and say, let us show common restraint. And see this in the framework of our continuing work with the Russians to secure their own nuclear materials, to destroy nuclear weapons that are scheduled for destruction, and to continue our effort to reduce the nuclear threat.

The argument, it seems to me, doesn't hold water, this argument that somehow we would be better off, even though we're not going to start testing again, to walk away from this treaty and give a green light to all these other countries in the world.

Now, I sent this test ban treaty up to the Senate over two years ago. For two years, the opponents of the treaty refused to hold any hearings. Suddenly, they say, okay, you've got to vote up or down in a week. Now, this is a tough fight without much time, and there are -- lots of technical arguments can be made to confuse the issue. But I would like to just reiterate what has already been said by previous speakers and make one other point.

There are basically three categories of arguments against the treaty. Two have been dealt with. One is, well, this won't detect every test that anybody could do at every level. And General Shalikashvili addressed that. We will have sensors all over the world that will detect far more tests than will be detected if this treaty is not ratified and does not enter into force. And our military have repeatedly said that any test of a size that would present any kind of credible threat to what we have to do to protect the American people we would know about and we could respond in an appropriate and timely fashion.

The second argument is no matter what all these guys say, they can find three scientists somewhere who will say -- or maybe 300, I don't know -- that they just don't agree and maybe there is some scenario under which the security and reliability of the nuclear deterrent in America can be eroded. Well, I think that at some point, with all these Nobel laureates and our laboratory heads and the others that have endorsed this -- say what they say, you have to say, what is the likelihood that America can maintain the security and reliability of its nuclear deterrent, as compared with every other country, if they come under the umbrella of this and the treaty enters into force?

The same people say that we ought to build a national missile

defense, notwithstanding the technological uncertainties, because our skill is so much greater, we can always find a technological answer to everything. And I would argue that our relative advantage in security -- even if you have some smidgen of a doubt about the security and reliability issue -- will be far greater if we get everybody under this tent and we're all living under the same rules, than it will be if we're all outside the tent.

Now, there's a third sort of grab-bag set of arguments against it -- and I don't mean to deprecate them. Some of them are actually quite serious and substantial questions that have been raised about various countries' activities in particular places, and other things. The point I want to make about them is, go back and look at the process we adopted in the Chemical Weapons Convention. Every single other objection that has been raised, or question that has been raised, can be dealt with by adding an appropriately-worded safeguard to this treaty. It either falls within the six we've already offered and asked for, or could be crafted in a careful negotiation as a result of a serious process. So I do not believe that any of these things are serious stumbling blocks to the profound argument that this is in our interest.

Look, 154 countries have signed this treaty. Russia, China, Japan, South Korea, Israel, Iran, all our NATO allies -- 51 have already ratified, 11 of our NATO allies, including nuclear powers Britain and France. But it can't go into effect unless the U.S. and the other designated nations ratify it. And, once again, we need American leadership to protect American interests and to advance the peace of the world.

I say again, we're spending \$4.5 billion a year to protect the security and reliability of the nuclear stockpile. There is a reason that Secretary Cohen and Secretary Richardson and our laboratory heads believe that we can do this. Once again I say the U.S. stopped testing in 1992. What in the world would prevent us from trying to have a regime where we want other people to join us in stopping testing?

Let me just give one example. Last year, the nuclear tests by India and Pakistan shook the world. After those tests occurred, they had a serious confrontation along the line of control in Kashmir. I spent our Independence Day, the 4th of July, meeting with the Pakistani Prime Minister and his senior government officials in an intense effort to try to help defuse the situation.

Now, both of these countries have indicated they will sign this treaty. If our Senate defeats it, do you think they'll sign it? Do you think they'll ratify it? Do you think for a minute that they will forgo further tests if they believe that the leading force in the world for nuclear nonproliferation has taken a u-turn? If our Senate defeats the treaty, will it encourage the Russians, the Chinese and others to refrain from trying to find and test new, more sophisticated, more destructive nuclear weapons? Or will it give them a green light?

Now, I said earlier we've been working with Congress on missile defense to protect us from a nuclear attack should one ever come. I support that work. And if we can develop a system we think will work, we owe it to the American people to work with the Russians and others to figure out a way to give our people the maximum protection. But our first line of defense should be preventing countries from having those weapons in the first place.

It would be the height of irresponsibility to rely on the last line of defense; to say, we're not going to test, you guys test, and we're

in a race to get up a missile defense, and we sure hope it will work if the wheels run off 30 or 40 years from now. This argument doesn't hold water.

People say, well, but somebody might cheat. Well, that's true, somebody might cheat. Happens all the time, in all regimes. Question is, are we more likely to catch them with the treaty, or without?

You all know -- and I am confident that people on the Hill have to know -- that this test ban treaty will strengthen our ability to determine whether or not nations are involved in weapons activities. You've heard the 300 sensors mentioned. Let me tell you what that means in practical terms. If this treaty goes into effect, there will be 31 sensors in Russia, 11 in China, 17 in the Middle East alone, and the remainder of the 300-plus in other critical places around the world. If we can find cheating, because it's there, then we'll do what's necessary to stop or counter it.

Let me again say I want to thank the former chairs of the Joint Chiefs who have endorsed this. I want to thank the current Chair, and all the Joint Chiefs, and the previous service chiefs who have been with us in this: Lawrence Eagleburger, the Secretary of State under President Bush; Paul Nitze, a top presidential advisor from Presidents Truman to Reagan; former Senator Nancy Kassebaum-Baker, many Republicans and Democrats who have dealt with this issue for years have stayed with us. John Glenn, from Mercury to Discovery -- are you going up again, John? -- has always been at the cutting edge of technology's promise. But he's also flown fighter planes and seen war.

The Nobel laureates who are here -- Dr. Ramsey, Dr. Fitch, both part of the Manhattan Project; Dr. Ramsey a young scientist, Dr. Fitch a teenage soldier, witnessed the very first nuclear test 54 years ago in the New Mexico desert. Their letter says, it is imperative ? underline "imperative" -- that the test ban treaty be ratified.

Let me just say one other thing. There may be a suggestion here that our heart is overcoming our head and all that. I'd like to give you one example that I think refutes that on another topic. One of the biggest disappointments I've had as President, a bitter disappointment for me, is that I could not sign in good conscience the treaty banning land mines, because we have done more since I've been President to get rid of land mines than any country in the world by far. We spend half the money the world spends on de-mining. We have destroyed over a million of our own mines.

I couldn't do it because the way the treaty was worded was unfair to the United States and to our Korean allies in meeting our responsibilities along the DMZ in South Korea, and because it outlawed our anti-tank mines while leaving every other country intact. And I thought it was unfair.

But it just killed me. But all of us who are in charge of the nation's security engage our heads, as well as our hearts. Thinking and feeling lead you to the conclusion that this treaty should be ratified.

Every single serious question that can be raised about this kind of bomb, that kind of bomb, what this country has, what's going on here and yonder -- every single one of them can be dealt with in the safeguard structure that is normally a product of every serious treaty deliberation in the United States Senate. And I say again, from the time of President Eisenhower, the United States has led the world in the cause of nonproliferation. We have new, serious proliferation threats that our predecessors have not faced. And it is all the more imperative that we do

everything we possibly can to minimize the risks our children will face.

That is what you were trying to do. I thank the senators who are here with us today and pray that they can swell their ranks by next week.

Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

4:03 P.M. EDT

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Thu, 07 Oct 1999 12:34:03 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news on CTBT, 10/7; Coalition message

October 7

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: update; early CTBT news, 10/7; suggested talking points on the matter of CTBT vote

THE SITUATION ON CAPITOL HILL

Though there may still be an agreement to withdraw or postpone the vote scheduled for Tuesday the 12th in the Senate on the CTBT, the vote on CTBT is still scheduled for Tuesday, October 12 and our community must continue to press ahead accordingly.

STATUS OF RATIFICATIONS

For those of you keeping track, as of today, the number of states that have signed the CTBT is: 154. The number of states that have ratified is 51, including 26 of the 44 specific states required to ratify before the treaty enters into force. One of the latest ratifiers is Mexico, so have a pupusa or chile relleno tonite to celebrate.

Also, keep in mind that 41 of the 44 key states have signed, and two more (India and Pakistan) have made conditional pledges to sign. Therefore, entry into force of the CTBT is within reach if the U.S. sets the right example by ratifying.

TODAY'S HIGHLIGHTS:

A few of the CTBT-related activities include:

- * SFRC and Sen. Armed Services hearing on CTBT today
- * UCS press conference this morning at 9am
- * religious leaders for CTBT meeting with Natl. Security Advisor Sandy Berger and President Clinton at the White House at 11am
- * Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers conference call w/newspaper editors featuring Byron Dorgan and Steve Andreasen, NSC at 2pm
- * mass phonebanking continues
- * Clinton heads to Ottawa to meet with Canadian P.M.
- * CTBT conference continues in Vienna on accelerating entry into force.

THE TASK AHEAD

The decision, if there is one, to withdraw or postpone ratification of the CTBT in the hands of the Senate and the President. If the Senate fails to ratify the Treaty next week OR in the near future, there will be serious, negative national and international security consequences and the responsibility for lays at the feet of those who vote against it. Some in our community have preferences about whether further delay or probable defeat of the Treaty on Tuesday is better/worse.

I think it is important that we do not share our preferences openly because, frankly, our views about the inside baseball tactics are not going to have any effect and in fact they may hurt our cause down the road. In order to achieve the best possible outcome, it seems to me and others I have spoken with in the last 36 hours that it is vital to keep the pressure on the Senate to do what is right.

As you speak with others, especially members of the news media, I suggest for your consideration the following messages:

SUGGESTED MESSAGES

* We're committed to doing all we can to see an end to nuclear testing through the ratification of the Test Ban Treaty. We realize that this is an uphill fight. But the realization of this goal has been an uphill fight for over forty years and it is a goal that cannot and will not be denied because it is the right thing to do for this nation's security, for global security and for future generations.

* We believe there should be a vote on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and that the Senate provide its advice and consent for ratification. Senate consideration of the Treaty is long overdue and it saddens us that the Senate has chosen to devote so little time to the vital question of ending testing and stopping nuclear weapons proliferation. We remain hopeful that the Senate will weigh the issues carefully and that each Senator is allowed to vote according to his or her conscience and allowed to put petty partisanship aside on this tremendously important issue.

* If the Treaty is rejected on Tuesday, there will be severe international consequences that will haunt us all for years to come. The United States will have failed to set the right example to others and it will have failed to do what is in its own national security interests. Rejection may very well lead to the resumption of nuclear testing by other nations. The responsibility for that outcome, if indeed that is what happens, will rest with those who failed to consider the consequences, who failed to carefully weigh the issues, and who vote against the Treaty.

* If the President and the Senators decide to postpone consideration of the Treaty, they must not postpone U.S. ratification for long. The consequences of prolonged U.S. inaction may be as severe as the possible rejection of the Treaty by the Senate on Tuesday: the longer the United States takes to ratify and help implement the Treaty, the more likely it is that one nation may break the existing global moratorium and set in motion a dangerous political and military chain reaction. If there is further delay or postponement, we will not relent until the Test Ban Treaty is ratified and it enters into force.

(See attached op-ed by George Perkovich on the consequences of failing to ratify for more details.)

The level of commitment, the excellence of everyone's work under demanding conditions, and the tremendous support of those people out in the field for this effort is truly inspiring. Keep up the good work.

DK

Attached below:

1) ...The Next President Will Pay the Price, By George Perkovich, Thursday, October 7, 1999

2) Washington Post, October 7, 1999, Pg. 8 "Senate Conservatives To Demand Vote On Test Ban Treaty"

...The Next President Will Pay the Price

By George Perkovich

Thursday, October 7, 1999; Page A35

If the Senate eventually fails to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, there will be another victim besides the one Senate Republicans intended. For it is not only President Clinton who will be harmed by the action but the person who takes office as president--and many Republicans presume it will be one of their own--in 2001. The new president will face nuclear shock waves around the world, bereft of bipartisan support when he most needs it.

Here are some likely scenarios:

* India will probably conduct more nuclear weapons tests. India's nuclear scientists and hawkish strategists want a sophisticated arsenal, ranging from small tactical weapons to huge hydrogen bombs. They also wish to overcome doubts about the technical performance of the weapons tested in May 1998. More tests would satisfy them and their potential military "customers" that they can mimic the great powers.

Conversely, ratifying the test ban treaty would tether the nuclear hawks and allow India to concentrate on the economic route to major powerdom. India's leading statesmen, Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee and Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh, recognize this and want to avoid a costly and dangerous arms race. A Senate rejection of the test ban treaty would undermine these statesmen and badly complicate increasingly vital U.S.-Indian relations.

* Pakistan would match India test for test. This would lead to the kind of arms race that Presidents Reagan, Bush and Clinton have sought to block in the subcontinent. Lest an arms race seem inconsequential, it should be recalled that India and Pakistan just battled in Kashmir. The fighting came closer to erupting into an all-out war and possible nuclear escalation than was reported. If more testing occurs and hawks in both countries are unleashed, defense spending will increase. Pakistan will move closer to bankruptcy. This will heighten the risk of Taliban-like groups gaining power in Pakistan, metastasizing cells of intolerance, aggression and anti-American terrorism that would bedevil the next American president.

* While China has signed the test ban treaty, it will not ratify it if the United States doesn't. China assumes that rejection means Republicans want to conduct more nuclear tests; otherwise, why wouldn't they ratify? In this case, China will make preparations to resume nuclear testing, especially if India conducts more tests. China possesses only some 20 long-range, single-warhead missiles capable of striking America. This poses no serious threat to the U.S. deterrent. China has conducted some 45 nuclear explosive tests, the United States 1,030. The test ban is valuable precisely because it constrains the kind of weaponry advances that the Chinese military might otherwise wish to make with purloined American design information.

* Japan will face pressure to reconsider its nuclear abstinence if China and India build up nuclear forces. Test ban opponents in Washington argue that American ballistic missile defenses should reassure Japan that it does not need to hedge its bets. However, the Japanese, like U.S. allies in Europe, recognize the technical and strategic problems posed by inevitably less-than-perfect defenses. Indeed, Senate rejection of the test ban paired with aggressive promotion of ballistic missile defenses will prompt China and Russia to feel that the United States is bolstering its capacity for nuclear coercion and possible first use. Moscow and Beijing will augment their nuclear offenses to counter defenses. In this context, Japan (and NATO allies) will feel more rather than less threatened. The next American president could then confront a crisis in alliance relations.

* Globally, rejection of the test ban will endanger the nuclear nonproliferation regime. In 1995 the international community agreed to extend indefinitely the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty on the promise that the nuclear weapon states would complete a test ban treaty by 1996. This was the minimal disarmament condition that the world would accept from the United States and the other nuclear states. The 187 parties to the nonproliferation treaty will meet next April to review the status of the treaty. If the Senate rejects the test ban, we can be sure that measures to tighten nonproliferation controls and maintain sanctions on Iraq will be opposed by an outraged international community. Instead of being the champion of nonproliferation, the United States will be seen as the rogue state of proliferation.

Again, isolationists may say, "Who needs the nonproliferation regime? If we feel threatened by proliferation, we can take care of it ourselves." But the U.S. interest in keeping countries such as Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons requires cooperation from states such as Russia and our European allies in controlling exports. Washington's persuasive powers will be seriously undermined by roguish behavior on the test ban treaty.

Republicans in the Senate who want both to defeat the test ban and elect a Republican president should be careful what they wish for. If they reject this treaty they will create conditions that no new president could welcome. Given that the United States could ratify the treaty and still legally escape from it if a threat to national security emerged, the next president would likely wonder, "Whose idea was this?"

George Perkovich is the author of "India's Nuclear Bomb," to be published next week.

Washington Post
October 7, 1999
Pg. 8

Senate Conservatives To Demand Vote On Test Ban Treaty

By Helen Dewar and Roberto Suro, Washington Post Staff Writers

Senate Republican conservatives signaled yesterday that they will demand a vote next week on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, complicating efforts by Senate leaders to avert a showdown that would likely result in rejection of the pact.

Under an agreement scheduling the vote, a single senator can block its cancellation, and several said they would do so unless President Clinton takes the initiative to shelve the treaty, one of his major foreign policy priorities.

Some were prepared to insist on a vote regardless of what Clinton does. Sen. James M. Inhofe (R-Okla.) announced he will demand a vote, and Sens. Tim Hutchinson (R-Ark.) and Robert C. Smith, a Republican-turned-independent from New Hampshire, joined Inhofe in signing a letter to that effect.

The maneuvering started after Republicans, who had delayed action on the treaty for two years, responded to Democratic pressure for a vote by scheduling it for next Tuesday or Wednesday. But then leaders of both parties decided to try to find a mutually acceptable way of avoiding a vote that many senators feared could damage U.S. prestige, encourage nuclear proliferation and boomerang at the polls next year. The problem is that each side wants the other to take the first step.

As the day began, Clinton indicated he could accept a postponement to avoid what both parties describe as almost certain defeat. But he refused to ask for it, and Democrats said neither they nor Clinton could accept conditions being sought by Republicans.

"If senators, in their wisdom, believe they need more time, they need more months to look at this, then we will certainly be open to looking at their concerns," White House press secretary Joe Lockhart told reporters. "Again, they have the power in the Senate to set the schedule to bring this on the floor on a day that they agree." He repeatedly said one week was insufficient time to debate the treaty's merits.

Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) has said he is willing to consider

canceling the vote if Clinton agrees not to seek a vote on the treaty before he leaves office in January 2001. Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) said he also would insist that Clinton request withdrawal of the treaty in writing. Armed Services Committee Chairman John W. Warner (R-Va.) put it more gently, saying Clinton "must share with the Senate leadership the burden of not going forward."

Many senior Republicans have urged that the vote be put off. "We're not testing now. What's the rush?" said Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Alaska), arguing that more time is needed to develop alternative means of testing the viability of the nation's nuclear stockpile.

But Inhofe said the treaty should be rejected now on its merits.

