

**Meeting of Interfaith Group for the CTBT**  
**1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 18, 1999**  
**FCNL conference room, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC.**

**Agenda**

1. Introductions
2. Status of CTBT in Congress
3. Letter to Berger
4. Meetings with Hill staff
3. Grassroots advocacy
  - a. Further use of petition
  - b. State-level meetings
  - c. North Carolina
5. CDI video
6. Media activities
7. Sign-on letters
  - a. Distribution of letters on CTBT to senators
  - b. Kerrey Amendment on START reductions
  - c. On defense spending
8. Other matters

Next meeting: Tuesday, June 16, 1999, 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., FCNL Conference Room

## Nuclear Abolition as a Human Rights Issue

The General Assembly of the United Nations on December 10, 1948 adopted without dissent the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This action was based upon the recognition that "the inherent dignity of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world." It was adopted at a time when "disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind." (The last phrase and other terminology in the Universal Declaration were written before great sensitivity for gender inclusive language developed.)

The first three articles lay the foundation for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

*Article I.* "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

*Article II.* "Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status."

"Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty."

*Article III.* "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person."

Although the Universal Declaration of Human Rights doesn't deal specifically with military issues, the development, testing, deployment, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons constitute clearcut abuses of human rights.

- Uranium mining, nuclear weapons testing, and disposal of nuclear wastes have disproportionately effected indigenous people and people of color.
- The only two bombs used in warfare killed Japanese civilians.
- Consideration of other use has most commonly involved people of color, such as Koreans, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Iraqis.
- Any further use of nuclear weapons, regardless of the adversary, would be a barbarous act by killing and maiming large numbers of civilians.
- Threatening civilians with death in the name of nuclear deterrence is likewise a barbarous act, for it holds innocent people hostage for political and military purposes.
- The spread of radioactive fallout harms civilians far beyond the sites of nuclear explosions. It pollutes the air, destroys crops, and poisons the ground.
- Large-scale use of nuclear weapons would kill millions of people in numerous countries beyond the borders of combatant nations. The possibility of nuclear winter threatens the continued existence of the human race.

In these ways nuclear weapons, threatened and used, are contrary to the right to life and security specified in Article III of the Universal Declaration.

Furthermore, the vast expenditures of public funds to develop and maintain nuclear arsenals is, as former U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower stated, "a theft from those who are hungry and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed." This is contrary to Article 25 of the Universal Declaration that specifies: "Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family." (Update to "all persons" for "themselves" and "their" families.)

Therefore, individuals and organizations which have a strong commitment to human rights should also have an interest in the abolition of nuclear weapons.

## **One Day Consultation on Nuclear Abolition and Human Rights**

Suggested conveners: Rev. Dr. Tyrone S. Pitts, General Secretary, Progressive National Baptist Convention and Rev. Dr. Thom White Wolf Fassett, General Secretary, United Methodist General Board of Church and Society

Support staff: Clayton Ramey, Disarmament Coordinator, Fellowship of Reconciliation and Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Location: to be determined

8:30 Gathering. Continental breakfast

9:00 Welcome, self-introductions, & introduction of topic

### **PART I. THE PROBLEM**

9:30 Panel: "Who Has Been Effected by Nuclear Weapons Production?"  
Overview of impact of uranium mining, nuclear weapons production and testing  
Mining and testing in American West (Native American)  
Testing in the South Pacific (an indigenous person)

10:30 Break

10:45 Presentation: "Who Would Be Effected by Nuclear War?"  
Such as a PSR representative

11:30 Panel: "Theft of Resources: A Justice Issue"  
Cost of nuclear weapons production and deployment  
Alternative uses of resources

12:30 Luncheon

### **PART TWO. SOLUTIONS**

1:00 Theological Perspective  
Speaker

1:30 Panel: Policies Leading to Nuclear Abolition  
Steps to Nuclear Abolition  
Nuclear Weapons Convention  
Arenas for Action (national, international)

2:30 Break

2:45 Possible Faith-based Activities  
Open Discussion

4:00 Adjourn

**Some Thoughts about the Path to Abolition of Nuclear Weapons  
and Strategies for Organizing in the United States**

by Andrew M. Lichterman  
April 1999

**WESTERN STATES LEGAL FOUNDATION**

1440 Broadway, Suite 500  
Oakland, California USA, 94612  
+1 (510) 839-5877 [wslf@earthlink.net](mailto:wslf@earthlink.net)

## Introduction

Western States Legal Foundation (WSLF) is a non-profit, public interest organization which monitors, analyzes, and challenges U.S. nuclear weapons programs and policies, with a focus on the Lawrence Livermore, Los Alamos and Sandia National Laboratories and the Nevada Test Site. WSLF seeks to abolish nuclear weapons, compel open public environmental review of nuclear technologies, and ensure appropriate management of nuclear waste. Grounded in both international and environmental law, the principle guiding our activities is democratization of decisionmaking affecting nuclear weapons and related nuclear technologies. WSLF's legal, technical and organizing activities support the growth of nonviolent public participation in shaping domestic and global nuclear policy. WSLF is a founding member of the Abolition 2000 Global Network to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons.

Since 1982, WSLF has played a leading role in exposing threats to peace and the environment posed by research, testing, production, deployment and threatened use of nuclear weapons. WSLF was one of the first organizations to recognize that the Stockpile Stewardship program represented an ambitious effort to rebuild and modernize the U.S. nuclear weapons complex, with the aim of maintaining large arsenals for decades to come while retaining the capacity to design and deploy nuclear weapons with new military capabilities. Our work in documenting the details of these programs and analyzing their implications for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty regimes has made a significant contribution to the international debate over the role these treaty regimes can and should play in the path to abolition of nuclear weapons.

WSLF is an organization which brings together an unusual combination of skills and values. Growing out of the nonviolent direct-action anti-nuclear movement of the 1970's and 1980's, our core staff and board members have worked closely together for over 15 years. WSLF is small and locally-based, with extensive international connections. Our approach is fact-based and principled, rooted in a deeply-held commitment to social transformation through nonviolence and democratic, non-hierarchical decision-making. In the context of the "big picture," we seek to understand the links between issues. For all of these reasons WSLF has had a long-standing interest in bringing together people and perspectives that ordinarily do not meet.

At present, prospects for nuclear disarmament seem to be shifting rapidly into reverse. In the United States, the abolition movement is weak and fragmented. Many people of good will are acting on outdated information and assumptions. And as the Cold War recedes into history, it is becoming increasingly difficult to come to grips with current nuclear realities. At WSLF we believe that it's imperative to re-examine assumptions, strategies and approaches to eliminating nuclear weapons. To encourage this new dialogue, we are introducing the WSLF Working Papers. Our purpose is to promote discussion of where we should be going, what's working and what's not. The views expressed are those of the authors. We welcome your comments and responses.

-- Jacqueline Cabasso, Executive Director, April 27, 1999

# **SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT THE PATH TO ABOLITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND STRATEGIES FOR ORGANIZING IN THE UNITED STATES**

**Andrew M. Lichterman<sup>1</sup>**

What follows are some thoughts about the current state of efforts in the United States to abolish nuclear weapons, and where we should go from here. This is not a proposal for a campaign, but rather some ideas about the kind of social movement we will need to make abolition possible. Some of the areas identified for thought and action at the end of the piece, I believe, might be worth considering as elements of a campaign.

My main point, in brief, is that we are losing, losing badly, and that it is time for a reappraisal of the approaches and strategies which have predominated in anti-nuclear work in the United States in recent years. I believe that abolition will not come quickly, and it will not be achieved through conventional interest group pressure techniques applied in national political forums. Rather, abolition will not be achievable except as part of broader and deeper social change, and we must come to understand how our work is related to other efforts to bring about the kind of transformation which could make abolition of nuclear weapons possible.

I begin with an overview of our current circumstances and of the general direction I believe our work should take. Next comes a discussion of the problems I see with some of the prevalent current strategies in nuclear weapons work. In the latter part of the piece I suggest some examples of approaches and initiatives which might help build the social movement we need.

For the most part, these ideas are not new. There are many people who already are working hard to make real one or another piece of the still-fragmentary vision set out here. But I feel that it is worthwhile now to try to pull some of these ideas together, because the perspective reflected here is fragile and marginal in a society dominated by enormous organizations and concentrated wealth, and may well be drowned out if the larger institutions which do work against nuclear weapons continue to avoid discussion of broader social change, while pursuing a political “center” in which fewer and fewer aspects of the social forces which drive the quest for military dominance can be questioned.

## **Some elements of our current predicament**

Peace workshop stresses need for new strategies  
By Beena Sarwar

LAHORE, Dec 20 (IPS): "Peace has been brought onto the world agenda, and a movement is

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrew Lichterman is an attorney with the Western States Legal Foundation. He can be reached at [alichterman@worldnet.att.net](mailto:alichterman@worldnet.att.net)

being created and developed in South Asia, but we must not repeat the mistakes of the European peace movement," vehemently commented eminent scholar Eqbal Ahmed. "It was rotten. It was ethno-centric, nuko-centric, phobo-centric (creating fear rather than understanding), techno-centric (concerned with the technology rather than causes), Oxo-centric. "It failed to link up with the European and American working class, with issues of race and poverty. And lastly, it never talked of Israel. We cannot, we must not, repeat these mistakes. We must show people that their bread is linked with the bomb."

For half a century, the Cold War was invoked to justify both enormous, constantly modernizing superpower militaries and international arms sales to their allies and clients. In the post-Cold War world, we cannot ignore the fact that these enormous armed bureaucracies and their industrial suppliers continue to pursue their own interests: to constantly produce huge quantities of ever more technologically sophisticated weapons. These interests are not the same as those of the vast majority of the people on the planet. For this to continue, these same interests must persuade the rest of us that there is a new justification for expending vast resources, in a world full of unaddressed ecological crises and starving, sick, and undereducated people, on more and better weapons.

The picture they are painting for us is one of a world of demonized "rogue states" who are at every moment apt to act violently and unpredictably. Against this is counterposed a regime of great powers, at least one of which claims the right to act unilaterally virtually anywhere on the globe to perceived threats to "security." The "dangerousness" of the so-called "rogue states" is sustained and intensified by high technology international arms sales and technology transfers, made both more possible and, to the arms makers, more necessary by the end of the limitless superpower arms demands of the Cold War.

This never ending, multilateral arms race is driven by decisions and actions which are not conspiratorial, but structural. They are expressed in the everyday bureaucratic inertia of government officials keeping budget lines alive, of corporate sales forces and lobbyists angling for the next lucrative round of guaranteed-profit contracts. But it is also apparent that these military institutions are able to command an enormous share of the talent and treasure of the world's most powerful nations because they serve other interests. It requires little insight to recognize that military force is most likely to be deployed by the United States where it maintains the access of trans-national corporations to raw materials and to markets under conditions which assure a concentration of riches and power unparalleled in human history for a fraction of a percent of the population of the planet.

Many people in the United States act as if they want to get rid of nuclear weapons without changing any of this— and seem to believe that this is possible. But abolition of nuclear weapons most likely will not be possible unless accompanied by very substantial changes in the way that the United States government uses military force, and in its relationship with the large, concentrated economic entities whose interests are served by U.S. foreign and military policy. In the end, this will most likely also require substantial changes in the distribution of power and

wealth within the United States itself.

The abolition movement does not have to solve all of these problems before meaningful work on abolition is possible. Such mechanical notions of sequential cause and effect do not reflect the interconnectedness of social reality, and also overestimate the extent to which we can comprehend the flow of history from our place within it. And if nuclear weapons are not an aberration, but an expression of very fundamental structures in our society and of the intentions of groups of people who hold much of the planet's wealth and wield overwhelming influence over most of its military power, they are part of a system which must be changed in many aspects simultaneously for abolition to become possible.

We do not have to have a fully worked out, coherent position on these issues on which all of us can agree. Such agreement in a fragmented and fragmentary movement is most likely impossible. Further, many of us have experienced both the dangers of seeking a forced and premature world view which serves as both litmus test and blueprint, and the strength and flexibility of social movements which instead bring together a variety of perspectives in a common struggle. But if we are to have a movement which can succeed, I believe that we must have a shared belief that these fundamental issues are relevant, and should play a central role in determining how we do our work.

