

Return-Path: <dkimball@clw.org>
Date: Tue, 22 Sep 1998 15:44:02 -0400 (EDT)
X-Sender: dkimball@[204.245.159.2]
To: mupj@igc.apc.org, btiller@psr.org, tcollina@ucsusa.org,
ctbt@2020vision.org, disarmament@igc.org
From: dkimball@clw.org (Daryl Kimball)
Subject: Re: CTBT retreat planning -- after NWWG

Howard:

That sounds good to me ... though I don't think Tom will be able to make it since he is in Boston until sometime on Thursday.

See you in the morning,

DK

>Dear Friends:

>

>Why don't we meet after Thursday morning's meeting of the Nuclear Weapons
>Working Group at the Mott House and try to develop a consensus on the CTBT
>retreat? That way we could offer an agreed upon proposal to the Deep
>Cuts/CTBT Working Groups on Thursday afternoon.

>

>Shalom,

>Howard

>

>

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
110 Maryland Ave. NE #201
Washington DC 20002
p: (202)546-0795; fax: (202)546-5142
website: <http://www.clw.org/pub/clw/coalition/>

To: abolition-caucus
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: President Clinton and New Agenda resolution
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

The Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy reports that the New Agenda Coalition resolution on nuclear disarmament is now before the First Committee of the UN General Assembly. France and UK delegates immediately opposed it. The United States hasn't been heard from yet but in the past has opposed such resolutions.

I suggest that many persons and organizations immediately contact President Clinton and urge him to have the United States support the New Agenda resolution. In such a fax earlier this week I praised President Clinton for his leadership in moving along the Middle East peace process. I urged him to use similar leadership for nuclear disarmament. I reminded him that he has often spoken of the desire to eliminate nuclear weapons and that in his second inaugural address he described a land of new promise where "our children will sleep free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." I indicated that it is now time to match his soaring rhetoric with decisive action. One way would be to accept the ideas of the New Agenda Coalition, support their resolution, and work for its implementation.

You can put your ideas in your own words. I suggest you write to President Clinton, attention of Mr. Samuel R. Berger, national security advisor. Mailing address is The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20500. E-mail address is president@whitehouse.gov. Mr. Berger's fax number is 202 456-2883.

Shalom,
Howard

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

Date: Tue, 17 Nov 1998 10:41:41 -0800 (PST)

X-Sender: mupj@pop.igc.org

To: ograbc@aol.com, "Jim Matlack" <denhartz@erols.com>, washofc@aol.com, adelorey@erols.com, jmskipper@aol.com, epf@igc.org, crramey@igc.org, joe@fcnl.org, kathy@fcnl.org, mark.brown@ecunet.org, mccwjdb@erols.com, mknolldc@igc.org, lwright@igc.org, network@igc.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org, Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org, GaryP@ctr.pcusa.org, gdpayton@aol.com, lwyolton@prodigy.net, uuawo@aol.com, arosenbaum@uahc.org, McColloc@ucc.org, lintnerj@ucc.org, Dringler@umc-gbcs.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org

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

Subject: November 24 meeting

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

Dear Colleagues:

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

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

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

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

Shalom,
Howard

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Mon, 16 Nov 1998 21:36:27 -0500
From: "Ross Wilcock" <rwilcock@pgs.ca>
Importance: Normal
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: FWB: The NAC Resolution & Deterrence
To: "Abolition-Caucus-L" <abolition-caucus@igc.org>
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

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

Date: Tue, 17 Nov 1998 15:20:26 +1300
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
From: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org (Rob Green)
Subject: The NAC Resolution & Deterrence

Dear Abolitionists,

As convenor of the "Overcoming Nuclear Threats" Working Group, I thought I should bring to your attention an important aspect of the breakthrough achieved by the New Agenda Coalition's UNGA resolution.

Among the statements to the First Committee on introducing the resolution, the UK objected that it was "incompatible with the maintenance of a credible minimum deterrent". NAC member Mexico boldly retorted that it was "not intended to be compatible with nuclear deterrence, as the policy of deterrence is outmoded, inconsistent with NPT obligations for nuclear disarmament, and must go."

In the NATO nuclear weapon states' Explanations of Vote, all three cited deterrence doctrine for opposing it. In so doing, they implicitly announced that that they had no intention of eliminating their nuclear arsenals:

* The US Ambassador drew in NATO: "Along with our allies we reviewed it [nuclear deterrence doctrine] recently and concluded that it should remain the basis of our defense." He then showed the US position on the ICJ Advisory Opinion when he added: "Let me be clear: you will not make nuclear disarmament occur faster by suggesting that a fundamental basis of our national security for more than fifty years is illegitimate."

* France stated that the resolution called into question the principle of nuclear deterrence, which underpinned NATO doctrine and was fundamental to French security.

Despite this reiteration of the fundamental role played by nuclear deterrence in NATO's strategy, all the non-nuclear members except Turkey abstained! This constituted almost unprecedented insubordination; was implicit acknowledgement of the force of Mexico's arguments; and means that a debate might well now be demanded to review NATO's nuclear strategy, to avoid spoiling its 50th birthday party on 9 April and save the next NPT PrepCom.

What it means for us is that we have new, categoric evidence that a key aspect of our campaign should be to rubbish deterrence much more robustly than hitherto. My latest contribution to this is in the Appendix to the Middle Powers Initiative's Briefing Book "Fast Track to Zero Nuclear Weapons", which I was commissioned to write. I would welcome any improvements to the arguments!

Best wishes,
Rob Green

Commander Robert D Green, Royal Navy (Retired)
Chair, World Court Project UK
NZ: Disarmament & Security Centre UK: 2 Chiswick House
 PO Box 8390 High Street
 Christchurch Twyford
 Aotearoa/New Zealand Berkshire RG10 9AG

Tel/Fax: (+64) 3 348 1353 Tel/Fax: (+44) 1189 340258
Email: robwcpuk@gn.apc.org

To: relctbt
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Senator Warner and the CTBT
Cc: ctbt
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Dear Colleagues:

At recent meetings on the CTBT we have decided that it would be worthwhile to give some attention to Senator John Warner of Virginia. He is a moderate Republican and will be chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee in the next Congress.

Therefore, we ask you to contact your key constituents in Virginia after the first of the year. To assist you I have drafted a letter to Virginians, which you may use, modify, or replace with your own version. I would appreciate learning what you have done and any feedback you have on Senator Warner's response.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Sample letter on CTBT for use in Virginia

Dear Virginian:

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is now before the U.S. Senate for ratification. By banning all nuclear explosions, the CTBT will curb the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, help guard against the renewal of the arms race, and establish an extensive global monitoring and verification system. It has been signed by over 150 countries, including the five long-standing nuclear weapon states: United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China. In order for the treaty to enter into force and become international law, it must be ratified by the United States and 43 other nuclear-capable countries. Accordingly, action by the U.S. Senate is urgently needed.

President Clinton submitted the CTBT to the Senate for ratification on September 24, 1997. It was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for consideration, but so far Senator Jesse Helms, committee chair, has refused to schedule hearings on the treaty. Moreover, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott has not been willing to schedule a vote by the Senate on the CTBT. We and other supporters of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty believe that it is important for hearings to start as quickly as possible and for the Senate as a whole to debate and vote on the treaty during the 1999 session.

Senator John Warner of Virginia is now taking over as chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee and can therefore play a key leadership role in achieving CTBT ratification. We ask you to get in touch with Senator Warner and urge him to publicly announce his support for the CTBT. Request him to have the Armed Services Committee schedule fair and open hearings on the CTBT in the near future. Also, ask him to talk with Senator Lott about placing the CTBT on the Senate schedule for floor action in 1999.

You can reach Senator John Warner at Russell Senate Office Building, Room 225, Washington, DC 20500; telephone, 202 224-2023; fax, 202 224-6295; or e-mail: senator@warner.senate.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Organizational signer

Return-Path: <owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org>
Date: Thu, 17 Dec 1998 15:02:24 -0500
From: Peace through Reason <prop1@prop1.org>
Sender: owner-abolition-caucus@igc.org
Subject: Head of State EMAIL Addresses FWD
To: abolition-caucus@igc.apc.org
X-Sender: prop1@prop1.org

Thanks to Tom Boland <wgcp@earthlink.net> for sending this.

HEAD F STATE E-MAIL LIST

Countries are listed alphabetically
by their common english usage
(ie.Ivory Coast, North Korea, etc.).

These e-mail addresses are up to date
as of November 1, 1998.

Albania, Prime Minister Pandeli Majko postmaster@minjash.tirana.al

Antigua and Barbuda, Prime Minister Lester Bird pmo@candw.ag

Argentina, Presidente Dr. Carlos Saul Menem spyd@presidencia.gov.ar

Armenia, President Robert Kocharian president@president.am

Australia, Prime Minister John Howard <http://www.pm.gov.au/comments.htm>

Austria, Federal Chancellor Viktor Klima vklima@spoe.or.at

Azerbaijan, President Geidar Aliyev postmaster@lider.azerbaijan.su

Barbados, Prime Minister Owen Arthur foreign@caribsurf.com

Belgium, Prime Minister M. Jean-Luc Dehaene info@belgium.be

Brazil, President Fernando Henrique Cardoso pr@planalto.gov.br

Bulgaria, President Petar Stoyanov president@president.bg

Cameroon, President Paul Biya celcom@camnet.cm

Canada, Prime Minister Jean Chretien pm@pm.gc.ca

Chad, President Idriss Deby presidency@tchad.td

Chile, President Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle webmaster@presidencia.cl

Colombia, Presidente Andres Pastrana Arango pastrana@presidencia.gov.co

Costa Rica, President Miguel Angel Rodriguez Echeverria

rherrera@ns.casapres.go.cr

Croatia, President Dr. Franjo Tudjman www-admin@president.hr

Czech Republic, President Vaclav Havel president@hrad.cz

Denmark, Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen stm@stm.dk

Dominica, President Crispin Anselm Sorhaindo sorhaindoch@cwdom.dm

Dominica, Prime Minister Edison James pmoffice@cwdom.dm

Dominican Republic, President Leonel Fernandez Reyna
correspondencias@presidencia.gov.do

Ecuador, President Jamil Mahuad Witt webmast@mmrree.gov.ec

Egypt, President Mohammed Hosni Mubarak webmaster@presidency.gov.eg

El Salvador, President Armando Calderon Sol presidente@casapres.gob.sv

Estonia, President Lennart Meri sekretar@vpk.ee

Estonia, Prime Minister Mart Siimann valitsus@rk.ee

Fiji, President Kamisese Mara info@fiji.gov.fj

Finland, President Martii Ahtisaari presidentti@tpk.vn.fi

France, Prime Minister Lionel Jospin
<http://www.premier-ministre.gouv.fr/PM/MAIL.HTM>

France, President Jacques Chirac http://www.elysee.fr/mel/mel_.htm

Gabon, President El Hajd Omar Bongo eleusis@mail.eunet.fr

Georgia, Chairman, State Council Eduard Shevardnadze
office@presidpress.gov.ge

Germany, President Prof. Dr. Roman Herzog
<http://www.bundespraesident.de/post.htm>

Germany, Chancellor Gerhard Schoeder
<http://www.bundesregierung.de/inland/.bin/pbamaild?10>

Ghana, President Jerry Rawlings hagan@cais.com (Ministry of Foreign
Affairs)

Greece, Prime Minister Kostas Simitis mail@primeminister.gr

Greece, President Constantinos Stephanopoulos mfa@mfa.gr

Greenland, Prime Minister homerule@gh.gl

Guatemala, President Alvaru Arzu alvaroarzu@guate.net

Hungary, Prime Minister Viktor Orban vikt.orban@meh.hu

Iceland, Prime Minister David Oddsson david@althingi.is

Iran, President Seyed Mohammad Khatami iranemb@salamiran.org

Iraq, President Saddam Hussein irqun@undp.org (e-mail for Iraq's Mission to the U.N. in New York City)

Ireland, President Mary McAleese webmaster@aras.irlgov.ie

Ireland, Prime Minister Bertie Ahern webmaster@taoiseach.irlgov.ie

Israel, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu feedback@pmo.gov.il

Jamaica, Prime Minister Percival John Patterson jis@jis.gov.jm

Japan, Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi jpm@kantei.go.jp

Jordan, King Hussain Bin Talal info@nic.gov.jo

Latvia, President Guntis Ulmanis chancery@president.lv

Lebanon, Prime Minister Selim Ahmed Hoss info@lp.gov.lb

Lithuania, President Valdas Adamkus gidirg@president.lt

Luxembourg, Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker
<http://www.restena.lu:80/gover/mailbox.html>

Malaysia, Prime Minister Dr. Dato` Seri Mahathir Mohamad
http://www.smpke.jpm.my/fr_fback.htm

Maldives, President Maumoon Abdul Gayoom admin@foreign.gov.mv

Mauritius, President Cassam Uteem statepas@intnet.mu

Micronesia, President Jacob Nena foreignaffairs@mail.fm

Mongolia, President Natsagiyn Bagabandi webmaster@presi.pmis.gov.mn

Namibia, President Sam Nujoma <http://www.republicofnamibia.com/write.htm>

New Zealand, Prime Minister Jenny Shipley mailbox@mx.parliament.govt.nz

Norway, Prime Minister Kjell Magne Bondevik
postmottak@smk.dep.telemax.no

Pakistan, Prime Minister Mian Muhammad Nawaz Sharif
primeminister@pak.gov.pk

Panama, President Ernesto Perez Balladares ofasin@pan.gbm.net

Poland, President Aleksander Kwasniewski listy@prezydent.pl

Romania, President Emile Constantinescu guv@kappa.ro

Russia, President Boris Yeltsin president@gov.ru

Saint Lucia, Prime Minister Kenny Anthony pmoffice@candw.lc

Seychelles, President France-Albert Rene ppo@seychelles.net

Slovenia, Prime Minister Janez Drnovsek
tomaz.lovrencic@vlada.sigov.mail.si

Slovenia, President Milan Kucan darinka.ilovar@up.sigov.mail.si

South Korea, President Kim Dae Jong
<http://www.bluehouse.go.kr/cwd98/owa/engcwmail.first>