While there were no negotiations yesterday, both sides said an agreement to cancel the vote remains possible. But both sides continued to make their cases for and against the treaty.

The treaty received a major boost from the military when Army Gen. Henry H. Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said the chiefs unanimously favored ratification. "The world will be a safer place with the treaty than without it, and it is in our national interest to ratify the CTBT treaty," he told the Armed Services Committee.

Treaty opponents countered with a letter from six former defense secretaries from Republican administrations opposing the pact on the grounds that it would "reduce the credibility of America's nuclear deterrent."

Appearing with Shelton, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen was lukewarm about shelving the treaty while the United States continues the moratorium on testing it adopted in 1992. Noting that some senators do not want to ratify the pact, but do not want to reject it either, Cohen said, "In that case you have a moratorium, but no disincentive for other countries not to test."

If other nations develop nuclear capability, he said, the United States might be forced "to review our own deterrent requirement" and perhaps return to full-scale testing and production of nuclear weapons.

At a White House ceremony, Clinton made a 20-minute appeal for the treaty.

"The best way to constrain the danger of nuclear proliferation and, God forbid, the use of a nuclear weapon, is to stop other countries from testing nuclear weapons,"

he said. "That's what this test ban treaty will do. A vote, therefore, to ratify is a vote to increase the protections of our people and the world from nuclear war. By contrast, a vote against it risks a much more dangerous future."

Staff writer Charles Babington contributed to this report.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

From: Maureen_T._Shea@who.eop.gov

Date: Thu, 07 Oct 1999 15:49:18 -0400

Subject: Statements

To: washofc@aol.com, DenHartz@erols.com, CWU_Washington.parti@ecunet.org,
washofc@aol.com, thart@dfms.org, jskipper@dfms.org, epf@igc.apc.org,
disarm@forusa.org, joe@fcnl.org, kathytim@earthlink.net,
kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org,
mknolldc@igc.org, mupj@igc.org, jsammon@networklobby.org,
dave@paxchristiusa.org, Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org, lwyolton@prodigy.net,
uuawo@aol.com, lintnerj@ucc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org,
gpowers@nccbuscc.org, mupj@igc.org, lisaw@nccusa.org, jnoble@uahc.org,
jsmith@clw.org, sampsono@panet.US-STATE.gov,
johnmillsbaugh@hotmail.com, marsusab@aol.com

X-Lotus-FromDomain: EOP

Statements from the President and Senators Dorgan and Jeffords with Q&A
from press on CTBT today at departure ceremony with religious leaders:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary
For Immediate Release
October 7, 1999

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT UPON DEPARTURE
AT THE WHITE HOUSE SOUTH LAWN

11:55 A.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. All this past week a chorus of voices has been rising to urge the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Yesterday our nation's military leaders and our leading nuclear experts, including a large number of Nobel Laureates, came here to say that we can maintain the integrity of our nuclear stockpile without testing. And that we would be safer with the Test Ban Treaty.

Today, religious leaders from across the spectrum and across the nation are urging America to seize the higher ground of leadership to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. I want to thank those who are here, including Bishop John Glynn of the US Catholic Bishop's Conference, Reverend Elenora Gidding-Ivory of the Presbyterian Church, Reverend Jay Lintner of the National Council of Churches of Christ, Mark Pelavin of the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, Bishop Theodore Schneider of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Joe Volk of the Friends Committee, Dr. James Dunn; there are others here as well. And I would like to say a special word of thanks to Reverend Joan Brown-Campbell of the National Council of Churches, as she concludes her responsibilities; for all the support she has given to our Administration over the years.

And let me express my special gratitude to Senator Jim Jeffords from Vermont and Senator Byron Dorgan of North Dakota for their presence here and for their leadership in this cause.

These Americans are telling us that the debate about this treaty ultimately comes down to a fairly straightforward question; will we do everything in our power to reduce the likelihood that someday somewhere nuclear weapons will fall into the hands of someone with absolutely no compunction about using them? Or will we instead, send a signal to those who have nuclear weapons or those who want them, that we won't test but that they can test now or they can test when they develop or acquire the weapons. We have a moral responsibility to future generations to answer that question correctly. And future generations won't forgive us if we fail that responsibility.

We all recognize that no treaty by itself can guarantee our security, and there is always the possibility of cheating. But this treaty, like the Chemical Weapons Convention, give us tools to strengthen our security, a global network of sensors to detect nuclear tests by others. The right to demand inspections, the means to mobilize the whole world against potential violators. To throw away these tools will ensure more testing and more development of more sophisticated and more dangerous nuclear weapons.

This is a time to come together and do what is plainly in the best interest of our country by embracing a treaty that requires other nations to do what we have already decided to do ourselves. A treaty that will freeze the development of nuclear weapons around the world at a time when we enjoy an overwhelming advantage in military might and technology.

So I say to the Senate today whatever political commitments you may have made, stop, listen, think about the implications of this for our children's future.

You have heard from the military. I hope you will listen to them. You have heard from Nobel Laureates and other experts in nuclear weapons. I hope you listen to them. You listened to our military and scientific leaders about national missile defense, listen to them about the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Listen to the religious leaders who say it is the right thing to do. Listen to our allies, including nuclear powers Britain and France, who say America must continue to lead. And listen to the American people who have been for this treaty from the very beginning.

And ask yourselves, do you really want to leave our children a world in which every nation has a green light to test, develop and deploy nuclear weapons, or a world in which we have done everything we possibly can to minimize the risks nuclear weapons pose to our children? To ratify this treaty is to answer the question right and embrace our responsibility to future generations. Thank you.

Q Any progress on delaying the treaty vote?

THE PRESIDENT: I had a dinner here the other night that had Republicans and Democrats, including Republicans who were on both sides of the issue. There seems to be, among really thoughtful people who care about this, an overwhelming consensus that not enough time has been allocated to deal with the substantive issues that have to be discussed. So we have had conversations, obviously, with the leadership and with

members in both parties, and I think there is a chance that they will reach an accord there.

Q Yes, just a follow-up. If it looks like you're not going to get the votes is it better tactically to go down to defeat and blame it on the Republicans or to just ?

THE PRESIDENT: I'm not interested -- that's not the -- that's a game and that's wrong. I'm not interested in blaming them for this. I think the members who committed to be against the treaty before they heard the arguments and studied the issues and listened to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Nobel Laureates made a mistake. I think that was wrong. On the other hand, there are lots of issues, complex issues, that serious people who have questions about it have raised, that deserve to be answered, worked through. And there are plenty of devices to do that if there is time to do that. All I ask here is that we do what is in the national interest. Let's just do what's right for America. I am not interested in an issue to beat them up about. That would be a serious mistake. That's not the way for the United States to behave in the world. But neither should they be interested in an issue that they can sort of take off the table with a defeat. That would do terrible damage to the role of the United States which has been, from the time of President Eisenhower, the leader through Republican and Democratic Administrations alike, Republican and Democratic Congresses alike, until this moment we have been the leader in the cause of nonproliferation.

We should not either try to get an issue that will enable us to beat up on them, neither should they have an issue that enables them to show that they can just deep six this treaty. That would be a terrible mistake. Therefore, we ought to have a regular orderly substantive process that gives all the people the necessary time to consider this on the merit and that gives the people who made early commitments, I think wrongly, but they did it, the chance to move to doing the Senate's business the way the Senate should do it.

Look at what these people are saying here today. This is huge, this is bigger than party politics, this is bigger than personal politics, this is about America's future, and the future of our children and the world. We have a chance to reduce the likelihood that more countries will obtain nuclear weapons. We have a chance to reduce the likelihood that countries that are now working on developing nuclear technologies will be able to convert them into usable weapons. We have a chance to reduce the likelihood that countries that now have weapons will be able to make more advances, more sophisticated and bigger weapons. We cannot walk away from that and we cannot let it get caught up in the kind of debate that would be unworthy of the children and grandchildren of Republicans and Democrats.

Thank you.

I would like to ask Senator Jeffords -- let me just give credit where credit is due. Senator Jeffords got this group together. And when I heard they were meeting I invited them to come down here to stand with us. So he deserves the credit for this day and Senator Dorgan has been perhaps our most vociferous advocate on the Democratic side of this treaty. So I would

like to ask Senator Jeffords to say a few words and then invite Senator Dorgan to say a few words.

SENATOR JEFFORDS: Thank you, Mr. President. I thank my honored members of the religious community for the tremendous help they have been to this cause. And I appreciate the opportunity to be here today to discuss the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We have just heard from prominent religious leaders that it is imperative that the Senate ratify this treaty.

They have told us that the issue is a vital matter of religious consciousness for their communities of faith. I hear the same message from my constituents. Nuclear proliferation is one of the largest threats, if not the largest threat, that this nation faces. Ratification of this treaty will improve our chances of stopping the spread of nuclear weapons and will strengthen our national security, not only today but in the future.

We owe it to our children and our grandchildren to add this important brick to the foundation of international peace. Three years ago 152 nations agreed in principle to forgo nuclear testing, but it will take leadership to lock up that commitment. The world is looking to the United States, and this week, to the United States Senate, to show that leadership. I firmly believe we must seize this moment to ratify the treaty.

Mr. President, as you know, this is a risky venture. But there is no absolute guarantee, but I am convinced that what risks there are certainly far outweighed by the dangers if we do not ratify. And I thank you for your leadership. And I would like to also add I don't stand alone in the Republican Party as agreeing with this position. Thank you.

SENATOR DORGAN: Mr. President, thank you for your leadership on this issue. There are big issues and small issues. We in the Senate spend the better part of a week some while ago debating whether to rename National Airport here in Washington, DC. That's a small issue. A big issue is the issue of whether we should ratify a treaty that will help stop the spread of nuclear weapons. And without a day of hearing, after languishing for two years in the Senate, the Majority Leader abruptly decided ten days hence we would have 14 hours of debate and make a decision as a country. That is not a responsible way to handle this issue.

It is unthinkable to me that this country or this United States Senate would decide that we will not test nuclear weapons, and we made that decision seven years ago, but we will defeat a treaty, according to some members of the Senate, that would prevent others from making the same decision, that would prevent others from conducting nuclear tests. It is an unthinkable position for me.

As I said, the question for this country is will we exhibit the moral leadership to decide that we will press the world to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and to try to prevent the horrors of a nuclear war. The ratification of this treaty is critical. This country has been a world leader and to deny this treaty would, in my judgment, deny our opportunity

to make this a safer world for our children and their children.

Thank you very much.

-END-
12:20 P.M. EDT

X-Sender: jdi@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Thu, 07 Oct 1999 16:11:08 -0400
To: jdi@clw.org
From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>
Subject: Cohen and JCS quotations from yesterday's hearing

KEY QUOTATIONS FROM SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILLIAM COHEN AND THE CHAIRMAN OF
THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AT YESTERDAY'S HEARING
(Senate Armed Services Committee hearing - October 6, 1999)

Defense Secretary Cohen on Test Ban Treaty's Impact on Non-Proliferation:

"If you believe, as I do, that we'll be safer in a world in which there are fewer nuclear weapons, then we have to ask, "How do we restrain other states from creating and building these nuclear arsenals?" I believe that the CTBT is one answer. I think it provides an important tool to meet one of the most pressing national security challenges, and that is, as you pointed out, nuclear proliferation . . .

With respect to the national security benefits of the treaty, Mr. Chairman, let me say, by banning nuclear explosive testing, the treaty removes a key tool that a proliferator would need in order to acquire a high degree of confidence in its nuclear weapons design. And in this way, the treaty can limit the nuclear threat facing the United States and our allies, and our deployed military forces. I'd like to point out it can never prevent proliferation or reduce the current nuclear threat, but it can make it more difficult to develop an advanced new type of nuclear weapon, and thereby we are able to cap the threat. So it's no guarantee, but it certainly is going to make it more difficult, and I believe by making it more difficult, we will have a safer world rather than a less safer one . . .

On nonproliferation, I think that this treaty is essential to the preservation of the United States nonproliferation efforts, which is critically important to our national security. Now, in 1995, 186 state parties to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, they extended the duration of the NPT indefinitely, unconditionally, and many of them, if not most of them, based upon the premise that there was a commitment on the declared nuclear powers that we were going to conclude a CTBT as furthering the goals of nonproliferation. So their continuation and their commitment to nonproliferation certainly may be called into question by its rejection."

Secretary Cohen on stockpile stewardship:

"Today we have high confidence in the safety and the reliability of the enduring nuclear weapons stockpile. And this, as you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, you may challenge us, but our confidence is based on an extensive data base."

Secretary Cohen on verification:

"Mr. Chairman, on verifiability. "Can states cheat on the CTBT without being detected?" And the answer is, yes, we would not be able to detect every evasively conducted nuclear test. But from a national

security standpoint, this is not going to be dispositive, in my judgment. I am confident that the United States will be able to detect a level of testing and the yield and the number of tests by which a state could undermine our U.S. nuclear deterrent."

JCS Chairman Henry Shelton on Chiefs support for the Treaty:

"The Joint Chiefs support ratification of the CTBT with a safeguards package. This treaty provides one means of dealing with a very serious security challenge, and that is, as Secretary Cohen has outlined, nuclear proliferation. The CTBT will help limit the development of more advanced and destructive weapons and inhibit the ability of more countries to acquire nuclear weapons. In short, the world will be a safer place with the treaty than without it, and it is in our national security interests to ratify the CTBT treaty."

JCS Chairman Henry Shelton on safeguards:

"Mr. Chairman, CTBT, with the safeguards package, has the full support of the Joint Chiefs, and that's based on the current intelligence estimates and Department of Energy's projection for the Stockpile Stewardship program. This combination provides for our national security interests by helping to reduce the spread of nuclear weapons while ensuring that we retain a strong nuclear deterrent."

Secretary Cohen on rejection of the Treaty:

"I would ask you to consider the consequences if you reject the treaty, what signal does that send to all those countries who are looking to us, everyone that signed up to the Nonproliferation Treaty, everyone that signed up to the CTBT, and we say, "Well, we've decided that we're not satisfied with our scientific capability and we've decided to reject it." I think that that will lower the threshold. I think it will be very difficult for us to complain about India, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, North Korea or anybody else. And so there are difficult choices."

General Shelton on stockpile stewardship:

"Well, sir -- as you know, we have a system right now for ensuring that we maintain -- and I think a credible system -- for ensuring that we maintain a safe and reliable stockpile. As you said a while ago, we haven't tested since 1992. Yet for the last three years, we have had the program in effect that has these weapons certified each year."

General Shelton on the unanimous view of the Chiefs

SEN. LEVIN: General, you testified that you are speaking on behalf of all the chiefs. Is that correct?

GEN. SHELTON: That's correct, sir.

SEN. LEVIN: Is this the unanimous conclusion of the chiefs?

GEN. SHELTON: Unanimous, yes, sir.

JCS Chairman Henry Shelton on impact of Treaty on rogue states:

SEN. THURMOND: "General Shelton, I question whether the CTBT will limit actions of rogue states, like Iraq, Iran, Libya or North Korea, in developing their own weapons. These countries will test to suit their purposes. What assurances do we have that the existence of this new treaty will constrain development of nuclear capabilities by a

rogue nation and thus effectively curb proliferation of nuclear weapons?"

GEN. SHELTON: "Senator Thurmond, I think first and foremost that if, in fact, they are signatories to the treaty that you have a built-in pressure by an international community not -- rather just a bilateral pressure exerted by the United States. Certainly, if they elected to try to pursue with low yield weapons testing these types of weapons, those low enough that they were undetectable, there is no way that you can monitor that per se as we've testified to. However, their ability to develop a capability, an advanced capability that could in any way, shape or form affect our deterrence or a nuclear balance is limited by the treaty itself. And so that is, I think, a major step that the treaty provides for us, a major tool that we don't have at this particular time."

Secretary Cohen on U.S. technological advantages for maintaining stockpile:

SEN. BINGAMAN: "Secretary Cohen, the U.S. ability to assure the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons without any testing far exceeds, at least in my view, far exceeds the ability of any other nation to maintain the safety and reliability of their weapons without testing. That's my impression. Is that an accurate description of the situation?"

SEC. COHEN: "Senator Bingaman, you've indicated that the United States is in far better position to maintain its stockpile in a reliable and responsible fashion without testing. As you yourself have just pointed out, we are, in fact, testing. We are not engaging in nuclear explosions. And that is a difference. We are testing through a variety of means which do not involve nuclear explosions. But we are testing, and that is the means in which we are maintaining that reliability."

SEN. BINGAMAN: "My strong impression is that our computing capability gives us an ability to simulate which none of our potential adversaries have, and that gives us a very substantial lead over anyone in maintaining our nuclear deterrent."

SEC. COHEN: "I believe that is correct, that we have a capability that is unmatched in this regard."

Secretary Cohen on whether the Treaty gives Iraq an advantage:

SEN. BYRD: "Iraq is not one of the mandatory parties to the treaty. In the event the treaty should enter into force without Iraq as a signatory, would that give Iraq a window of opportunity to develop, unchecked, a nuclear weapons arsenal and leave the United States to have to play catch up?"

SEC. COHEN: "Senator Byrd, I don't think that the United States will ever have to play catch up to Iraq for the indefinite future. I believe that by ratifying the treaty, by all of the countries who would follow our lead as well as those who have already ratified the treaty, that it would make it exceedingly difficult for Iraq to conduct the kind of tests that would give them a capability that would threaten our nuclear deterrent."

Secretary Cohen on verification of what happened in Russia:

SEN. INHOFE: Getting to the matter of verification, which we haven't really talked about as much as I think we should, I am sure you saw Sunday's page A-1 story in the Washington Post by Robert Suro, but I am going to read just a paragraph out of it. The title was "CIA

Unable To Precisely Track Testing":

"Among the troubling facts uncovered, according to senior officials, the CIA has concluded that it cannot monitor low-level nuclear tests by Russia precisely enough to ensure compliance with the CTBT. Twice last month, the Russians carried what might have been nuclear explosions at its Novaya Zemlya testing site in the Arctic.