This does not mean that those of us who have chosen nuclear weapons as a main focus of our work should simultaneously organize and bring political pressure to bear on everything which we identify as root causes of the global inequality, both economic and technological, of which nuclear weapons are an expression and which they help to sustain. Rather, it suggests we should build an open-textured movement, that we should be looking always outwards, seeking both to understand and to make clear to others the connections with other injustices, other oppressions affecting those with whom we must make common cause if we are to gather sufficient social power to be truly effective.

Nuclear weapons are both a preeminent example and a symbol of much of what is wrong with the current order of things. Through studying, discussing, and organizing around the way nuclear weapons are connected to other social ills and injustices, from local ecological devastation and a culture of violence which stretches from the state to the street to global inequality, we can deepen our own understanding of what must be done, as well as the understanding of those we hope to persuade. We then open up the possibility that we will become part of a larger movement which can make the changes which could truly make abolition possible. This movement already is struggling to be born in a million places, around a million particular conflicts, each an expression of the terrible predicament our species has locked itself into, endlessly turning our most highly trained individuals and our most feverish energies to perfecting the means of annihilation as millions starve, while turning our faces from the continuing devastation of the planet we all depend on.

At present, the possibility of a broad-based social movement, with abolition of nuclear weapons as an integral part, seems unlikely. Yet the main alternative now being pursued in the

United States— attempting to convince government officials by conventional forms of interest-group pressure, at a historical moment characterized by unprecedented disparities in wealth, virtually complete domination of the electoral process by money, a very low level of political participation in the general population, and a formal political realm which appears to have been reduced to a spectacle largely disconnected from the arenas where actual political power is exercised and decisions are made, seems more unrealistic still.

At best, we must expect that the road to abolition to be both long and difficult. Does this mean that an idea like “Abolition 2000” and the call for a time-bound framework for abolition is the wrong approach? No. For it is precisely the sense of urgency, concretely formulated, which distinguishes us from the endless vague expressions of good intentions from those who actually have every intention of keeping nuclear weapons so long as they find them useful (and the dominant factions in the United States do find them useful, and are likely to continue to find them useful, even if not in rubble-bouncing numbers and large yields, unless they are replaced by something which allows certain kinds of power to be deployed even more effectively). It is not really central to our task to work out the precise sequence of steps or the timing of the path to abolition. That is not our role, and I believe neither will present insuperable problems once the conditions and the will necessary for abolition exist. Our task is to do our part to create the conditions and the will.

## **Understanding the obstacles**

### **1) We must identify the people and organizations who want to retain nuclear weapons, and the reasons they want them.**

We cannot form effective strategies to abolish nuclear weapons without first identifying those people and organizations who want to keep nuclear weapons, and the reasons they want them. We often argue too unreflectively that nuclear weapons are “useless,” risking the possibility that a new state of affairs in which dominant interests find new uses for nuclear weapons— and for new kinds of nuclear weapons— will leave us behind. The debate about first use in NATO, for example, is no longer really about first use in response to a conventional attack on Europe, it is about threat or use of nuclear weapons against possessors of other weapons of mass destruction, most likely relatively small powers without nuclear weapons of their own. And in the United States we see a dual-track strategy of propaganda and technological development to legitimize and make more feasible the use of nuclear weapons, perhaps preemptively, against states or even non-state actors claimed to have weapons of mass destruction. The propaganda campaign strives to equate chemical and biological weapons with nuclear weapons in the public mind and to create a heightened sense of threat, while testing both international and domestic response to unilateral preemptive strikes using less provocative “conventional” high-tech weaponry; the technology development seeks to refine both nuclear weapons effects knowledge and the weapons themselves so that they might be used effectively with “acceptable collateral damage.”

Some of these purposes may be served by other kinds of high technology weapons, for example increasingly accurate conventional bombs and missiles delivered by stealth aircraft, aided by space-based sensing, and sophisticated information systems. But before we make “pragmatic” arguments that we don’t “need” nuclear weapons because our “national security” can be protected by these other technologies, we must consider whether we share the same vision of national security with those who wish to develop and use those “conventional” weapons. We must also consider carefully whether these arguments are as practical as they seem, for by making them outside the context of a broader critique we are acceding both to the continued existence of an enormous military and supporting industrial establishment which has great political power in itself, within which the everyday institutional drivers—pork, horse-trades, and budget line maintenance—tend to generate support for nuclear weapons programs even from institutional players who do not see them as particularly “useful;” and to the purposes which that huge military establishment now serves.

Against this background, we must ask ourselves if the strategies typically represented as “practical”—variations on the theme of limited campaigns targeted at elite decision making forums, which accept existing definitions of relevant questions, which do not link the existence of nuclear weapons to the purposes for which military force is deployed by nuclear weapons states, and which in some instances do not even mention abolition of nuclear weapons—are really paths to abolition, or paths to a world in which nuclear weapons are rationalized and normalized. With significant factions in the U.S. military, for example, interested in freeing up more money for expeditionary forces suitable for global force projection, and also cognizant of the dangers of a hair-trigger strategic balance, de-alerting and even elimination of many strategic nuclear weapons systems may be an attractive option. This does not mean, however, that these factions favor abolition—there is much evidence which suggests that they would like a “stable “strategic” balance, within which a much smaller but still substantial arsenal of more “useable” nuclear weapons are retained. And while the immense technological and industrial capacity of a few nations, already nuclear weapons states, allows them to become less reliant on nuclear weapons for strategic purposes, elites in other countries may feel so threatened by technologically sophisticated, mass-produced armaments and military structures requiring world-girdling and space-based sensing and communications structures that they retain or develop nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction as an “equalizer”—in the jargon of the U.S. military, “asymmetric threats” to counter the U.S. race to achieve “full-spectrum dominance.”

All of this manifests the potential now present for several simultaneous arms races, some perhaps entailing weapons with a level of destructiveness near that of nuclear weapons. The “strategic balance” also is likely to be far less “stable” due to many players, complex technology, and dependence on sensors, information processing, and computing which attains speeds and complexity difficult for the human mind to encompass, which is itself vulnerable to attack and disruption (a new virtual “fog of war”) and which places humans at a remove (alienating, responsibility—diffusing, error-inducing) from the consequences of their actions.

Abolition of nuclear weapons is not a simple project which can be approached step by step from a plan, like building a house. The advocates of nuclear weapons, and of political domination through military force generally, have strategies too. We have to think about how our strategies play out in a very complex world where there are others with conflicting interests, who currently are far wealthier, more powerful, and better organized than we are.

In sum, strategies which seem appealing in isolation because they may be “winnable” in the current climate, in that they do not require agreement to the goal of abolition but instead focus on the more immediately unstable aspect of the current nuclear weapons regime, may in the actual interplay of contending interests lead not to abolition but to a world in which smaller, modern, diverse nuclear arsenals become an intrinsic part of high-technology global force projection, with the elites of some nuclear weapons states believing themselves more rather than less able to use nuclear weapons without catastrophic risk to themselves. This is by no means a certain outcome, but it is a possible one, and it is the outcome likely to be sought by influential factions within the U.S. military and its associated techno-industrial establishment. This suggests at minimum that we must situate all of our short-run and narrower initiatives squarely in the abolition context. We at the very least have an obligation to think these problems through carefully.

### **Approaches currently dominant in the United States, and why they hold little promise under current conditions:**

#### **– Persuasion of elected officials.**

In the absence of a large, mobilized social movement, there is little chance that elected officials can be persuaded to abolish nuclear weapons. Without significant change in U.S. economic and foreign policy, the U.S. nuclear arsenal is likely to be reduced or eliminated only if it is replaced by other forms of high-technology violence. This is not an acceptable alternative, either morally or practically.

Our national politics now are almost completely disconnected from the needs and concerns of the great majority of the population, so much so that only a minority of the population bothers to participate even at the most minimal level— voting. There is little difference among available electoral options on most issues— the distribution of wealth, how to assure the provision of such basic needs as housing or health care, and most of all, on foreign policy and the use of military force. Only five members of Congress opposed the recent round of attacks on Iraq, and few members initially opposed the U.S. intervention in Yugoslavia, taken without any semblance of regard for the requirements of international law. Representatives of both parties overwhelmingly favor massive increases in military spending, despite a military budget larger than the combined military expenditures of any conceivable roster of enemies.

Our political system, it should be clear by now, is dominated entirely by money, and hence by concentrated wealth. It is not merely a matter of money buying access— the very

domination of fund-raising as the preeminent concern of elected officials means that they spend the great majority of their time raising money, which means that even before there is any “quid pro quo,” every elected official spends most of their “constituent” time talking only to people who are in a position to give them significant sums of money. The only possible counterbalance is a large, active, and well organized social movement, one which we have barely begun to put together.

### **–Removal of those now in power from office.**

The same considerations apply here. In an electoral system entirely dominated by concentrated wealth, nothing less than a very significant social movement is required for those without large amounts of money to have a significant effect— particularly where they are opposing very large and concentrated economic interests, who in turn protect and serve the interests of other very wealthy organizations and individuals. Under current conditions (again, low political participation and mobilization, virtually unlimited campaign spending) electoral approaches are very expensive, and tend to pull debate both towards the simplistic and away from any demand for fundamental change. They are the worst first approach for any initiative which requires fundamental change (i.e. abolition of nuclear weapons). Here too, our first priority must be to build a movement, bottom up, nationwide.

Does this mean we ignore Congress and administration? No. There are extreme excesses, particularly dangerous initiatives which must and can be fought. In a time of low political mobilization in this celebrity and power-obsessed culture, activities centered on particular government actions also can be of some use, because that is where the media focus is. But to be really useful, such actions must be carefully conceived to be more than merely reactive, to “break the frame” in which permissible questions can be asked.

But we should not mistake these activities for the main work of organizing the social movement we need for abolition. And the pressures and incentives are strong to do precisely that— funding, career paths, media attention, all those things that make the life of individuals and organizations easier, more stable and predictable in this culture are more available if you focus on conventional forums and approach them in conventional ways. A strong movement, rooted in social and organizational structures we have built for ourselves outside the institutions of the dominant order, is needed not only to mobilize at some future time the requisite social power to make change possible, but at an earlier stage to provide the ground for independent political and ethical judgment. The more independent our base is, the less chance that we will lose our way as we work close to the centers of power, where both the temptations and the threats are strong. Our main focus must be on building a movement, in communities across the country, which forms an independent power base which can be mobilized and which cannot be ignored.

### **We must not base our movement on the manipulation of fear.**

We must avoid taking the short cut of exploiting fear. Fear is the main chord played by

the dominant political and cultural institutions we are struggling against. It is a theme that they have practiced well in a million variations, and we cannot hope to match them, particularly since they control the means of amplification. The currents of fear at any given moment in this culture in many instances have been planfully instigated by one propaganda campaign or another of elites whose solution to our fears is to offer us more “security,” “internal security,” “national security,” the code-phrases for violence deployed either to control us or to control others in our name.

Even when these popular fears have some independent origin (often displaced from some dislocation or violence being worked on millions of people by an economy which ceaselessly grinds up and reorders cities, countryside, entire chunks of the natural world) the response offered to us, in a thousand subtle and unsubtle messages whispered or blared through mass media we do not own, is to let the experts fix it, let the powerful tell us what to do, let us track it down and lock it up or bomb it until it surrenders. Trying to “piggy back” our concerns onto fear-centered issues because they are conveniently present in the media spotlight is risky in the extreme. The representation of the issue—terrorism, computer glitches, or whatever—already has been shaped and filtered largely to foreordain the kinds of solutions which can be offered. Given the relative level of access to the media, we will at best be another voice raising the alarm. And in the absence of a social movement with an alternative vision of how problems can be solved, it will be the National Security State and its allies that responds.

Using the politics of fear manifests a desire for easy solutions to complex problems. Trying to inject energy into the body politic solely through fear is like taking amphetamines for energy instead of eating and sleeping. If we do this, we do it because we ourselves are afraid to face our own fears—about how weak we really are, about our adequacy to the task of building a movement against a very strong, well-organized, and potentially very violent opposition.

This does not mean that we should be pollyannas, or that we can somehow avoid talking and thinking about the dangers of our predicament. But we must do so in the context of a well-elaborated, constantly deepening world-view developed within efforts to build a social movement. This kind of communication can’t be done in sound-bytes or thirty second spots—and the search for sound-bytes in this fear-driven culture leads almost always back to the simple exploitation of fear. We must face up to the reality that at this point we must create and spread an alternative account of the world and how it works before our message can be understood without distortion and misdirection. For the most part, this work must be done from the ground up, face to face, one by one.