South Africa, President Nelson Mandela communications@po.gov.za

Sri Lanka, President Chandrika Bandaranaike Kumaratunga
for_min@sri.lanka.net

Suriname, President Jules Wijdenbosch burpres@sr.net

Swaziland, Prime Minister Dr. Barnabas Sibusiso Dlamini
ppcu@realnet.co.sz

Sweden, Prime Minister Goran Persson regeringen@regeringen.se

Thailand, Prime Minister Chuan Leekpai govspkmn@mozart.inet.co.th

Togo, President Etienne Gnassingbe Eyadema
<http://www.republicoftogo.com/english/ecrir-pdt.html>

Trinidad and Tobago, President Arthur Robinson presoftt@carib-link.net

Trinidad and Tobago, Prime Minister Basdeo Panday bpanday@trinidad.net

Turkey, President Suleyman Demirel cankaya@tccb.gov.tr

Turkey, Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz ddlbsl@tccb.gov.tr

Uganda, President Yoweri Kaguta Museveni mofa@starcom.co.ug

Ukraine, President Leonid Kuchma postmaster@ribbon.kiev.ua

United States of America, President William Clinton
president@whitehouse.gov

Uruguay, President Julio Maria Sanguinetti presidente@presidencia.gub.uy

Yugoslavia, Federal President Slobodan Milosevic
slobodan.milosevic@gov.yu

Yugoslavia, Federal Prime Minister Momir Bulatovic
momir.bulatovic@gov.yu

Zambia, President Frederick Chiluba state@zamnet.zm

Comments? Outdated links? I can be reached at:

Donald Vermithrax, Ottawa, Canada

Head of State E-Mail Page

© Copyright 1997, 98 by Donald Vermithrax

Head of State E-Mail List.....About this E-Mail List

Lobbyist Tools/Linx Page..... Activist Forum New!

About this E-Mail List

Countries are listed alphabetically by their common english usage
(ie.Ivory Coast, North Korea,
etc.). These e-mail addresses are up to date as of November 1, 1998.

Head of State E-Mail List

Albania, Prime Minister Fatos Nano postmaster@minjash.tirana.al

Antigua and Barbuda, Prime Minister Lester Bird pmo@candw.ag

Argentina, Presidente Dr. Carlos Saul Menem spyd@presidencia.gov.ar

Armenia, President Robert Kocharian president@president.am

Australia, Prime Minister John Howard <http://www.pm.gov.au/comments.htm>

Austria, Federal Chancellor Viktor Klima vklima@spoe.or.at

Azerbaijan, President Geidar Aliyev postmaster@lider.azerbaijan.su

Barbados, Prime Minister Owen Arthur foreign@caribsurf.com

Belgium, Prime Minister M. Jean-Luc Dehaene info@belgium.be

Brazil, President Fernando Henrique Cardoso pr@planalto.gov.br

Bulgaria, President Petar Stoyanov president@president.bg

Canada, Prime Minister Jean Chretien pm@pm.gc.ca

Chad, President Idriss Deby presidency@tchad.td

Chile, President Eduardo Frei Ruiz-Tagle webmaster@presidencia.cl

Colombia, Presidente Andres Pastrana Arango pastrana@presidencia.gov.co

Costa Rica, President Jose Maria Figueres Olsen
rherrera@ns.casapres.go.cr

Croatia, President Dr. Franjo Tudjman www-admin@president.hr

Czech Republic, President Vaclav Havel president@hrad.cz

Denmark, Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen stm@stm.dk

Dominica, President Crispin Anselm Sorhaindo sorhaindoch@cwdom.dm

Dominica, Prime Minister Edison James pmoffice@cwdom.dm

Dominican Republic, President Leonel Fernandez
correspondencias@presidencia.gov.do

Ecuador, President Fabian Alarcon webmast@mmrree.gov.ec

Egypt, President Mohammed Hosni Mubarak webmaster@presidency.gov.eg

El Salvador, President Armando Calderon Sol presidente@casapres.gob.sv

Estonia, President Lennart Meri sekretar@nw.vpk.ee

Estonia, Prime Minister Mart Siimann valitsus@rk.ee

Fiji, President Kamisese Mara info@fiji.gov.fj

Finland, President Martii Ahtisaari presidentti@tpk.vn.fi

France, Prime Minister Lionel Jospin
<http://www.premier-ministre.gouv.fr/PM/MAIL.HTM>

France, President Jacques Chirac http://www.elysee.fr/mel/mel_.htm

Gabon, President El Hajd Omar Bongo eleusis@mail.eunet.fr

Ghana, President Jerry Rawlings hagan@cais.com (Ministry of Foreign Affairs)

Georgia, Chairman, State Council Eduard Shevardnadze
office@presidpress.gov.ge

Germany, President Prof. Dr. Roman Herzog
<http://www.bundespraesident.de/post.htm>

Germany, Chancellor Gerhard Schoeder
<http://www.bundesregierung.de/inland/.bin/pbamaild?10>

Greece, Prime Minister Kostas Simitis mail@primeminister.gr

Greece, President Constantinos Stephanopoulos mfa@mfa.gr

Greenland, Prime Minister lavi@info.gh.gl

Guatemala, President Alvaru Arzu alvaroarzu@guate.net

Hungary, Prime Minister Viktor Orban orban@mehp.meh.hu

Iceland, Prime Minister David Oddsson postur@for.stjr.is

Iran, President Seyed Mohammad Khatami iranemb@salamiran.org

Ireland, President Mary McAleese webmaster@aras.irlgov.ie

Ireland, Prime Minister Bertie Ahern webmaster@taoiseach.irlgov.ie

Israel, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu pm@pmo.gov.il

Japan, Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi jpm@kantei.go.jp

Jordan, King Hussain Bin Talal info@nic.gov.jo

Latvia, President Guntis Ulmanis chancery@president.lv

Luxembourg, Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker
<http://www.restena.lu:80/gover/mailbox.html>

Malaysia, Prime Minister Dr. Dato` Seri Mahathir Mohamad
http://www.smpke.jpm.my/fr_fback.htm

Maldives, President Maumoon Abdul Gayoom admin@foreign.gov.mv

Mauritius, President Cassam Uteem statepas@intnet.mu

Micronesia, President Jacob Nena foreignaffairs@mail.fm

Namibia, President Sam Nujoma <http://www.republicofnamibia.com/write.htm>

New Zealand, Prime Minister Jenny Shipley mailbox@mx.parliament.govt.nz

Norway, Prime Minister Kjell Magne Bondevik
postmottak@smk.dep.telemax.no

Pakistan, Prime Minister Mian Muhammad Nawaz Sharif
primeminister@pak.gov.pk

Panama, President Ernesto Perez Balladares ofasin@pan.gbm.net

Poland, President Aleksander Kwasniewski listy@prezydent.pl

Romania, President Emile Constantinescu guv@kappa.ro

Russia, President Boris Yeltsin president@gov.ru

Saint Lucia, Prime Minister Kenny Anthony pmoffice@candw.lc

Seychelles, President France-Albert Rene ppo@seychelles.net

Slovenia, Prime Minister Janez Drnovsek
tomaz.lovrencic@vlada.sigov.mail.si

Slovenia, President Milan Kucan darinka.ilovar@up.sigov.mail.si

South Korea, President Kim Dae Jong webmaster@cwd.go.kr

South Africa, President Nelson Mandela communications@po.gov.za

Sri Lanka, President Chandrika Bandaranaike Kumaratunga
for_min@sri.lanka.net

Suriname, President Jules Wijdenbosch burpres@sr.net

Swaziland, Prime Minister Dr. Barnabas Sibusiso Dlamini
ppcu@realnet.co.sz

Sweden, Prime Minister Goran Persson regeringen@regeringen.se

Thailand, Prime Minister Chuan Leekpai govspkmm@mozart.inet.co.th

Togo, President Etienne Gnassingbe Eyadema
<http://www.republicoftogo.com/english/ecrir-pdt.html>

Trinidad and Tobago, President A.N.R. Robinson presoftt@carib-link.net

Trinidad and Tobago, Prime Minister Basdeo Panday bpanday@trinidad.net

Turkey, President Suleyman Demirel cankaya@tccb.gov.tr

Turkey, Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz ddlbsl@tccb.gov.tr

Uganda, President Yoweri Kaguta Museveni mofa@starcom.co.ug

Ukraine, President Leonid Kuchma postmaster@ribbon.kiev.ua

United States of America, President William Clinton
president@whitehouse.gov

Uruguay, President Julio Maria Sanguinetti presidente@presidencia.gub.uy

Yugoslavia, Federal President Slobodan Milosevic
slobodan.milosevic@gov.yu

Yugoslavia, Federal Prime Minister Momir Bulatovic
momir.bulatovic@gov.yu

Zambia, President Frederick Chiluba state@zamnet.zm

END FORWARD

-

** NOTICE: In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, this material is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. **

Return-Path: <MARK_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org>
Sender: MARK_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org
Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1999 16:10:00 -0500 (EST)
Subject: CTBT SWING LIST
To: mupj@igc.apc.org
From: MARK_BROWN.parti@ecunet.org (MARK BROWN)

To: mupj@igc.apc.org

Dear Howard,

Please fax (202-783-7502) the CTBT swing list. Or you could email it to:

marsusab@aol.com

Mark B. Brown
Assistant Director (International Affairs and Human Rights)
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs
Washington, D.C.
Mon, Jan 4, 1999

To: marsusab@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Senate swing list
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\CTBTRATI.DOC;

Mark,

The Senate swing list on the CTBT is attached. If you can't download it, please let me know and I'll fax you a copy.

Howard

To: marsusab@aol.com
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.apc.org>
Subject: Key senators on CTBT
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\KEYSENAT.DOC;

Mark,

Attached is a list of key senators on the CTBT

Howard

De-alerting the Nuclear Arsenal
Excerpts of Policy Statements of the United Methodist Church

The Book of Resolutions of the United Methodist Church, 1992

From "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option"

We recommend that the United States and the Commonwealth of Independent States* immediately and concurrently deactivate their entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal. They should:

- bring all strategic submarines into port, remove their missiles, and take off the warheads;
- open all ICBM silos, take out the missiles, place them on the ground, and remove the warheads.

We hope that Great Britain, France, and China will understand the necessity to deactivate immediately their strategic arsenal: land-, air-, and sea-based.

After deactivation is accomplished, the United States and the Commonwealth of Independent States should work out a schedule for dismantling all strategic nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles and destroying their warheads. Great Britain, France, and China should join this schedule. The process should be implemented in a agreed and verified sequence that is balanced so that at no stage could any nation gain an advantage.

* The Commonwealth of Independent States was the successor to the Soviet Union but no longer functions.

The Book of Resolutions of the United Methodist Church, 1996

From "Nuclear Abolition: Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence"

As a means of moving much more rapidly toward nuclear abolition, we recommend that the following initiatives be undertaken:

5. As a prelude to further reductions, all possessor nations should immediately and concurrently move to zero alert by deactivating their entire strategic arsenal through removal of warheads or vital components from delivery vehicles with safe storage under international inspection.
6. As a companion measure, all possessor nations should withdraw all tactical nuclear weapons from active deployment and store them safely under international inspection.
7. As rapidly as possible, all deactivated strategic and tactical nuclear weapons and all delivery vehicles should be dismantled under international inspection in an agreed sequence that is balanced so that at no stage could any nation gain an advantage.

Zero Alert by the End of 1999

The Next Step toward Nuclear Abolition

How long? This question is posed persistently throughout the Bible. In the wilderness the Lord queries Moses, "How long will this people despise me? And how long will they not believe in me?" Psalm 4 asks the people, "How long will you love vain words, and seek after lies?" Jeremiah inquires of Jerusalem, "How long shall your sick thoughts lodge within you?"

Psalm 13 turns the question around and inquires of God, "How long, O Lord? Wilt thou forget me forever? How long wilt thou hide thy face from me?" Psalm 35 records many adversaries and asks, "How long, O Lord, wilt thou look on? Rescue me from their ravages." Habakkuk cries out, "O Lord, how long shall I cry for help and thou wilt not hear?"

One of the Proverbs takes a more practical approach and asks, "How long will you lie there, O sluggard? When will you arise from your sleep?"

When we think about nuclear weapons, a paramount evil of our day, we can ask ourselves the same question. How long will we accept the sick thoughts of the nuclear priesthood that claim these instruments of mass destruction have legitimacy? How long will we vainly believe that nuclear weapons provide security? How long will we be blinded to the fact that the possessors are most insecure because of their mutual threats against one another? How long will we not trust God for our true security? How long until we sluggards arise from our sleepy doldrums and insist that our earthly rulers renounce these evil weapons and abolish them forever?

Voices of Religion

Numerous voices of religion have spoken of the inherent evil of nuclear weapons. The Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds."

The United Methodist Council of Bishops in 1986 carried this a step further by declaring "we say a clear and unconditional *No* to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing." The quadrennial General Conference of the United Methodist Church has thrice endorsed this conclusion.