SEC. COHEN: "Senator Inhofe, let me say that last year there were also some concerns about what might have been a test carried out by the Russians. It was determined in fact that it was not a test that would have been banned, and it was banned by the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty for those who have signed up to it.

Secondly, the test apparently was low enough in yield that it would not, in the judgment of our experts, pose any kind of a significant threat to our nuclear deterrent."

Secretary Cohen on verification:

SEN. JACK REED (D-RI): "So simply stated, my conclusion, perhaps it's yours, is that what we know now we'd be much better off in terms of being a part of this treaty, even though that they could not definitely determine precisely that this was a nuclear test. Is that your view, too?"

SEC. COHEN: "I think that our capacity to verify tests will be enhanced and increased under the treaty by virtue of the fact that we'd have several hundred more monitoring sites across the globe that will aid and assist our national technical means. Yes."

Secretary Cohen on implications of rejection of Treaty:

SEC. COHEN: "Senator Cleland, I believe that if this treaty is rejected, it will send a signal to other countries that we are no longer committed with the same enthusiasm that we've had for nonproliferation. It will give them an excuse to find ways to either test or acquire weapons. They may try to acquire them anyway, but it certainly would have an inhibiting effect upon those who would seek to acquire the weapons by developing them and testing them."

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

From: Maureen_T._Shea@who.eop.gov

Date: Thu, 07 Oct 1999 16:00:20 -0400

Subject: CTBT

To: CWU_Washington.parti@ecunet.org, columbandc@igc.apc.org,
DenHartz@erols.com, eivory@ctr.pcusa.org, lintnerj@ucc.org,
OGRABC@aol.com, uuamriley@aol.com, brobinson@jesuit.org,
Russ.Siler@ecunet.org, ned@fcn.org, network@networklobby.org,
joe@fcn.org, CORINNE.WHITLATCH@ecunet.org, HerbWEAO@aol.com,
thart@dfms.org, jhullharvey@umc-gbcs.org, CHRIS.HOBGOOD@ecunet.org,
DenHartz@erols.com, fmonahan@nccbuscc.org, DenHartz@erols.com,
dshank@sojourners.com, Sdaly@catholiccharitiesusa.org,
NWisdo@nccbuscc.org, oga@nae.net, 74617.760@compuserve.com,
jcarr@nccbuscc.org, Steve.Raabe@ecunet.org, tsteege@uuscdc.org,
kay.bengston@ecunet.org, marsusab@aol.com, florence@fcn.org,
brent_walker@bjcpa.org, tfassett@compuserve.com, carolf@nccusa.org,
sleighttl@ldschurch.org, driley5587@aol.com, womnelca@elca.org,
inquiries@cpjustice.org, mhunt@hers.com, ruthfitzpa@aol.com,
mhunt@hers.com, dneu@hers.com, conoverp@ucc.org, pking@nccbuscc.org,
mscholle@catholiccharitiesusa.org, evalentin@umc-gbcs.org,
fiofomc@aol.com, tia@tialliance.org, LLLader@aol.com,
lclinton@umc-gbcs.org, usnsa-oea@usbnc.org, schwarz8@ix.netcom.com,
RHSteinert@aol.com, FJett@umc-gbcs.org, nccw@us.net, msigner@rcrc.org,
J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org, David_Whettstone@mcc.org,
dianebeck@mindspring.com, JRBLOOM@worldnet.att.net, kmorrow@jesuit.org,
kwade@bread.org, jimwal165@aol.com, dblair@comp.uark.edu,
rmmeyerwom@aol.com, ralmeida@bread.org, engelhardt@bread.org,
Elizabeth_Yu@mail.mcc.org, cphillips@nccbuscc.org,
Martin_Shupack@mcc.org, Rachelle_Schlabach@mcc.org,
TL_HEATH.parti@ecunet.org, lsmith@catholiccharitiesusa.org,
BMcRipley@ctr.pcusa.org, KrysjackE@aol.com, jskipper@dfms.org,
CFFC@igc.apc.org, pwlester@chn.org, washofc@aol.com, pruggere@igc.org,
canbrooks@barnett-sivon.com, MonicaL@proj.org,
lcarr@lutheranservices.org, ealsgaard@umc-gbcs.org, raddy@dfms.org,
RField@voa.org, APalm@voa.org, washofc@aol.com, DenHartz@erols.com,
CWU_Washington.parti@ecunet.org, washofc@aol.com, thart@dfms.org,
jskipper@dfms.org, epf@igc.apc.org, disarm@forusa.org, joe@fcn.org,
kathytim@earthlink.net, kathy@fcn.org, rachel@fcn.org,
J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org, mknolldc@igc.org, mupj@igc.org,
jsammon@networklobby.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org,
Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org, lwyolton@prodigy.net, uuawo@aol.com,
lintnerj@ucc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org,
mupj@igc.org, lisaw@nccusa.org, jnoble@uahc.org, jsmith@clw.org,
sampsone@panet.US-STATE.gov, johnmillspaugh@hotmail.com,
Mark_Brown@lgate.eop.gov

X-Lotus-FromDomain: EOP

?These Americans are telling us that the debate about this treaty ultimately comes down to a fairly straightforward question; will we do everything in our power to reduce the likelihood that someday somewhere nuclear weapons will fall into the hands of someone with absolutely no compunction about using them? Or will we instead, send a signal to those who have nuclear weapons or those who want them, that we won't test but that they can test now or they can test when they develop or acquire the

weapons? We have a moral responsibility to future generations to answer that question correctly. And future generations won't forgive us if we fail that responsibility.?

President Clinton ? October 7, 1999

(in a departure ceremony with religious leaders supporting the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty)

BANNING NUCLEAR TESTING The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) ends nuclear testing worldwide. More than 150 countries have signed the Treaty so far, agreeing to stop all nuclear explosive testing. The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty would constrain nuclear weapons development and also help prevent nuclear technologies from spreading to other countries.

The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty strengthens U.S. national security. Keeping America strong requires that we not only support our troops and modernize our weapons, but that we also reduce the threats we face, including the threats of nuclear proliferation and war. The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty is a means of doing that.

The United States ended nuclear testing seven years ago; the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty forces other countries to end testing, too. In 1992, during the Bush Administration, the United States ended its own nuclear testing. We have developed means of making sure our nuclear weapons work by complex tests and computer simulations, rather than by tests with nuclear reactions, and we spend \$4.5 billion a year to ensure that our nuclear weapons remain at the cutting edge of reliability and readiness. This ?Stockpile Stewardship? program has been in place for four years with impressive results, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, weapons lab directors and numerous scientists, are confident we can maintain our strong nuclear arsenal with nuclear testing.

The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty puts in place a worldwide network for detecting nuclear explosions. This international monitoring system with over 300 stations around the globe ? including 31 in Russia, 11 in China, and 17 in the Middle East ? improves our ability to monitor suspicious activity and catch cheaters. The United States already has dozens of monitoring stations of its own; the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty allows us to take advantage of other countries? stations and create new ones, too. The Treaty also allows us to inspect suspected nuclear testing sites in other countries. No means of verification can guarantee that we will catch every low level test, but we are confident that, with the tools provided by the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, we can detect any that might threaten our national security interests.

The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty contains six safeguards that preserve our strong nuclear arsenal and protect us against ?cheating.? Most importantly, it includes a condition that says the President may withdraw

from the Treaty if the Administration cannot certify the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons. We do not need to test now ? but if we decided later that we needed to resume testing, we could and we would.

If we fail to ratify the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, other countries ? including China, Russia, India and Pakistan ? might begin testing again. India and Pakistan are drawing closer to signing the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty; if the United States fails to ratify, they are less likely to do so. The Nuclear Test Ban Treaty constrains the Russians and Chinese from further modernizing their nuclear weapons; if the Treaty fails, these constraints are lost. In fact, Congress's Cox Committee, which investigated potential Chinese espionage, said that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty would prevent China from exploiting nuclear secrets they may have acquired. Not all potential nuclear states have signed the Treaty yet. But if we fail to ratify, it will guarantee they will not. The world is looking to the United States for leadership.

Generals, scientists, and lab directors all agree that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty is in our national security interest. It reduces the threat of nuclear war without reducing the reliability of America's nuclear force or undermining our technological superiority. Former military commanders ? including Colin Powell and John Shalikashvili ? have endorsed the Treaty. Thirty-two American Nobel laureates have written the Senate calling ratification ?imperative.? And a broad range of religious leaders believes ratifying the Treaty is the right thing to do. Reducing the threat of nuclear war by ending nuclear testing strengthens our security and promotes our values.

The push to end nuclear testing began with President Eisenhower, who called his failure to win it ?the greatest disappointment of any administration, of any decade, of any time and of any party.? It is time that we fulfill President Eisenhower's vision and ratify the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Fri, 08 Oct 1999 00:14:23 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news release: "Consequences of Failure to Ratify CTBT"

October 8, 1999

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball, Executive Director

RE: new release on opening day of CTBT debate

Please find below the Coalition's latest news release on the CTBT ratification debate.

DK

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

"Senate Must Consider Consequences of Failure to Promptly Ratify CTBT: Non-Proliferation Experts Warn of the Security Costs of Rejection or Delay of the Test Ban"

For Release: October 8, 1999

Contact: Daryl Kimball, 202-546-0795 x136 or 487-4386 (cell); or Adam Eidinger 202-547-3577 or 986-6186

(WASHINGTON, DC) On the opening day of Senate floor debate on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), nuclear non-proliferation specialists and Treaty proponents are advising the Senate to consider the national security benefits of approval — and the consequences of U.S. failure to ratify.

Nobel Prize winning physicist and former Director of the Theoretical Division at Los Alamos Laboratory, Hans A. Bethe explains in an October 3, 1999 letter to the President: "Every thinking person should realize that this treaty is uniquely in favor of the United States. We have a substantial lead in atomic weapons technology over all other countries. We have tested weapons of all sizes and shapes suitable for military purposes. We have no interest in and no need for further development through testing. Other existing nuclear powers would need tests to make up this technological gap. And even more importantly, a test ban would make it essentially impossible for new nuclear powers to emerge."

As President Ronald Reagan's arms control advisor, Ambassador Paul Nitze, said in his letter of October 6, 1999 in favor of the CTBT: "The Senate is soon to be faced with a critical choice between approving a treaty that

would bolster international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons on the one hand and condoning the continuation of nuclear proliferation and the weakening of the non-proliferation regime on the other." Nitze concludes, "It is unequivocally clear that ratifying the CTBT would be in the U.S. national interest."

Realizing that Senate rejection of the CTBT would have serious consequences for U.S. national security, a number of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, are now trying to craft an agreement to postpone the vote on the Treaty. An agreement may not be possible because of opposition from hard-line Republicans who seek to resume nuclear testing and would like to defeat the Test Ban Treaty.

Globally, rejection of the test ban will endanger the nuclear non-proliferation regime. "If the Treaty is rejected on Tuesday, there will be severe international consequences that will be felt for years to come. The United States will have failed to set the right example to others and it will have failed to do what is in its own national security interests," argues Ambassador Thomas Graham, President of the Lawyers Alliance for World Security and former Special Representative of the President for Arms Control, Non-Proliferation, and Disarmament.

"Rejection of the Test Ban Treaty may unravel the fabric of the international nuclear non-proliferation regime. The U.S. succeeded in achieving the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1995 on the basis of the commitment of the nuclear weapons states to conclude the Test Ban Treaty. This is a good bargain that must honored," Graham cautioned.

Prolonged inaction on the Treaty also has its consequences. "If the President and the Senators decide to postpone consideration of the Treaty, they must not postpone U.S. ratification for long. The consequences of prolonged U.S. inaction may be as severe as the possible rejection of the Treaty by the Senate on Tuesday," said Daryl Kimball, Executive Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, an alliance of 17 leading nuclear non-proliferation and arms control organizations. "The longer the United States takes to ratify and help implement the Treaty, the more likely it is that one nation may break the existing global moratorium and set in motion a dangerous political and military chain reaction," he added.

a dangerous political and military chain reaction," he added.

As George Perkovich, author of the forthcoming book, *India's Nuclear Bomb*, argues in the October 7, 1999 edition of *The Washington Post*, "if the U.S. fails to ratify the CTBT, India will probably conduct more nuclear weapons tests. India's nuclear scientists and hawkish strategists want a sophisticated arsenal, ranging from small tactical weapons to huge hydrogen bombs. They also wish to overcome doubts about the technical performance of the weapons tested in May 1998. More tests would satisfy them and their potential military "customers" that they can mimic the great powers." Perkovich also notes that "Pakistan would match India test for test. This

would lead to the kind of arms race that Presidents Reagan, Bush and Clinton have sought to block in the subcontinent. Pakistan will move closer to bankruptcy. This will heighten the risk of Taliban-like groups gaining power in Pakistan, metastasizing cells of intolerance, aggression and anti-American terrorism that would bedevil the next American president."

Frank G. Wisner, former Ambassador to India (1994-97) agrees. In his September 30, 1999 letter to Senator Joseph Biden (D-DE) on September 30, 1999, he wrote: "I regard the early passage of this Treaty as a matter of the highest national importance If the United States Senate delays a decision or rejects the Treaty, I am confident that the United States will run a serious risk of India abandoning the Treaty. Pakistan will follow suit."

In addition, former Ambassador to Pakistan Robert B. Oakley wrote to Senator Biden on October 1, 1999, warning that rejection of the CTBT by the U.S. Senate "... would be a virtual invitation for India to start implementing the new nuclear doctrine recently proposed by its National Security Advisory Board. This doctrine calls for a major increase in Indian nuclear capabilities, which can only be achieved by more testing. Given the prevailing tension in the sub-continent," he adds, " the nuclear arms race which could well ensue would be extremely dangerous."

While China has signed the test ban treaty, it will not ratify it if the United States doesn't. "China currently possesses only some 20 long-range, single-warhead missiles capable of striking America," Perkovich argues in *The Washington Post*. "This poses no serious threat to the U.S. deterrent. China has conducted some 45 nuclear explosive tests, the United States 1,030. The test ban is valuable precisely because it constrains the kind of weaponry advances that the Chinese military might otherwise wish to make with purloined American design information."

Addressing the question of the impending vote on the Test Ban Treaty and the highly partisan tactics of Treaty opponents , Kimball said: "We believe that the Senate should provide its advice and consent for ratification of the Test Ban Treaty. Senate consideration of the Treaty is long overdue and it saddens us that the Senate has chosen to devote so little time to the vital question of ending testing and stopping nuclear weapons proliferation. We remain hopeful that the Senate will weigh the issues carefully and that each Senator is allowed to vote according to his or her conscience — putting aside petty partisanship on their decision on this tremendously important issue."

###

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is an alliance of 17 nuclear non-proliferation and arms control organizations committed to a practical, step-by-step program of action to reduce nuclear dangers. For copies of the letters and documents cited in this news release, contact 202-546-0795 x136. For more information on the CTBT, see the Coalition's CTBT Web Site <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Action still needed on CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Colleagues:

With the Senate about to start debate on the CTBT, a vote on the treaty is scheduled to take place late Tuesday. Although there is discussion about ways to prevent a vote, we have to assume that the vote will occur. Therefore, we need to continue our efforts to get our members in the key states to call their senators.

If you have e-mail lists, fax blasts, and phone trees, you might send out a fresh message. During the holiday weekend some senators will be in their home states and could be visited. Saturday and Sunday worship services can be an opportunity to get out the word. It would be desirable for Senate offices to have many calls on Tuesday morning and afternoon. (Calls on Sunday and the Monday holiday may encounter filled voice mail boxes.)

Senator Lugar has come out against the treaty. It would be desirable for him to receive letters from Hoosiers, expressing disappointment for his decision.

I think it would be useful to convene a special meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT on Wednesday after the Senate has acted (voting yes or no or shelving the treaty) to discuss our next steps. If there is a time you can't meet on Wednesday, please let me know by replying to this message. We'll try to find a time when most can attend.

Shalom,
Howard

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Fri, 08 Oct 1999 12:08:27 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: update on NGO work on CTBT, 10/8

October 8, 1999

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: schedule/activities on CTBT October 8-12

As the historic debate on CTBT ratification begins this morning, non-governmental organizations are extremely active in their efforts to educate the public and the Senate of the value of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. I apologize for posting some items late or for missing some items that might be underway:

- * Peace Action-sponsored rally for the CTBT at the Capitol, 10/8 (see alert below)
- * Local pro-CTBT rallies/delegation visits by Peace Action in 8 states, 10/8-11 (see attached WORD file)
- * mobilization of activists networks to contact the Senate on the CTBT (dozens of organizations)
- * Individual meetings for Coalition member group representatives and expert with key Senate CTBT aides, when possible
- * 8 Key community leaders from Alaska, New Mexico, Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana and other states flying in to meet with their Senators, 10/6-8
- * Ongoing editorial board advisory work on CTBT and follow-up calls (20/20 Vision); and editorial board advisory fax-blast by the Coalition
- * packets of state specific editorials dropped to key Senate offices (20/20 Vision, FCNL, Coalition), 10/7
- * packets of all pro-CTBT editorials (just over 100) dropped to Senate, 10/8 (Contact J. Smith at 202-898-0150 x137 for copies)
- * Council for a Livable World CTBT T.V. ad running in selected markets on CNN and MSNBC, 10/7-8 & 10/11. It is now online. The url is <<http://www.clw.org/cf/ctbttvad.html>> If you want to view it quickly without the 5-10 minute download time, you can access our server side copy in Netscape click File:Open Page, Click on Choose File.. and surf to g:\shared\html\v3.1\ef\ctbttvad.htm Anyone outside the office will have to use the online version.
- * The Defense Department will host a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

(CTBT) demonstration on Friday, Oct. 8, 1999 at 2 p.m. EDT at the prototype International Data Center (IDC) located at the Center for Monitoring Research (CMR) in Rosslyn, Va. [No it's not that kind of demonstration ... more of a tour. An NGO/Rabinowitz Communications idea.]