Some recent history in anti-nuclear weapons organizing illustrates the problem. Campaigns to raise awareness about dangers of Russian “loose nukes” and nuclear terrorism, conducted for the most part in isolation and without a clear connection to a broader, well-elaborated abolition message, became part of the chorus of voices focusing attention on a problem. What kinds of solutions has this brought us so far? These fear-focused campaigns, coming from across the political spectrum, have helped promote (although are by no means

solely responsible for), among other things 1) A joint U.S.-Russia multi-billion dollar mixed-oxide fuel program as a “solution” to the now-“urgent” problem of Russian plutonium. This program will provide massive subsidies to the nuclear establishment in both countries for many years to come. It is unclear whether the disposition cycle will increase or decrease the risk of diversion of weapons useable materials. 2) Increased spending by the U.S. military and the nuclear weapons laboratories in particular on “counterproliferation,” including possible improved military capabilities and uses for nuclear weapons, and more money for ballistic missile defenses. 3) Increased cooperation between the Russian and U.S. nuclear weapons establishment, with mixed results ranging from some increases in the “stability” of the strategic nuclear confrontation still existing between the two countries to information exchanges and joint research which may speed development of new kinds of hi-tech weapons. 4) There was a brief flurry of general media interest, with an impact on organizing potential which is unclear, but does not appear to have been great. It is difficult to see any unambiguous progress towards abolition in all of this.

The current Y2K frenzy raises similar problems. It is a major, continuing mass-media story, almost purely fear-driven, with most coverage focusing superficially on the various catastrophes which may result. The complexity and irrationality of the cultural response is intensified by its millenarian resonance. There is almost no attention to the structural characteristics or the particular political, economic, and technological history which has allowed this set of circumstances to arise. So far, most anti-nuclear organizing around the issue has taken much the same tone, trying to attract attention to the particularly horrific possible catastrophes which the interplay of Y2K and strategic weapons systems might cause. It will be interesting to see what kinds of solutions are offered up this time around by those in power, which elite initiatives this set of fears will help to drive. Obvious opportunities (some already being exploited) include more money for military computing and warning systems, also possibly for ballistic missile defense to protect against accidental launches resulting from future computer failures .

It should be observed, moreover, that the Y2K issue has some other interesting defects for anti-nuclear organizing. If something truly awful happens, the campaign obviously will have failed. If nothing obviously awful happens (and we could come quite close to disaster without the public ever finding out), the experts and the military can claim credit for their robust systems and smart quick fixes. The only way this campaign can succeed is if either the campaign or early-developing Y2K problems convince those on the inside that they really don't have a grip on a terribly important problem. It is not clear that this would have significant or long-lasting effects which would increase the chances for abolition in the absence of a broader movement which can provide a more meaningful context. It is worth noting in this regard that computer problems leading to false alarms in the early warning system have been public knowledge for years without a particularly significant effect on progress towards elimination of nuclear weapons.

Again, this does not mean that technology failures like Y2K are not “real,” or that we should not attempt to address them as part of our work. Y2K, in fact, presents an opportunity to

make new connections, to elaborate a small piece of our counter-story, about the social effects of greed, fear, secrecy, and the inertia of institutions. It is a story not yet thought, much less told, of which I can suggest only fragments. Our tale could help us to understand what happens when technology choices which affect us all are made by small elites, in contexts where the defining tone is first apocalyptic fear, then the lure of unprecedented wealth. It allows us to see the connections between nuclear weapons and the particular form one of our central industries have taken, tied tightly to nuclear weapons both in its beginnings and in the dangers we now face.

The cycle begins with massive military subsidies to computing to aid weapons design and to achieve the miniaturization of guidance systems, all in the frenetic context of an arms race where the price of any slackening of the pace, in the closed and secretive world of the arms-makers, seemed to be total destruction. As the urgency of the arms race gradually faded, the new industries it had spawned experienced a new frenzy of technology competition, driven now not only by ordinary market pressures but by the accelerating capital surges of the emerging global casino, the dizzying pace of money movement itself made possible in part by the explosive proliferation of cheap fast computing. In this world, stock price is both all-important and driven largely by perception, the quality of products and of underlying technologies overshadowed by surface glitz and speed.

These are technological and economic rhythms which allow little time for collective discussion, for reflection, for consideration of the wisdom of the path chosen— or even to check for bugs. The vast majority of the world's population, those who suffer and will suffer the impacts of production and the risks of malfunction, never have been part of the discussion, had no say in the decisions. And now as we face the consequences, the same people and organizations who built these technologies with our money and in our name the first time around will come forward with more technological solutions to the problems they have caused, entire new profit centers emerging to fix inexcusable mistakes in hypertrophied technologies, responsibility for which is far too diffuse to ascribe blame. At the same time the national security elites, resurgent with a new roster of conjured Threats and recycled rationales for secret decision-making, are pushing the technology forward again with enormous government expenditures for computing initiatives ranging from weapons design to battlefield surveillance and communications.

This little sketch, of course, is far too simple. We will have to do far better to approach the truth. It can't be done with sound-bites.

In the end, we need a politics grounded in hope and not fear. Manipulating peoples' fears cannot build the world we want, it can only lead to renewed efforts to achieve control by one group or another, and hence to more violence. We must start from the love we have for those people and those parts of the living world to which we are most deeply attached, for which we would give up everything. Only there can we find the courage to risk what we must. And only there-- in the memory of a nature we once lived in rather than off, in the hope of a world where we recognize the most distant stranger as our kin-- can we find fragments of the vision of a better

world which any movement must have at its center if it is to do anything more than replace one power with another.

### **What type of organizing should we do?**

In the early 1980's there was a vigorous and diverse anti-nuclear movement in the United States. There were strong elements in that movement who favored the kind of approach I am putting forward here, broadening and deepening the movement by recognizing and addressing connections to other issues with common root causes. This approach for the most part lost out to the Freeze, a classic interest-group politics "campaign," which stressed what were thought to be "winnable" goals in the existing political climate. From the standpoint of abolition, that campaign must be judged in retrospect to have failed, having little meaningful impact on the arms race, on nuclear arsenals, or on the underlying economic and political structures which sustained them, and which continue to do so fifteen years later despite the end of the Cold War. In addition, that campaign did little to build a movement for the long term, and when the immediately visible causes of the fear that campaign sought to exploit receded from view, much of the anti-nuclear movement disappeared as well. We should learn from this history.

For this movement to be broad enough to achieve the fundamental changes we seek (and abolishing nuclear weapons is likely to require fundamental social change, except under the circumstances where they are replaced by something worse), we must build coalitions. And our likely allies also will find most appealing, and in fact in many instances will require, an approach which deals honestly and directly with the interests served by having nuclear weapons— both the direct economic interests of the "military industrial complex" and the foreign policy interests which are served by a military policy which assumes that it is right and necessary to be able to place overwhelming force on short notice anywhere on the planet.

What does all this mean on a practical level? It means that "grassroots organizing" must mean far more, and have a different emphasis, than having the same memberships of the same organizations send postcards or call their congress people on "action alerts." There are nowhere near enough of us yet to counterbalance the power of concentrated wealth, to even begin to shake American politics out of its business as usual rut— with its nearly exclusive emphasis on business. For now, and probably for a number of years, we are better off asking our supporters who are not themselves engaged activists to spend the five minutes or half hour they have this week not on a letter or a phone call to a decision maker upon whom there is almost no hope of having an effect under current conditions, and instead ask them to do one bit of outreach— call or talk to a friend about these issues, tell them how they can learn more and get involved. We also should place our main emphasis on events and activities which will allow people to learn a lot more, to understand why these issues are important and how they are connected to their everyday lives, and to the other issues they care about. This last is important, because it is through understanding these connections that we build the networks of activists and the coalitions which can truly have an effect. Absent this context, sending postcards or telegrams or e-mails to elected officials does little to help people progress as activists and become more engaged.

Our “grassroots” efforts must be aimed at building locally rooted organizations which can sustain the work necessary to achieve abolition over the long run. Our resources and our actions should not be focused primarily on top down, celebrity-centered activities and mass media campaigns. Such techniques can in some instances be useful in serving our purposes of building sustainable local organizations and strengthening links to other movements, but they should be carefully evaluated for their suitability to these goals, rather than pursued as an end in themselves.

**Some areas for thought and action which might be promising (but by no means a complete list):**

**-A strategy focused on cities aimed at reviving elements of progressive coalitions which in the past have been at the center of the peace and justice movements.** The demographic and political strength of any progressive movement in this country in the future will be even more concentrated in urban areas than in the past. This is true partly because the population is more urban than ever, but also because the increasing concentration of wealth in a small percentage of the population, combined with the flight of large portions of the middle class to the suburbs has meant that the impact of skewed public spending policies falls disproportionately on cities, and on their poorer residents in particular.

We should be able to portray concretely the impact of our continued commitment to a huge nuclear arsenal on the fabric of everyday urban life-- the positive initiatives for the cities which are being foregone, from a decline in the quality of public education to the more general disappearance of public goods, and we should be able to make connections to broader issues-- to the way violence is socially sanctioned as the ultimate arbiter of conflict, as the response both globally and domestically to problems which only can be solved by addressing underlying political and economic conflicts (from handguns and the death penalty to no fly zones, cruise missiles, and nuclear threats). Where possible, we should focus on local military and nuclear weapons projects to be able to concretely demonstrate both their social and ecological impacts and the social choices they entail, from toxic and radioactive waste to spending alternatives (particular projects also tend to have price tags both more comprehensible and more comparable to the costs of urgent local needs than the huge abstract figures in the national budget).

This vision for a central element of a campaign is neither romantic nor abstract. Urban coalitions of this kind as recently as the late 1980's in the San Francisco Bay Area brought together unions, environmentalists, traditional peace constituencies, and a number of local elected officials, including Congressman Ron Dellums, to stop major military projects. In the process, a great deal of education occurred within issue-oriented organizations about the relationship between their focus and others-- between peace and environmental issues, jobs, housing, local transportation, and the fundamental effects that a huge military establishment has on the shape of urban life. This kind of campaign works best when the connections are made horizontally-- between local organizations with diverse concerns, all affected by militarism, the

culture of violence, and concomitant public spending priorities.

Nuclear weapons issues can be an effective ground on which to forge the connections for a broader social movement. The long term health and environmental effects of the weapons complex already have brought together local coalitions and national networks of health, environmental, and peace activists. The connections to economic democracy, today made mainly as a simple zero sum accounting of butter vs. guns, can be expanded and deepened by illuminating the structural effects of hi-tech militarism on the economy: the concentration of scientific and technical research to “brute force” solutions to a wide range of problems, from hardware-intensive approaches to computing to disproportionate focus on high energy density physics, cross-subsidies to dangerous and uneconomical technologies like nuclear power, the way huge centralized scientific institutions amortize expensive, exotic, hyper-specialized facilities like supercomputers and inertial confinement fusion by making inflated claims and coming up with marginal, inefficient applications to attract research dollars that probably are better spent in a more decentralized and varied way.

### **Organizing among scientists and hi-tech workers.**

Scientists played an important role in the “ban the bomb” movement of the 1950's and 1960's and on into the 80's, providing information and a critical alternative to the pronouncements of government scientists about the infinite promise of nuclear energy for both war and peace. Although several of the organizations founded during that period to oppose nuclear weapons development still exist, they are barely visible in the abolition movement in the U.S., apparently finding the rebuilding and modernization of the nuclear weapons complex an acceptable price tag for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and putting forward no real alternatives to an arms control process which has stagnated. This is so despite the fact that the nuclear weapons laboratories are once again assuming a central place in the U.S. military industrial complex, further entrenching increasingly sophisticated high-energy physics tools and knowledges by using the same facilities and computing methods used for nuclear weapons work to develop a wide range of high-technology weapons concepts, ranging from microwave and other directed energy weapons to possible routes to pure fusion weapons which would mean the end of existing materials-based approaches to nonproliferation. Fundamental questions about the ethics of working to develop weapons of mass destruction are seldom heard in the United States today.