In 1997 a spokesman for the Holy See at the United Nations stated, "Nuclear weapons are incompatible

with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation."

Concurrence of Military Experts

A sizable number of generals, admirals, and civilian national security leaders agree with this conclusion. In 1995 the government of Australia brought 17 of them together in a study body known as the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. Members included General George Lee Butler, formerly head of U.S. Strategic Command, and Robert MacNamara, secretary of defense under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. In 1996 the Commission reported its conclusions:

The Canberra Commission is persuaded that immediate and determined efforts need to be made to rid the world of nuclear weapons and the threat they pose to it. The destructiveness of nuclear weapons is immense. Any use would be catastrophic. The proposition that nuclear weapons can be retained in perpetuity and never used -- accidentally or by decision -- defies credibility. The only complete defence is the elimination of nuclear weapons and assurance that they will never be produced.

A growing chorus of reports from military leaders and civilian experts echo this call for the elimination of nuclear weapons. They include the Steering Committee of a Stimson Center Project on Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction, chaired by General Andrew J. Goodpaster (1995), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998).

Citizens throughout the world are in the forefront of the quest for nuclear abolition. More than 1,000 citizen organizations have joined together in a global network known as Abolition 2000. Governments of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), at one time referred to as "third world countries", add their testimony for the necessity of eliminating nuclear weapons.

When so many generals, admirals, civilian leaders with national security experience, scientists, bishops, other church leaders, citizen organizations, and non-aligned states agree that nuclear weapons must be eliminated, what are we waiting for? How long must we wait for the political leaders who control national policy to respond to the moral and practical imperative of nuclear

abolition? How long until we citizens become a massive and effective political force to insist on the elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the globe?

De-alerting: An Immediate Step

The distinguished commissions and study groups have worked out coherent sets of ideas to chart the course toward nuclear abolition. Although they differ in details, they concur that nuclear abolition is an achievable objective. Among them there is a remarkable consensus that an immediate step should be to take the world's nuclear arsenal off hair-trigger alert. This would prevent accidental or unauthorized nuclear attack. It would offer time for reflection and negotiation in the event of a grave crisis among the nuclear powers. It would set stage for the phased dismantlement of the nuclear arsenal.

Many people in the United States and elsewhere believe that because the Cold War is over, there is no longer a risk of nuclear attack. They are wrong. Russia has 10,240 operational warheads in service, the United States has 8,425, France 450, China 400, Great Britain 260. Israel, India, and Pakistan have an undisclosed number. More than 5,000 of the Russian warheads are on land- and submarine-based missiles that are on hair-trigger alert and could be launched at US targets on a moments' notice. The United States has similar deployment of more than 5,000 warheads likewise on hair-trigger alert that could attack Russia.

This means that a huge portion of the U.S. population resides in cities and near military bases that are the targets for Russian missiles that can arrive within 30 minutes of launching, or within 15 minutes for a submarine-launched missile. A large portion of the Russian population is similarly vulnerable. Although in 1994 President Clinton and President Yeltsin agreed to de-target their missiles by not aiming them at one another's country, re-targeting can occur within a few seconds. Moreover, Russian missiles re-target automatically when launched. Because both sides follow a launch-on-warning doctrine, accidental or unauthorized launch of a single missile could provoke a retaliatory barrage of nuclear missiles.

This is no idle fear. In January 1995 Russian radar technicians feared that a scientific rocket launched in Norway was a nuclear missile headed for Russia. Military authorities alerted President Yeltsin, who activated the electronic case that could authorize fire of nuclear missiles in response. Fortunately, a few moments before Yeltsin had to decide, senior military officers determined that the rocket was headed out to sea. As it turned out, Norwegian officials had notified Russian authorities of the planned launch several weeks earlier, but the word never reach top command.

The danger of misinterpretation remains. With the breakup of the Soviet Union, Russia no longer has use of early warning radar once based in Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and other former Soviet republics. Some of the remaining radar is in disrepair. Systems built to control nuclear weapons are crumbling. Furthermore, midnight of December 31, 1999 is rapidly approaching when massive computer failure may occur in radar systems, at missile sites, and in other military installations. This adds to the risks arising from malfunctioning and misinterpretation.

Thus, it is strongly in the self-interest of the United States for the Russian nuclear arsenal to be taken off hair-trigger alert. In exchange, the United States could greatly ease Russian fears by taking similar action. In this case self-interest and idealism coincide.

How to Proceed

The surest and most far-reaching way to de-alert the nuclear arsenal would be to separate warheads from delivery vehicles and store them in other locations. Submarines would return to port, their missiles removed, and warheads separated. Likewise warheads would be removed from land-based missiles.

A less drastic approach would be to remove vital components of missiles, such as the guidance system, and store them elsewhere so as to make the missiles inoperable. Launching systems could be temporarily demobilized, such as by covering silos with mounds of dirt and by disabling mobile launchers. Depending upon which method is used, it would then take hours, days, or weeks to rearm missiles and restore launchers. Mutual or international observation would prevent reinstallation from occurring surreptitiously.

De-alerting can occur quickly through reciprocal executive initiative without prolonged negotiations and a treaty that requires legislative ratification. That's what occurred in the fall of 1991 when President Bush ordered a stand-down of strategic bombers with their nuclear bombs placed in storage, and he terminated the alert status of silo- and submarine-based missiles scheduled for elimination under the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Soviet President Gorbachev reciprocated by ordering deactivation of land-based missiles and strategic submarines and promising to put rail-based missiles in garrison and keep strategic bombers on low level of readiness. Subsequently the two nations withdrew thousands of shorter-range tactical nuclear warheads from deployment outside their homeland.

In a similar manner President Clinton and President Yeltsin could commence a similar reciprocal process to de-alert the entire US and Russian nuclear arsenals. China, Great Britain, and France should join the process. So should Israel, India, and Pakistan.

How long would it take to de-alert the entire global nuclear arsenal? Experts who have studied the options for de-alerting say that it is technically feasible to accomplish in twelve months. Therefore, recently 68 citizen organizations from around the globe proposed to Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin that de-alerting start immediately and be completed no later than the end of 1999. This can occur if there is sufficient political will. That will happen only if there is strong citizen demand that de-alerting take place.

What You Can Do

Because the most immediate way to achieve de-alerting is through executive action, US citizens who want to pursue this cause should focus their attention on President Bill Clinton and Vice President Al Gore. Write to them at The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20500 or by e-mail at president@whitehouse.gov or vice-president@whitehouse.gov. Urge them to take leadership to de-alert the US nuclear arsenal and ask them to work out reciprocal de-alerting with Russia and the other nuclear powers. You can draw on the case made for de-alerting found in this article.

Although executive action is the quickest way to achieve de-alerting, members of Congress are potent political actors, and some of them may oppose de-alerting. Therefore, write to them and register your support for de-alerting. Ask them to come out in favor of this approach. If the president acts and your senator or representative speaks out against it, contact him or her and express your disappointment over his or opposition. [her](#)

Encourage others to write to the president, vice-president, and members of Congress. Circulate a petition in favor of de-alerting.

Form a study group on de-alerting or bring the subject before an existing group. In addition to the articles referenced below, we have available a citizen activists packet of information on de-alerting.

If you are member of a peace group or a church body that passes resolutions, offer one in support of de-alerting. Send it to the president.

Try to influence public opinion. Write letters to the editor. Call in to radio talk shows.

If enough of us undertake these activities to influence public opinion and executive decisions, we have a good chance of prevailing. How long will this take? It depends upon how hard we try and how effectively we mobilize other citizens to work with us.

Beyond De-alerting

De-alerting is a very significant first step along the road toward nuclear abolition. In and of itself, it is doesn't eliminate nuclear weapons, but it sets the stage

for meaningful reductions. As nuclear powers remove their arsenals from hair-trigger alert, they will better understand that they have no acceptable use for these terrible weapons of mass destruction. They can then take steps to dismantle them. Dismantlement might occur through successive treaties that bring about staged reduction. Or it could happen under a nuclear weapons convention that provides a comprehensive approach to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Whatever the ultimate course, de-alerting can move us along the road to the goal of Earth freed from the curse of nuclear weapons. How long will that take? Once again it's up to us.

For Further Reading

Bruce G. Blair, Harold A. Feiveson, and Frank N. von Hippel, "Taking Nuclear Weapons off Hair-Trigger Alert" *Scientific American*, November 1997. Available at <http://www.sciam.com/1197issue/1197vonhippel.html>

Lachlan Forrow, M.D. and others, "Accidental Nuclear War -- A Post-Cold War Assessment" *The New England Journal of Medicine*, April 1998.

Arjun Makhijani, "De-Alerting: A First Step" *Science for Democratic Action*, August 1998.

Tim Zimmerman, "Take Nuclear Arsenals Off Hair-Trigger Alert" *U.S. News*, December 29, 1997. Available at <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/issue/971229/29nuke.html>

[Addendum. Perhaps in a box]

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is in the forefront of the effort to achieve de-alerting of nuclear arsenals and other steps leading toward nuclear abolition. We need your participation and support. To join our work and make a financial contribution, please fill out and return the membership form on the next page.

Zero Alert by the End of 1999

The Next Step toward Nuclear Abolition

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

How long? This question is posed persistently throughout the Bible. In the wilderness the Lord queries Moses, "How long will this people despise me? And how long will they not believe in me?" Psalm 4 asks the people, "How long will you love vain words, and seek after lies?" Jeremiah inquires of Jerusalem, "How long shall your sick thoughts lodge within you?"

Psalm 13 turns the question around and inquires of God, "How long, O Lord? Wilt thou forget me forever? How long wilt thou hide thy face from me?" Psalm 35 records many adversaries and asks, "How long, O Lord, wilt thou look on? Rescue me from their ravages." Habakkuk cries out, "O Lord, how long shall I cry for help and thou will not hear?"

One of the Proverbs takes a more practical approach and asks, "How long will you lie there, O sluggard? When will you arise from your sleep?"

When we think about nuclear weapons, a paramount evil of our day, we can ask ourselves the same question. How long will we accept the sick thoughts of the nuclear priesthood that claim these instruments of mass destruction have legitimacy? How long will we vainly believe that nuclear weapons provide security? How long will we be blinded to the fact that the possessors are most insecure because of their mutual threats against one another? How long will we not trust God for our true security? How long until we sluggards arise from our sleepy doldrums and insist that our earthly rulers renounce these evil weapons and abolish them forever?

Voices of Religion

Numerous voices of religion have spoken of the inherent evil of nuclear weapons. The Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds."

The United Methodist Council of Bishops in 1986 carried this a step further by declaring "we say a clear and unconditional *No* to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing." The quadrennial General Conference of the United Methodist Church has thrice endorsed this conclusion.

In 1997 a spokesman for the Holy See at the United Nations stated, "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation."

Concurrence of Military Experts

A sizable number of generals, admirals, and civilian national security leaders agree with this conclusion. In 1995 the government of Australia brought 17 of them together in a study body known as the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. Members included General George Lee Butler, formerly head of U.S. Strategic Command, and Robert MacNamara, secretary of defense under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. In 1996 the Commission reported its conclusions:

The Canberra Commission is persuaded that immediate and determined efforts need to be made to rid the world of nuclear weapons and the threat they pose to it. The destructiveness of nuclear weapons is immense. Any use would be catastrophic. The proposition that nuclear weapons can be retained in perpetuity and never used -- accidentally or by decision -- defies credibility. The only complete defence is the elimination of nuclear weapons and assurance that they will never be produced.

A growing chorus of reports from military leaders and civilian experts echo this call for the elimination of nuclear weapons. They include the Steering Committee of a Stimson Center Project on Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction, chaired by General Andrew J. Goodpaster (1995), a statement of 60 generals and admirals leaders from around the globe (1996), the National Academy of Sciences in the United States (1997), a statement of 117 civilian leaders, including 47 past and present heads of states and prime ministers (1998), and the New Agenda Declaration adopted by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden (1998).

Citizens throughout the world are in the forefront of the quest for nuclear abolition. More than 1,000 citizen organizations have joined together in a global network known as Abolition 2000. Governments of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), at one time referred to as "third world countries", add their testimony for the necessity of eliminating nuclear weapons.

When so many generals, admirals, civilian leaders with national security experience, scientists, bishops, other church leaders, citizen organizations, and non-aligned states agree that nuclear weapons must be eliminated, what are we waiting for? How long must we wait for the political leaders who control national policy to respond to the moral and practical imperative of nuclear abolition? How long until we citizens become a massive and effective political force to insist on the elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the globe?

De-alerting: An Immediate Step

The distinguished commissions and study groups have worked out coherent sets of ideas to chart the course toward nuclear abolition. Although they differ in details, they concur that nuclear abolition is an achievable objective. Among them there is a remarkable consensus that an immediate step should be to take the world's nuclear arsenal off hair-trigger alert. This would prevent accidental or unauthorized nuclear attack. It would offer time for reflection and negotiation in the event of a grave crisis among the nuclear powers. It would set stage for the phased dismantlement of the nuclear arsenal.

Many people in the United States and elsewhere believe that because the Cold War is over, there is no longer a risk of nuclear attack. They are wrong. Russia has 10,240 operational warheads in service, the United States has 8,425, France 450, China 400, Great Britain 260. Israel, India, and Pakistan have an undisclosed number. More than 5,000 of the Russian warheads are on land- and submarine-based missiles that are on hair-trigger alert and could be launched at US targets on a moments' notice. The United States has similar deployment of more than 5,000 warheads likewise on hair-trigger alert that could attack Russia.