* NGOs address Conference on Accelerating EIF of the CTBT Treaty; conferece concludes

* Media consultants working reporters and pushing CTBT experts lists on T.V. and radio

* Religious leaders for the CTBT press conference on the Hill to release letter signed by hundreds of national and regional leaders from various denominations (coordinated by FCNL), 10/7

* Religious leaders for the CTBT ad in Roll Call, 10/7

* mobilization of heads of communion to call or come to Washington to visit swing Senators in their offices

* LAWS CTBT Support Committee collection of former military/diplomatic leaders is circulating a letter of support from former military and national security officials for distribution to the Hill, 10/8

* Seismological Society of America/American Geophysical Union statement on CTBT verification, 10/7

* phone banking designed to produce 5000-7000 contacts to the Senate (coordinated through Disarmament Clearinghouse w/cooperation from several peace, environmental and religious organizations)

* Working Assets flash activist network approx. 10,000 potential callers, 10/7-8

* Ongoing Issue Briefs and News Releases for distribution to press, editors, and hill offices as necessary (Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers and other organizations)

* Letter of support for the CTBT from several dozen historians, including Stephen Ambrose and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., being organized by Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, 10/8

More later,

DK

PEACE ACTION NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
October 7, 1999

CONTACT: Sheila Dormody, Peace Action
202-862-9740 x3006

TEST BAN ACTIONS AT U.S. CAPITOL AND AT OFFICES OF REPUBLICAN SENATORS:

TEST BAN TREATY NOW! PROTECT OUR CHILDREN'S FUTURE

WHAT: Pro-CTBT Demonstration Just Before Senate Debate Starts

ATTENTION PHOTOGRAPHERS: Bring Your Wide-Angle Lens! Dramatic Visuals!

WHO: Leaders from Peace Action, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, and Women's International League for Peace & Freedom.

WHEN: OCTOBER 8, 1999 AT 9:00AM

WHERE: South East Lawn of the U.S. Capitol

>From October 8 through 11, concerned citizens and leaders of peace, environmental and religious groups are leading pro-Test Ban actions in Washington, DC and in key states with Republican Senators: Maine, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, Michigan and Oregon (see attached list). A vote to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is expected as soon as Tuesday, October 12. While anti-testing activists and elected officials from both parties have advocated for the test ban for decades, the vote to ratify the treaty is now embroiled in partisan politics that threaten to defeat or indefinitely postpone it.

"With 82% of the American people supporting the test ban, along with top military leaders and scientists, it is unconscionable that partisan politicking by the far right wing of the Republican Party is endangering the treaty," asserted Gordon S. Clark, Peace Action's Executive Director. "No one wants a return to nuclear testing and a new nuclear arms race, but that is the deadly direction Jesse Helms and Trent Lott are forcing the nation to take," added Clark.

On the morning of October 8th, demonstrators will gather on the Capitol's South East Lawn with huge photos of Senators Trent Lott and Jesse Helms, asking "Who's Sabotaging the Test Ban?" and declaring "You Have No Right to Threaten Our Children's Future!" Although the United States was the first nation to sign the CTBT at the United Nations, the Republican-controlled Senate has been loathe to advance the treaty's entry-into-force. "We are looking for Republican leadership to heed President Eisenhower's initial call for the CTBT," stated Clark.

Peace Action is the nation's largest grassroots peace and disarmament organization. Since 1957, we have worked toward abolishing nuclear weapons, cutting Pentagon spending to fund community investment, and stopping weapon sales to human rights abusers.

No. 250-P
PRESS ADVISORY October 7, 1999

The Defense Department will host a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban

Treaty (CTBT) demonstration on Friday, Oct. 8, 1999 at 2 p.m. EDT at the prototype International Data Center (IDC) located at the Center for Monitoring Research (CMR) in Rosslyn, Va.

The prototype IDC, a data collection, analysis and distribution system, and the International Monitoring System, a network of 321 monitoring stations worldwide, are part of the global verification regime necessary to ensure compliance with the CTBT.

The CMR is located at 1700 North 13th St., Suite 1450. More information on the center can be found at www.pidc.org. Media should arrive at the CMR by 1:45 p.m. EDT.

Media interested in attending the demonstration should contact Lt. Cmdr. Anthony Cooper at (703) 697-3189.

COALITION TO REDUCE NUCLEAR DANGERS -- NEWS RELEASE

"Senate Must Consider Consequences of Failure to Promptly Ratify CTBT: Non-Proliferation Experts Warn of the Security Costs of Rejection or Delay of the Test Ban"

For Release: October 8, 1999

Contact: Daryl Kimball, 202-546-0795 x136 or 487-4386 (cell); or Adam Eidinger 202-547-3577 or 986-6186

(WASHINGTON, DC) On the opening day of Senate floor debate on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), nuclear non-proliferation specialists and Treaty proponents are advising the Senate to consider the national security benefits of approval — and the consequences of U.S. failure to ratify.

Nobel Prize winning physicist and former Director of the Theoretical Division at Los Alamos Laboratory, Hans A. Bethe explains in an October 3, 1999 letter to the President: "Every thinking person should realize that this treaty is uniquely in favor of the United States. We have a substantial lead in atomic weapons technology over all other countries. We have tested weapons of all sizes and shapes suitable for military purposes. We have no interest in and no need for further development through testing. Other existing nuclear powers would need tests to make up this technological gap. And even more importantly, a test ban would make it essentially impossible for new nuclear powers to emerge."

As President Ronald Reagan's arms control advisor, Ambassador Paul Nitze, said in his letter of October 6, 1999 in favor of the CTBT: "The Senate is soon to be faced with a critical choice between approving a treaty that would bolster international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons on the one hand and condoning the continuation of nuclear proliferation and the weakening of the non-proliferation regime on the

other." Nitze concludes, "It is unequivocally clear that ratifying the CTBT would be in the U.S. national interest."

Realizing that Senate rejection of the CTBT would have serious consequences for U.S. national security, a number of Senators, Republicans and Democrats, are now trying to craft an agreement to postpone the vote on the Treaty. An agreement may not be possible because of opposition from hard-line Republicans who seek to resume nuclear testing and would like to defeat the Test Ban Treaty.

Globally, rejection of the test ban will endanger the nuclear non-proliferation regime. "If the Treaty is rejected on Tuesday, there will be severe international consequences that will be felt for years to come. The United States will have failed to set the right example to others and it will have failed to do what is in its own national security interests," argues Ambassador Thomas Graham, President of the Lawyers Alliance for World Security and former Special Representative of the President for Arms Control, Non-Proliferation, and Disarmament.

"Rejection of the Test Ban Treaty may unravel the fabric of the international nuclear non-proliferation regime. The U.S. succeeded in achieving the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1995 on the basis of the commitment of the nuclear weapons states to conclude the Test Ban Treaty. This is a good bargain that must honored," Graham cautioned.

Prolonged inaction on the Treaty also has its consequences. "If the President and the Senators decide to postpone consideration of the Treaty, they must not postpone U.S. ratification for long. The consequences of prolonged U.S. inaction may be as severe as the possible rejection of the Treaty by the Senate on Tuesday," said Daryl Kimball, Executive Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, an alliance of 17 leading nuclear non-proliferation and arms control organizations. "The longer the United States takes to ratify and help implement the Treaty, the more likely it is that one nation may break the existing global moratorium and set in motion a dangerous political and military chain reaction," he added.

a dangerous political and military chain reaction," he added.

As George Perkovich, author of the forthcoming book, *India's Nuclear Bomb*, argues in the October 7, 1999 edition of *The Washington Post*, "if the U.S. fails to ratify the CTBT, India will probably conduct more nuclear weapons tests. India's nuclear scientists and hawkish strategists want a sophisticated arsenal, ranging from small tactical weapons to huge hydrogen bombs. They also wish to overcome doubts about the technical performance of the weapons tested in May 1998. More tests would satisfy them and their potential military "customers" that they can mimic the great powers." Perkovich also notes that "Pakistan would match India test for test. This would lead to the kind of arms race that Presidents Reagan, Bush and Clinton have sought to block in the subcontinent. Pakistan will move closer to bankruptcy. This will heighten the risk of Taliban-like groups gaining power in Pakistan, metastasizing cells of intolerance, aggression and

anti-American terrorism that would bedevil the next American president."

Frank G. Wisner, former Ambassador to India (1994-97) agrees. In his September 30, 1999 letter to Senator Joseph Biden (D-DE) on September 30, 1999, he wrote: "I regard the early passage of this Treaty as a matter of the highest national importance If the United States Senate delays a decision or rejects the Treaty, I am confident that the United States will run a serious risk of India abandoning the Treaty. Pakistan will follow suit."

In addition, former Ambassador to Pakistan Robert B. Oakley wrote to Senator Biden on October 1, 1999, warning that rejection of the CTBT by the U.S. Senate "... would be a virtual invitation for India to start implementing the new nuclear doctrine recently proposed by its National Security Advisory Board. This doctrine calls for a major increase in Indian nuclear capabilities, which can only be achieved by more testing. Given the prevailing tension in the sub-continent," he adds, " the nuclear arms race which could well ensue would be extremely dangerous."

While China has signed the test ban treaty, it will not ratify it if the United States doesn't. "China currently possesses only some 20 long-range, single-warhead missiles capable of striking America," Perkovich argues in *The Washington Post*. "This poses no serious threat to the U.S. deterrent. China has conducted some 45 nuclear explosive tests, the United States 1,030. The test ban is valuable precisely because it constrains the kind of weaponry advances that the Chinese military might otherwise wish to make with purloined American design information."

Addressing the question of the impending vote on the Test Ban Treaty and the highly partisan tactics of Treaty opponents , Kimball said: "We believe that the Senate should provide its advice and consent for ratification of the Test Ban Treaty. Senate consideration of the Treaty is long overdue and it saddens us that the Senate has chosen to devote so little time to the vital question of ending testing and stopping nuclear weapons proliferation. We remain hopeful that the Senate will weigh the issues carefully and that each Senator is allowed to vote according to his or her conscience — putting aside petty partisanship on their decision on this tremendously important issue."

###

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is an alliance of 17 nuclear non-proliferation and arms control organizations committed to a practical, step-by-step program of action to reduce nuclear dangers. For copies of the letters and documents cited in this news release, contact 202-546-0795 x136. For more information on the CTBT, see the Coalition's CTBT Web Site <<http://www.clw.org/coalition/ctbindex.htm>>

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\CTBactions1.doc"

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

In-district lobby visits to both OH Senators today and press conference in OH on Monday

In-district lobby visit in IL

today

In-district lobby visit in MO and in KS

today

Rally at district office in NM

today

Rally at district office in OR

today

Activity planned in TX

PSR (202) 898-0150

Full press coverage including Op-Eds in

ME

Press work also being done in

NM

In-district lobby visits with both GA

Senators

design or build is safe and will work. Congress realized this in 1992 when it compelled the United States Presidential Administration to seek the conclusion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by 1996. It was a welcome move for the world's strongest power to show the way. The treaty is effectively verifiable. We need have no fear of the risk of cheating. We will not be relying on the good will of a rogue state to allow inspectors onto its territory. Under the treaty, a global network of stations is being set up, using four different technologies to identify nuclear tests. The system is already being put in place. We know it will work. Opponents of the treaty claim that, without testing, it will not be possible to guarantee the continuing safety and reliability of nuclear weapons. All nuclear powers, including the United States, Britain and France, examined this issue carefully. All reached the same conclusion. With the right investment and modern technology, the necessary assurance of safety and reliability can be maintained without further nuclear tests. Rejection of the treaty in the Senate would remove the pressure from other states still hesitating about whether to ratify it. Rejection would give great encouragement to proliferators. Rejection would also expose a fundamental divergence within NATO. The United States and its allies have worked side by side for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty since the days of President Eisenhower. This goal is now within our grasp. Our security is involved, as well as America's. For the security of the world we will leave to our children, we urge the United States Senate to ratify the treaty.

Jacques Chirac is the President of France. Tony Blair is the Prime Minister of Britain. Gerhard Schroder is the Chancellor of Germany.

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

Web: <http://www.disarmament.org>

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Sat, 09 Oct 1999 17:06:24 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: update and news on CTBT, Pt. 1

October 9, 1999

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: update and news on the CTBT, 10/9

Yesterday, October 8, the Senate began debate on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The most notable development was Sen. Hagel's somewhat surprising announcement that he would oppose the Treaty if came to a vote on Tuesday.

Despite talk on Capitol Hill about withdrawal of the Treaty from Senate consideration at this time, no arrangement or deal to postpone consideration of the test ban treaty was reached as of Friday night. Several Senators -- Republican and Democratic -- have called for a delay including Daschle, Levin, Byrd, Bingaman and Biden and Stevens, Domenici, Lugar, Thompson, and Hagel. However, some hard-line "Dr. Strangelove" Republicans have said they would oppose any arrangement to postpone a vote. They include: Helms, Hutchinson, Inhofe, Kyl, and Smith. They insist that the President must pledge not to bring up the Treaty in 2000 as well other conditions.

Debate will resume debate on Tuesday (after the Columbus Day holiday). The first vote on Tuesday will occur at 5:30 P.M. on the Agricultural Appropriations conference report. It is possible that a second vote could occur at that time on the Test Ban Treaty.

BOTTOM LINE -- CTBT proponents should prepare for a vote on Tuesday.

Attached below are several news stories that describe the current situation:

- * October 9, 1999, 10:46a.m., "Clinton: US Needs Nuke Test Ban," By The Associated Press
- * October 9, 1999, 1:10a.m., "Clinton Asks To Delay Test Ban Vote," By Tom Raum, AP
- * October 8, 1999, 7:45p.m., "Asian Countries Urged on Test Ban" The Associated Press
- * October 9, 1999, "Clinton Asks Senate to Delay Vote on the Test Ban Treaty," The New York Times
- * October 8, 1999, "A Treaty We All Need," By Jacques Chirac, Tony Blair and Gerhard Schroder, The New York Times Op-Ed Page

DK

October 9, 1999

Clinton: US Needs Nuke Test Ban

Filed at 10:46 a.m. EDT

By The Associated Press

CHICAGO (AP) -- President Clinton today said a landmark test ban treaty is America's best chance at nuclear security for the future. Rejecting the pact, he said, would prevent the United States from taking the lead in halting the global spread of nuclear weapons.

"The stakes are high," Clinton said in his weekly radio address, delivered before he spoke to Hispanic leaders.

A day after acknowledging he lacks the votes in the Senate to ratify the treaty, Clinton again urged the Senate to delay Tuesday's scheduled vote.

"America has been the world leader against the proliferation of nuclear weapons for more than four decades," Clinton said today. "If our Senate defeats it, we won't be anymore."

Conservatives are still pressing for a chance to kill the pact outright.

"The Senate should go on record as planned," the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Republican Jesse Helms of North Carolina, said Friday. "The Senate should vote this treaty down."

Supporters concede they cannot come close to the 67 votes, a two-thirds majority, needed for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Democrats and some influential Republicans suggest that rejection of the treaty could bring international condemnation and complicate efforts to reduce the spread of nuclear weapons.

But efforts to negotiate a way out of next week's vote have failed so far.

On Friday, Clinton bowed to Republican demands that he request a delay. "I have asked them to put it off because we don't have the votes," he told reporters in Ottawa, where he met with Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien.

Clinton at first seemed to reject a second Republican demand for a letter asking to put off consideration of the agreement until 2001, after the presidential election.

"This treaty was never treated seriously," he charged. "They want me to give them a letter to cover the political decision they have made? ... I don't think so."

But White House spokesman Joe Lockhart later softened the statement,

saying ``his (Clinton's) intention was not to rule out sending a letter."

That did not placate Helms and other Senate conservatives.

``Let's make it clear so the president can get his confusing rhetoric straightened out," Helms said. ``Since he has rejected our offer, I will object, along with many of my Republican colleagues, to any effort to put off next week's vote."

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., said a vote on the treaty remained on track.

``My suggestion to him is pipe down and agree to these two conditions (a delay and a rescheduling to 2001). Otherwise, let's vote," Lott told reporters.

But Sen. John Warner, R-Va., chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and an opponent of the treaty, said the president and the Senate leadership must share in the responsibility if the treaty vote is put off.

``I see him moving in that direction, each day another step," Warner said.

The developments occurred as the GOP-led Senate opened debate on the treaty, which would impose a blanket international ban on all nuclear test explosions.

Calling the march toward a vote ``pigheaded," Minority Leader Tom Daschle, D-S.D., told reporters that Democrats may invoke a seldom-used parliamentary procedure that would block further action on the treaty.

Such a move, forcing the Senate to give attention to legislation instead of treaties, would require only a 51-vote majority, rather than the two-thirds majority needed to ratify a treaty.

Daschle said he believed he could win enough Republican support for the move to prevail because some influential Republicans who oppose the treaty have been among those calling for a delay.

But Republican leaders warned that such a procedural move would be a violation of Senate customs -- in which the majority leader makes calendar-related decisions -- and could backfire.

The treaty has been signed by 154 nations, including the United States, but ratified by only 48 [actually 51].

At the State Department, Foreign Minister Abdus Samad Azad of Bangladesh announced that his South Asian country was in the process of becoming the 49th state to ratify the pact and said ``we would be worried if the United States did not."

Clinton Asks To Delay Test Ban Vote

By Tom Raum

Associated Press Writer

Saturday, Oct. 9, 1999; 1:10 a.m. EDT

WASHINGTON — President Clinton is asking the Senate to delay a vote on a landmark nuclear test ban treaty, conceding "we don't have the votes." But conservatives are still pressing for a chance to kill the pact.

"The Senate should go on record as planned," Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms, R-N.C., said Friday. "The Senate should vote this treaty down."

Supporters concede they can't come close to mustering the 67 votes, a two-thirds majority, needed for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. A final vote on the pact is set for Tuesday evening.

Democrats and some influential Republicans suggest that rejection of the treaty could bring international condemnation and complicate efforts to reduce the spread of nuclear weapons.

But efforts to negotiate a way out of next week's vote have failed so far.

On Friday, Clinton bowed to Republican demands that he request a delay. "I have asked them to put it off because we don't have the votes," he told reporters in Ottawa, where he was meeting with Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien.