Organizing among scientists and technical workers would not be easy. Science has emerged since World War II as a force of production in itself. The upper ranks of this sector have metamorphosed into powerful corporate entities (of which the nuclear weapons laboratories are a leading example), institutions which deploy the full arsenal of modern corporate power—public relations divisions, high-priced law firms, lobbying staffs— to assure their share of the forced levy which we all must pay. Far too many scientists have found comfortable places for themselves in these wealthy institutions, content to spend their days in well-equipped laboratories seeking to unleash savage energies whose effects on the planet and on human beings always is

kept at a remove. Their only encounter with the violence they wreak is likely to be a dark blot blossoming on a grainy video screen, ten seconds on the nightly news designed to prove that Our Technology Works, and that the number of dismembered children, orphaned children, shattered families remains within calculated limits. Trained increasingly for specialized roles within large organizations, scientists (and other professionals) are difficult to organize in part because of a self-concept, inculcated early, of intellectual workers as proprietors of their own skills and knowledge, both able and obligated to make judgments about both fact and value individually.

But there are opportunities in organizing scientists and technical workers, some provided by the contradictions between this same set of professional ideologies and the everyday reality of the professional/technical workplace today. In many areas, there is an oversupply of people with advanced degrees. In addition, in a world where most scientific (and other professional) skills are deployed within organizations with predefined goals of gaining and maintaining market, political, and military power, the professional self-concept of neutrality and independence is eroding rapidly. People with scientific and professional skills are becoming less distinguishable from other employees. They may earn more money, but the disciplinary relation between employer and employee has largely eclipsed any substantial “professional” relationship between highly-trained people and the large organizations they work within.

The employee professional has few economic options outside employment in similar large organizations, and has little in the way of an independent social, material, or intellectual basis for judgment outside the organizational context. This becomes ever more true as an increasing percentage of professionals are employed in large organization settings. This is the future faced by most people with technical and professional skills-- to compete for the few spots in the lucrative upper echelons of corporatized professional knowledge oligopolies, or to become functionaries in huge organizations with little control over their work, no intellectual context for reflection or ethical judgment besides the deployment of knowledge for the achievement of predefined organizational goals, and an economic future at the mercy of the endless downward wage pressure of an economy dominated by transnational corporations.

We are still in a transitional period where people enter science and some professions with certain expectations which are inconsistent with the above realities: expectations of some measure of autonomy in the workplace, with regard to both intellectual and ethical choices. This set of expectations can be deepened and made more self-conscious, forming the basis for a critique of the work world in which most technical workers find themselves. Nuclear weapons work, with its secrecy, its hierarchy, its frequent distortions of truth to fit elite political ends, and its intrinsic core of world-destroying violence, in many ways epitomizes the worst tendencies of the larger whole.

When organizing professional and technical workers, however, it is essential to keep both the organizing work and any organizations which emerge out of it anchored in the contexts where the social and ecological consequences of the relevant technology choices are felt. Both activists who organize professionals and activists who themselves have conventional professional skills

and training need active, mobilized grassroots organizations to maintain their independent perspective. Otherwise they are likely to fall back into both conventional "professional" approaches to social problems, and also on the information and world view generated within the large bureaucratic organizations they are attempting to monitor. There are a many reasons for this: habit, availability of pre-packaged information, pressures to "be reasonable," professional peer-reference groups with careers within mainstream bureaucratic organizations, and, finally, material need, the temptation to at least "hedge one's bets" and remain marketable within conventional professional settings. In general, oppositional professionals always run the risk of having professional norms distort their perspective, often in very subtle ways. Hence the need as well to remain firmly grounded, on an everyday level, in social movements which prefigure the way of life we hope to bring about.

**Healing the divided society and the divided self: Nonviolence and the modern predicament.**  
*Modernity did not make people more cruel; it only invented a way in which cruel things could be done by non-cruel people.*"<sup>1</sup>

There are pervasive forms of consciousness in the institutions where nuclear weapons, and decisions about them, are made, which represent a critical barrier even to beginning the dialogue which might lead to social change of the magnitude necessary for abolition to occur. This consciousness is a kind of alienation particular to a bureaucratized world of very large organizations, organizations within which living human beings narrow their consciousness for most of their waking hours into one or another technical or expert function. This world view is increasingly prevalent among all those who work in large hierarchical organizations, and hence presents a problem for political transformation which extends well beyond the institutions of the national security state.

In the culture of experts and bureaucrats, the quantity and tidy ordering of information substitute for richness of experience and understanding. Expertise replaces wisdom, and with the omnipresence of computers as the main tool and filter of bureaucratized work, binary simulacra, overwhelmingly visual, replace lived experience in a body in the world. The preselection of what acceptably can be known, and hence the limits of possibility of our collective fates, becomes invisible as the walls which keep unruly knowledges and uncontrolled nature out become the horizons of our artificial second nature. The culture of experts stands apart (and feels itself irreducibly above) the "local knowledges" which are immediate, embedded in the natural world and in traditions which once were generated in face-to-face interactions, and still are to some degree, and perhaps could be more fully again.

Philosophical nonviolence, adhered to in one form or another by many peace activists over the past half century, has at its core an understanding of the consciousness peculiar to the roles imposed by enormous bureaucratized institutions which reduce their inhabitants, quite

---

<sup>1</sup> Zygmunt Bauman, Life in Fragments: Essays in Postmodern Morality (Oxford: 1995), 197.

literally, to working parts. It seeks to transcend conventional political channels by appealing directly to the people who are experiencing themselves mainly as members of organizations, as functionaries who simply can do nothing differently. It is a reassertion of the living world against the reduction of human society towards a machine which consumes and obliterates life, asking government officials and weapons makers to stop splitting themselves in the way which allows them to function so successfully in their official roles, appealing to the other parts of their being-- as children and parents, brothers and sisters, as living creatures of a fragile planet.

It is essential that we restore this vital insight to the center of our work. One way is through creative nonviolent forms of direct action-- rethinking the now-ritualized pattern of blockade, arrest, and trial, returning again to the fundamental intention to break down the barriers which separate us from each other and from parts of ourselves, and which allow us to be treated and to treat others like things. We must also question whether in the long run reinforcing this splitting by becoming specialists ourselves, engaging only in "rational argument" or "moral witness" or "interest group pressure" in the accepted mode of comfortably separated institutional spheres, really is the path we wish to follow.

There is in some ways a disturbing mirroring of the specialization and compartmentalization characteristic of the bureaucratic form in our own way of doing things. "Public interest" and "social movement" groups tend not only to specialize in content, but in form as well. Most groups fall into one or another identifiable box: some typical combinations are rational and expert, attuned to the knowledges generated by conventional institutions; oriented towards electoral politics, counting votes and attempting to apply countable, measurable pressure in one political forum or another; grassroots, with less in the way of formally recognized knowledge and skills but often having a richly elaborated understanding of the effects of the social, economic, or technological choices at issue; moral/philosophically nonviolent, with or without formal religious ties, often engaging in direct action.

Some groups combine a couple of these aspects, but few can operate in all realms. But we all should try to remain open to other realms of experience and approaches to social change. There is a tendency among some groups to claim superiority for their particular partial approach in all settings, or to criticize other approaches as ineffective or even disruptive. There are good reasons for individual groups either to specialize or to remain true to a particular vision or calling. But a social movement--if that is what we wish to have-- must be able to address all aspects of our modern predicament. And if we separate these aspects of our consciousness in thought and in action, we should do so consciously, not merely because the existing order of things makes it easier or more convenient.

In the United States, the part of the peace movement grounded in faith-based communities has played a central role in developing the tradition of nonviolent thought and action and keeping it alive. In addition, faith-based nonviolent organizations have been a consistent presence in many communities even during times when the larger "peace movement" has ebbed. Many of these groups also exemplify a more comprehensive approach to violence,

connecting violence in the street to the violence of the state, and militarism to the broader injustices it serves to enforce. If we are to progress further in addressing the critical problem of this “splitting of consciousness,” we will have to work together in new ways, and be willing to confront concerns and divisions which may make us uncomfortable. For many progressive activists, for example, any appearance of breaking down the boundaries between the kinds of attitudes and approaches that are perceived as the province of religion and those that are considered to be properly within the realm of politics is alarming. And these concerns have real basis, in a country where the most politically effective purveyors of organized religion in recent years have for the most part been cheerleaders for all varieties of state violence, from jails and the death penalty as the main solution to poverty to cruise missiles, nuclear weapons and star wars as the main response to global inequality, and in a world where religious nationalism often has played a role in violent conflict.

Some groups and individuals who work in conventional decision-making forums where formal, professional modes of both argument and presentation predominate, also are uncomfortable with bringing other forms of knowledge and expression in, for example the richly detailed knowledges of communities who have inhabited a place for many generations of the effects of modernity on their world, and the impassioned personal testimony of those who have seen their communities or their health destroyed by the global effects of the nuclear weapons enterprise.

Finding ways to combine the power of our diverse approaches and forms of knowledge in ways which break down the barriers within institutions and individuals which allow the comfortable separation of cause from effect, and the exercise of technical skill from moral responsibility, will require both much work and great discernment, but it is one of the most promising paths we can pursue, and one of the few where we may find unforeseen opportunities for rapid progress.

### **Campus Outreach**

Some reasons for this are obvious: This work will take time. We are getting older, and we are not building a movement which can be sustained for the many years it will take to abolish nuclear weapons. For a generation or more raised getting its information from increasingly homogeneous, concentrated corporate media, we must begin again by reaching out to people in face to face settings, counterposing information which is richer and more connected to immediate experience (and again, to local realities) than the speedy ephemeral glitz of TV or the internet. (You may be able to help sustain connections with the internet once it is established; much as you can to some degree with the telephone; but you can't build real trust and community that way).

In addition, many of the goals of the other organizing focuses discussed above can be advanced through on-campus organizing. The young scientists, professionals, and technical workers of tomorrow, of course, are on campus today, hoping for meaningful and creative

working lives, not yet beaten down by the narrow economic choices and everyday disciplinary structures of the workplace. And there is considerable evidence that the generation now on campus is moving back towards activism, but usually with a focus on the concrete visible manifestations of the order of things: institutionalized racism and sexism on campus, urban violence, the prison-industrial complex which has devastated the lives of so many of their contemporaries. There are clear connections which can be made between these issues and the institutionalized culture of violence in the service of privilege at the highest level. We can and should make those connections.

In our efforts to organize young people, we need to do more than provide information. We need to ask them what they need to really get involved in our work, both in terms of material and social support and in terms of a way of understanding the campaign for abolition which links up to their concerns. My own conversations with students suggest that there are quite a few who are intensely interested in our issue, particularly when placed in the broader context of a culture which celebrates and encourages violence, and how we can develop meaningful nonviolent responses to it. From what I have heard, it also appears that we must pay more attention to the basic requirements for young people to do this work, particularly as something more than an occasional volunteer. Fifteen and more years ago, many of my contemporaries (now in their mid-forties) were able to work nearly full time as activists while supporting themselves with part time jobs, and finding both social support and an inexpensive way of life due to the extensive alternative culture present in many U.S. urban areas. With the continuing drop in lower income real wages and the rising cost of urban living, this is more difficult to do today. Many of the young people I have spoken with are willing to piece together their living to do public interest work, but are having a hard time finding a niche. Concrete assistance with this— for example, putting people in touch with what alternative institutions and networks remain in our own areas, and help from people with long experience doing alternative work while living on a shoestring with the everyday basics such as finding affordable housing and managing finances— can help our movement grow.

**We should emphasize actions which engage people and develop their knowledge and skills as activists.**

In general, we should move away from a model of professional representation of “constituencies” in centers of power and conventional political forums. This type of political activity does little to build movements, for it does little to increase the skills, knowledge, and level of engagement for anyone but the small staffs of professionals who argue in courtrooms or lobby in congressional corridors.

An approach aimed at developing activists will change the way we choose actions and forums and the way in which we approach the forums we choose. We are likely to prefer public forums where participation for ordinary citizens without technical or professional credentials is possible and meaningful. We will devote more time to decision-making processes in which our “clients” or “constituency” become real participants, with enough information and, over time,

experience to shape the direction our actions should take. Some small concrete examples of this are training people to represent themselves or extensive, consensus-based decision-making in choosing trial goals and strategies in demonstration legal defense; and providing people with trainings about both environmental review procedures and the science relied on, so that they can combine those knowledges with their own understanding of the impacts technology choices have on their lives and communities.

Even these sorts of efforts, however, can accomplish little beyond incremental change without a widely respected vision of the alternative institution, within a social movement which prefigures the way of life we hope to bring about and of workplaces which also, to the extent possible, strive to fit the same model. Otherwise, grassroots groups are left to choose between the typical short grassroots organization life-span, in which one or two generations of passionate activists are used up and thrown away, left to rebuild their lives in the cold world of the market, or institutionalization according to the conventional model. This usually entails dependence in large part on mass direct mail campaigns, the relationship to group "membership" reduced inevitably towards advertising, identifying target markets, towards becoming a business selling the work of conscience and citizenship done by proxy to people too busy to do it themselves. In the workplace, it can also mean conventional social roles, 60 hour a week workaholic professionals feeling justified by their stature, their skills, and the sacrifice of doing business-like work at less than market wages to treat secretaries like secretaries and activists from the provinces like supplicants.