This means that a huge portion of the U.S. population resides in cities and near military bases that are the targets for Russian missiles that can arrive within 30 minutes of launching, or within 15 minutes for a submarine-launched missile. A large portion of the Russian population is similarly vulnerable. Although in 1994 President Clinton and President Yeltsin agreed to de-target their missiles by not aiming them at one another's country, re-targeting can occur within a few seconds. Moreover, Russian missiles re-target automatically when launched. Because both sides follow a launch-on-warning doctrine, accidental or unauthorized launch of a single missile could provoke a retaliatory barrage of nuclear missiles.

This is no idle fear. In January 1995 Russian radar technicians feared that a scientific rocket launched in Norway was a nuclear missile headed for Russia. Military authorities alerted President Yeltsin, who activated the electronic case that could authorize fire of nuclear missiles in response. Fortunately, a few moments before Yeltsin had to decide, senior military officers determined that the rocket was headed out to sea. As it turned out, Norwegian officials had notified Russian authorities of the planned launch several weeks earlier, but the word never reach top command.

The danger of misinterpretation remains. With the breakup of the Soviet Union, Russia no longer has use of early warning radar once based in Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and other former Soviet republics. Some of the remaining radar is in disrepair. Systems built to control nuclear weapons are crumbling. Furthermore, midnight of December 31, 1999 is rapidly approaching when massive computer failure may occur in radar systems, at missile sites, and in other military installations. This adds to the risks arising from malfunctioning and misinterpretation.

Thus, it is strongly in the self-interest of the United States for the Russian nuclear arsenal to be taken off hair-trigger alert. In exchange, the United States could greatly ease Russian fears by taking similar action. In this case self-interest and idealism coincide.

How to Proceed

The surest and most far-reaching way to de-alert the nuclear arsenal would be to separate warheads from delivery vehicles and store them in other locations. Submarines would return to port, their missiles removed, and warheads separated. Likewise warheads would be removed from land-based missiles.

A less drastic approach would be to remove vital components of missiles, such as the guidance system, and store them elsewhere so as to make the missiles inoperable. Launching systems could be temporarily demobilized, such as by covering silos with mounds of dirt and by disabling mobile launchers. Depending upon which method is used, it would then take hours, days, or weeks to rearm missiles and restore launchers. Mutual or international observation would prevent reinstallation from occurring surreptitiously.

De-alerting can occur quickly through reciprocal executive initiative without prolonged negotiations and a treaty that requires legislative ratification. That's what occurred in the fall of 1991 when President Bush ordered a stand-down of strategic bombers with their nuclear bombs placed in storage, and he terminated the alert status of silo- and submarine-based missiles scheduled for elimination under the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Soviet President Gorbachev reciprocated by ordering deactivation of land-based missiles and strategic submarines and promising to put rail-based missiles in garrison and keep strategic bombers on low level of readiness. Subsequently the two nations withdrew thousands of shorter-range tactical nuclear warheads from deployment outside their homeland.

In a similar manner President Clinton and President Yeltsin could commence a similar reciprocal process to de-alert the entire US and Russian nuclear arsenals. China, Great Britain, and France should join the process. So should Israel, India, and Pakistan.

How long would it take to de-alert the entire global nuclear arsenal? Experts who have studied the options for de-alerting say that it is technically feasible to accomplish in twelve months. Therefore, recently 68 citizen organizations from around the globe proposed to Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin that de-alerting start immediately and be completed no later than the end of 1999. This can occur if there is sufficient political will. That will happen only if there is strong citizen demand that de-alerting take place.

What You Can Do

Because the most immediate way to achieve de-alerting is through executive action, US citizens who want to pursue this cause should focus their attention on President Bill Clinton and Vice President Al Gore. Write to them at The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20500 or by e-mail at president@whitehouse.gov or vice-president@whitehouse.gov. Urge them to take leadership to de-alert the US nuclear arsenal and ask them to work out reciprocal de-alerting with Russia and the other nuclear powers. You can draw on the case made for de-alerting found in this article.

Although executive action is the quickest way to achieve de-alerting, members of Congress are potent political actors, and some of them may oppose de-alerting. Therefore, write to them and register your support for de-alerting. Ask them to come out in favor of this approach. If the president acts and your senator or representative speaks out against it, contact him or her and express your disappointment over his or her opposition.

Encourage others to write to the president, vice-president, and members of Congress. Circulate a petition in favor of de-alerting.

Form a study group on de-alerting or bring the subject before an existing group. In addition to the articles referenced below, we have available a citizen activists packet of information on de-alerting.

If you are member of a peace group or a church body that passes resolutions, offer one in support of de-alerting. Send it to the president.

Try to influence public opinion. Write letters to the editor. Call in to radio talk shows.

If enough of us undertake these activities to influence public opinion and executive decisions, we have a good chance of prevailing. How long will this take? It depends upon how hard we try and how effectively we mobilize other citizens to work with us.

Beyond De-alerting

De-alerting is a very significant first step along the road toward nuclear abolition. In and of itself, it doesn't eliminate nuclear weapons, but it sets the stage for meaningful reductions. As nuclear powers remove their arsenals from hair-trigger alert, they will better understand that they have no acceptable use for these terrible weapons of mass destruction. They can then take steps to dismantle them. Dismantlement might occur through successive treaties that bring about staged reduction. Or it could happen under a nuclear weapons convention that provides a comprehensive approach to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Whatever the ultimate course, de-alerting can move us along the road to the goal of Earth freed from the curse of nuclear weapons. How long will that take? Once again it's up to us.

For Further Reading

Bruce G. Blair, Harold A. Feiveson, and Frank N. von Hippel, "Taking Nuclear Weapons off Hair-Trigger Alert" *Scientific American*, November 1997. Available at <http://www.sciam.com/1197issue/1197vonhippel.html>

Lachlan Forrow, M.D. and others, "Accidental Nuclear War -- A Post-Cold War Assessment" *The New England Journal of Medicine*, April 1998.

Arjun Makhijani, "De-Alerting: A First Step" *Science for Democratic Action*, August 1998.

Tim Zimmerman, "Take Nuclear Arsenals Off Hair-Trigger Alert" *U.S. News*, December 29, 1997. Available at <http://www.usnews.com/usnews/issue/971229/29nuke.html>

**Interfaith Working Group for
CTBT Ratification**

American Friends Service Committee
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
Fellowship of Reconciliation
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office
Mennonite Central Committee
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
National Council of Churches
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice
Lobby
Pax Christi USA
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 Denominations Interested
in CTBT Ratification**

African Methodist Episcopal Church
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
American Baptist Churches USA
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

**Other Religious Associations Interested
in CTBT Ratification**

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
Jewish Peace Fellowship
Leadership Conference of Women Religious
Methodists Federation for Social Action
Muslim Peace Fellowship
New Call to Peacemaking
Orthodox Peace Fellowship
The Shalom Center
Sisters of Mercy of America
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace
Sojourners
Washington Ethical Society

Interest expressed in such ways as:
Head of communion signing letter to senators
Sending representative to breakfast meeting
with Senator Jeffords on CTBT
Asking for more information, to be kept
informed

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

September 23, 1998

Interfaith Working Group for CTBT Ratification

American Friends Service Committee
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
Fellowship of Reconciliation
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office
Mennonite Central Committee
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
National Council of Churches
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby
Pax Christi USA
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 Denominations Interested in CTBT Ratification*

African Methodist Episcopal Church
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
American Baptist Churches USA
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

Other Religious Associations Interested in CTBT Ratification*

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
Jewish Peace Fellowship
Leadership Conference of Women Religious
Methodists Federation for Social Action
Muslim Peace Fellowship

New Call to Peacemaking
Orthodox Peace Fellowship
The Shalom Center
Sisters of Mercy of America
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace
Sojourners
Washington Ethical Society

*Interest expressed in such ways as head of communion or other top official signing letter to senators, sending representative to breakfast meeting with Senator Jeffords on CTBT, asking for more information, to be kept informed.

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

September 23, 1998

Outreach to World Religious Community

by Howard W. Hallman

During the past year I have begun reaching out to the world religious community to promote mobilization for nuclear abolition. As a co-convenor of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, last September I approached Dr. Dwain Epps, top official of the World Council of Churches for international affairs, about focusing attention on the next session of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee, scheduled the spring of 1998 in Geneva. He accepted the idea. Through Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA (another co-convenor of the Religious Working Group), we brought in Pax Christi International. I explored ways to bring in other faiths but never found a way to do it.

Prior to the PrepCom meeting, Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, issued a statement entitled "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition" to the PrepCom delegates. (I drafted the statement and worked with Dwain Epps and through Dave Robinson with the Pax Christi International for final revisions.) The opening night of the session Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels hosted a reception for the delegates, honoring Ambassador Eugeniusz Wyzner, chair of the Prep Com.

The NGO community gained the permission of Ambassador Wyzner to have presentations by NGO representatives at one session of the PrepCom. For this purpose I developed a statement on "A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons" in consultation with the Religious Working Group and others. Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton from Detroit presented this statement to the delegates.

After the NPT Preparatory Committee session was over, I developed some further ideas on "Mobilizing the Religious Community for Nuclear Abolition" and circulated it to contacts I had made before and during the PrepCom meeting. Ambassador Doug Roche of Canada, who attended the PrepCom as an advisor and consultant to the Holy See, told me who I send my ideas to at the Holy See. My written statement is attached along with several responses I have received. Presently I am pursuing my ideas in a low-key manner, but I want to maintain my contacts with the world religious community.

September 26, 1998

Checklist for De-alerting Debate

Debaters

Pro (2)

Con (2)

Moderator

Date, time

Place

Sponsors

Primary

Co-

Who decides on debaters, moderator?

Media coverage

C-Span

Other TV

Print media

Who arranges?

Audience

Who?

Invitations

Who invites?

Publicity

Who handles?

**Public Advocacy for CTBT
Evaluation Worksheet**

Activity	Basic Information	Participants	Achievements	Strengths	Weaknesses
GRASSROOTS State organizing States (by tiers)					
	Selection process Use of state contacts Use of D.C. contacts State organizers (summer '98)				
Regional workshops	When Where				
Postcards	<u>Fall 1997</u> States covered How many postcards				
	<u>Interfaith (early 1998)</u> States covered How many				
	<u>Spring 1998</u> States covered How many				
Conference calls	When Where				

Activity	Basic Information	Participants	Achievements	Strengths	Weaknesses
Call-in days When					
Radio call-in days When Where					
Educational material What By whom Distribution					
Grassroots actions Direct contact with senators					
Letters and other communications					
Attendance at town meetings					
Demonstrations					
Other					
Other kinds of grassroots activities					

Activity

Basic Information

Participants

Achievements

Strengths

Weaknesses

ADVOCACY IN D.C.

Direct contact with senators

Who

When

Sign-on letters

When

To whom

Issue

Lobby days

When

Organizer

Who contacted

On specific issues

Getting hearings

Specter-Biden

CTBT PrepCom funding

Interface with grassroots lobbying

Advocacy with Administration

When

How

COALITION BUILDING

Contact list

Faith community

Students

Activity**Basic Information****Participants****Achievements****Strengths****Weaknesses****MEDIA**

Editorial board outreach

Who contacted

When

Op-ed articles

News conferences

When

Sponsors

Television

Radio

Other national outreach

Grassroots media

Letters to editor

Op-ed articles

Meetings with editors

Radio and television

Other

CAMPAIGN STRUCTURE

CTBT Working Group

CTBT Grassroots Task Force

Interfaith CTBT Coalition

Nuclear Weapons Working Group

Draft petition on Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

As people of faith, we join this appeal for U.S. Senate action on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), an international treaty to ban all nuclear test explosions. We believe that ratification of the CTBT is the most effective tool available now to contribute significantly toward reducing the dangers posed by nuclear weapons. To care for God's creation and to best fulfill our moral responsibilities, we urge the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty as early as possible in 1999.

CTBT CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES

GRASSROOTS

State organizing

- Selection of states (by tiers)

- Use of state contacts

- Use of D.C. contacts

- State organizers (summer '98)

Regional workshops

Postcards

- Fall 1997

- Interfaith (early 1998)

- Spring 1998

Conference calls

Radio call-in days

Educational material

Grassroots actions

- Direct contact with senators

- Letters and other communications

- Attendance at town meetings

- Demonstrations

- Other

Other kinds of grassroots activities

ADVOCACY IN D.C.

Direct contact with senators

Sign-on letters

Lobby days

On specific issues

- Getting hearings

- Specter-Biden

- CTBT PrepCom funding

Interface with grassroots lobbying

Advocacy with Administration

MEDIA

Editorial board outreach

Op-ed articles

News conferences

Television

Radio

Polling

Grassroots media

Letters to editor

Op-ed articles

Meetings with editors

Radio and television

Other

COALITION BUILDING

Contact list

Faith community

Students

Other

CAMPAIGN STRUCTURE

CTBT Working Group

CTBT Grassroots Task Force

Interfaith CTBT Coalition

Nuclear Weapons Working Group

Support groups

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

Disarmament Clearinghouse

October 29, 1998

United States Delegation to the 53rd UN General Assembly First Committee
Statement on Eight Nation Resolution

"Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the need for a new agenda"

In one of the few concrete proposals it contains, the resolution calls on the nuclear weapons states to de-alert those weapons. The U.S. has considered carefully this issue and has agreed with Russia on pre-launch notification of strategic launch vehicles and space launchers. However, we believe the wholesale adoption of de-alerting measures leads to instability. Because such measures are unverifiable, a situation could arise--similar to the August 1914 rush to mobilization--in which the potential that one country might quickly return to alert status could start a dangerous rush by all to do so, leading to greater instability. We have instead targeted our efforts at improving command and control systems--a more valuable approach than wholesale de-alerting.