Clinton at first seemed to reject a second Republican demand for a letter asking to put off consideration of the agreement until 2001, after the presidential election.

"This treaty was never treated seriously," he charged. "They want me to give them a letter to cover the political decision they have made? ... I don't think so."

But White House spokesman Joe Lockhart later softened the statement, saying "his (Clinton's) intention was not to rule out sending a letter."

That did not placate Helms and other Senate conservatives.

"Let's make it clear so the president can get his confusing rhetoric straightened out," Helms said. "Since he has rejected our offer, I will object, along with many of my Republican colleagues, to any effort to put off next week's vote."

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., said a vote on the treaty is still on track despite Clinton's latest comments.

"My suggestion to him is pipe down and agree to these two conditions (a delay and a rescheduling to 2001). Otherwise, let's vote," Lott told reporters.

But Sen. John Warner, R-Va., chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and an opponent of the treaty, was more charitable toward Clinton.

He said the president and the Senate leadership must share in the responsibility if the treaty vote is put off. "I see him moving in that direction, each day another step," Warner said.

The developments occurred as the GOP-led Senate opened debate on the treaty, which would impose a blanket international ban on all nuclear test explosions.

Calling the march toward a vote "pigheaded," Minority Leader Tom Daschle, D-S.D., told reporters that Democrats may invoke a seldom-used parliamentary procedure that would force the Senate out of its treaty-considering mode and block further action on the treaty.

Such a move, forcing the Senate to give attention to legislation instead of treaties, would require only a 51-vote majority, rather than the two-thirds majority needed to ratify a treaty.

Daschle said he believed he could win enough Republican support for the move to prevail, since some influential Republicans who oppose the treaty have been among those calling for a delay.

He said Sen. Robert Byrd, D-W.Va., a former majority leader, would make the motion if Lott would not agree to a postponement.

But Republican leaders warned that such a procedural move would be a violation of Senate customs – in which the majority leader makes calendar-related decisions – and could backfire on Democrats.

"Only the majority leader should make that motion. And if we don't get an agreement, we would oppose that move," Lott said.

The treaty has been signed by 154 nations, including the United States, but ratified by only 48 [actually 51].

At the State Department, Foreign Minister Abdus Samad Azad of Bangladesh announced that his South Asian country was in the process of becoming the 49th state to ratify the pact and said "we would be worried if the United States did not."

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright welcomed the move and reiterated her view that the treaty deserved more consideration by the Senate.

Asian Countries Urged on Test Ban

The Associated Press
Friday, Oct. 8, 1999; 7:45 p.m. EDT

VIENNA, Austria — An international conference on Friday urged India, Pakistan and North Korea to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, but it remained unclear when these countries might comply.

Delegates also appealed to the United States to ratify the document next week in hopes that other countries will follow suit.

Ninety-two ratifying and signatory states of the treaty agreed on a final declaration following a conference on the issue at Vienna's ornate Hofburg palace, the former residence of the Habsburg emperors.

The purpose of the three-day meeting was to examine ways to facilitate ratification of the document. The treaty, which so far has been signed by 154 states and ratified by 51, bans all nuclear explosions in all environments.

It doesn't become binding until 44 nuclear states have ratified it. So far, 41 have signed the treaty.

Countries that have not yet ratified include the United States, Russia, China and Israel.

The treaty is expected to come up for a vote in the U.S. Senate next week. Conference observers said the treaty's future hinges to a large extent on the American vote.

"It's quite clear that we need an American lead on this issue," said Wolfgang Hoffmann, the executive secretary of the Vienna-based organization in charge of the treaty, as quoted by the Austria Press Agency.

In his capacity as chairman of the meeting, Japan's Foreign Minister Masahiko Komura also called on the United States in particular to ratify the treaty, and he appealed to India and Pakistan "to speed up the process of signing and ratification."

During the conference, speakers emphasized the urgent need for the treaty to be enforced as soon as possible to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Without mentioning India and Pakistan, the final declaration referred to "two states whose ratification was needed for the treaty's entry into force but which had not yet signed it (but) had expressed their willingness not to delay" the treaty coming into force." It called upon them "to fulfill those pledges."

It also urged North Korea to sign and ratify the treaty, without mentioning the impoverished communist-run country by name. The document referred to "one state ... which has not yet signed it (and) ... had not expressed its intention toward the treaty."

© Copyright 1999 The Associated Press

Clinton Asks Senate to Delay Test Ban Vote

By Helen Dewar

Washington Post Staff Writer

Saturday, October 9, 1999; Page A4

President Clinton urged the Senate yesterday to delay voting on a global treaty to ban nuclear testing, warning that its virtually certain defeat would give a "green light to every other country in the world" to test, develop and modernize nuclear weapons.

Clinton's appeal came as the Senate formally opened debate on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and its leaders engaged in a test of wills over efforts planned by Democrats to avert a vote on the pact scheduled for Tuesday or Wednesday.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.), who has demanded that Clinton also agree to put off further action on the treaty until after next year's elections, said he is open to further initiatives by the president. But for now, Lott said, the vote is still on for next week.

At a news conference in Ottawa, where he was conferring with Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien, Clinton said he was asking the Senate to put off action because "we don't have the votes," a reference to head counts that show the treaty as much as 20 votes short of the two-thirds needed for ratification.

In what appeared to be an oblique nod toward Lott, Clinton said that the treaty would not be brought up again "until we think we can pass it" and that it ought to be "taken out of politics." But aides said this did not satisfy

Lott, who wants a more ironclad guarantee that Clinton not press the issue for the remainder of his term. Democrats say Clinton should not, and will not, give such assurances.

As debate started yesterday, Democrats said that if Lott does not move first they will employ an unusual parliamentary tactic aimed at cutting off consideration of the treaty and moving the Senate back to regular legislative business at some point before the vote begins.

To do so would require a majority vote. Suggesting that it was "pigheaded" to go ahead with the vote, Minority Leader Thomas A. Daschle (D-S.D.) noted that many Republicans have urged a delay and expressed guarded optimism that he could pick up enough GOP support for the 45-member Democratic minority to prevail on the issue.

But Lott appeared ready to fight against any GOP defections. His spokesman, John Czwartacki, said it would be "unthinkable . . . a direct assault at majority control" for the Democrats to try to usurp Lott's scheduling power.

In the day-long opening debate, several senators joined in calling for a delay. "Have we totally lost all sense of responsibility? . . . Why do we have to do it now?" asked Sen. Robert C. Byrd (D-W.Va.). "We are trapped in a political swamp," complained Sen. Chuck Hagel (R-Neb.). "Don't let us get into a box we can't get out of. . . . This is not responsible government."

The debate was sparsely attended by senators and tended to track over ground already deeply furrowed in three days of hearings that were hastily called after Republican leaders decided abruptly last week to move ahead with a treaty vote.

"The treaty will jeopardize rather than enhance our national security," said Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) in summing up the case for treaty foes. "It will undermine our vital nuclear deterrent by jeopardizing the reliability of our nuclear stockpile. It will prevent us from making our weapons as safe as they can be. It will not help stop nuclear proliferation and is not verifiable."

Treaty backers disagreed and said rejection of the pact would pose far greater dangers to this country as well as the rest of the world. "If we do not ratify this treaty, we will miss a historic opportunity to stem the tide of nuclear proliferation," said Sen. Carl M. Levin (Mich.), ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee. "We will instead be encouraging a new and possibly worldwide nuclear arms race."

Foes said technology is insufficient for maintenance and modernization of the U.S. nuclear stockpile without tests and for monitoring low-level explosions by other countries. "Militarily significant" tests can be conducted "with little or no risk of detection," said Sen. Wayne Allard (R-Colo.).

If the treaty is so flawed, then why are America's closest allies so "apoplectic" about reports that the treaty is likely to be rejected by the Senate, asked Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr. (D-Del.), referring to rare appeals this week from European leaders for the Senate to act favorably on the treaty. The treaty would protect this country's nuclear superiority while "considerably restrict[ing] the ability of other nations to threaten this U.S. superiority," he said, and low-level tests are unlikely to have much effect on the nuclear balance.

During the debate, Lott urged rejection of the treaty and said Republicans were only doing what Clinton wanted when they agreed to bring up the treaty. "I'm ready to vote," he added.

© 1999 The Washington Post Company

The New York Times

October 9, 1999

Clinton Asks Senate to Delay Vote on the Test Ban Treaty

By JOHN M. BRODER

WASHINGTON -- Acknowledging that he lacks the votes to approve a treaty banning nuclear testing, President Clinton pleaded with Senate leaders on Friday to delay action. But he refused to give in to a Republican demand that he withdraw the treaty, and thus concede that it will not be enacted while he is in the White House.

Clinton said he would be willing to wait as long as a year for a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty if it got a fair Senate hearing on its merits. As the Senate opened debate on Friday, Clinton said the arguments surrounding it had deteriorated into a nakedly political exercise.

Senator Trent Lott of Mississippi, the Republican majority leader, who firmly opposes the treaty, rejected the President's entreaties and said he planned to proceed with a vote on Tuesday. "This treaty is not going to be ratified; it's not going to happen," Lott said. "So let's have this debate, and, as for myself, I'm ready to vote."

Lott's political position is at once strong and tricky. He has the advantage in dealing with the President. But a majority of the 55 Senate Republicans are believed to support a move to delay action on the treaty to avoid a political and diplomatic embarrassment for the United States.

So behind the scenes, Lott and his lieutenants are seeking a way to postpone the vote and still satisfy those Republican hard-liners who want to kill the treaty, regardless of any embarrassment to the United States, and inflict political pain on the President.

Some conservatives who believe that the treaty is fatally flawed are pushing for a quick vote. Officials in Congress and at the White House said tonight that the impasse was not likely to be resolved before Tuesday, when Senators return to Washington and resume their deliberations on the accord.

While Clinton all but acknowledged that the treaty would not be ratified while he is in office, he adamantly refused to sign a document formally asking that it be withdrawn and agreeing not to submit it again during his Presidency.

"They want me to give them a letter to cover the political decision that they have made that does severe damage to the interest of the United States and the interest of nonproliferation in the world?" Clinton said angrily. "I don't think so."

On the Senate floor, the treaty's critics and supporters spent inconclusive hours debating its merits, most speaking from prepared texts and

hardened positions.

Democrats begged for more time to sell the treaty's virtues, while Republicans said its flaws would never be overcome by argument or amendment.

Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Democrat of New York, said the spread of nuclear technology would be "ineluctable" if the test-ban treaty was voted down by the United States.

"We must not reject this treaty," Moynihan said. "The word will be that we said 'No,' just as in 1919 we said 'No' to the Treaty of Versailles."

He was answered by Senator James M. Inhofe, Republican of Oklahoma, who characterized the treaty as "nothing short of unilateral disarmament."

"I believe that in the White House they honestly believe that if we all stand in a circle and we all hold hands and we all disarm, then everyone's going to be happy," Inhofe said. "But I'm not at all satisfied with that. I feel that we have to have the nuclear deterrent."

Clinton said he did not intend to use the treaty as a political weapon in next year's elections and said he would be happy to give Lott full credit for its approval if it could somehow be refashioned to be acceptable to a majority of Senators.

"If they adopted it, I'd be glad to say it was Trent Lott's triumph," Clinton said. "I don't give a rip who gets the credit for it."

Lott gave no ground this afternoon, even as his lieutenants quietly sought a compromise that would avoid the embarrassment of voting down a treaty supported by America's allies and much of the American public while denying Clinton an election-year instrument of political blackmail. Lott said he believed that the treaty was fatally flawed and would not be approved by the current Senate next week or next year.

He ridiculed the President and Democratic supporters of the pact for demanding a vote -- and then immediately reversing themselves when he mischievously agreed 10 days ago to bring it to a quick vote, upon which they protested that they needed more time to prepare.

"Finally they got what they wanted," Lott said, "and then they said they didn't want what they said they wanted."

The majority leader's hard-edged remarks on the floor Friday reflect the balancing act he faces in trying to lead not just the Senate, but also his diverse caucus of Republicans.

Lott is a consummate deal-maker who has no desire to be remembered as the first majority leader to preside over the defeat of a major international arms treaty in more than 70 years.

Approval of the treaty requires a two-thirds vote by the Senate, or 67

votes if all 100 members are present. Both sides say the pact is far short of the needed votes because of Republican opposition.

Senator Thomas A. Daschle, the Democratic leader, said Democrats were likely to introduce a motion to remove the treaty from the Senate's "executive calendar," a move that requires only a majority vote. That would delay consideration for an indeterminate time and allow the treaty to be taken up whenever a majority voted to do so.

Retired Gen. Colin L. Powell, who supports the treaty, Friday phoned Senate leaders to urge them to delay the decision to provide time to generate the needed votes.

Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr. of Delaware, the senior Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, said General Powell told him today that it would be better to leave the test-ban treaty in limbo than to defeat it.

Biden repeatedly expressed outrage throughout the day at what he called the Republicans' procedural stratagem.

He contrasted the number of days of hearings held before other arms-control and diplomatic treaties recently brought to the Senate with the one day of committee hearings and two days of floor debate accorded the nuclear testing treaty.

"Give me a break," Biden snarled at one point. "C'mon, c'mon. This is a stacked deck."

As debate on the floor unfolded, several senators continued to work behind the scenes to avert a vote on the treaty, which is likely either late Tuesday or on Wednesday.

Senator John W. Warner, a Virginia Republican who heads the Armed Services Committee, said he was circulating a letter among senators appealing to Lott to shelve the treaty rather than subject it to a near-certain defeat that would hurt American interests around the world.

But it was unclear if Democrats would be able to persuade at least six Republicans, for a total of 51 senators, to join them to approve the procedural motion.

Votes on procedural motions in the Senate are usually tests of party loyalty, and even Republicans who favor delaying a vote might be reluctant to cross party leaders without Lott's blessing.

Warner and Senator Chuck Hagel, a Nebraska Republican who strongly supports postponing the vote, said they would study the Democrats' motion, but declined to embrace it immediately.

Top Republican aides said they were still waiting for additional assurances from Clinton and Senate Democrats that they would not raise the treaty next year as a campaign issue. "We'll be listening to what they say over the weekend," one top aide said.

The New York Times

October 8, 1999, Friday
Editorial Desk

A Treaty We All Need

By Jacques Chirac, Tony Blair and Gerhard Schroder

During the 1990's, the United States has made a vital contribution to arms control and nonproliferation. Thanks to the common resolve of the world's powers, we have achieved a substantial reduction in nuclear arsenals, the banning of chemical weapons, the indefinite and unconditional extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and, in 1996, the conclusion of negotiations on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. South Africa, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus have renounced nuclear weapons in the same spirit.

The decisions we take now will help determine, for generations to come, the safety of the world we bequeath to our children. As we look to the next century, our greatest concern is proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and chiefly nuclear proliferation. We have to face the stark truth that nuclear proliferation remains the major threat to world safety.

Failure to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty will be a failure in our struggle against proliferation. The stabilizing effect of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, extended in 1995, would be undermined. Disarmament negotiations would suffer.

Over half the countries that must ratify the new treaty to bring it into force have now done so. Britain, France and Germany ratified last year. All the political parties in our countries recognize that the treaty is strongly in our interests, whether we are nuclear powers or not. It enhances our security and is verifiable.

The treaty is an additional barrier against proliferation of nuclear weapons. Unless proliferators are able to test their devices, they can never be sure that any new weapon they design or build is safe and will work.

Congress realized this in 1992 when it compelled the United States Presidential Administration to seek the conclusion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by 1996. It was a welcome move for the world's strongest power to show the way.

The treaty is effectively verifiable. We need have no fear of the risk of cheating. We will not be relying on the good will of a rogue state to allow inspectors onto its territory. Under the treaty, a global network of stations is being set up, using four different technologies to identify nuclear tests. The system is already being put in place. We know it will work.

Opponents of the treaty claim that, without testing, it will not be possible to guarantee the continuing safety and reliability of nuclear

weapons. All nuclear powers, including the United States, Britain and France, examined this issue carefully. All reached the same conclusion. With the right investment and modern technology, the necessary assurance of safety and reliability can be maintained without further nuclear tests.

Rejection of the treaty in the Senate would remove the pressure from other states still hesitating about whether to ratify it. Rejection would give great encouragement to proliferators. Rejection would also expose a fundamental divergence within NATO.

The United States and its allies have worked side by side for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty since the days of President Eisenhower. This goal is now within our grasp. Our security is involved, as well as America's. For the security of the world we will leave to our children, we urge the United States Senate to ratify the treaty.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Sat, 09 Oct 1999 17:07:24 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news on CTBT Pt. 2, 10/9

October 9, 1999

TO: CTBT supporters
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: further news and resources on the CTBT, 10/9

1. Check out the White House Web Site
<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/WH/New/html/CTBT/>> for resources on:

- * Support for CTBT from Military Leaders, Scientists, Arms Control Experts & Others
- * Facts on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)
- * President Clinton's Remarks on CTBT, Oct. 6
- * CTBT Safeguards
- * Press Briefing on CTBT, Oct. 4

2. Attached below are several additional news stories and CNN transcripts of recent Clinton statements and accounts of CTBT proponents campaign efforts. Go team! Included is coverage of:

- * religious leaders press conference at White House
- * out of town activists brought in by 20/20 Vision

3. Also attached below are recent remarks from the President on the CTBT from press conference with Canadian P.M. Chretien at which he addressed the CTBT.

DK

Special Event

President Clinton Comments on Nuclear Test Ban Treaty,
Patients' Bill of Rights; Sen. Kyl Reacts

Aired October 7, 1999 - 11:56 a.m. ET

THIS IS A RUSH TRANSCRIPT. THIS COPY MAY NOT BE IN ITS
FINAL FORM AND MAY BE UPDATED.

BERNARD SHAW, CNN ANCHOR: Quickly to the South Lawn, the president preparing to go to New York, where he's going to have meetings and make a couple of speeches, and he's strolling up to the podium to comment on what's happening on Capitol Hill and the battle with the

Republicans.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES: Good morning.