Once the connection has grown thin between the "professional" staff and people living at the point where the decisions taken in centers of power have their social and ecological effects, "public interest" groups can come to rely more and more on the large organizations they seek to monitor for both information and, hence, implicitly, for the definition of issues and the delimitation of the range of permissible debate. A typical professionalized, public interest organization which does not have an active, everyday engagement with a mobilized grassroots constituency will largely be limited to identifying gaps, contradictions, and errors in the huge amounts of information gathered by government and the corporations. They will also be able to independently check information and assertions, so long as they remain within the ambit of conventional professional norms. But in most instances, conventional public interest organizations which locate themselves and exert most of their resources in capitol cities and orient themselves to affecting directly upper decision-making levels in large organizations, will remain captive to a considerable extent 1) to the definition of questions made at the center and 2) to information collected and screened in accordance with bureaucratic imperatives.

It is not a bad idea to attempt to influence policy at high levels-- the question is: from what perspective and social base does one do so? This is not just a question of attitude, some mental shift which can be achieved, it is a real question of the structure of oppositional organizations and the use of resources-- where to have offices, what the appropriate balance and relationship is between "volunteers," "organizers," and "expert staff." If our goal is fundamental social change, our first priority must be the construction of a social movement from the bottom

up. It must be a movement grounded in the experience and participation of people at the point where the decisions taken at a great distance, both geographic and social, have their effects, and which prefigures in its organizational form and its everyday social relationships the society we hope to bring about. This is so not only because the building of a strong social movement is the most likely path to the real social power we must have to make change. It is also because only within such a context can we create an independent ground for evaluating information, for ethical and political judgment, and for the formation of strategies in a world still pervaded by great disparities of wealth, power politics, and violent conflict.

**Meeting of Interfaith Group for the CTBT**  
**1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, June 15, 1999**  
**FCNL conference room, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC.**

**Agenda**

1. Introductions
2. Status of CTBT
  - a. Congress
  - b. Administration
3. Grassroots advocacy
4. Call-in day: July 16
5. Proposal for lobby day in September
6. Other

Next meeting: Tuesday, July 20, 1999, 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., FCNL Conference Room

June 29, 1999

**RE: Markey resolution on de-alerting**

Greetings,

We are considering introducing a "sense of the Congress" resolution in favor of the de-alerting of nuclear weapons. I have enclosed a draft resolution (pdf file--let me know if you prefer a different format). In addition to Bruce Blair's email, our request is for:

- 1) Comments on the draft resolution: suggested corrections, additions, and deletions.
- 2) Suggested cosponsors. We would especially be interested in suggestions for Republicans who might be interested in supporting the resolution.

We also would welcome supporting material, particularly descriptions of incidents and other evidence of the need for de-alerting, and ideas for timing of the introduction, outside supporters, and other ways of drawing attention to the issue.

We think de-alerting is a rather modest and nonpartisan proposal, and hope to draw support from beyond the "usual suspects."

Feel free to circulate this draft among colleagues but please do not publicize it.

Thanks for your help,  
Lowell Ungar  
Office of Representative Edward J. Markey

\*\*\*\*\*

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress that nuclear weapons should be taken off hair-trigger alert.

Whereas accidental or mistaken launch of a nuclear missile could devastate a city, and launch of a nuclear force could wreak worldwide destruction;

Whereas the United States and Russia currently maintain thousands of nuclear weapons on "hair-trigger" alert, such that they can be fired within minutes;

Whereas in several incidents false signals of missile attacks have triggered a process in which National leaders had to decide in only a few minutes whether to fire nuclear weapons;

Whereas the failure of computers to recognize the year 2000 date change could infect command, control, communications, and intelligence systems, causing false signals or blank monitoring screens;

Whereas Russian monitoring and control systems are deteriorating;  
Whereas tensions between Russia and the United States are increasing due to a number of policy disagreements;

Whereas a massive preemptive attack attempting to destroy the nuclear weapons capability of the United States is extremely unlikely, and mutual measures to slow the firing of nuclear weapons would make a preemptive strike even more difficult;

Whereas much of the nuclear force of the United States, including submarines at sea, is almost invulnerable and thus would preserve retaliatory ability through a nuclear attack, making immediate firing of weapons unnecessary;

Whereas President Bush in 1991 ordered a unilateral stand-down of United States strategic bombers and de-alerted some missiles, and Soviet President Gorbachev quickly reciprocated with similar actions, improving bilateral relations and national security; and

Whereas there are several ways that land and submarine based weapons could be temporarily disabled, with times ranging from minutes to weeks in order to reactivate them: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that-

(1) the United States should immediately take off of hair-trigger alert as many of its nuclear weapons as is feasible and consistent with strategic plans, and should encourage Russia to reciprocate, in hopes of decreasing the risk of accidental or mistaken firing of nuclear weapons;

(2) the Department of Defense and the State Department should study methods to increase further the time needed to launch all nuclear missiles and study the effect these actions would have on nuclear deterrence, relations with other recognized nuclear powers, the international nuclear nonproliferation regime, and other aspects of national security;

(3) the President should expedite the establishment of a United States-Russian joint early-warning center to ensure accurate detection of any missiles and effective communication in the event of a false alarm, computer malfunction, accident, or diplomatic crisis, as set forth in the "Joint Statement on the Exchange of Information on Missile Launches and Early Warning", agreed to in 1998, and should facilitate the establishment of a temporary center before the end of 1999 that could address any problems which might arise due to the failure of computers to recognize the year 2000 date change.

Meeting of Interfaith Group for the CTBT  
1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, July 20, 1999  
FCNL conference room, 245 2nd Street, NE, Washington, DC.

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Status of CTBT
  - a. Congress
  - b. Administration
3. Polling results
4. Grassroots activities
  - a. August
  - b. September-October
5. Possible D.C. lobby day in September
6. Our meeting schedule for remainder of year
7. Other

# Regarding No First Use of Nuclear Weapons

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

For a number of years I have joined others in urging a policy of no-first use of nuclear weapons. I saw this as a positive step toward pulling away from nuclear confrontation and toward the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons.

However, in the spring of 1998 while attending the meeting of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee in Geneva, I came to realize that inherent in a no-first use policy is acceptance of second use. Because I believe that any use of nuclear weapons is morally wrong, I cannot accept second use, or even threatened second use under a policy of nuclear deterrence.

Therefore, I urge all persons in the faith community to rethink their support for no-first use and instead to unequivocally insist on no use of nuclear weapons under any circumstance, and no threatened use.

This stand is consistent with a variety of policy statements emanating from religious bodies and religious leaders.

Thus, in the 1983 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."

In 1986 the United Methodist Council of Bishops stated: "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."

In 1997 Archbishop Renato Martino, speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly, specified: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation."

In 1998 Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary, World Council of Churches and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President, Pax Christi International in a statement addressed to NPT Preparatory Committee delegates indicated: "Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment.... *When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt.*"

Beyond the moral and spiritual condemnation of any use of nuclear weapons, there are practical considerations. During debate on NATO' nuclear policy this spring when many were advocating a no-first use policy, I wrote the following:

While this may seem an advancement, the policy retains second use -- which may come very rapidly after a NATO nation is attacked.

Where does this lead? If a rogue Russian general launches a missile at Washington, London, Paris, Berlin, or some other target, does the U.S. attack Moscow and its hundreds of thousands of innocent residents? If a Serbian terrorist sets off a nuclear bomb somewhere, does NATO level Belgrade? If an adversary of NATO uses a tactical nuclear weapon on the battlefield, does NATO retaliate with grave destruction to the environment and drifting radioactive fallout?

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops in their 1983 pastoral letter, *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, accepted nuclear deterrence "not as an end in itself but as a step toward a progressive disarmament." However, they insisted: "Under no circumstances may nuclear weapons or other instruments of mass slaughter be used for the purpose of destroying population centers or other predominantly civil targets." They added: "Retaliatory action whether nuclear or conventional which would indiscriminately take many wholly innocent lives, lives of people who are in no way responsible for reckless actions of their government, must also be condemned. This condemnation, in our judgment, applies even to the retaliatory use of weapons striking enemy cities after our own have already been struck."

Examination of how and where nuclear weapons might be used in response to nuclear attack reveals that inevitably numerous innocent lives would be taken, if not directly then through the effects of radioactive fallout. Although the U.S. Catholic Bishops in 1983 did not take their reasoning as far as to absolutely condemn second use, the logic of their condemnation of retaliatory action leads to a rejection of second use, given the nature of nuclear weapons.

Therefore, instead of merely advocating no first use, the faith community should call upon all nuclear weapons states to renounce unconditionally the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes and to pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary under any circumstance.

July 23, 1999

To comment on this statement, please get in touch with Howard Hallman at:  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013  
E-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

Dear Colleagues:

As part of the meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT on August 10, I would like to have another round of discussion on whether this group, once the CTBT is ratified, might continue with a broader agenda of issues dealing with nuclear disarmament.

The most ambitious scope for such an endeavor is laid out in the attached "Interfaith Action for Nuclear Abolition [or "Disarmament" if "Abolition" sounds too radical]. This includes a list of steps for achieving total abolition. An alternative to this broad proactive agenda would be to address particular issues only as they arise in the political scene, such as de-alerting, deep cuts through START III, stockpile stewardship, national missile defense.

Left undeveloped in the attachment are sections on structure and methods. The methods would start with those used in the CTBT campaign and would add other methods used in other interfaith campaigns. There could even be nonpartisan involvement in election campaigns.

As to structure, one possibility would be to expand the mission of the Interfaith Group on the CTBT, rename it, and broaden its membership. Other models are provided by the National Religious Partnership for the Environment, by Jubilee 2000, and by other faith-based campaigns.

What we do should take into account the Nuclear Disarmament Initiative of the Washington National Cathedral, the U.S. Catholic Conference, and the Fourth Freedom Forum. As I understand this endeavor, it encompasses (i) development of a joint statement by religious and military leaders, (ii) release of the statement at a news conference, (iii) an interfaith service at the National Cathedral, and (iv) production of educational material for "people in the pew". This is a welcome initiative.

What I am suggesting focus much more on public policy advocacy, aimed directly at policy making within the Executive Branch and in Congress through a combination of grassroots mobilization and focused attention in Washington on key decision makers. That's what we've done on the CTBT. Extension of such concerted public policy advocacy to the broader agenda of nuclear abolition would complement the educational focus of the Nuclear Disarmament Initiative, based in the Washington National Cathedral.

I believe that a coalition of faith-based organizations with focus on public policy advocacy (operating within the allowable framework of tax laws) could attract foundation funding for a supportive staff and also supplemental staff for participating organizations.

This is what I would like to discuss on August 10. If you're not going to attend, I would welcome your comments prior to the meeting.

Shalom,  
Howard

# **Interfaith Action for Nuclear Abolition**

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

## **The Problem**

For decades religious leaders and religious bodies have condemned the existence of nuclear weapons and have spoken against their use and threatened use. Yet, the world's nuclear arsenal has persisted.

Today the United States and Russia maintain thousands of nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert, poised for rapid launching. The United Kingdom, France, China, and Israel also possess nuclear warheads kept on hair-trigger alert. In 1998 India and Pakistan conducted nuclear weapon tests and are developing their own nuclear arsenals. Several other states would like to do likewise. There is increasing danger that terrorist organizations will gain possession of nuclear weapons.

In face of the continued risk of nuclear war and the unspeakable horror that would result, we are called to speak out once again and to engage in concerted action on the necessity of nuclear abolition.

## **Our Commitment**

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

We have said this before in numerous statements and reports and have called for global nuclear disarmament. However, the political and military leaders of nuclear weapon states have refused to heed our calls for nuclear disarmament. This time as we speak out again on this subject, we intend to move beyond words to action.

To this end we pledge to work together in partnership to press for the elimination of all nuclear weapons on Earth. We commit ourselves and the institutions we represent to engage vigorously in educational activities and public policy advocacy for nuclear abolition. We will sustain our partnership on this issue until our goal is achieved.