**Interfaith Group for the CTBT
Meeting of November 24, 1998
FCNL Conference Room
235 Second Street, NW, Washington, D.C.**

Proposed Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Breakfast conference call costs
3. Petition campaign
4. Delegations to cabinet officers
5. CTBT campaign evaluation and 1999 strategy
6. Meeting schedule for 1999
7. Other

PUBLIC ADVOCACY FOR THE CTBT
A Review and Planning Session
November 3, 1998
(Notes by Bob Tiller)

1. LESSONS LEARNED

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. EVENTS IN 1999

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

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

Five top-rated actions and strategies:

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

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

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

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

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

Others receiving some support:

- Update and reissue the CRND brochure (mention an 800 number)
- Focus on Clinton and get him to make this a higher priority
- Focus on Lott
- Focus on Helms — make him an issue, possible sit-ins
- Devise a Senator-by-Senator strategy for key Republicans
- Video for use at conferences, esp. religious assemblies
- Public access TV
- Build media into everything, get editorials written
- State-by state work with religious communities, including state-by-state petitions (U)
- Compile a list of all conferences (not just religious) — contact the organizer and offer resources
- Set up a toll-free number — perhaps with a recording on CTBT, perhaps with a feature for contacting Senators

- Student organizing — set up a DC subgroup
- Hill briefings and other Hill events (U)
- More state-by-state conference calls (U)
- National poll right before the Senate vote (U)
- Focus on Presidential candidates
- Organize around "Sleepwalking to Armageddon" TV show

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

4. ORGANIZING AND STRUCTURING OURSELVES FOR 1999

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

KEY SENATORS ON CTBT

Not for publication. For use only by CTBT campaign supporters.

1. Majority Leader (only the majority leader can schedule a floor vote)
Lott (Miss.)

2. Respected Republicans who would bring other senators
Domenici (N.M.)
Lugar (Ind.)
Stevens (Alaska)
Warner (Va.)
Gorton (wash.)

3. Moderate Republicans who could be early CTBT supporters
Bennett (Utah)
Chafee (R.I.)
Collins (Maine)
Domenici (N.M.) (also above)
Frist (Tenn.)
Gregg (N.H.)
Smith (Ore.)
Snowe (Maine)
Stevens (Alaska) (also above)

Jefforts (Vt.) and Spector (Pa.) are already supporters

4. Centrist Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee (list by committee seniority)
Lugar (Ind.) (also above)
Hagel (Neb.)
Smith (Ore.) (also above)
Thomas (Wyo.)
Frist (Tenn.) (also above)
Brownback (Kan.)

5. Other Senators who will be key for a floor vote
Abraham (Mich.)
Bond (Mo.)
Bunning (Ky.)
Campbell (Colo.)
Crapo (Idaho)
DeWine (Ohio)
Enzi (Wyo.)
Fitzgerald (Ill.)
Grassley (Iowa)
Hatch (Utah)
Hollings (S.C.)
McCain (Ariz.)

McConnell (Ky.)
Murkowski (Alaska)
Roberts (Kan.)
Roth (Del.)
Thompson (Tenn.)
Thurmond (S.C.)
Voinovich (Ohio)

Compiled by David Culp, December 2, 1998

Nuclear Weapons Working Group of Monday Lobby

Regular Participants

Alliance for Nuclear Accountability
Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
Disarmament Clearinghouse
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Peace Action
Physicians for Social Responsibility
20/20 Vision
Women's Action for New Directions

Occasional Participants

British American Security Information Council
D.C. Green Party
Institute for Science and International Security
National Security News Service
Plutonium Challenge
Union of Concerned Scientists
Veterans for Peace
Women Strike for Peace
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

Arms Control Association
British American Security Information Council
Center for Defense Information
Council for a Livable World
Federation of American Scientists
Henry L. Stimson Center
International Center
Institute for Science and International Security
Lawyers Alliance for World Security
National Security News Service
Natural Resources Defense Council
Peace Action Education Fund
Physicians for Social Responsibility
Plutonium Challenge
20/20 Vision
Union of Concerned Scientists
Women's Action for New Directions

CTBT Working Group

Members of Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
About half participate regularly
Open to attendance by other CTBT advocates
Among regular "outside" participants are:
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Interfaith Group for the CTBT

American Friends Service Committee
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
Fellowship of Reconciliation
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office
Mennonite Central Committee
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
National Council of Churches
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice
Lobby
Pax Christi USA
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 Denominations Interested in CTBT Ratification

African Methodist Episcopal Church
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
American Baptist Churches USA
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

Other Religious Associations Interested in CTBT Ratification

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
Jewish Peace Fellowship
Leadership Conference of Women Religious
Methodists Federation for Social Action
Muslim Peace Fellowship
New Call to Peacemaking
Orthodox Peace Fellowship
The Shalom Center
Sisters of Mercy of America
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace
Sojourners
Washington Ethical Society

Interest expressed in such ways as:
Head of communion signing letter to senators
Sending representative to breakfast meeting
with Senator Jeffords on CTBT
Asking for more information, to be kept
informed

Advisers to Interfaith Group on the CTBT

Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers
Disarmament Clearinghouse
Peace Action
Physicians for Social Responsibility
Plutonium Challenge
20/20 Vision
Women's Action for New Directions

Resolution on the New Agenda Coalition on nuclear disarmament

passed 19 November 1998

‘The European Parliament,

- having regard to its previous resolutions on nuclear disarmament, testing and non-proliferation,
 - A. welcoming the joint statement of 9 June 1998 by the Foreign Ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa and Sweden, entitled, ‘Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: the needs for a new agenda’, a group also known as the New Agenda Coalition (NAC),
 - B. welcoming the broad diversity of this coalition of countries, crossing as it does traditional lines of co-operation, and also welcoming the eight countries’ initiating a multilateral debate at the highest level of government on such an important and urgent issue,
 - C. noting that the United Nations’ First Committee passed the NAC resolution on 13 November 1998, with 97 votes in favour, 19 against and 32 abstentions,
 - D. concerned by both the continued retention of nuclear weapons by a few and the nuclear aspirations of others, and reasserting its call for a nuclear-weapon-free world,
 - E. noting that this timely initiative, which includes two EU Member States and one associate member, reflects the post-Cold War redefined security environment and sets a path towards constructive engagement discussions on the subject of nuclear disarmament,
 - F. emphasising that the UN resolution does not propose actions that contradict any existing EU, NATO or national policies, and supports existing policies regarding *inter alia* the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the US-Russia START process and nuclear-weapon-free zones,
1. Calls upon the EU Member States to support the NAC initiative and to vote in favour of it in the General Assembly in December;
 2. Calls on those countries that possess nuclear weapons to fulfil their commitment to disarm by virtue of Article VI of the NPT;
 3. Calls also on the non-nuclear weapon members of the NPT to fulfil their treaty commitments i.e. not to receive, manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices;
 4. Calls on states outside of the NPT to immediately, and unconditionally, accede to the treaty and to place all fissionable materials under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards;
 5. Underlines the importance and the necessity of further improving existing verification procedures with a view to ensuring effective compliance by all states concerned, including the allocation of appropriate funding;

6. Requests that those countries opposing the UN resolution make clear their objections by specifically naming the paragraphs in question;
7. Calls upon all Member States of the EU to undertake discussions on the subject of taking nuclear forces off their current high-sensitivity alert procedures, also known as de-alerting, as highlighted in the Canberra Commission report of 1996;
8. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council, the Commission, the Foreign Ministers of the NAC and the United Nations Secretary General.'

Pre-vote reference numbers: PE 273.845)RC1
PE 273.856)
PE 273.878)
PE 273.882)
PE 273.887)
PE 273.891)

Or.en

**Meeting of
Interfaith Group for the CTBT
January 19, 1999
1:30 to 3:00 p.m.**

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. CTBT status with Administration and Congress
3. Contacts with cabinet officers
4. Interfaith petition
5. Focused action
6. Other

Next meeting: Tuesday, February 16, 1:30 to 3:00 p.m.

Dear Colleagues:

As we design a U.S. campaign to abolish nuclear weapons, we need to think strategically about who we want to influence and how we go about this task. I would like to offer some ideas, mostly in outline form.

I. PREMISE

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

II. WHO TO INFLUENCE

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

III. TIMELINESS

Decision-making processes, such as budget-making, appropriations, legislation, instructions for treaty negotiators, take place over time. Therefore, efforts to influence decisions should commence as early as possible in the decision-making process and continue throughout the process. Persons seeking to influence decisions should understand the schedule and points of influence at each stage of decision-making. They should focus their efforts in a timely manner.

IV. STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

A. Influence who is elected and appointed to public office

1. Electoral activities

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

2. Appointments to public office

- Propose nominees

Support or oppose particular nominees

B. Influence decision-making processes

1. Executive (chief executive, department heads, top advisors)

- a. Direct contact by
 - i. Representatives of national organizations
 - ii. Experts
 - iii. Delegations of grassroots representatives
- b. Indirect contact
 - i. Through legislators
 - ii. Through influential persons who have access
- c. Communications
 - i. Sign-on letters
 - ii. Petitions
 - iii. Grassroots letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
 - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques

2. Legislative bodies

- a. Direct contact at capitol
 - i. By lobbyists
 - ii. Delegations from home districts
 - iii. Public hearings
- b. Direct contact In home districts
 - i. Individuals, delegations
 - ii. Community meetings
- c. Communications
 - i. Letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
 - ii. Petitions
 - iii. Sign-on letters
 - iv. Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques

3. Treaty negotiators

- a. Citizen drafts of treaty proposals
- b. Track treaty negotiations and keep network organizations informed
- c. Rally support for or opposition to specific treaty provisions

4. International bodies

- a. Track proceedings
- b. Influence delegations on specific issues

C. Influence public opinion

1. Media

- a. Think pieces, proposals, and other documents
- b. Editorials, op-ed pieces, magazine articles
- c. News actualities
- d. Television shows, radio talk shows, radio and television ads

2. Direct action

- a. Rallies, demonstrations, celebrations, commemorations
- b. Leafleteering and picketing

3. Sending messages

- a. Petitions
- b. Pledges signed by individuals
- c. Policy resolutions of organizations

- d. Policy resolutions of local and state legislative bodies
- e. Local and state referendums

4. Education

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

V. Division of Labor

A campaign to abolish nuclear weapons won't necessarily undertake all of these activities, but to be successful it must embark upon many of them. For this to be effective there needs to be a division of labor among lobbyists, grassroots organizers, speakers, media outreach persons, treaty drafters, researchers, strategists, and others. Given the pluralistic nature of organizations committed to nuclear abolition, it seems highly unlikely that all of these activities and actors can be contained in a single, unified organization. Rather many different organizations must work together, each doing what it does best, each respecting what others are doing. The campaign structure should reflect this diversity and use it to the advantage of a broadly encompassing campaign. In designing this structure it may be useful to chart who is doing what and to design linkages between various components.

I would be interested in your response to these ideas.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

Influencing Governmental Decision Makers to Achieve Nuclear Abolition

OVERVIEW

■ Premise

Presently all known nuclear weapons on Earth are possessed and controlled by governments of nation states. Therefore, a citizen campaign to achieve nuclear weapons abolition must focus attention on the governing officials of nation states and international bodies composed of representative of nation states.

■ Who to influence

- Executive branch
 - Chief executive
 - Civilian departments
 - Military department
 - Treaty negotiators
- Legislative body
- International bodies and negotiating forums

■ Timeliness

Decision-making processes take place over time.
Efforts to influence decisions should commence as early as possible and continue throughout the process.
Persons seeking to influence decisions should understand the schedule and points of influence at each stage.

STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

■ Influence who is elected and appointed to public office

Electoral activities

- Run for office
- Support specific candidates
 - Campaign workers
 - Financial contributions
- Contact with all candidates
 - Submit issue papers and policy proposals
 - Send delegations to discuss issues
 - Birdog campaign appearances
- Nonpartisan activities, such as
 - Candidate forums
 - Questionnaires
 - Voting records of incumbents running for reelection
- Recommendations for political party platforms

Appointments

- Propose nominees
- Support or oppose particular nominees

■ **Influence decision-making processes**

Executive (chief executive, department heads, top advisors)

- Direct contact by
 - Top leaders of national organizations
 - Experts
 - Delegations of grassroots representatives

- Indirect contact
 - Through legislators
 - Through influential persons who have access

- Communications
 - Sign-on letters
 - Petitions
 - Grassroots letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
 - Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques

Legislative bodies

- Direct contact
 - At capitol
 - Lobbying
 - Delegations from home districts
 - Public hearings
 - In home districts
 - Individuals, delegations
 - Community meetings
- Communications
 - Letters, phone calls, faxes, e-mail
 - Petitions
 - Sign-on letters
 - Picketing, vigils, and other message-sending techniques

Treaty negotiators

- Citizen drafts of treaty proposals
- Track treaty negotiations and keep network organizations informed
- Rally support for or opposition to specific treaty provisions

International bodies

- Track proceedings
- Influence delegations on specific issues

■ **Influence public opinion**

Media

- Think pieces, proposals, and other documents
 - Editorials, op-ed pieces, magazine articles
- News actualities

Television shows, radio talk shows, radio and television ads

Direct action

Rallies, demonstrations, celebrations, commemorations

Leafleteering and picketing

Sending messages

Petitions

Pledges signed by individuals

Policy resolutions of organizations

Policy resolutions of local and state legislative bodies

Local and state referendums

Education

Speeches at organization meetings and conventions

Community forums

Speaker tours, teach-ins

Educational activities within networks, such as religious,
civic, professional, racial/ethnic, and others

Prepared by Methodists United for Peace with Justice December 27, 1996
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036

September 16, 1998

Duane Shank
Sojourners
2401 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Dear Duane:

Here is the material handed out today at the interfaith meeting on the CTBT. The left hand side of the folder contains a list of suggestions for actions that can be taken in the next three weeks before the Senate adjourns. I hope you'll be able to follow through.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

September 16, 1998

Fred Clark
Evangelicals for Social Action
10 E. Lancaster Avenue
Wynnewood, PA 19096

Dear Fred:

Here is the material handed out today at the interfaith meeting on the CTBT. The left hand side of the folder contains a list of suggestions for actions that can be taken in the next three weeks before the Senate adjourns. I hope you'll be able to follow through.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

September 16, 1998

Ms. Sally Lilienthal, President
Ploughshares Fund
Fort Mason Center
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Sally:

As you approach the time when you are deciding whether to award the requested grant to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, I would like to supply you with a couple of items of supplementary material.