All this past week a chorus of voices has been rising to urge the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Yesterday our nation's military leaders and our leading nuclear experts, including a large number of Nobel Laureates, came here to say that we can maintain the integrity of our nuclear stockpile without testing, and that we will be safer with the Test Ban Treaty.

Today religious leaders from across the spectrum and across the nation are urging America to seize the higher ground of leadership to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

I want to thank those who are here, including Bishop John Glen (ph) of the U.S. Catholic Bishops Conference; Reverend Eleanor Giddings Ivory (ph) of the Presbyterian Church; Reverend Jay Lentner (ph) of the National Council of Churches of Christ; Mark Palavin (ph) of the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism; Bishop Theodore Schneider (ph) of the Evangelical Lutheran Church; Joe Volk (ph) of the Friends Committee; Dr. James Dunn (ph). There are others here as well.

And I'd like to say a special word of thanks to Reverend Joan Brown Campbell (ph) of the National Council of Churches, as she concludes her responsibilities, for all the support she has given to our administration over the years.

And let me express my special gratitude to Senator Jim Jeffords from Vermont and Senator Byron Dorgan of North Dakota for their presence here, and for their leadership in this cause.

These Americans are telling us that the debate about this treaty ultimately comes down to a fairly straightforward question: Will we do everything in our power to reduce the likelihood that some day somewhere, nuclear weapons will fall in the hands of someone with absolutely no compunction about using them? Or will we instead send a signal to those who have nuclear weapons or those who want them, that we won't test, but that they can test now or they can test when they develop or acquire the weapons?

We have a moral responsibility to future generations to answer that question correctly. And future generations won't forgive us if we fail that responsibility.

We all recognize that no treaty by itself can guarantee our security. And there is always the possibility of cheating.

But this treaty, like the Chemical Weapons Convention, gives us tools to strengthen our security: a global network of sensors to detect nuclear tests by others; the right to demand inspections; the means to mobilize the whole world against potential violators. To throw away these tools will ensure more testing and more development of more sophisticated and more dangerous

nuclear weapons.

This is a time to come together and do what is plainly in the best interest of our country, by embracing a treaty that requires other nations to do what we have already decided to do ourselves; a treaty that will freeze the development of nuclear weapons around the world at a time when we enjoy an overwhelming advantage in military might and technology.

So I say to the Senate today, whatever political commitments you may have made, stop, listen, think about the implications of this for our children's future.

You have heard from the military. I hope you will listen to them.

You have heard from Nobel laureates and other experts in nuclear weapons. I hope you will listen to them.

You have listened to our military and scientific leaders about national missile defense. Listen to them about the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Listen to the religious leaders who say it is the right thing to do.

Listen to our allies, including nuclear powers Britain and France, who say America must continue to lead.

And listen to the American people who have been for this treaty from the very beginning and ask yourselves: Do you really want to leave our children a world in which every nation has a green light to test, develop and deploy nuclear weapons, or a world in which we have done everything we possibly can to minimize the risks nuclear weapons pose to our children.

To ratify this treaty is to answer the question right and embrace our responsibility to future generations.

Thank you.

QUESTION: Any progress on delaying the treaty vote?

CLINTON: Well, I think they're -- I had a dinner here the other night that had Republicans and Democrats, including Republicans who were on both sides of the issue.

There seems to be, among really thoughtful people who care about this, an overwhelming consensus that not enough time has been allocated to deal with the substantive issues that have to be discussed. And so we have had conversations, obviously, with the leadership and with members in both parties and I think there's a chance that they will reach an accord there.

QUESTION: On the test ban -- a follow-up on the test ban, sir?

CLINTON: You want to ask on test ban treaty?

QUESTION: Yes, just to follow up. If it looks like you're not going to get the votes, is it better tactically to go down to defeat and blame it on the Republicans or to just...

CLINTON: No. I'm not interested -- look. That's not the -- I'm not -- that's a game, and that's wrong.

I'm not interested in blaming them for this. I think that -- I think the members who committed to be against the treaty before they heard the arguments and studied the issues and listened to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Nobel laureates made a mistake. I think that was wrong.

On the other hand, there are lots of issues, complex issues, that serious people who have questions about it have raised that deserve to be answered, worked through, and there are plenty of devices to do that if there is time to do that.

All I ask here is that we do what is in the national interest. Let's just do what's right for America. I am not interested in an issue to beat them up about.

That would be a serious mistake. That's not the way for the United States to behave in the world. But neither should they be interested in an issue that they can sort of take off the table with a defeat that would do terrible damage to the role of the United States, which has been from the time of President Eisenhower, the leader through Republican and Democratic administrations alike, Republican and Democratic Congresses alike, until this moment we have been the leader in the cause of nonproliferation. And we should not either try to get an issue that will enable us to beat up on them, neither should they have an issue that enables them to show that they can just deep-six this treaty.

That would be a terrible mistake. Therefore, we ought to have a regular, orderly, substantive process that gives all the people the necessary time to consider this on the merit. And it gives the people who made early commitments, I think, wrongly, but they did it, the chance to move to doing the Senate's business the way the Senate should do it.

Look at what the people are saying here today. This is huge, this is bigger than party politics. This is bigger than personal politics. This is about America's future and the future of our children and the world. We have a chance to reduce the likelihood that more countries will obtain nuclear weapons.

We have a chance to reduce the likelihood that countries that are now working on developing nuclear technologies will be able to convert them into usable weapons. We have a chance to reduce the likelihood that countries that now have weapons will be able to make more advanced, more sophisticated and bigger weapons.

We cannot walk away from that and we cannot let it get caught up in the kind of debate that would be unworthy of the children and grandchildren of Republicans and Democrats.

Thank you.

CLINTON: Let me give credit where credit is due. Senator Jeffords got this group together. And when I heard they were meeting, I invited them to come down here to stand with us. So he deserves the credit for this. And Senator Dorgan has been our most vociferous advocate on the Democratic side of this treaty. So I would like to ask Senator Jeffords to say a few words and then invite Senator Dorgan to say a few words.

CNN Today

Senate Plunges Into Debate Over Global Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

Aired October 8, 1999 - 2:04 p.m. ET

THIS IS A RUSH TRANSCRIPT. THIS COPY MAY NOT BE IN ITS FINAL FORM AND MAY BE UPDATED.

LOU WATERS, CNN ANCHOR: The United States Senate has plunged into debate on the Global Nuclear Test Ban Treaty despite the supporters' attempts to put that ratification process on hold. Lacking the two-thirds vote to approve the agreement, the supporters, including President Clinton, prefer to fight the battle later rather than see the treaty killed. Opponents say the treaty would force the United States to stop nuclear test explosions with no way of knowing whether other nations might be cheating.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SEN. JOHN KYL (R), ARIZONA: Our intelligence agencies lack the ability to confidently detect low-yield tests. We would be irresponsible to the extreme to ratify an unverifiable arms control treaty, especially when that treaty will inevitably reduce our confidence in our own nuclear deterrent.

SEN. JOSEPH BIDEN (D), DELAWARE: Why did all of our allies sign and ratify this treaty? Why are they apoplectic about the prospect that we won't sign this treaty? I'd like to ask my colleagues when, the last time they can remember, the prime minister of Great Britain, the president of France, et cetera, saying publicly: My Lord, I hope the Senate doesn't do that?

(END VIDEO CLIP)

WATERS: Among those allies that Senator Biden mentioned, the leaders of France, Britain and Germany appealed to the Senate to pass the treaty in an op-ed piece in today's "New York Times." The leaders say: "Failure to ratify the treaty will be a failure in the struggle against nuclear proliferation."

French President Jacques Chirac, British Prime Minister Blair, German Chancellor Schroeder contend the test ban treaty is verifiable.

Pressure to approve the treaty is coming from Americans, too.

We have more on that from CNN's David Ensor.

(BEGIN VIDEOTAPE)

DAVID ENSOR, CNN CORRESPONDENT (voice-over): Ground zero in the uphill grassroots fight for a test ban treaty. Around a table, activists, politicians and scientists from states with undecided senators, flown into Washington by a coalition of pro-treaty groups. They plot strategy before heading to Capitol Hill to lobby.

HOWARD KERR (R), TENNESSEE STATE HOUSE: If they say they're not leaning toward, then I'm going to ask: Why in the world would you be leaning the other way? Help me to understand that.

DAVID CULP, PLUTONIUM CHALLENGE: If you're not meeting with the senator himself or herself, I would think about trying to grab them as they come off the Senate floor and walk back to their office building.

ENSOR: With so little notice before next week's vote, they are playing catch-up with the odds against them. It is often frustrating. Two men just in from Alaska are taken to see their senator, Frank Murkowski. He tells them he does not agree; he will vote no on the treaty.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Well, I can hardly say I was encouraged.

ENSOR: At her home in Alexandria, Virginia, Penny Nance (ph) responds to e-mail and Internet requests from a treaty opponent, the American Conservative Union, that she call her senators' offices and lobby against the treaty.

PENNY NANCE, LOBBYIST: ... and I think this would severely hinder our ability to protect our children.

While in public the president makes his daily pitch for the treaty, behind the scenes there is talk of possible horse-trading to come, both sides suspicious that the other side may offer concessions on unrelated issues in exchange for votes.

KYL: If the administration is capable of pressuring people or offering them something to change their votes, then they might be more successful.

ENSOR: Administration officials say they know of no horse-trading for votes. Taking no chances, activists on both sides throughout the country, deeply divided on how best to contain the nuclear menace, are working the phones day and night.

David Ensor, CNN, Washington.

Morning News

Senate Ferociously Debates How to Prevent Nuclear Armageddon

Aired October 8, 1999 - 11:05 a.m. ET

THIS IS A RUSH TRANSCRIPT. THIS COPY MAY NOT BE IN ITS FINAL FORM AND MAY BE UPDATED.

BILL HEMMER, CNN ANCHOR: "Ban the Bomb": It was a slogan that goes back for decades, but it still resonates in the halls of Congress. That's where the Senate is set to debate a treaty for a global ban on nuclear testing.

Pro-treaty Senators want the debate delayed for fear of a vote shortage.

CNN's David Ensor live now from Capitol Hill in Washington with more on this -- David.

DAVID ENSOR, CNN CORRESPONDENT: Bill, it is an historic debate about perhaps one of the most important questions of all: nuclear Armageddon -- nuclear Armageddon and how best to avoid it, and the Senate is ferociously divided about the answer to that question.

Senator Kyl of Arizona spoke first against the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. He said that if the treaty was passed, the United States would not be able to test to assure the safety and effectiveness of American nuclear weapons.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SEN. JON KYL (R), ARIZONA: Our intelligence agencies lack the ability to confidently detect low-yield tests. We would be irresponsible to the extreme to ratify an unverifiable arms control treaty, especially when that treaty will inevitably reduce our confidence in our own nuclear deterrent.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

ENSOR: But Senator Biden of Delaware was scathing in reply, responding to Senator Kyle's argument that U.S. allies like Germany and Japan, fearing that the U.S. nuclear arsenal might not be safe, would feel they had to build nuclear weapons as well.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

SEN. JOSEPH BIDEN (D), DELAWARE: Why did all of our allies sign and ratify this treaty? Why are they acopleptic (ph) about the prospect that we won't sign this treaty. I'd like to ask my colleagues when was the last time that they can remember the prime minister of Great Britain, the president of France, etcetera, saying publicly, my lord, I hope the Senate doesn't do that?

(END VIDEO CLIP) ENSOR: With treaty proponents publicly admitting that they expect to lose this vote, next week, if it goes ahead, negotiations are underway behind the scenes to try to find a way to avoid having a Senate vote, next week. The Republican leadership has said the president

would have to publicly state not only that he wants the treaty withdrawn but he will agree to that being withdrawn for the rest of his presidency, something the White House says at least at this point they can't accept.

Now, Senator Daschle, the minority leader of the Senate, has also just said that he would -- he believes there's a parliamentary maneuver under which the treaty could be withdrawn. He is hoping that Senator Lott will suggest to the Senate that it vote to return to pending business. If that were done, he says, that by a 51-member vote the Senate could drop the treaty, at least for now -- Bill.

HEMMER: All right, David Ensor, live on Capital Hill. Now to Daryn with more.

[EXCERPTS]

WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

(Ottawa, Canada)

For Immediate Release
October 8, 1999

PRESS AVAILABILITY BY THE PRESIDENT AND PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN

Parliament
Ottawa, Canada

12:05 P.M. EDT

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Madames et monsieurs, ladies and gentlemen, it's a great pleasure for me to receive the President of the United States in Canada for this occasion of opening the new embassy, and for the President to come and make a speech in Mont Tremblant on federalism.

As you know, the relations between Canada and the U.S. are excellent, and the President is here for his fifth visit to Canada since he started in office. And when I asked him to come to the conference at Mont Tremblant I had to call upon our longstanding friendship. And everyone is very pleased that you, the leader of the greatest democracy and the greatest federation, should come to give your point of view.

--- the President of the United States to come and make this statement, the speech in Mont Tremblant, because he has been -- he is in a very privileged position. He has been the governor of a state, of Arkansas, and he has been the President of the Conference of the

Governors, and he has been, on the other side, the President of the United States. So he knows the functioning of a federal system inside out.

And I'm sure that the people coming from around the world will benefit very strongly from his experience. And I want to say thank you very much. And I take it as a great sign of friendship for Canada and for myself that you have accepted to be with us today.

If you want to say a few words.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. First of all, Prime Minister, thank you for welcoming me back for my fifth trip to Canada since I've been President.

I would like to be very brief, and then we'll open it to questions. I'm here today to dedicate our embassy, to speak at the Prime Minister's federalism conference, and to have the chance to meet with Prime Minister Chretien...

One of the things that we have worked on together is our efforts in nonproliferation. And Canada and the United States agree with all of our NATO allies that the comprehensive test ban treaty is the right thing to do, it's the interest of the United States.

There has been far more controversy about it in our country than in other countries, including other nuclear powers who are our allies. And I was -- we've been trying to have a debate on this for two years, but it is clear now that the level of opposition to the treaty and the time it would take to craft the necessary safeguards to get the necessary votes are simply not there.

So I hope that the Senate will reach an agreement to delay the vote and to establish an orderly process, a non-political orderly process, to systematically deal with all the issues that are out there and to take whatever time is necessary to do it.

With this treaty other nations will find it harder to acquire or to modernize nuclear weapons, and we will gain the means to detect and deter. If we don't have the treaty, the United States will continue to refrain from testing, and we'll give a green light to every other country in the world to test, to develop, to modernize nuclear weapons.

I think it's clear what we ought to do, but it's also clear that we ought not to rush this vote until there has been an appropriate process in the Senate.

Thank you very much.

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Thank you, sir. Now, we'll take questions. Sir?

Q Mr. President, the Senate Majority Leader has stated that he would consider taking the test ban treaty off the table, withdrawing it from consideration under the caveat that it would not be reintroduced in

the 106th Congress. Would you, sir, in order to preserve this treaty, be willing to give up ownership of it to the next Congress and the next administration?

THE PRESIDENT: First of all, I don't own it. And insofar as I do, we always will, since we negotiated it and the United States was the first to sign it. But it isn't mine, it belongs to the world. And I think the whole nature of your question shows what's wrong with the way the Senate has treated this.

They've treated this like a political document. They've treated this whole issue like a political issue. They went out and got people committed to vote against the treaty before they knew the first thing about it. And what I have said is -- I don't understand what he's worried about. This thing could never have come up in the first place if he hadn't agreed to it. And I wouldn't bring it up unless I thought we could ratify it, because I won't treat it politically.

So this whole thing is about politics. It's about burn us in 1999, because we're against the treaty that 80 percent of the American people support; but please don't burn us again in 2000. It's political. This treaty is not going to come up until we think we can pass it. And it won't come up until they treat it seriously.

Every serious American treaty, for example, has the legislative language attached as safeguards, just like we did in the Chemical Weapons Treaty, so that everyone understands exactly what it means. In this treaty they actually went out of their way to try to keep safeguards from being attached to it so that they could have the maximum number of votes against it.

So I will give you a nonpolitical answer. I will say again, they should put it off and then they should agree to a legitimate process where Republicans and Democratic senators think about the national interest. They have total control over when it comes up, not me. If it had been up to me we would have started on this two years ago. We would have had six months of hearings, two weeks of debate, lots of negotiations and this whole thing would have been out of the way a year and a half ago.

It was not out of the way because that's the decision they made not to bring it up. They control when it comes up. So you're asking the wrong person whether it would come up next year. You should turn around and ask Senator Lott whether it would come up next year.

What I want to do -- I don't care when it comes up, except when it comes up, I want it to come up as soon as we can, pass it, with a legitimate process. As messy as this has been, this has illustrated to the American people, beyond any question, that this whole deal has been about politics so far.

Now, there are some people who are honestly against this treaty. But we haven't been able to hear from them for two years, and we haven't been able to answer them, and we haven't been able to work on it. So I think it's been a very healthy thing to bring it up. But now we ought to

do what's right for America, take it out of politics -- this is not going to be a huge issue next year in the election, one way or the other. We should deal with this on the merits. They should agree to a process -- then they control when it comes up.

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Oh, the question is for Clinton -- (laughter.)

Q Mr. Clinton, I want to know if your meeting with Mr. Bouchard today is an indication of any change in U.S. policy towards Quebec sovereignty? And secondly, if Mr. Chretien asked you anything about that meeting today?

THE PRESIDENT: No, and, no. That's the short answer.

PRIME MINISTER CHRETIEN: Thank you. Next. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: The short answer, no and no. I did meet with him when he was in opposition about four years ago. He is the premier of the province. We're going there; he's the host; it's a courtesy and I think I should do it. But there has been no change in our policy, whatsoever.

Q First of all, Mr. President, are you going to meet Senator Helms' demand that you actually submit what you announced here today in writing? How badly has this hurt the United States --

THE PRESIDENT: I'm sorry, what --

Q Senator Helms' demand that you submit it in writing to him.