## **Steps to Nuclear Abolition**

In order to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons, we call upon the United States and all other possessors of nuclear weapons to carry out the following actions:

- Renounce unconditionally the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes.
- Pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary under any circumstance.
- Immediately take all nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and by other means.
- Embark upon a program to systematically dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles as soon as possible with adequate safeguards and verification, carried out under multilateral treaties and reciprocal national initiatives.
- Ratify and implement the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; cease all research, development, testing, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons; and refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal.
- Enter into a multilateral process to develop, adopt, and carry out a nuclear weapons convention that outlaws and abolishes all nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control.
- Develop and implement a system for control of all fissile material with international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards.

### **Organizational Framework**

To be developed.

### **Methods for Action**

To be developed.

July 27, 1999

Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

**Meeting of Interfaith Group for the CTBT**  
**1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, August 10, 1999**  
**FCNL Conference Room, 245 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, NE, Washington, DC**

**Agenda**

1. Introductions
2. Status of CTBT, prospects for ratification
3. August activities
  - a. Home state meetings of senators
  - b. Radio call-in
  - c. Interfaith petition in Mississippi
  - d. Contacts with Senate staff
4. September activities
  - a. Letters and calls to senators: pledges for key states
  - b. Phone bank
  - c. Heads of communion letters to Senator Lott (a proposal)
  - d. National day of action, September 14 (a Peace Action initiative)
  - e. Other
5. Approaches to broader nuclear disarmament issues (brief discussion)
6. Other

Next meeting: Tuesday, September 21, 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., same place.

**Pledges for calls and letters to senators on CTBT during September 1999.**

**State and Senator(s)**

**Number of Calls/Letters Pledged**

ALASKA: Stevens

INDIANA: Lugar

KANSAS: Brownback, Roberts

MAINE: Collins, Snowe

MISSISSIPPI: Lott

NEBRASKA: Hagel

NEW HAMPSHIRE: Gregg

NEW MEXICO: Domenici

OHIO: DeWine, Voinovich

OREGON: G. Smith

RHODE ISLAND: Chafee

TENNESSEE: Frist, Thompson

UTAH : Bennett, Hatch.

WASHINGTON: Gorton

VIRGINIA: Warner

WYOMING: Thomas, Enzi

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Organization \_\_\_\_\_

**SUGGESTED TOOLS FOR GENERATING CALLS AND LETTERS**

1. Contact your field representatives and key activists in each key state and urge them to activate phone, postal mailing, and e-mail alert systems.
2. Action alerts to membership on getting the CTBT message out.
3. Phone banking to individual members in key states, asking them to call their Senators.
4. Use time at local events and organizational meetings to ask individuals to write letters.

Please return pledge to Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036 Phone/fax: 301 896-0013 E-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

**DEAR SENATOR LOTT:**

**PLEASE SCHEDULE A VOTE ON THE COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY.**

As people of faith, we appeal for U.S. Senate action on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), an international treaty to ban all nuclear test explosions. We believe that ratification of the CTBT is an essential step toward reducing the dangers posed by nuclear weapons. To care for God's creation and to best fulfill our moral responsibilities, we urge you to schedule a vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty before Congress adjourns in 1999.

## **Interfaith Group for the CTBT**

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT formed in June 1997 to work for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It functions as a partnership operation without staff of its own. It is chaired by Howard W. Hallman, chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

### **Participating Organizations**

Representatives of the following denominational offices and religious associations participate in the activities of the 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

Representatives of several peace and disarmament organizations attend meetings of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT to serve as advisors and to help relate interfaith activities to the broader CTBT ratification campaign. They include Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge, 20/20 Vision, and Women's Action for New Directions.

### **Activities**

A brief summary of activities of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is as follows:

December 1997 -- Briefing on status of CTBT in Senate by staff of a Republican senator and a Democratic senator. Decision to concentrate on key members of Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

January-February 1998 -- with help from 20/20 Vision a postcard alert on the CTBT with an interfaith message. Sent by 12 religious organizations to members in eight key states.

February 1998 -- sign-on letters from 18 religious organizations to Senator Helms, Senator Lott, and all other senators, urging public hearings on the CTBT.

February-April 1988 -- CTBT was on agenda of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish legislative briefings in Washington for grassroots activists

Spring 1998 -- articles on CTBT in denominational publications; information placed on denominational web sites.

May 1998 -- "A Statement by American Religious Leaders: Ratify the CTBT", endorsed by 56 national religious leaders (including 23 heads of communion), 50 regional leaders, and 100 local leaders of congregations. Submitted to all senators.

January-September 1998 -- grassroots organizing in a dozen key states, working cooperatively with peace organizations.

June-September 1998 -- Support for Specter-Biden sense-of-the-Senate resolution favoring hearings on the CTBT, including a sign-on letter by 14 religious organizations.

September 1998 -- Interfaith breakfast with Senator Jeffords and Steve Andreasen of the National Security Council staff to rally support for the CTBT. A conference call hookup enabled people at 17 sites in 13 states to listen in.

October 1998-April 1999 -- Interfaith petition drive, covering the whole country but especially concentrating on 25 swing states. Nineteen religious organizations participated. A central contact in about 35 states pulled together petition for joint submissions and in a dozen states organized interfaith delegations to present petitions to senators' field offices. More information on the petition drive is available at [www.loga.org](http://www.loga.org).

March 1999 -- Facilitated letter to Senate Majority Leader Lott from Catholic, Episcopal, and United Methodist bishops in Mississippi, urging him to schedule floor action on CTBT.

April 1999 -- Entire Interfaith Group for the CTBT met with Robert Bell of National Security Council staff for a briefing and to urge stepped-up action by the Clinton Administration for the CTBT.

Spring 1999 -- CTBT was on agenda of legislative briefings in Washington for grassroots activists from faith-based organizations.

Spring 1999 -- Twelve religious organizations co-sponsored a new 20/20 postcard alert on the CTBT along with 12 peace organizations.

May-June 1999 -- Interfaith delegations met with staff of Majority Leader Lott, Minority Leader Daschle, and two top Democrats on Foreign Relations Committee (Senators Biden and Sarbanes) on behalf of CTBT. Turned down in request to meet with Senator Helm's staff.

Summer 1999 -- Provided names of religious contacts in Mississippi and New Mexico for 20/20 conference calls on CTBT.

July 1999 -- Helped facilitate release of opinion poll on CTBT in North Carolina by State Council of Churches.

August 1999 -- Worked with 20/20 Vision to encourage home state visits with senators during August recess.

September 1999 -- As push for action by Democratic senators increases, are encouraging more grassroots calls and letters to 22 key senators from 15 states. Asking bishops in several key states to call their senators. Participating in National Day of Action on September 14, organized by Peace Action. Religious leaders will speak at a rally on the Capitol steps.

Various organizations have taken the lead in these endeavors. For instance, the Friends Committee on National Legislation gathered signers for the religious leaders statement issued in May 1998. The Presbyterian Office organized the conference call for the Jeffords breakfast. The Office of Church in Society, United Church of Christ took the lead in the petition drive. The Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs created a web page on its web site for the petition drive. Other organizations cooperate in other ways. The chair functions as catalyst and gap-filler and handles liaison with the broader CTBT ratification campaign.

Throughout the CTBT ratification campaign faith-based organizations are working closely with secular peace and arms control organizations in joint and complementary activities.

### **Other Religious Organizations Supporting in CTBT Ratification**

Beyond the regular participants in the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, other denominations and religious associations have been involved in the CTBT ratification campaign by signing letters, attending the Jeffords breakfast, circulating the interfaith petition, or seeking further information.

#### **Denominations**

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

**Religious Associations**

Alliance of Baptists  
Baptist Peace Fellowship  
Buddhist Peace Fellowship  
Catholic Conference of Major Superiors of Men's Institutes  
Columban Fathers Justice and Peace Center  
Evangelicals for Social Action  
Jewish Peace Fellowship  
Leadership Conference of Women Religious  
Methodist 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

For further information, contact Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. Phone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: [mjpp@igc.org](mailto:mjpp@igc.org).

September 2, 1999

**Meeting of Interfaith Group for the CTBT**  
**1:00 to 2:30 p.m., Tuesday, September 21, 1999**  
**FCNL Conference Room, 245 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, NE, Washington, DC**

**Agenda**

1. Introductions
2. Status of CTBT
  - a. Congress
  - b. Administration
3. Campaign activities
  - a. Grassroots
    - i. Reports from faith-based organizations
    - ii. Efforts of other organizations
    - iii. Commitments for further activities
  - b. In Washington
    - i. Activities underway
    - ii. What to do in next six weeks
4. Other

Next meeting: Tuesday, October 19, 1:00 to 2:30 p.m., same place.

## Swing Votes on the CTBT

### New England

Maine	Collins	Catholic
	Snowe *	Eastern Orthodox
New Hampshire	Gregg	United Church of Christ

### Middle Atlantic

Pennsylvania	Santorum *	Catholic
Delaware	Roth *	Episcopal

### Southeast

Virginia	Warner	Episcopal
South Carolina	Thurmond	Baptist
Georgia	Coverdell	United Methodist
Florida	Mack	Catholic
Tennessee	Frist *	Presbyterian
	Thompson	Protestant
Kentucky	Bunning	Catholic
	McConnell	Baptist

### Great Lakes

Ohio	DeWine *	Catholic
	Voinovich	Catholic
Michigan	Abraham *	Eastern Orthodox
Indiana	Lugar *	United Methodist
Illinois	Fitzgerald	Catholic

### Great Plains

Minnesota	Grams *	Lutheran
Iowa	Grassley	Baptist
Missouri	Ashcroft *	Assembly of God
	Bond	Catholic
Nebraska	Hagel	Episcopal
Kansas	Brownback	United Methodist
	Roberts	United Methodist

### Mountains

Montana	Burns	Lutheran
Wyoming	Enzi	Presbyterian
	Thomas *	United Methodist
Colorado	Allard	Protestant
	Campbell	Native American
New Mexico	Domenici	Catholic
Arizona	McCain	Episcopal
Utah	Bennett	Latter Day Saints
	Hatch	Latter Day Saints
Idaho	Crapo	Latter Day Saints

### West

Oregon	Smith	Latter Day Saints
Washington	Gorton *	Episcopal
Alaska	Murkowski	Catholic
	Stevens	Episcopal

\* Up for reelection in 2000

October 1, 1999

## Interfaith Support for the CTBT

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT formed in June 1997 to work for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Active participants include representatives of the following denominational offices and religious associations.

Church of the Brethren, Washington Office  
Church Women United  
Episcopal Church, Washington Office  
Episcopal Peace Fellowship  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Mennonite Central Committee  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
National Council of Churches  
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby  
Presbyterian Church (USA), Washington Office  
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship  
Union of American Hebrew Congregations  
Unitarian Universalist Association  
United Church of Christ, Office for Church in Society  
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society  
U.S. Catholic Conference

Other faith-based organizations have shown support for CTBT ratification by signing letters, attending a strategy meeting with Senator Jeffords, circulating an interfaith petition, and asking to be kept informed. They include:

### **Denominations**

African Methodist Episcopal Church  
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church  
American Baptist Churches USA  
American Friends Service Committee  
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)  
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church  
Friends General Conference  
Friends United Meeting  
Moravian Church, Northern Province  
National Missionary Baptist Convention  
Orthodox Church in America  
Progressive National Baptist Convention  
Seventh Day Adventist Church, General  
Conference  
Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch,  
Eastern Archdiocese

### **Religious Associations**

Alliance of Baptists  
Baptist Peace Fellowship

Buddhist Peace Fellowship  
Catholic Conference of Major Superiors of  
Men's Institutes  
Columban Fathers Justice and Peace Center  
Evangelicals for Social Action  
Fellowship of Reconciliation  
Jewish Peace Fellowship  
Leadership Conference of Women Religious  
Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office  
Methodist Federation for Social Action  
Muslim Peace Fellowship  
New Call to Peacemaking  
Orthodox Peace Fellowship  
Pax Christi USA  
The Shalom Center  
Sisters of Mercy of America  
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace  
Sojourners  
Washington Ethical Society  
September 22, 1999

This project will initiate a five-year program to mobilize the interfaith community in the United States in support of efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons. Although many religious denominations have policies calling for elimination of nuclear weapons, they lack persistent follow-through activities to educate members of congregations on this subject and to assist them in affecting public policy. Building upon a start made in an interfaith campaign in support of Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, this new project will develop an interfaith action network on nuclear disarmament that will function in every state and congressional district in the United States. The project will deal with such steps toward nuclear disarmament as de-alerting, deep cuts in the strategic arsenal, support for the international nonproliferation regime, and ultimately a nuclear weapons convention to eliminate all remaining nuclear weapons on Earth.