The first is a list of registrants for an interfaith breakfast with Senator James Jeffords on the CTBT, which we held this morning. The purposes were to brief attendees on the status of the treaty in the Senate and to chart a course of activities for the remaining days of the session. Other presenters were Steve Andreasen of the National Security Council staff and Marie Rietmann of 20/20 Vision. You can see from the list that we are drawing in an ever-broadening circle of CTBT supports from the religious community.

The second is an outline of elements of a grassroots campaign on de-alerting which Bob Tiller of Physicians for Social Responsibilities and I have developed. We are thinking of a series of activities in the period between election day in November and the end of the calendar year. It would combine the efforts of religious and secular organizations. This would be a major new undertaking that I would help carry out with the support of the Ploughshares grant which we have requested.

If you want one more reading on our activities, you might talk with Marie Rietmann about how the religious community formed the nucleus of a conference call she organized in Mississippi. We have been working a year and a half to identify religious activists in that state. Now a substantial and influential number are drawn into the CTBT ratification campaign.

If you need further information, please let me know.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

September 17, 1998

Ms. Sally Lilienthal, President
Ploughshares Fund
Fort Mason Center
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Sally:

When I wrote you yesterday, I neglected to report that for the Interfaith Breakfast with Senator Jeffords we arranged a conference call so that local activists could listen in to the presentations. We had 18 call-ins from 13 states, some of them small groups assembled to listen together. The states included Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, Indiana, Nebraska, and Texas. Because it was a 9:00 a.m. EDT event we didn't try to recruit listeners beyond the central time zone.

The enclosed flyer for the breakfast lists the sponsors of this event.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

September 17, 1998

Marie Rietmann
20/20 Vision
1828 Jefferson Place, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Marie:

In behalf of the interfaith community I want to thank you for the help you provided in staging the Interfaith Breakfast with Senator Jeffords on the CTBT, held on September 16. Because of your relationships on Capitol Hill you effectively picked up the liaison role with Senator Jeffords' office, and you recruited Steve Andreasen from the National Security Council staff to be an additional resource person. Your presentation to the attendees was precise and relevant to the task of mobilizing religious organizations and their grassroots to support the treaty. The packet of material which you assembled is quite useful. I want to send copies to several organizations which couldn't be represented at the breakfast but which want to work for CTBT ratification. Your contributions helped make the breakfast a very successful events.

This builds upon the previous work you have done with the religious community. Especially commendable is the Mississippi conference call you arranged in August that brought together representatives of several religious organizations within the state along with persons from other citizen organizations. You're a great bridge builder.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

cc. Robin Caiola

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

September 23, 1998

To: Clayton Ramey
Dave Robinson

Fax: 914 358-4924
814 452-2784

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman

Dear Clayton and Dave:

I'm going on vacation to Italy from September 29 to October 14, so I won't make the gathering on nuclear abolition in Chicago on October 9 and 10. I suggested to the organizers that they have a presentation on mobilizing the religious community (such as by one of you) and if that happened I would try to get some denominational people there. I haven't heard anything, so that's not likely to occur. However, if one or both of you are there, you will be feeding ideas into the strategy sessions. Therefore, I want to share some information and ideas with you.

We've built a fairly cohesive interfaith working group on CTBT ratification (it doesn't have a formal name), have mobilized churches and religious organizations in a number of key states, and have helped established linkages between religious organizations and peace organizations, both in Washington and among the grassroots. Attached is a list of denominations and religious associations involved with the working group and some others who have expressed an interest in CTBT ratification.

I would like to keep this network going and to have it work on other issues related to nuclear disarmament, such as de-alerting and stockpile stewardship. I'm trying to set up a meeting in the third week in October, after I return, to talk about next steps on the CTBT, de-alerting, and evolving the CTBT network into a working partnership with a broader agenda. I would like to relate it to the nuclear abolition campaign. I believe that this particular network will be most effective in focusing upon concrete steps toward abolition, such as de-alerting, curtailing weapons development, pushing for deep cuts in the nuclear arsenal, rather than dealing with nuclear abolition as a more abstract goal. This goal needs to be in the picture, but we are likely to engage more religious activists on the specific steps.

Another matter is the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition. Except for one meeting in Philadelphia, it has never functioned as a working group. However, Dave, you and I were able to draw on the name for our work at the NPT PrepCom. The list-serve I set up has functioned very little. It has perhaps 25 miscellaneous subscribers, and I have requests from ten or so more to be put on the list. I've thought about dropping it or turning it over to somebody else, but I want to wait to see what happens at this strategy meeting before taking any action. If it were to continue, should it be international in scope or only USA? What do you think we should do?

There does need to be a major role for the religious community in the quest for nuclear abolition. Please make sure this is kept in mind in Chicago.

Dear Colleagues:

(1) There will be a meeting of the interfaith group working for CTBT ratification on Tuesday, October 20 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the FCNL conference room, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC. The agenda will consist of three items:

- (a) Consideration of a proposal to have a petition drive in churches and at other religious gatherings in January, aimed at senators in specific states (the idea that Jay Lintner advanced at the breakfast with Senator Jeffords).
- (b) A grassroots campaign on de-alerting the nuclear arsenal that Bob Tiller and I have developed for November and December; exploration whether religious organizations would like to be involved.
- (c) Discussion of whether our loose-knit working group might evolve into some kind of an interfaith unit on nuclear disarmament with a broader agenda (such as CTBT, de-alerting, stockpile stewardship, deep cuts through START III, nuclear weapons convention).

(2) There will be a meeting on Tuesday, November 3 (election day) from 10:00 a.m. to 12 noon to evaluate our experience with the CTBT ratification campaign during the past 15 months. It will involve representatives of all groups engaged in public advocacy for the CTBT, in Washington and among the grassroots. This will set the stage for developing strategies for the final push in 1999 for treaty ratification. Please put this date on your calendar. More information will be forthcoming, including a short evaluation questionnaire being developed by Kathy Crandall of the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

(3) In addition to this questionnaire, it would be helpful if each of you could make a brief report (one or two pages) on your activities for CTBT ratification since the summer of 1997. This can include such activities as postcard alerts (your own or jointly), other communications to grassroots, web page, articles and notices in denominational and organization journals, participation in regional workshops, conference calls, promotion of state-level coalition activities, sign-on letters, direct lobbying (list senators), board and denominational resolutions, etc. Please have these reports available by our meeting on October 20. They will be collated and distributed as background for the November 3 evaluation meeting.

(4) I'm going to be out of the country from September 29 to October 14, vacationing with my wife in Italy. If I don't get out a reminder for the October 20 meeting when I return, please remember the date and join us then.

Shalom,
Howard

September 26, 1998

Mr. George Perkovich
W. Alton Jones Foundation
232 High Street
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Dear Mr. Perkovich:

We would like to request the W. Alton Jones Foundation to consider a two year grant of \$112,000 to Methodists United for Peace with Justice in support of our work to facilitate cooperative action of the U.S. religious community on nuclear disarmament. This would build upon successful work during the past year in mobilizing interfaith action in support of Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

As you know, I worked with Bill Hoehn the past two years in developing proposals for a grant from the W. Alton Jones Foundation. Twice your board has turned us down. Although I am not privy to the board's thinking, my conjecture is that they may have been skeptical that a small association like ours would have the capability of mobilizing the larger forces of religious denominations. A year later our work for CTBT ratification proves that we do, as shown in the attached report on our CTBT activities. A list of references are provided so that you can check us out.

Beginning in June 1997 I put together a coalition of representatives from 21 denominations, peace fellowships, and other religious associations to work for ratification of the CTBT. They are listed in the attachment. To foster ties with peace and disarmament organizations, representatives of Physicians for Social Responsibility, 20/20 Vision, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Plutonium Challenge, and Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers attend the monthly meetings. Participants of the interfaith coalition have sent out postcard alerts, signed joint letters to members of the U.S. Senate including one with signatures of over 200 religious leaders across the nation, organized grassroots activities in a number of key states, linked religious activists with peace organizations in those states, and made direct contact with senators in Washington. Our most recent event was a breakfast meeting with Senator James Jeffords and Steve Andreasen of the White House national security staff to rally support for the CTBT in the waning days of this session of Congress. From the meeting came a commitment to continue to work in 1999 for treaty ratification. Of all these activities, grassroots mobilization is most significant.

Mr. George Perkovich
September 26, 1998
Page two.

My role in this endeavor has been to draw the group together, serve as convener and chair of monthly meetings, keep in touch with participants, follow through on decisions made at these meetings, fill gaps, and serve as liaison to other groups working for CTBT ratification. Part of my work has been supported by a \$15,000 grant from the Ploughshares Fund, which is now expended. In addition, as a co-convener of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition (a part of the Abolition 2000 network), I was involved in getting an international religious perspective into the 1998 session of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee in Geneva (see attachment for more details).

The religious coalition working for CTBT ratification is now ready to evolve into some kind of on-going body to work on a broader agenda for nuclear disarmament. This possibility will be considered at a meeting we have scheduled for October 20. I am proposing that participants form an Interfaith (or Religious) Working Group (or Partnership, Coalition) on Nuclear Disarmament. Initial participants would be the 21 organizations now working together on the CTBT. It would have the potential for drawing in twice that many from denominations and religious associations which have shown some interest in CTBT ratification (see list).

The mission of this interfaith group would encompass support for CTBT ratification, de-alerting (Bob Tiller of PSR and I have recently originated a grassroots campaign on this subject), deep cuts in strategic weapons through START III, curtailment of new weapons development under the guise of stockpile stewardship, and multilateral initiatives, such as those recently advanced by the eight-nation New Agenda Coalition. I would continue to serve as convener, chair, and facilitator of follow through, but the coalition would function primarily as a cooperative, non-hierarchical venture with participants taking major responsibility for follow-through activities. We would continue to maintain close working relationships with peace and arms control organizations and would have their representatives attend our monthly meetings. Grassroots activities would have strong linkages with local and state counterparts of secular organizations.

A grant from the W. Alton Jones Foundation will make it possible for me to devote three-fourths of my time to building this interfaith coalition and serving as a catalyst to keep it going. Among other activities I will create a web site that will have linkages both with denominational web sites and those of peace and arms control organizations. I will also maintain contacts I have established with the international religious community, especially the World Council of Churches, the Holy See's Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace, and some leads I have developed with other faiths.

If you would like a full-blown proposal or additional information beyond the attachments, please let me know. I would welcome an opportunity to talk with you directly either in Washington or in Charlottesville. I will be out of the country from September 29 through October 14 but will be available after that.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

October 19, 1998

To: Kathy Crandall, Marie Rietmann

From: Howard W. Hallman

Re: November 3 meeting on CTTB campaign evaluation

Dear Kathy and Marie:

For our meeting on November 3, I believe it would be useful to have a set of evaluation worksheets on various aspects of the CTBT campaign. We can use them to explore the achievements, the strengths and weaknesses of each element of our campaign activities.

With that in mind I have drafted the attached worksheets. I tried to recall all our major activities, but I may have left some out. I suggest that after appropriate revision we send these forms to all likely participants in the meeting to be used for their preparation. The items can serve as our agenda at the meeting.

We can talk about this when we meet on Tuesday, October 20 after the interfaith meeting.

Shalom,

October 19, 1998

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

Dear Msgr. Martin:

I regret that communications difficulties preventing me from completing arrangements to see you when I was in Rome recently. I wrote you fairly late (September 16, not August 7 as my letter erroneously indicated). At the time I didn't have the address of the Hotel Astoria Garden where I would be staying. It turned out to be via V. Bachelet 8, not via Boezio 15 as used in Msgr. Crepaldi's letter to me, indicating that you would be available. He sent a fax copy to the U.S., but the person monitoring my mail didn't check my fax machine. Thus, his message didn't catch up with me. So it goes.

But we had a great time in Rome, including a visit to Saint Peter's, attendance at a 5 o'clock mass, a day at the Vatican Museum, which gave us time for two visits to the Sistine Chapel, a tour of the Vatican Garden, a visit to the Catacombe di San Callisto, tramping through the Roman ruins, seeing the Pantheon, and visiting other tourist sites. You have an intriguing city.

If I had had a chance to visit with you, I would have told you about our initiative to promote the idea of de-alerting the nuclear arsenal, a topic that Archbishop Martino dealt with in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly First Committee last week. We hope that the Holy See will press the nuclear weapons states to move rapidly toward de-alerting. Under separate cover I am sending you some background information on this topic, directed mostly toward an American audience but with information useful globally.