THE PRESIDENT: Submit what?

Q The CTBT -- I'm sorry -- the CTBT, the withdrawal of it in writing. He's asked for that. How badly has that hurt a U.S. leadership role in arms control? And what's the message from India where the world's largest democracy just overwhelmingly reelected the government that you criticized heavily for conducting nuclear tests?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think, first of all, if you look at India, you have to see the people voted for that government for all kinds of reasons. And what I believe is -- look, France conducted a nuclear test before they signed the treaty. What I believe is that the United States does not sign the treaty and show a little leadership here, why should the Pakistanis and the Indians do it?

Ever since the end of World War II, and beginning with the election of Dwight Eisenhower, we have had a bipartisan commitment to leading the world away from proliferation. It has never been called into question until the present day. Never.

Now, we had to work for a very long time to get the Chemical Weapons Convention passed, which is very important. But Senator Helms and the others followed a legitimate process. I never had a doubt that the objections that they raised and the safeguards they wanted were absolutely

heartfelt and serious. This treaty was never treated seriously. They took two years, had no time for hearings, said I'll give you eight days, and later we discovered -- after they said that, that that was offered only after they had 43 commitments on a party-line vote to vote against the treaty from people who hadn't heard a hearing and hadn't even thought about it -- most of them.

So they want me to give them a letter to cover the political decision they have made that does severe damage to the interest of the United States and the interest of nonproliferation in the world? I don't think so. That's not what this is about. They have to take responsibility for whether they want to reverse 50 years of American leadership in nonproliferation that the Republicans have been just as involved in as the Democrats, to their everlasting credit.

Now, they have to make that decision. I cannot bring this treaty up again unless they want to. I have asked them to put it off because we don't have the votes. I have talked to enough Republicans to know that some of them have honest, genuine reservations about this treaty, and they ought to have the opportunity to have them resolved, instead of being told that they owe it to their party to vote against the treaty and that the leadership of their party will do everything they can to keep us from writing safeguards into the treaty which answer their reservations, which is what we do on every other thing.

So I don't want to get into making this political. But they shouldn't tie the Senate up or themselves up in knots thinking that some letter from me will somehow obscure from the American people next year the reality that they have run the risk of putting America on the wrong side of the proliferation issue for the first time in 50 years. And they want to do it and then they don't want to get up and defend it before the American people in an election year. That's what this whole thing is about. That is the wrong thing to do.

We don't have the votes. I'm not going to try to bring it up without the votes. Let them take it down, but also agree on a legitimate process to take this out of politics. I will not criticize them as long as they are genuinely working through the issues, the way we did in the Chemical Weapons Treaty.

They're entitled to advise and consent. They're entitled to take all the time they want. But nobody hit a lick at this for two years. And then they tried to get it up and down on grounds that were other than substantive, and that's wrong. And it's bad for America. It has nothing to do with me and my administration. I wouldn't care who got the thing ratified, as long as we did it in the right way.

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002

(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Sun, 10 Oct 1999 12:31:23 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: news on CTBT, 10/10

October 10, 1999

TO: Coalition members and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: today's coverage on CTBT

Attached below are several key news articles and columns on the CTBT debate. Kudos to Sykes, Kidder, and von Hippel for an on target op-ed in the Post and to Peace Action for getting photos of their demonstration on Capitol Hill in The New York Times and on Meet the Press.

Please note a couple of facts that reporters at supposedly the better papers like the NYT and Washington Post continue to neglect:

* the 3 nuclear weapons laboratory directors have said this past week (and repeatedly over the last two years) that "... we are confident that a fully supported and sustained stockpile stewardship program will enable us to continue to maintain America's nuclear deterrent without nuclear testing." (See October 8 DOE News Release, below.)

* the number of states that have signed the CTBT is 154; the number that have ratified is 51; the number of the 44 needed for entry into force is 26; and the number of the 44 needed for entry into force that have signed is 41, and 2 additional states -- India and Pakistan -- have made conditional pledges to join the Treaty, putting CTBT entry into force within reach.

Attached below is:

* DOE News, October 8, 1999, "Joint Statement by Three Nuclear Weapons Laboratory Directors"

* "False Fears About a Test Ban," Ray Kidder, Lynn Sykes and Frank von Hippel, The Washington Post, October 10, 1999

* "Fears of 50's Stalk Senate: Debate on Test Ban Centers on Deterrence," The New York Times, October 10, 1999

* "Washington War of Words on Policing Nuclear Tests," The New York Times, October 10, 1999

More later,

DK

DOE News, October 8, 1999

"Joint Statement by Three Nuclear Weapons Laboratory Directors"

C. Paul Robinson, Sandia National Laboratories
John C. Browne, Los Alamos National Laboratory
C. Bruce Tartar, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

"We, the three nuclear weapons laboratory directors, have been consistent in our view that the stockpile remains safe and reliable today.

"For the last three years, we have advised the Secretaries of Energy and Defense through the formal annual certification process that the stockpile remains safe and reliable and that there is no need to return to nuclear testing at this time.

"We have just forwarded our fourth set of certification letters to Energy and Defense Secretaries confirming our judgement that once again the stockpile is safe and reliable without nuclear testing.

"While there can never be a guarantee that the stockpile will remain safe and reliable indefinitely without nuclear testing, we have stated that we are confident that a fully supported and sustained stockpile stewardship program will enable us to continue to maintain America's nuclear deterrent without nuclear testing.

"If that turns out not to be the case, Safeguard F -- which is a condition for entry into the Test Ban Treaty by the U.S. -- provides for the President, in consultation with the Congress, to withdraw from the Treaty under the standard "supreme national interest" clause in order to conduct whatever testing might be required."

The Washington Post, October 10, 1999

"False Fears About a Test Ban"

Ray Kidder, Lynn Sykes and Frank von Hippel*

More than eighty percent of the American people want a permanent ban on nuclear-weapons tests and support outside the U.S. is at least as high. This public support, sustained over 45 years, has powered the movement that has persuaded the governments of 154 nations to sign a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and has finally brought it up before the U.S. Senate.

The arguments against the test ban treaty today are the same as those that opponents used to slow its progress for 40 years: the fear that other countries will cheat and be able to reap advantages from small clandestine tests, and the belief that the only way to make sure that a nuclear weapon

works is to test it.

The first argument is illustrated by a continuing controversy within the U.S. intelligence community as to whether Russia is conducting small underground nuclear tests on its Arctic test site. There have been repeated leaks, based on spy satellite images, that Russia is continuing to carry out activities on the island of Novaya Zemlya identical to those that used to accompany underground tests. Russian spy satellites are presumably detecting similar activities at the U.S. Nevada test site. The U.S. government says that we are carrying out permitted and essential zero-nuclear-yield ("sub-critical") tests with plutonium. Russia says it is doing the same.

If the U.S. and other key countries ratify the test ban and the treaty comes into force, we could request an on-site inspection by the international Test Ban Treaty Organization. Inspectors could go to the site where the suspicious activity had taken place and drill into the test chamber. If the drilling yielded fresh fission products, a cheater would be exposed.

Still there is a possibility that a small nuclear test, carried out secretly away from monitored test sites, might escape detection. What could be gained from such a test? Very little below the threshold for the "boosting" of fission explosives. Allegations about Chinese nuclear spying to the contrary, boosting the yield of a fission explosive with the fusion of a small amount of tritium-deuterium gas was the key step in the development of modern compact warheads, a "secret" that has been officially declassified for decades. Testing boosting requires a nuclear explosion with a power of at least a few hundred tons of TNT and full boosting gives yields of thousands of tons. This is beyond the level that could plausibly be concealed from U.S. seismic monitoring stations. The detection threshold would be lowered further if the Treaty comes into force and more seismic stations in other countries can be used. The U.S. has done virtually no testing for nuclear-weapons development below 1000 tons of TNT. We can therefore be comfortable with a ban on nuclear tests of all size.

What about the reliability argument? Here the most powerful counter would be to make public the statistical record of the remarkable success of U.S. nuclear tests. Virtually all of these tests were developmental tests. The analyzed classified record shows that, after the U.S. nuclear establishment mastered the art of designing boosted thermonuclear weapons more than two decades ago, there have been virtually no failures. Except for tests that were exploring new design concepts or testing sensitivity to extreme environmental conditions, the deviations from theoretically predicted yields were remarkably small. Given this level of understanding and the availability of non-nuclear means, such as sub-critical tests, to confirm the key properties of nuclear materials, there is no question that U.S. nuclear weapons can be maintained without nuclear testing.

On the surface, the debate over the nuclear test ban is about technical uncertainties. Below the surface, it is about competing priorities. Many test ban opponents only care that the U.S. be

unconstrained in the development of nuclear weapons. If the U.S. resumed testing, however, other countries would as well. They would improve their nuclear weapons much more than we would and the world would be pushed back closer to nuclear-weapons use.

*Ray Kidder, a senior nuclear weapons physicist, retired from the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in 1990. Lynn Sykes, a seismologist, is Professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences at Columbia University. Frank von Hippel is a Professor of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University.

The New York Times, October 10, 1999

NEWS ANALYSIS

"Fears of 50's Stalk Senate: Debate on Test Ban Centers on Deterrence"

By ERIC SCHMITT

WASHINGTON -- In debating the historic treaty that would ban all underground nuclear testing, the Senate is reliving one of the most divisive arguments of the cold war: do international arms control treaties enhance or imperil America's nuclear deterrent?

To its supporters, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, as it is formally known, would lock in American superiority achieved from more than 1,000 nuclear tests since 1945, and curb the spread of advanced atomic arms.

But to its critics, the ban would freeze an accord-abiding United States dangerously in place while states like North Korea and Iran, or even China or Russia, cheated by conducting clandestine tests that could erode America's advantage and set off a new global arms race.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union a decade ago, the United States' atomic arsenal has been a hedge against not only a resurgent Russia or hegemonic China but also a growing number of nuclear nations.

"That deterrent has never been as important to the security of Americans as it is today with rogue states developing the capacity to attack our cities and our population," said Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, the United States delegate to the United Nations under President Reagan, who opposes the treaty.

Conservatives express fears that the test ban treaty is a dangerous first step toward weakening America's nuclear deterrent and preventing the United States from building newer and deadlier weapons in the future. These critics note with alarm that the treaty's preamble says the cessation of all nuclear weapons tests "constitutes an effective means of nuclear

disarmament."

Senator James M. Inhofe, Republican of Oklahoma, said he suspected that "in the White House they honestly believe that if we all stand in a circle and we all hold hands and we all disarm, everyone is going to be happy. I'm not at all satisfied with that."

Treaty supporters dismiss such concerns as unfounded hyperbole, saying the United States has no intention of giving up its nuclear shield. While the pact cannot prevent countries from building crude nuclear devices or from conducting militarily insignificant nuclear explosions, supporters say the pact can restrict their ability to develop and field the most advanced weapons.

"It is potential proliferators who need to test; we do not," Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this week. "The treaty will make it more difficult and dangerous for countries to develop and modernize nuclear weapons."

At the heart of this debate over deterrence is the safety and reliability of a national nuclear weapons inventory that has shrunk from 12,000 strategic warheads in the late 1980's to about 6,000 warheads now. Under the Start 2 treaty, now awaiting approval by the Russian Parliament, the American arsenal would decline to between 3,000 and 3,500 warheads -- a marked reduction that would nonetheless leave the United States with by far the world's most formidable nuclear force.

The United States imposed a moratorium on underground nuclear tests in 1992, complementing a treaty banning atmospheric tests adopted in 1963. The underground tests were used to try out new designs and check for safety flaws in existing bombs. To maintain the reliability of the aging arsenal now, the Government employs a series of sophisticated computer models and nonnuclear explosive tests.

Every year, physicists at the nation's three nuclear weapons laboratories -- Los Alamos, Sandia and Lawrence Livermore -- must certify that the stockpile is safe and reliable. If problems are detected in a weapon, the whole weapons class could be recalled, effectively drawing down the nuclear stockpile.

Under a condition President Clinton attached to the test ban treaty, laboratory directors' failure to certify the stockpile would be grounds for the United States to pull out of the pact.

The Government spends \$4.5 billion a year on the sophisticated test program, but in testimony this week, the laboratory directors said it would not be fully operational for at least 5 to 10 years. In giving the treaty a highly conditional endorsement, the scientists said the arsenal was safe and reliable now, but they warned about inadequate financing, shortages of trained experts and aging weapons in the future.

"I am confident that a fully supported and sustained program will enable us to continue to maintain America's nuclear deterrent without nuclear testing," said John C. Browne, director of Los Alamos National

Laboratory in New Mexico. "However, I am concerned about several trends that are reducing my confidence level each year."

Even staunch arms control advocates like Senator Richard Lugar, Republican of Indiana, express reservations about the science-based substitute for actual testing. "The bottom line is that the Senate is being asked to trust the security of our country to a program that is unproven and unlikely to be fully operational until perhaps 2010," said Lugar, who opposes the treaty.

If the United States were to lose its nuclear edge, critics contend, allies now under the American umbrella might feel compelled to develop their own atomic weapons, a scenario that treaty supporters say is highly unlikely.

The Senate Republican Policy Committee, chaired by Larry Craig of Idaho, issued an analysis of the pact this week saying, "Today's nuclear arsenal is adequate for current threats, but this may not always be the case. The C.T.B.T. will limit our ability to tailor a nuclear defense to meet unexpected threats or new missions."

But under the accord, most of the 4,000 components in a nuclear weapon can be modified, including the casings, detonators, batteries and arming systems, nuclear physicists say. Parts that wear out can be replaced. In 1996, for example, the weapons laboratories modified the B-61-7 nuclear bomb into the B-61-Mod 11 earth-penetrating weapon by hardening the outer casing, improving the bomb's ability to destroy deeply buried targets.

Moreover, the Pentagon has determined that it is not always cost-efficient to incorporate the latest safety devices in all weapons. In 1992, the Navy opted not to replace its W-88 Trident missile warhead with a new version that had less sensitive explosives, said Christopher Paine, a senior researcher at the Natural Resources Defense Council's nuclear program. Instead, the Navy devised a cheaper way to improve safety by changing the way it loaded the warhead onto the missile, Paine said.

Indeed, actual nuclear tests have been more important for perfecting new types of weapons than correcting flaws in existing arms, nuclear weapons experts say.

A 1996 study by the three weapons laboratories that reviewed problems detected in the arsenal determined that of 830 specific defects found from 1958 to 1993, fewer than 1 percent were discovered through nuclear tests. And virtually all of the problematic weapons have been phased out of the stockpile.

The New York Times, October 10, 1999

"Washington War of Words on Policing Nuclear Tests"

By WILLIAM J. BROAD

A mystery unfolded last year when India, on May 13, announced that it had set off a pair of nuclear blasts. The global network of seismometers -- sensitive devices buried deep in the earth to monitor shock waves from distant earthquakes and blasts -- recorded no faint rumbles emanating from India's underground test site in its northwestern desert. There was no blip, no twitch of pen or meter suggesting the awesome power of the atom had just been released.

Had India faked the explosive tests? Were they flops? Or had small blasts eluded the eavesdroppers? And if they had, what did that mean for a global ban on nuclear blasts in which compliance was to be assiduously verified?

These questions have a strong bearing on the bruising battle in Washington over whether the Senate should bless Washington's participation in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which more than 150 nations have signed.

Friends and foes have engaged in a war of words, with arms control experts from the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of Energy warning Congress that the United States would have a hard time knowing if foreign states were secretly setting off small blasts. But last week two of the world's top groups of earth scientists weighed in heavily on the side of treaty backers, saying technology could easily police the ban.

The test ban supporters say that even current sensors are up to the job and that the network called for by the treaty will be even better. Moreover, this official network will be augmented by the rapid global spread of all kinds of private sensors, including seismometers and spy satellites. All this, treaty advocates say, will make it hard to hide all but the smallest blasts.

Though the treaty's opponents point to the Indian claim as a test-ban embarrassment, the emerging consensus among nuclear experts is that what failed that day was not global monitoring but the pair of explosive devices. "The Indian claims were exaggerated," said George Perkovich, author of "India's Nuclear Bomb" (University of California), to be published this week. The problems were so great, he added, that India left another nuclear device in the ground undetonated.

To police the globe for clandestine blasts, the nuclear test ban treaty calls for 321 monitoring stations -- 170 to detect underground shock waves, 80 to sniff the air for telltale radioactivity, 60 to listen for revealing sounds and 11 to track undersea booms.

"If a suspicious occurrence cannot be resolved through consultation and clarification," says a treaty document, "each state party has the right to request an on-site inspection."

The array of seismic monitoring devices should be able to detect

nuclear blasts as small as a kiloton, or equal to 1,000 tons of high explosives. On recording gear for earthquakes, experts say, such a blast would measure about magnitude 4, like a minor tremor.

In the bomb business, 1,000 tons is indisputably small. The weapon that leveled Hiroshima had a power of about 15,000 tons, and the first hydrogen bomb was about 700 times as powerful, enough to cause the Pacific isle of Elugelab, one mile in diameter, to vanish.

The American Geophysical Union and the Seismological Society of America, in a joint statement released on Wednesday in Washington, said that when arrays of sensors called for by the treaty are all switched on worldwide, "no nation could rely upon successfully concealing a program of nuclear testing, even at low yields" in which blasts are very small.

Gregory E. van der Vink, an earth scientist at Princeton University who helped draft the statement, said existing instruments already exceed the treaty's monitoring goals.

In fact, for places like underground test sites in China and Russia, Dr. van der Vink added, the sensitivity of existing seismic detectors is already up to hundreds of times better than necessary.

The scientists said the treaty's own 170 seismic stations will be augmented by thousands of private ones run by universities and research institutions worldwide.

Most private seismic sensors track earthquakes. But for decades such detectors have also been used for monitoring arms control treaties and nuclear blasts, whose characteristic signatures in most cases are easy to distinguish. "We've had 40 years to work on this and we've done quite well," Jeffrey Park, a Yale geologist who helped draft the scientists' statement, said last week.