# Proposal for a Citizens Hearing on the CTBT

by Howard W. Hallman

Date: Monday, October 11, 1999  
Columbus Day (Senate in recess?)

Time: 10 a.m. to 12 noon, 1:00 to 3:00 p.m.

Place: Capitol Hill, such as:  
a room in a Senate Office Building (obtained by a retired senator)  
Methodist Building  
Church of the Reformation, 222 East Capitol (basement)  
a hotel

Cosponsors: Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers & Interfaith Group for the CTBT

Hearing panel  
Senator Dale Bumpers  
Senator Mark Hatfield  
Possibly other retired senators

Testimony by eight panels (30 minutes each), such as (order to be determined):  
Interfaith (Catholic, Protestant, Jewish)  
Scientists, physician  
Verification specialists (seismologists, etc.)  
Pollsters  
Women  
Environmentalists  
Victims perspective (persons affected by past testing)  
Human rights (including international perspective)

Media coverage  
C-Span II (Senate in recess)  
CNN  
Other television and radio  
Print media  
Taping by CDI for edited use  
Related appearances on Jim Lehrer's News Hour, Larry King's show, etc.

Publicity  
E-mail to grassroots networks to watch  
Other

Printed record  
Verbatim record or reporter's summary  
Distributed to all senators

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

May 7, 1999

To: Heather Nolen

Fax: 202 546-6232

No. of pages: 6

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Heather:

Here is the list of senators and their ratings on likely support for the CTBT.

I'm also sending the sign-on letter to senators which Tsehai requested.

Shalom,

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

May 10, 1999

Dear Colleagues:

I want to share with you three items of correspondence:

- (1) A letter from "Sandy" Berger acknowledging our visit with Bob Bell and Steve Andreasen.
- (2) Our letter to Berger, asking the Administration to step up the pace of its CTBT advocacy.
- (3) A letter from three bishops in Mississippi to Senator Lott.

Shalom,

May 13, 1999

Dear Senator:

Out of a concern for preservation of God's creation, the United Methodist Church and numerous other religious bodies have long advocated the end of nuclear weapons testing. Therefore, we were gratified when the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) was signed by heads of state on September 24, 1996. By banning nuclear test explosion this treaty halts the spread of nuclear weapons. It prevents further damage to the environment, for even underground tests have caused radioactive material to leak into the atmosphere and ground water.

From this perspective we are sadly disappointed that the U.S. Senate has failed to ratify the CTBT even though the Senate received the treaty from President Clinton more than a year and a half ago. Indeed, even the first step in the ratification process -- public hearings by the Committee on Foreign Relations -- has not commenced. Nor has Senate leadership established a time for the CTBT to come before the entire Senate for consideration, as required by the U.S. Constitution.

The time has come for this inactivity to cease. Therefore, we urge you to work with other senators to expedite consideration of the CTBT through hearings and floor debate. In addition to moving the process along, we ask you to support the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty when it comes up for a vote.

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.o**

May 13, 1999

To: Hardy Lott

Fax: 202 224-9993

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Following up my phone call, I would like to request an opportunity for a delegation from based-organizations to meet with Senator Lott to discuss the status of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), now pending before the Senate. I make this request as chair of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

This is a follow-up to the attached letter of April 13 in which we asked Senator Lott to schedule a date certain when the treaty will be voted on by the Senate. We would like to express directly to Senator Lott why we believe that the CTBT is very much within the national interest of the United States and why numerous faith-based organizations support Senate ratification.

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.o**

May 14, 1999

To: Clayton Ramey

Fax: 914 358-4824

No. of pages: 4

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Consultation on Nuclear Abolition and Human Rights

Dear Clayton:

Following up the conversation you and I had with Tyrone Pitts and my conversation with Thom Fassett, I have roughed out a schedule for a one-day consultation on "Nuclear Abolition and Human Rights." I have also drafted a short statement on "Nuclear Abolition as a Human Rights Issue." They are attached. Please give me your critique and add your suggestions.

I hope that these will be useful for further discussion between you and me. After we have reached a consensus, I suggest that we take our ideas to Pitts and Fassett, ask them if they would be co-conveners of a consultation, pick a date, decided upon invitees, and issue invitations. Meanwhile, we can line up participants in the program.

Please call me after you have read these items.

Shalom,

May 19, 1999

Ms. Melanne Verveer  
Chief of Staff to the First Lady  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Melanne:

In support of Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, we have organized a strong Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which I chair. In face of inaction by the Senate we have built a strong grassroots network of faith-based supporters around the nation. We have been concentrating particularly on Republican senators on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Lott, such influential senators as Domenici and Warner, and other moderate Republicans.

We also keep in touch with Bob Bell and Steve Andreasen of the National Security Council staff. Last month we met with them. As a follow-up of that meeting we have addressed the enclosed suggestions to "Sandy" Berger about ways in which we would like the Clinton Administration to step up its campaign for Senate ratification of the CTBT.

We would like to address a similar message to the political arm of the White House, specifically to John Podesta. We want to tell him about our grassroots network which we believe can produce 70 or more favorable votes for CTBT ratification if and when the treaty comes before the Senate. We want to convince him that this is a viable campaign for the White House to push, even in the midst of the war in Yugoslavia.

Can you suggest how we can get an appointment with Mr. Podesta? Perhaps you can assist us directly. We'll appreciate whatever help you can provide.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

May 20, 1999

Dear Peace with Justice Coordinator:

I would like to share with you a letter I wrote to your bishop, inviting him to sign the CTBT petition and to facilitate its circulation at your upcoming annual conference.

I hope that you will be able to follow through on this.

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.o**

June 1, 1999

To: Rabbi David Saperstein

Fax: 202 667-9070

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Rabbi Saperstein:

In my capacity as chair of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, I have set up a meeting with Mr. Chris Williams on Senator Lott's staff to discuss the status of the CTBT in the Senate and to indicate interfaith support for the treaty. The meeting will take place on Thursday, June 3 at 9:30 a.m. in Senator Lott's Capitol office, Room S-230. I invite you to join a small interfaith delegation for this meeting.

At the meeting Jack Cullinan will represent the U.S. Catholic Conference (Jerry Powers can't make it). I am trying to get Jay Lintner, who is now serving as Washington director of the National Council of Churches, and Jay Volk of FCNL or Daryl Byler of the Mennonite Central Committee to represent the perspective of the peace churches.

If you cannot make Thursday morning's meeting, perhaps you can send a representative. Please let me know one way or the other.

Shalom,

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

June 2, 1999

To: Mr. Chris Williams  
Office of Senator Lott

Fax: 202 224-9993

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Interfaith delegation on the CTBT

Dear Mr. Williams:

Thank you for scheduling a meeting tomorrow, Thursday, June 3 at 9:30 a.m. for an interfaith delegation to discuss the status of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Our delegation will consist of:

Jay Lintner, Director, Washington Office, National Council of Churches  
& Director, Washington Office of Church in Society, United Church of Christ  
Jack Cullinan, U.S. Catholic Conference (representing Jerry Powers, Director, Office of  
International Justice and Peace)  
Kathy Guthrie, Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Adina Rosenbaum, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (representing Rabbi  
David Saperstein)  
Howard Hallman, Chair, Interfaith Group for the CTBT, and Chair, Methodists United  
for Peace with Justice.

Shalom,

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

June 7, 1999

To: Chris Williams

Fax: 202 224-9993

No. of pages: 4

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Chris:

We greatly appreciate the time you spent with the interfaith delegation last Thursday to discuss the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

I promised to send you further information about how the CTBT can help deal with the Chinese and their alleged espionage of information on nuclear weapons. Attached are a couple of pieces that deal with this issue.

If we can provide you further information, please let us know.

Shalom,

June 10, 1999

The Honorable Byron Dorgan  
713 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Attn: Jennifer Gieser

Dear Senator Dorgan:

As a long-time advocate of the end of nuclear weapons testing, we greatly appreciate your recent speeches in the Senate in behalf of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). We hope you are successful in bringing the treaty before the Senate.

I serve as chair of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT. We have been working together for two years to build public support for the treaty within the faith community around the country. As the enclosed list indicates, more than twenty faith-based organizations are the primary core of our working group, but many others have been involved through sign-on letters and participation in other activities in behalf of the CTBT.

A year ago more than 200 religious leaders wrote the Senate in support of the CTBT. A copy of this letter is enclosed. I am also sending a collection of denominational policy statements on the CTBT.

We have a strong grassroots network that has been in touch senators considered to be swing votes for treaty ratification. As soon as the treaty is scheduled for a vote, we will step up this campaign so that members of the Senate will know from their home folks that the faith community within the United States favors ratification of the CTBT.

Thus, we applaud what you are doing and will work to build public support for the efforts you and others are making in behalf of CTBT ratification.

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.or**

June 16, 1999

To: Ms. Melanne Verveer  
Office of the First Lady

Fax: 202 456-6244

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Melanne:

Thank you for forwarding to John Podesta our request for a meeting with him to discuss the broad national and grassroots support within the faith community for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). His office indicates that he would like to find a date to meet with us later in June.

Now that Mrs. Clinton is officially exploring whether to run for the U.S. Senate in New York, she is likely to become much more publicly involved in foreign policy issues. This adds to her informal, private role on such matters.

Therefore, I am wondering if Mrs. Clinton would be interested in meeting with an interfaith delegation to discuss the CTBT, why we believe Senate ratification is so important, and hear about the broad support we have developed in key states around the nation.

If this is a possibility, I would like to discuss it with you or one of your staff in greater depth and consider who might form an interfaith delegation, when and where we could meet.

Shalom,

June 17, 1999

The Honorable Albert Gore  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Attn: Mr. Leon Firth

Dear Mr. Vice President:

For many years religious denominations in the United States have advocated an end to nuclear weapons testing. For that reason the faith community was gratified when the Clinton-Gore Administration completed negotiations for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 1996.

In June 1997 in anticipation of a campaign to achieve Senate ratification of the treaty, we formed the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which I serve as chair. Since then we have worked vigorously in Washington and around the nation to develop public support for ratification. We are working particularly in about thirty states whose senators are swing votes for ratification. This includes a petition drive, letters and phone calls, and visits to senators' home-state offices. In Washington we have written members of the Senate repeatedly, including the enclosed letter signed by more than 200 national, regional, and local religious leaders. The breadth of our alliance is indicated in the enclosed list of participants in our campaign.

We believe the next six weeks is a crucial time for getting the Senate to agree to a vote on the CTBT. We believe that this can be achieved only through stepped-up public advocacy by the Clinton-Gore Administration. To this end we have sent the attached letter to National Security Advisor "Sandy" Berger offering suggestions for what can be done.

As a long-term advocate of arms control as well as presiding officer of the Senate, you hold a key position in gaining Senate approval. Therefore, we would like to arrange for an interfaith delegation to meet with you (a) to show you the depth and breadth of interfaith support for the CTBT and (b) to discuss our ideas on how the Administration can lead the way to treaty ratification. If one of your staff would like to discuss this request in greater depth, I am available at 301 896-0013.

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.or**

June 21, 1999

To: Rev. James McDonald

Fax: 804 329-5066

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: CTBT ratification campaign

Dear Rev. McDonald:

In our continuing campaign for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, we see the Senate's July 3-11 recess as opportunity for citizens to reach their senators during public appearances in their home state.

Would you or one of your associates be willing to find when and where Senator Warner will be appearing in Virginia during this recess period? Suggestions on how to do this and the senator's scheduler are indicated in the attachment. When you have this information, please try to enlist Virginians to attend such events and ask Senator Warner about his support for the CTBT. Also, please let us know the schedule so that national interfaith organizations can share this information with their key contacts in Virginia.

To report this information, you can reach me at phone/fax 301 896-0013 or by e-mail at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

Shalom,

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

June 21, 1999

To: Joe Circincione

Fax: 202 483-1840

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: CTBT ratification

Dear Joe:

I notice in today Post's that you were quoted as saying the CTBT would lose if Senator Helms forced a vote today. I believe you are wrong because of the tremendous grassroots pressure for treaty ratification that we will mount as soon as a vote is scheduled.