I also would have expressed to you my hope that Pope John Paul II might speak out in the near future in favor of the total abolition of nuclear weapons and that he would recommend as an intermediate step the attainment of zero alert by the end of 1999. I would hope that the Holy Father might say that the conditions of 1983 when he gave acceptance to nuclear deterrence as an interim policy no longer prevail, that deterrence no longer has the church's blessing (language used by the United Methodist bishops in the United States in 1986).

Msgr. Darmuid Martin
October 19, 1998
Page two.

In the United States we need this kind of statement from Pope John Paul in order to get the Catholic bishops to be stronger advocates of nuclear disarmament. As it is, they are more conservative than Rome on this issue. Bishops associated with Pax Christi USA are trying to get the National Council of Catholic Bishops to speak out more strongly on this issue, but the majority of them are still stuck with their 1983 acceptance of deterrence. As such they are far behind all the major Protestant denominations. Interfaith action pushing the U.S. government to move more vigorously to nuclear disarmament would greatly benefit from stronger support from the Catholic bishops.

Even though President Clinton is facing the impeachment inquiry, he is still acting as an active president on many issues. I haven't given up hope that the religious community can help persuade him that now is the time to act vigorously to set the stage for the total elimination of nuclear weapons in the early days of the new century.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Meeting of Interfaith Group on CTBT
1:00 to 2:30 p.m. Tuesday, October 20, 1998
FCNL, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC

Agenda

1. Introductions (1:00 to 1:05)

2. CTBT (1:05 to 1:35)
 Proposed petition campaign

3. De-alerting (1:35 to 2:00)
 Grassroots campaign

4. Future of this group (2:00 to 2:25)

5. Schedule for future meetings (2:25 to 2:30)

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

October 21, 1998

To: Rev. Jay Lintner

Fax: 202 543-5994

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Jay:

Here is the list of contacts for the organizations participating in the Interfaith Group for the CTBT. You may want to send your revised draft of the petition and cover letter to them. All but two of them are on the e-mail list of the communications I sent you this morning.

Shalom,

October 26, 1998

To: President William J. Clinton

Through: Mr. Samuel R. Berger

Fax: 202 456-2883

No. of pages: 5

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Act for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Mr. President:

Congratulations on your achievement of a new accord to move forward the peace process between Israel and the Palestinians. It was a stellar performance. It revealed that in spite of impeachment proceedings you have the capability of providing strong, effective, and practical presidential leadership on important matters.

I ask you now to use your considerable talents and the capabilities of your administration in making an all-out effort to achieve truly significant progress toward global nuclear disarmament. You have spoken of the desire to eliminate nuclear weapons and in your second inaugural address you described a land of new promise where "our children will sleep free from the threat of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons." It is now time to match your soaring rhetoric with decisive action.

Specifically I ask you to take two significant initiatives between now and the end of the year. First, respond affirmatively to the New Agenda Coalition on nuclear disarmament, undertaken by the foreign ministers of Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia, South Africa, and Sweden, and support multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. Second, work closely with Russia and other nuclear weapon states to de-alert the nuclear arsenal with the goal of achieving zero alert no later than December 31, 1999.

President William J. Clinton
Page two.
October 26, 1998

New Agenda Coalition

The eight nations which initiated the New Agenda Coalition last June are true friends of the United States. As the United States as a third party has been exceedingly useful in moving the Middle East peace process, so also these nations as a third party can help the nuclear weapon states speed up the sluggish nuclear disarmament process. Their recommendations reflect a broad consensus of a variety of study commissions, numerous retired military officers and civilian national security leaders, many civil organizations, and major religious denominations.

I understand that the nations associated with the New Agenda Coalition are planning to incorporate their recommendations into a resolution for the United Nations General Assembly. I have also heard that the United States is mobilizing opposition among NATO members. That's shameful.

I say that after my experience in Geneva last spring during the two-week session of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee. I was embarrassed and angered to see the U.S. delegation, acting upon instructions from Washington, to do all it could to thwart serious and sincere efforts to bring about meaningful, multilateral discussion of nuclear disarmament. The U.S. delegation to the Conference on Disarmament acts in a similar manner. A month or so after the NPT Preparatory Committee a top official in your administration explained this stance by insisting that the United States and Russia have the prerogative to dictate the pace of nuclear disarmament because they possess the most nuclear weapons.

This arrogance contrasts with the perspective offered the NPT Preparatory Committee delegates by Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International

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

Therefore, I ask that you immediately reverse the approach of the United States in opposing the New Agenda Coalition initiative and instead welcome their help in moving forward the pace of nuclear disarmament. I believe that we in the United States should have the humility to openly face up to our addiction to nuclear weapons and welcome the help of a third party, a counselor and advisor so to speak, to assist us and the other nuclear weapon states find our way out of our foolhardy, nuclear-weapons-forever posture.

President William J. Clinton
Page three.
October 26, 1998

I also ask you to reverse the U.S. policy at the Conference on Disarmament and to actively support the creation of a subsidiary body on nuclear disarmament. This would not preclude the United States and Russia from making deep cuts in their strategic arsenals through the START process. Rather it would recognize that all the peoples of Earth, acting through their governments, have an interest in and a role to play in ridding Earth of these evil instruments of mass destruction.

De-alerting

I request that you use your executive power to work with Russia and the other nuclear weapons states to immediately commence a process to de-alert the entire global nuclear arsenal and achieve zero alert no later than December 31, 1999. In doing so you would be following the example of your Republican predecessor, President George Bush who in the fall of 1991 ordered a stand-down of strategic bombers, terminated the alert status of a significant number of ICBMs, and brought back large numbers of tactical nuclear weapons to the United States. This produced reciprocal action by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. In a similar manner you and President Yeltsin could act under your executive authority without having to seek approval from the balky U.S. Senate and Russian Duma.

De-alerting has been recommended by every commission that has studied nuclear weapons in the 1990s. It has the support of retired generals and admirals. It is one of the recommendations of the New Agenda Coalition. Civilian experts, such as Bruce Blair of the Brookings Institution and Arjun Makhijani of the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, have developed workable schedules to achieve zero alert within one year. No doubt military experts in the Pentagon could come with a sensible approach if they were told by you, their commander-in-chief. The most straightforward method would be to separate warheads from delivery vehicles and place them in secure storage. If this can't be completely accomplished by the end of 1999, other interim methods are possible, such as removal of vital components of missiles and temporarily demobilizing launching systems, such as covering silos with mounds of dirt and disabling mobile launchers.

What is lacking is the political will to accomplish this desirable objective. Clearly there is public support for de-alerting. We can generate even more if you will step out in front to lead the way. I believe that a majority of U.S. senators will support de-alerting if it becomes a presidential initiative and if we citizens share our favorable views on de-alerting with our senators.

We now have a strong coalition of citizen organizations building grassroots support for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. This includes an interfaith working group and a network of religious denominations and religious associations supporting CTBT ratification (see attached list). Although I have no authority to commit any of these bodies, I believe that they would readily work actively to develop support within the religious community for a presidential de-alerting initiative. I believe that a significant number of heads of religious

President William J. Clinton

Page four.

October 26, 1998

communions would participate in a White House event to urge you to take leadership for de-alerting and to join with your administration in building public support.

De-alerting is a ready-made opportunity for presidential leadership. Therefore, I urge you to act now.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 26, 1998

To: Ms. Melanne Verveer
Office of the First Lady

Fax: 202 456-6244

No. of pages: 6

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Melanne:

It's been a while since you heard from me on nuclear disarmament. I believe the time is now ripe for President Clinton to take decisive action. It would be a good follow-through to his efforts in behalf of peace in the Middle East.

Therefore, I have written him (through Sandy Berger). I want to share my communication with you.

Shalom,

Dear Tom and Daryl:

As an addendum to our discussion on November 3, I would like to offer some further comments on the structure of our campaign for CTBT ratification. After the meeting three persons told me that they, too, were somewhat uncomfortable about how the CTBT Working Group is set up as a unit of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. Nobody wants to make a big public issue of it, but it may be worth discussing quietly.

As I indicated, sometimes I get the feeling that I allowed to attend as a "guest" of the Coalition and not as full-fledged partner. Sometimes meetings of both the CTBT Working Group and the Deep Cuts Working Group letters are circulated for signing only by Coalition members. When we were discussing a CTBT strategy "retreat", Daryl, you indicated that the religious community should participate through selected representatives rather than be open to all who are actively engaged in the CTBT ratification. Your reason was that you didn't want the meeting to be too large. Yet all 17 members of the Coalition would be invited even though more than half of them are not actively engaged in public advocacy for the C TBT as far as I can determine.

As an alternative, I suggest that the CTBT Working Group be considered a self-governing body composed of representatives of all organizations working for CTBT ratification. It would be continued to be staffed primarily by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, but it would have a more free-standing status.

Dear Daryl:

I'm disappointed and chagrined that you have excluded most of the faith community from the invitation list for the December 2 strategy session on the CTBT. My understand is that this is supposed to be broadly inclusive meeting involving all organizations working for CTBT ratification.

After receiving the invitation I tried to reach you to find out who in the faith community had been invited so that I could get in touch with others. In your absence Jenny Smith indicated that the December 2 event is being set up as basically as a meeting for member organizations of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers (CRND) plus a few others, such as myself. Furthermore, she explained that the meeting room wouldn't accommodate a larger gathering.

Jenny must have relayed to Tom Collina my concern that all faith-based organizations working for CTBT ratification weren't invited. Tom called when I was out and left a message saying the December 2 meeting was indeed a CRND meeting with a few extra guests, including myself as representative of the faith community. He said that we had to have two meetings because of differences over agenda and that the November 3 meeting was the one in which the faith community was involved. He indicated that the CRND can't interface with every constituency through Coalition meetings.

My understanding is that the pair of meetings evolved because of differences over purpose, not participants. I and several others emphasized the need to spend time in evaluation before embarking upon planning for next year. You emphasized a desire to bring in persons from the Administration and Congress. The compromise was to have evaluation among ourselves in a meeting separate from the one with persons from the Administration and Congress. The November 3 meeting was planned by a five-member committee of which you were a part (along with Bob Tiller, Kathy Crandall, Marie Rietmann, and myself). I and others accepted your agenda for the December 2 meeting. But I saw it not as an exclusive CRND meeting but rather a meeting for the whole community working for CTBT ratification, really the second stage of participatory strategic planning.

My many years of experience in coalition activities at the local level and nationally has taught me that coalitions gain strength from being broadly inclusive rather than narrowly exclusive. Organizations are most supportive of strategies they have had a hand in formulating. That's why the faith community should be fully included in the December 2 meeting. They are not just a special constituency to be assigned tasks that others determined but rather are full-fledged participants in the CTBT ratification campaign. During the past 15 months 22 faith-based organizations have engaged in advocacy for CTBT ratification, especially in building grassroots support. (In contrast, as far as I can determine, only 7 or 8 of the CRND's 17 members have been so engaged.) Accordingly these faith-based organizations should be fully involved in planning strategies for 1999. Although I have been a catalyst in bringing these groups into the CTBT campaign, I have no authority to represent them in closed proceedings.

Having an exclusive meeting on December 2 is contrary what I perceive as a consensus of our discussion on November 3 in which you and Tom Collina participated. We concluded that we should have a unified campaign with a unified campaign structure. We acknowledged that the faith community might need to have meetings together within the overall structure but that such

meetings should involve participants from peace organizations, as they have for 15 months. We agreed that details of grassroots activities could be worked out at meetings of the Nuclear Weapons Working Group of the Monday Lobby. We agreed that these separate threads should be woven together at meetings of the CTBT Working Group, which in my understanding would be broadly inclusive.

All of this leads me to wonder whether the CTBT Working Group should now be reconstituted as a free-standing body that is open to participation on an equal basis by all who are working for CTBT ratification. It could continue to receive staff support from the CRND, but it wouldn't be controlled by CRND staff as is now the case. Meetings would be open to all. This would include the faith community and other allies, such as environmentalists, women's organizations, and others. Likely the core of participants wouldn't be hugely different than now, for many of our allies will undertake support tasks but not attend a lot of meetings. However, being considered equal partners would enhance the identity with the campaign by organizations whose participation, particularly in grassroots outreach, are essential to success of the campaign.

This can start by making the December 2 meeting all-inclusive. If you want assistance in finding a larger meeting place, I'm willing to help.

I'm sharing this communication with others who have been involved in the CTBT ratification campaign and request their comments.

Shalom,
Howard

Dear Colleagues:

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

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

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

I had hoped that all CTBT advocates would meet together to develop a unified strategy for 1999. However, when I receive information on the Coalition's 1999 strategy, I'll share it with you. We will want relate efforts of the faith-based community to what others will be doing.

Shalom,
Howard

November 17, 1998

To: President William J. Clinton

Through: Mr. Samuel R. Berger

Fax: 202 456-2883

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: New Agenda Resolution for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Mr. President:

I am greatly disappointed that your Administration has responded so negatively to the Eight Nation Initiative seeking a New Agenda towards a nuclear weapon free world. It was especially shameful the way the United States pressured Slovenia to withdraw from the New Agenda Coalition. Another example of America the bully.

There is a warning for the United States in the abstentions of a number of NATO states. They are growing tired of U.S. obduracy in refusing to bring an end to its cold war nuclear posture. Citizen organizations in those states are pressing their governments to support international initiatives aimed at ridding the world of nuclear weapons. The United States will become increasingly isolated on this issue and on the wrong side, as has happened on other humanitarian matters, such as the ban on land mines and the International Criminal Court.

Therefore, I ask that you and your advisors reconsider your position on the New Agenda resolution before the final vote by the UN General Assembly in December. Instead of opposing the resolution, please have the U.S representative welcome the resolution for the excellent ideas it contains. If the U.S. is not willing to vote for the resolution, at least abstain. Tell other nations that they are free to vote as they choose without intra-alliance pressure.