The scientists cautioned that no verification system can be perfect. But they added that treaty monitoring would be good enough to detect all but the most egregious cheating, which would require not only great cost and skill but would probably be exposed anyway by satellite photographs, atmospheric sampling, or the growing web of seismometers.

Some of the trickiest spots to monitor are old underground nuclear test areas -- like Novaya Zemlya in Russia's northern archipelago, Lop Nor in China's northwestern desert and the Nevada Test Site in the American West -- where the treaty allows non-nuclear tests, including the detonation of conventional explosives to compress nuclear fuels short of firing.

Such tests are considered vital for checking weapon safety and reliability. Although it can be hard to distinguish their seismic effects from those of very small nuclear blasts, nuclear blasts emit certain radioactive isotopes of xenon, a colorless, odorless, highly unreactive gas -- gas that invariably percolates up through the ground. Sniffing for such gas is to be a main job of atmospheric surveillance.

Lawrence Turnbull, a top C.I.A. seismologist, has long warned of clever ways to evade detection of nuclear explosions. In 1995, he briefed industry executives on how foes could use large mines or caves for small clandestine blasts. The surrounding air would soften the bomb's shock waves, in theory making them so diminutive as to be undetectable.

Lynn R. Sykes, a seismologist at the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University and an authority on detecting nuclear blasts, dismissed the C.I.A.'s fears as groundless.

"Testing in a cavity is portrayed as easy, when in fact it is exceedingly difficult," he said. And experts say even deft clandestine tests would still emit telltale xenon gas, in theory allowing the cheats to be exposed.

What of small blasts that somehow managed to escape detection? After the cold war, official disclosures made clear that the superpowers had occasionally done very small tests underground. Most of these small explosions -- all below 1,000 tons -- were done after the superpowers had mastered the art of producing big blasts. The intentional making of tiny nuclear explosions can be difficult for a novice.

"The chance of a beginner doing anything under a kiloton is zilch," said Dr. Ray E. Kidder, a physicist at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California and a former bomb designer. Besides, he noted, there would be strong incentive to progress to larger blasts more useful for bomb design.

But Frank J. Gaffney, Jr., a former Pentagon official in the Reagan Administration who now directs the Center for Security Policy, a private Washington group that opposes the test ban, said tests below 1,000 tons were sufficient to investigate some aspects of the atomic triggers used to ignite hydrogen bombs.

"That can be very valuable militarily," he said in an interview. "And from such a successful test you can extrapolate." Small blasts, he added, echoing the view of some intelligence officials, "can escape detection."

Gaffney concluded that the treaty is a bad thing. "Our hands are tied," he said. "And everybody else does what they want."

Daryl Kimball, Executive Director
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Avenue NE, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20002
(ph) 202-546-0795 x136 (fax) 202-546-7970
website <<http://www.crnd.org>>

EXT - SOFTBALL COMPLEX - DAY

PLAYERS for the eight teams in the Genoa 70 and over softball league arrive for the first games of the season. They are the Rockets, Paradise, Beach Boys, Comets, Golden Oldies, Good Hope, Legends, and Whiz Kids.

The players park and get out of their cars. Some change to cleat shoes. They disperse to the four fields and carry bats, gloves and containers of water and sports drink.

Henry and Jake park side-by-side. They walk together to the pair of fields where Paradise will play the Beach Boys and the Rockets will play the Comets. Jake carries his boom box.

Jake comes to the field where his team will play. He puts the boom box on the bench and turns on disco music. Some of the Paradise players do the aerobic routine that Mimi taught. Others play catch.

Beach Boy music (the singing group) blares from the other bench where the BEACH BOYS PLAYERS (the softball team) gather. All are deeply tanned. A couple have blond, shaggy hair falling to their shoulders, suggesting that they wear wigs.

The Beach Boys swagger onto the field for infield practice. They are cocky and quite proficient.

Jake and Charlie stand on the sideline and watch them.

JAKE

So this is the team that beat you in the fall.

CHARLIE

Now they've got five new players who arrived from the North last week.

JAKE

That so?

CHARLIE

Yeah, including their player manager. The guy on first base. He comes down from Detroit every January to play with them.

JAKE

I wonder how he got a tan so quickly.

A bit later the players from Paradise and the Beach Boys gather at their respective benches. The UMPIRE gestures to the managers to come to home plate.

Jake turns to Charlie and speaks. Charlie picks up a bottle of water, opens it, and pours water on Jake's right hand. Jake starts toward home plate with a couple of score cards in his left hand.

Jake and BARNEY, the Beach Boys manager, join the umpire at home plate. They are within hearing distance of some of the players on each side.

Each manager hands a score card to the umpire and one to each other. The umpire beckons them to shake hands. Jake reaches beyond Barney's open hand and clasps him on the forearm.

Jake pulls back his hand and holds it up. It is covered with tan makeup. Barney's arm shows bare spots where his makeup came off.

JAKE

Ump, I object to these fellows wearing makeup.
This is a ball game, not a beauty contest.

BARNEY

There's no rule against it.

JAKE

What if I told you that one of my players is allergic to make up? If it rubs off on him, he could get hives.

BARNEY

That's not likely to happen.

JAKE

There are rules protecting persons with disabilities.

BARNEY

Half our guys have disabilities.

UMPIRE

(to Jake)

Does your player have a letter from his doctor about his condition?

JAKE

Of course, not. We didn't expect this would be a problem.

UMPIRE

Then I can't do anything about it.

(beat)

Let's play ball.

The managers return to their teams. Mike comes up to Jake.

MIKE

Who on our team is allergic to makeup?

JAKE

You tell me.

Paradise players around them laugh.

JAKE

Are we having fun?

PARADISE PLAYERS

Yeah!

JAKE

Are we going to beat the Beach Boys?

PARADISE PLAYERS

Yeah!

The Beach Boys take the field. From the Paradise team Mel goes out to coach at first base, and Tino goes to coach at third base. For the Beach Boys Barney plays first, Eddy is at shortstop, and Gus at third.

MEL

Barney, I thought makeup is for women, not for he-men.

Barney ignore him.

TINO

Hey, Eddy, if you guys want to wear makeup, you ought to play in a girls' league.

The game begins with Robbie batting for Paradise. He hits a sharp grounder to Eddy at shortstop. He muffs it and Robbie gets to first.

Dave hits a slow roller to Gus. Gus fields the ball and overthrows second base. The ball sails into right field, and Robbie advances to third.

TINO

I guess it's hard to throw with makeup on your hand.

GUS

Why don't you shut up?

Charlie comes to bat. He hits a long line drive between the left and left-center fielders. The ball goes through the gap and rolls to the fence. Robbie and Dave score, and Charlie gets to third.

A bit later the inning ends. As the Paradise players take the field, the scorekeeper puts up a "3" on the scoreboard.

JAKE

Are we having fun?

PARADISE PLAYERS

Yeah! We're having fun! It's a picnic!

The scoreboard changes successively as follows:

PARADISE	INNING	BEACH BOYS
5	2	2
7	5	4
12	8	7

The game is over. Players from each team form a line, and they walk by one another to shake hands. When he is through the line, Charlie pulls out a handkerchief and wipes his hands as if to remove make up. Nearby Paradise players laugh.

Paradise players gather up their gear. The Rockets filter in behind them to take their place on the bench. The Beach Boys remain in place. The Paradise team moves to the adjacent field.

Henry looks at the scoreboard. Jake comes up.

HENRY

That's pretty good for your debut.

JAKE

Pretty good? We were terrific. They were champs last fall.

(beat)

How'd you do?

HENRY

We beat the Comets sixteen to two.

JAKE

We play them now.

Jake heads for the adjacent field.

MONTAGE of the Rockets versus the Beach Boys. This time the Beach Boys are not to be denied. Although the Rockets' infield plays a polished game, the Beach Boys keep hitting the ball over their heads. The Rockets' final out of the game is a play at home plate.

The scoreboard shows Rockets 5, Beach Boys 11.

Henry and Jake walk together to the parking lot.

JAKE

The trouble with the Rockets is that they're too tight. Just like you.

HENRY

You stirred up the Beach Boys, so they took revenge on us.

JAKE

Loosen up.

HENRY

You may have beat the best and worst teams in the league, but you've got some defeats ahead of you.

JAKE

We'll see about that.

Jake whistles a tune and swaggers to his car.

INT - WOODWORKING SHOP - DAY

A pair of hands guides a piece of wood through a jigsaw in an intricate pattern.

Colleen works at the jigsaw in Henry's basement woodworking shop.

Lisa enters. She has several three by five cards in her hand. She walks around where Colleen can see her. Colleen turns off the jigsaw.

LISA

So when the cat's away.

COLLEEN

6

6

This is something I've been wanting to do for a long time. It's not as hard as he claimed. Or as dangerous.

LISA

What is it?

COLLEEN

A what-not shelf. Henry's promised one for years, but never made it.

Lisa holds up the cards.

LISA

I've got their addresses.

COLLEEN

How'd you do that?

LISA

I charmed a postal clerk.

(beat)

They're living separately.

COLLEEN

That'll cut down on the fighting.

LISA

They've asked to have all their mail forwarded except the bills.

COLLEEN

The bums!

Lisa hands Colleen a card.

LISA

Here's Henry's address. You can write to him.

COLLEEN

Never, unless he writes first.

LISA

7

7

Don't you miss him?

COLLEEN

Well, uh.

(beat)

He's not too old to learn a lesson.

LISA

I thought maybe you'd like to go to Florida.

COLLEEN

That'd be surrender. Would you go?

LISA

It's warmer there.

(beat)

No, not yet.

Colleen reads the address on the card.

EXT - SOFTBALL FIELD - DAY

Players from the Rockets and the Golden Oldies mix together in the field for batting practice. Hitters from the two teams alternate at hitting five practice pitches.

Henry stands in front of the Rockets' bench behind the fence and watches. Buddy arrives with his sister, HELEN (60), well-coiffured and trim.

BUDDY

Henry, I'd like you to meet my sister, Helen. She just arrived in town and has agreed to keep score for us.

HENRY

Nice to meet you, Helen,

HELEN

Likewise.

HENRY

Scorekeeping's a mystery to me. Glad to have someone who knows how.

8

8

HELEN

I'd rather be playing, but you don't have any co-ed teams around here.

Helen sits on the bench. Buddy joins Mike, Danny, and Ernie waiting their turn to bat.

In the background a boom box on the Golden Oldies' bench plays hit tunes of the 1940s, especially ones popular during World War II. "The White Cliffs of Dover" starts from the boom box. Henry sings along.

BOOM BOX & HENRY

"There'll be bluebirds over,
The white cliffs of Dover."

MIKE

Don't get caught up in nostalgia, Henry. That's their trick to distract us.

BUDDY

The one's I have nostalgia for are Phil Rizzutto and Pee Wee Resse.

MIKE

How about Joe Dimaggio and Stan Musial?

DANNY

And Hank Greenberg.

ERNIE

And don't forget Jackie Robinson.

HENRY

Yeah, those are the guys I want you to play like.

A bit later the Rockets are in the field, waiting for the first pitch. The first Golden Oldies batter comes to the plate. He hits a clean single to left field.

On the bench Helen makes an entry on the score sheet. Elliott sits next to her and chats with her.

The second batter hits left handed. In the field Norm as short fielder shifts to the right of second base. The batter hits a hard grounder to Raul, the Rockets' second baseman. He fields the ball cleanly and throws to Buddy, the shortstop, for a force out at second. Buddy throws the ball to Danny at first for the completion of the double play.

9

9

On the bench Henry rises and cheers.

HENRY

Attaway to go, guys.

The third Golden Oldies batter smashes a line drive to the right of Wayne, the Rockets' third baseman. Wayne quickly reaches over and backhands the ball for the third out.

The Rockets players come to the bench for their turn at bat. Norm sits next to Helen (on the other side from Elliott, and chats with her.

HENRY

Now let's get some hits to go with our defense.

MONTAGE: For the Rocket Raul leads off with a base hit. Wayne flies out to the left fielder. Ernie singles to right field, and Raul moves to third. Danny hits a long fly ball to the left-center fielder. Raul tags up and scores. Norm grounds out.

The scoreboard shows:

GOLDEN OLDIES	INNING	ROCKETS
0	1	1

DISSOLVE TO:

The scorekeeper changes the scoreboard to:

GOLDEN OLDIES	INNING	ROCKETS
4	7	11

For the Rockets Ernie bats. Danny stands on deck. In the bench area Elliott goes up to Henry.

ELLIOTT

Henry, are you ever going to let me play?

HENRY

You need more practice.

ELLIOTT

It's the third game already.

NORM

We've got a safe lead. Let him bat for me.

10

10

Elliott stands in the batter's box. Ernie is at second base, Danny at first.

Elliott swings wildly at the first pitch, which lands in the dirt in front of the plate. The second pitch is high, and Elliott fouls it out of play. He strikes out on the third pitch. This is the third out.

In the field Elliott replaces Norm at short field. The Golden Oldies have the bases loaded. The batter hits a grounder that rolls between Elliott's legs. Two runs score.

The Golden Oldies have runners on first and second. The batter hits a line drive back to Ira, the pitcher, who catches it for an out.

The next batter hits a hard grounder to Wayne at third. He quickly steps on third for a force out and throws to Danny at first for the double play.

The two teams form lines and shake hands. The Golden Oldies boom box comes on with World War II vintage song.

The Rockets gather at their bench, wipe their faces, drink sports drink. Henry takes Elliott aside and demonstrates getting the glove on the ground.

The Golden Oldies boom box switches to "The Jersey Bounce."

NORM

(singing and dancing to the boom box)

"They call it the Jersey bounce."

BUDDY

Hey, does anyone know why the farmer pushed his cow off the cliff?

RAY

No, why?

BUDDY

To see the Jersey bounce.

Many groans.

HENRY

I haven't heard that one since high school.

He chuckles slightly.

11

11

EXT - PARKING LOT - DAY

Players from the various teams prepare to depart. Some change out of their spiked shoes. Others chat with one another.

Helen walks with Norm and Elliott, who compete for her attention.

Henry stands beside his car. Jake comes up, looking dejected.

HENRY

How'd you do?

JAKE

Lost twice.

HENRY

There goes your perfect season.

(beat)

We won both of ours. We really clobbered the Whiz Kids.

JAKE

The Good Hope team was really good, but we should've beat the Legends. Too many errors.

HENRY

The trouble with Paradise is that you're too undisciplined.

Frank comes up to them.

JAKE

Good game, Frank. If everyone had played as well as you, we'd have won.

FRANK

Thanks.

TWO LEGENDS PLAYERS walk by. One of them, a big burly fellow, has a tattoo on his forearm. Frank studies them carefully.

FRANK

Now I remember where I've seen him before.

12

12

JAKE

Who?

FRANK

That big fellow there.

(beat)

Birmingham, Alabama. [month] 196x. Holding a
fire hose.

(beat)

I remember the tattoo.

HENRY

Directed at you?

FRANK

Knocked me down and my two sons.

JAKE

That was a long time ago.

FRANK

It's like yesterday to me.

Jake puts his hand on Frank's shoulder.

JAKE

Maybe he's changed.

FRANK

I hope so.

Frank walks away. Henry and Jake watch him go.

INT - KITCHEN - DAY

Colleen mixes a cake in her kitchen. Two grandsons, JOSH (12) and ALEX (10), enter.

JOSH

Grandma, where's Grandpa?

COLLEEN

Well, uh, he's away on a trip.

13

13

ALEX

Where to?

COLLEEN

Florida.

JOSH

What's he doing?

COLLEEN

It's sort of a vacation.

ALEX

How come you didn't go with him?

COLLEEN

He went with his friend, Jake.

JOSH

When's he coming back?

COLLEEN

I'm not sure.

(beat)

Would you boys like a cookie?

She opens a cookie jar.

JOSH

Can I have two?

ALEX

I want three.

COLLEEN

Help yourselves.

The boys take cookies from the jar.

EXT - BACKYARD - day

14

14

A volleyball game is in progress in the backyard of Buddy (the Rockets shortstop) and his wife, BETTY. On one side of the net are Helen, Elliott, Mike, and three other Rockets. Danny, four more Rockets, and a WIFE are on the other side.

At this Sunday afternoon cookout Henry, Jake, Buddy, Betty, the remaining Rockets players, and OTHER WIVES of players stand and sit around talking. They nibble on food and sip drinks.

On the court Danny jumps up by the net for a smash. He comes down awkwardly, scrapes the standard with his back, and tumbles to the ground. He puts his hand on his back under his shirt, takes it out, and notices blood.

Mike comes over and lifts Danny's shirt. There is a bleeding scrape mark on Danny's back.

Danny and Mike walk to a picnic table. Henry and Jake go over. Buddy comes up with a first aid kit. He lifts Danny's shirt and wipes the wound with an antiseptic. Danny winces but doesn't say anything. The bleeding stops.

Jake notices a large scar running down the side of Danny's back.

JAKE

Looks like you've done this before.

DANNY

Yeah, once upon a time.

JAKE

Which sport?

Danny remains silent.

MIKE

It wasn't support. It was combat. The Battle of the Buldge.

JAKE

My best friend didn't come back from that one.

BUDDY

Two-thirds of our team fought in World War II. A couple of the younger ones were in Korea.

15

15

JAKE

I was in North Africa early in the war.

(nodding toward Henry)

This fellow was in the Pacific campaign, but he never talks about it.

MIKE

Nobody does.

DANNY

We did what we had to do. Then we went home.

BUDDY

Yeah. That's the way it was.

(beat)

If you guys are done with their game, some more hamburgers and hotdogs are ready on the grill.

Various players head for the grill and eat more food.

16

16

INT - LISA'S BEDROOM - NIGHT

Lisa packs a suitcase. Colleen watches her.

COLLEEN

Are you taking a swimming suit?

LISA

Sure. It's Florida, isn't it?

COLLEEN

I borrowed some clothes from Dottie for my disguise.

LISA

I've got a bag full of stuff from the high school drama teacher.

COLLEEN

We'll show those bozos.

LISA

After we find them.

Lisa puts another item in her suitcase.

17

17