Beyond my concern for the overall U.S. position, I was particularly disturbed by one paragraph in Ambassador Grey's statement to the First Committee on the Eight Nation Resolution. Since you've been busy, you may not have seen it. He stated:

President William J. Clinton
November 17, 1998
Page two.

In one of the few concrete proposals it contains, the resolution calls on the nuclear weapons states to de-alert those weapons. The U.S. has considered carefully this issue and has agreed with Russia on pre-launch notification of strategic launch vehicles and space launchers. However, we believe the wholesale adoption of de-alerting measures leads to instability. Because such measures are unverifiable, a situation could arise--similar to the August 1914 rush to mobilization--in which the potential that one country might quickly return to alert status could start a dangerous rush by all to do so, leading to greater instability. We have instead targeted our efforts at improving command and control systems--a more valuable approach than wholesale de-alerting.

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

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

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

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

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

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

President William J. Clinton
November 17, 1998
Page three.

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

As I previously wrote, numerous faith-based organizations and secular peace and arms control organizations are ready to provide strong support, both national and grassroots, for imaginative and significant measures for nuclear disarmament, including de-alerting.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

November 17, 1998

To: Ms. Melanne Verveer
Office of the First Lady

Fax: 202 456-6244

No. of pages: 4

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Nuclear disarmament and U.S. position at UN

Dear Melanne:

Here's another communication on nuclear disarmament, addressed to President Clinton through Sandy Berger that I want to share with you.

Shalom,

November 27, 1998

To: The Honorable Erik Derycke
Minister For Foreign Affairs, Belgium,

Fax: 011-32-2-511-63-85

Pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Mr. Foreign Minister:

The courageous fast by our friend and colleague, Pol D'Huyvetter, highlights the opportunity that Belgium has to be equally courageous by providing leadership for long overdue changes in the nuclear posture of NATO and in the world as a whole.

From our perspective the use of nuclear weapons is immoral. So is the threat to use nuclear weapons through a policy of nuclear deterrence. This viewpoint is shared by the Holy See, the World Council of Churches, numerous religious denominations, and by leaders of other faiths. At the same time numerous military officers and civilian national security experts tell us that nuclear weapons have no military utility. For them all that is left is nuclear weapons deterring nuclear weapons. From both the moral and the practical viewpoints the solution is clear: abolish all nuclear weapons.

What is urgently needed now is for statesmen like yourself to step up and push for nuclear abolition. You now have the opportunity to act in three ways: (1) Have the Belgian delegate to the United Nations vote in favor of the resolution of the New Agenda Coalition calling for steps toward nuclear disarmament. (2) Have the United States withdraw all nuclear weapons from Belgium, for they have no legitimate use and actually make Belgium a target for Russian missiles. (3) Provide leadership to free NATO from reliance on nuclear weapons by supporting not only a no-first-use policy but also a no-use policy.

As Americans we need your help. Our own government is badly addicted to nuclear weapons. We need outside friends to help our policy makers overcome their addiction. Specifically we hope that Belgium and other friends will have the courage to stand up to the United States and insist upon policy changes that lead to the abolition of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

Shalom,

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

December 2, 1998

To: Bev DeLong

Fax: 403 282-8260

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Beebee Demonstration

Dear Bev:

Here is information about the beebee demonstration we used to carry out. The ratio of beebees is a little different than what I remember. It is more in the range of what is doable.

I hope you will be able to make use of this idea. It's very effective with an audience.

Shalom,

Suggestions on a letter to Secretary Albright regarding the CTBT

Dear Madame Secretary:

As you have said on a number of occasions, Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is urgently needed. A broad segment of the religious community in the United States agrees, as illustrated by the attached letter that went to all members of the U.S. Senate last May. We see 1999 as a crucial time for the Senate to complete action on the treaty.

We would like to have an opportunity for a small interfaith delegation of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders to meet with you to discuss the campaign for Senate ratification of the CTBT. We want to urge that the Clinton Administration make CTBT ratification a top priority in its dealings with Congress and in building public support for the treaty. We believe that the CTBT deserves the same all-out effort that the Administration gave to NATO expansion last year. We have several ideas to offer on how this might occur.

When we meet with you, we also want to tell you about activities now underway within the religious community to develop strong grassroots support for the CTBT. We want to discuss how our public advocacy for the CTBT can relate to the Administration's push for CTBT ratification.

[Then something about who the interfaith contact is for setting up this appointment.]

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

December 8, 1998

To: Mr. Wayne Glass
Office of Senator Bingaman

Fax: 202 224-2852

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Forum on De-alerting

Dear Wayne:

We are focusing on Thursday, December 17 as the date for the Forum on De-alerting. It will run from 10:00 a.m. until 12 noon. We realize that Senator Bingaman will not be in Washington that week to offer greetings, but we decided to go ahead this month for reasons you offered us. We also realize that we may be competing for attention with impeachment proceedings on the floor of the House of Representatives, but we want to hold the Forum on De-alerting anyway.

So far we have lined up Bruce Blair and Admiral Stansfield Turner as speakers. We tried unsuccessfully to get Admiral Hank Childs, who has some concerns about de-alerting. We considered asking Fred Celec of the Pentagon, who responded to an August sign-on letter to Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin, but on second thought we think it may not be a good idea to force a Pentagon official to speak publicly on de-alerting at a time when President Clinton may be considering a de-alerting proposal for his State of the Union Address. Thus, the event isn't shaping up as much of a debate as you would prefer, but there will opportunities in the future for debate.

Our greatest need is to tie down a location. You indicated that you would be able to help us find a room in one of the Senate office buildings. We estimate that we might draw up to 50 people from congressional staff and the NGO community. We would need a room with a table, podium, and mikes including floor mikes. Among other spots, the one across from your office might work, though it is a little larger than necessary for the crowd we expect. We would like to have the location settled no later than Thursday, December 10 so that we can get out publicity. Will you be able to help us?

We want to serve coffee, juice, rolls and bagels. Is there an in-house catering service we can call on? We will pay for it.

We want to try for C-Span coverage even though this may be a long shot? Is there anyone in your office who can help us make contact?

We will get out an announcement as soon as we have a room. We would also welcome a "Dear Colleague" letter from Senator Bingaman and if possible a Republican senator. Elizabeth Turpen says that Senator Domenici won't be a sponsor. We have had an indication that Senator Chafee may be interested in de-alerting, so he would be a possibility. Would you have any other suggestion for a Republican?

Upon your return to Washington I would greatly appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible on these matters.

Shalom,

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

D

December 16, 1998

To: Daryl Byler

Fax: 202 544 2820

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Petition

Dear Daryl:

Here is a copy of the petition you requested. If this copy isn't clear enough, Jay Lintner probably has an original.

Shalom,
Howard

Sample letter on CTBT for use in Virginia

Dear Virginian:

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is now before the U.S. Senate for ratification. By banning all nuclear explosions, the CTBT will curb the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, help guard against the renewal of the arms race, and establish an extensive global monitoring and verification system. It has been signed by over 150 countries, including the five long-standing nuclear weapon states: United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China. In order for the treaty to enter into force and become international law, it must be ratified by the United States and 43 other nuclear-capable countries. Accordingly, action by the U.S. Senate is urgently needed.

President Clinton submitted the CTBT to the Senate for ratification on September 24, 1997. It was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for consideration, but so far Senator Jesse Helms, committee chair, has refused to schedule hearings on the treaty. Moreover, Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott has not been willing to schedule a vote by the Senate on the CTBT. We and other supporters of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty believe that it is important for hearings to start as quickly as possible and for the Senate as a whole to debate and vote on the treaty during the 1999 session.

Senator John Warner of Virginia is now taking over as chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee and can therefore play a key leadership role in achieving CTBT ratification. We ask you to get in touch with Senator Warner and urge him to publicly announce his support for the CTBT. Request him to have the Armed Services Committee schedule fair and open hearings on the CTBT in the near future. Also, ask him to talk with Senator Lott about placing the CTBT on the Senate schedule for floor action in 1999.

You can reach Senator John Warner at Russell Senate Office Building, Room 225, Washington, DC 20500; telephone, 202 224-2023; fax, 202 224-6295; or e-mail: senator@warner.senate.gov.

Sincerely yours,

Organizational signer

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

January 4, 1999

To: Mary Miller

Fax: 202 393-3695

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Mary,

Here is the swing list you requested.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

January 5, 1999

To: Mark Brown

Fax: 202 783-7502

No. of pages: 4

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Mark,

Here is the CTBT swing list you requested. I've also sent it via e-mail to marsusab@aol.com.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

January 5, 1999

To: Rev. Jay Lintner

Fax: 202 543-5994

No. of pages: 4

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Jay,

Here is the CTBT swing list you requested.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org

January 20, 1999

To: Jay Lintner

Fax: 202 543-5994

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Jay:

Your instructions are thorough. I offer suggestions for a couple of additions and some corrections.

It might be useful to have at the beginning a brief overview of objectives, such as:

"The purpose of the petition drive is to circulate petitions favoring CTBT ratification in churches, synagogues, and other religious gatherings in February and early March and to present the petitions to senators around the time of the Easter recess. If possible, interfaith delegations should present petitions directly to senators when they are in their home states. However, where that cannot be arranged, interfaith delegations can take petitions to senators' in-state offices. Petitions can also be mailed to senators."

Washington Coordinating Plan

1. The CTBT brochure is available from the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers (which has its office with the Council for a Livable World).
4. The meeting on February 16 will start at 1:30 p.m.
7. Perhaps add: "If an appointment with a Senator cannot be arranged, try to set up interfaith delegations to deliver petitions to the Senator's in-state offices."

Description of Current Know Participation

9. Should be Church Women United.
14. They like NETWORK in caps.

Thanks to you and Marijke for taking on the task of coordination.

CTBT Ratification: Key Senators

Ones

All Democrats
except Hollings (S.C.)
(including new Senators
Bayh (Ind.), Edwards
(N.C.), Lincoln (Ark.)
and Schumer (N.Y.))
44 total

Jeffords (R-Vt.)
Specter (R-Pa.)

Subtotal = 46

Twos

Chafee (R-R.I.)
Collins (R-Maine)
Domenici (R-N.M.)
Frist (R-Tenn.)
Gregg (R-N.H.)
Hollings (D-S.C.)
Smith (R-Ore.)
Snowe (R-Maine)
Stevens (R-Alaska)

Subtotal = 9

Threes

Abraham (R-Mich.)
Bennett (R-Utah)
Bond (R-Mo.)
Brownback (R-Kan.)
Bunning (R-Ky.)
Campbell (R-Colo.)
Crapo (R-Idaho)
DeWine (R-Ohio)
Enzi (R-Wyo.)
Fitzgerald (R-Ill.)
Gorton (R-Wash.)
Grassley (R-Iowa)
Hagel (R-Neb.)
Hatch (R-Utah)
Lugar (R-Ind.)
McCain (R-Ariz.)
McConnell (R-Ky.)
Murkowski (R-Alaska)
Roberts (R-Kan.)
Roth (R-Del.)
Thomas (R-Wyo.)
Thompson (R-Tenn.)
Thurmond (R-S.C.)
Voinovich (R-Ohio)
Warner (R-Va.)

Subtotal = 25

Fours

Allard (R-Colo.)
Burns (R-Mont.)
Coverdell (R-Ga.)
Grams (R-Minn.)
Hutchinson (R-Ark.)
Hutchison (R-Texas)
Lott (R-Miss.)
Mack (R-Fla.)
Nickles (R-Okla.)
Santorum (R-Pa.)
Shelby (R-Ala.)

Subtotal = 11

Fives

Ashcroft (R-Mo.)
Cochran (R-Miss.)
Craig (R-Idaho)
Gramm (R-Texas)
Helms (R-N.C.)
Inhofe (R-Okla.)
Kyl (R-Ariz.)
Sessions (R-Ala.)
Smith (R-N.H.)

Subtotal = 9

David Culp
December 23, 1998

Key Senators on CTBT

Ê **Majority Leader** (Only the Majority Leader can schedule a floor vote.)
Lott (Miss.)

Ë **Respected Republicans** who would bring other Senators
Domenici (N.M.)
Lugar (Ind.)
Stevens (Alaska)
Warner (Va.)
Gorton (Wash.)

Ì **Moderate Republicans** who could be early CTBT supporters
Bennett (Utah)
Chafee (R.I.)
Collins (Maine)
Domenici (N.M.) (Also above)
Frist (Tenn.)
Gregg (N.H.)
Smith (Ore.)
Snowe (Maine)
Stevens (Alaska) (Also above)
Jeffords (Vt.) and **Specter** (Pa.) are already supporters.

Í Centrist Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee (listed by committee seniority)
Lugar (Ind.) (Also above)
Hagel (Neb.)
Smith (Ore.) (Also above)
Thomas (Wyo.)
Frist (Tenn.) (Also above)
Brownback (Kan.)

↑

Other Senators who will be key for a floor vote

Abraham (Mich.)

Bond (Mo.)

Bunning (Ky.)

Campbell (Colo.)

Crapo (Idaho)

DeWine (Ohio)

Enzi (Wyo.)

Fitzgerald (Ill.)

Grassley (Iowa)

Hatch (Utah)

Hollings (S.C.)

McCain (Ariz.)

McConnell (Ky.)

Murkowski (Alaska)

Roberts (Kan.)

Roth (Del.)

Thompson (Tenn.)

Thurmond (S.C.)

Voinovich (Ohio)

David Culp

December 23, 1998