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which I chair, has in place a nationwide network committed to building strong support for CTBT ratification. For a year and a half we have been working in states with Republican members on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and in a number of other states whose senators are considered swing votes for treaty ratification. We have circulated petitions in local churches and promoted visits to senators' home-state offices. We produced a letter from Catholic, Episcopal, and United Methodist bishops in Mississippi to Senator Lott. North Carolinians are sending pictures of children to Senator Helms, urging him to move the CTBT "for the benefit of our children."

Once a vote on the CTBT is scheduled we will substantially increase our efforts. For instance, the U.S. Catholic Conference is committed to getting cardinals, archbishops, and bishops to call their senators in behalf of the treaty. The major Protestant denominations, the historic peace churches, a segment of the evangelical community, and Reform Judaism have a similar commitment. Attached is the list of denominations and other religious organizations committed to the CTBT.

The feedback we get from our grassroots is that senators are not necessarily against the treaty but rather they don't want to make a public commitment until the CTBT becomes a real issue. That will happen when the Clinton Administration decides to go all out for the treaty. So we are pushing the Administration as much as the Senate.

I realize that you are probably unaware of the grassroots support that the faith community can generate for treaty ratification. PSR, 20/20 Vision, Peace Action, WAND, WILL, and other grassroots networks will also be pushing for ratification when it comes time for the Senate to vote. With this information I hope that you will be more optimistic about the prospects for ratification of the CTBT if we can get a vote on the treaty.

Shalom,

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

June 21, 1999

To: Sharon Breitweiser

Fax: 307 742-9189

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: CTBT ratification campaign

I am aware that you helped the campaign to achieve Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) by being a contact for interfaith groups for a petition on the CTBT. In our continuing campaign we see the Senate's July 3-11 recess as opportunity for citizens to reach their senators during public appearances in their home state.

Would you be willing to find when and where Senator Thomas and Senator Enzi will be appearing in Wyoming during this recess period? Suggestions on how to do this and the senators' schedulers are indicated in the attachment. When you have this information, please try to enlist Wyoming residents to attend such events and ask the senators about their position on the CTBT. Also, please let us know the schedule so that national interfaith organizations can share this information with their contacts in Wyoming.

To report this information, you can reach me at phone/fax 301 896-0013 or by e-mail at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

Shalom,

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

July 13, 1999

To: Steve Andreasen

Fax: 202 456-9190

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Steve:

I've been trying to reach you to inquire about the status of the CTBT on the priority list of the Clinton Administration.

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT has its next monthly meeting on Tuesday afternoon, July 20. We will discuss what, if anything, we will do with our grassroots networks during the August congressional recess. If it appears that the CTBT is very unlikely to come up in the Senate during the remainder of this year's session, we are likely to do very little. But if there is a real possibility of a floor vote, we will be more active in August.

We see Senate Democratic leadership going a good job to force the CTBT issue. In contrast, we seen nothing visible from the Administration. For the past month I have been trying to get an appointment with John Podesta for an interfaith delegation to talk about the CTBT. We want to hear what the political wing of the White House has to say. Others have also tried to talk with Mr. Podesta. We have all been put on hold.

We know that our grassroots campaign can produce more than 67 votes for the CTBT when the treaty reaches the Senate floor. We have less leverage to obtain committee hearings and to get a vote scheduled. We need the strength of the Clinton Administration and its bargaining power for that to happen. We are still waiting.

I would appreciate hearing from you no later than Thursday afternoon, July 15. I'm going out of town the next morning and won't return until just in time for the meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT on Tuesday, July 20.

Shalom,

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

July 15, 1999

To: Kathy Guthrie

Fax: 202 547-6019

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Kathy:

Here is a hard copy of the agenda for the July 20 meeting of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

Marie Rietmann and Daryl Kimball will miss the meeting. I've never reached David Culp. Therefore, we may depend mainly on you to report the discussion of the CTBT Working Group, which meetings tomorrow, July 16.

Shalom,

FirstName	LastName	Company	Address1	City	State	PostalCode	Denomination
Ann	Delorey	Church Women United	110 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washington	DC	20003	Church Women United
Tom	Hart	Episcopal Church, Washington Office	110 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washington	DC	20002	Episcopalians
Jere	Skipper	Episcopal Church, Washington Office	110 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washington	DC	20002	Episcopalians
Mary	Miller	Episcopal Peace Fellowship	P.O. Box 28156	Washington	DC	20039	Episcopalians
Clayton	Ramey	Fellowship of Reconciliation	Box 271	Nyack	NY	10960	FOR members
Mark	Brown	Ltgheran Office of Governmental Affairs	122 C Street, NW	Washington	DC	20001	Lutherans
Jean	Sammon	NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby	801 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, #460	Washington	DC	20003	NETWORK members
Dave	Robinson	Pax Christi USA	532 W. 8th Street	Erie	PA	16502	Pax Christi members
Walter	Owensby	Presbyterian Church (USA)	110 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washington	DC	20002	Presbyterians
Adina	Rosenbaum	Union of American Hebrew Congregations	2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW	Washington	DC	20036	UAHC members

FirstName	LastName	Company	Address1	City	State	PostalCode	Denomination
Gerard F.	Powers	U.S. Catholic Conference	3211 4th Street, NE	Washington	DC	20017	Catholics
Pam	Genise	Church of the Brethren, Washington Office	337 North Carolina Avenue, SE	Washington	DC	20003	Church of the Brethren members
Heather	Nolen	Church World Service	110 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washington	D.C.	20002	
Kathy	Guthrie	Friends Committee on National Legislation	245 Second Street, NE	Washington	DC	20002	
Daryl	Byler	Mennonite Central Committee	110 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washington	DC	20002	
Jim	Matlack	American Friends Service Committee	1822 R Street, NW	Washington	DC	20009	
Marie	Dennis	Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office	401 Michigan Avenue, NE	Washington	DC	20017	
Lisa	Wright	National Council of Churches	110 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washington	DC	20002	
L. William	Yolton	Presbyterian Peace Fellowship	3825 Gibbs Street	Alexandria	VA	22309-2252	
Rob	Cavanaugh	Unitarian Universalist Association	2026 P Street, NW, Suite 3	Washington	DC	20036	

<b>FirstName</b>	<b>LastName</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Address1</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>PostalCode</b>	<b>Denomination</b>
Jay	Lintner	on UCC Office for Church in Society	110 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washingto n	DC	20002	
Marijke	Haworth	UCC Office for Church in Society	110 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washingto n	DC	20002	
Robin	Ringler	UM General Board of Church and Society	110 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washingto n	DC	20002	

August 11, 1999

«FirstName» «LastName»  
«Company»  
«Address1»  
«City», «State» «PostalCode»

Dear «FirstName»:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. As Luke illustrated with the persistent widow who went back to the judge again and again to get justice, it's all right to ask previous contacts to write again.

Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

August 11, 1999

Ann Delorey  
Church Women United  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20003

Dear Ann:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. As Luke illustrated with the persistent widow who went back to the judge again and again to get justice, it's all right to ask previous contacts to write again.

Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

August 11, 1999

Tom Hart  
Episcopal Church, Washington Office  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Tom:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. As Luke illustrated with the persistent widow who went back to the judge again and again to get justice, it's all right to ask previous contacts to write again. This may be the time for selected bishops to call their senators.

Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

August 11, 1999

Jere Skipper  
Episcopal Church, Washington Office  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Jere:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. As Luke illustrated with the persistent widow who went back to the judge again and again to get justice, it's all right to ask previous contacts to write again. This may be the time for selected bishops to call their senators.

Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

August 11, 1999

Mary Miller  
Episcopal Peace Fellowship  
P.O. Box 28156  
Washington, DC 20039

Dear Mary:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. As Luke illustrated with the persistent widow who went back to the judge again and again to get justice, it's all right to ask previous contacts to write again. This may be the time for selected bishops to call their senators.

Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

August 11, 1999

Clayton Ramey  
Fellowship of Reconciliation  
Box 271  
Nyack, NY 10960

Dear Clayton:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. As Luke illustrated with the persistent widow who went back to the judge again and again to get justice, it's all right to ask previous contacts to write again.

Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

August 11, 1999

Mark Brown  
Ltgheran Office of Governmental Affairs  
122 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mark:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. As Luke illustrated with the persistent widow who went back to the judge again and again to get justice, it's all right to ask previous contacts to write again. This may be the time for selected bishops to call their senators.

Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

August 11, 1999

Jean Sammon  
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby  
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, #460  
Washington, DC 20003

Dear Jean:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. As Luke illustrated with the persistent widow who went back to the judge again and again to get justice, it's all right to ask previous contacts to write again.

Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

August 11, 1999

Dave Robinson  
Pax Christi USA  
532 W. 8th Street  
Erie, PA 16502

Dear Dave:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. As Luke illustrated with the persistent widow who went back to the judge again and again to get justice, it's all right to ask previous contacts to write again.

Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

August 11, 1999

Walter Owensby  
Presbyterian Church (USA)  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Walter:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. As Luke illustrated with the persistent widow who went back to the judge again and again to get justice, it's all right to ask previous contacts to write again.

Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

August 11, 1999

Adina Rosenbaum  
Union of American Hebrew Congregations  
2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Adina:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

August 11, 1999

Gerard F. Powers  
U.S. Catholic Conference  
3211 4th Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20017

Dear Jerry:

Momentum has shifted to our side in the effort to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT. Among the indicators are (i) the news conference on July 20 when nine senators (seven Democrats, two Republicans) released survey results showing that 82 percent of the American public support the CTBT, (ii) a letter from all 45 Senate Democrats to Senator Helms, asking for public hearings, (iii) advocacy by President Clinton in the White House Rose Garden on July 20 and at a Joint Chiefs of Staff event on August 9, and (iv) determination by Senator Dorgan, with the backing of Senate Democratic leadership, to tie up the Senate if necessary in order to get a vote scheduled on the CTBT. The latter will begin happening after the Senate returns after Labor Day.

This is the moment we've been waiting for. We need to pull out all stops to gain Republican support for the CTBT, especially support to require public hearings and a vote on the treaty. With that in mind the Interfaith Group for the CTBT is joining with peace and disarmament agencies to generate 100 or more letters to 22 senators in 16 states during September. Therefore, I'm sending you a pledge sheet to indicate how many letters and calls you can generate from your network in these states. Please return your pledge to me by mail at my home, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817, or by fax at 301 896-0013, or use a previous e-mailed listing to send it to me at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

You might consider particularly the suggestion for getting letters written at meetings or after worship. As Luke illustrated with the persistent widow who went back to the judge again and again to get justice, it's all right to ask previous contacts to write again. This may also be the time for selected cardinals, archbishops, and bishops to call their senators.

Thanks for your efforts on the CTBT.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair



August 13, 1999

Dear Colleagues:

Here is material for our grassroots campaign for the CTBT in Mississippi: "Suggested Grassroots Activities" and a revision of the interfaith petition, addressed specifically to Senator Lott. Thanks to Marie Rietmann for the activities flyer.

Please reproduce these items and send them to your grassroots contacts in Mississippi. Ask them to reach out to others. Letters and petitions should go to Senator Lott in September, preferably in the first half of the month.

Thanks for your efforts.

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**

August 18, 1999

To: Mary Miller

Fax: 202 393-3695

No. of pages: 7

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Mary,

Here is the material about the Cathedral's initiative and the religious leaders/generals statement.  
Use it with discretion.

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

August 27, 1999

To: Walter Owensby

Fax: 202 543-7753

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Walter:

Here is the list of states and senators we are concentrating on now for the CTBT campaign.

Shalom,

September 10, 1999

«Title» «FirstName» «LastName», «JobTitle»  
«Programunit»  
«Company»  
«Address1», «State» «PostalCode»

Dear «Title» «LastName»:

I would like to inquire whether the «Company» would consider making a substantial, five-year investment in the interfaith community in the United States for the purpose of mobilizing public support for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Particular emphasis would be upon developing and utilizing an interfaith action network that would function in every state and every congressional district. The purpose would be to provide timely information so that persons in the interfaith community can express their views to the President, other officers of the Executive Branch, and Congress on matters pertaining to nuclear disarmament.

This effort would build upon the experience of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which I chair and which is carrying out nationwide, grassroots mobilization to generate support for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (see enclosure). We have begun discussions on how to broaden this effort to encompass other issues of nuclear disarmament. Although this hasn't gone far enough to submit a formal request for a foundation grant, it would be helpful to have an indication of potential foundation support.

For decades prominent religious leaders and major religious denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Recently prominent retired military officers and civilian leaders have joined this call. Foundations like yours have invested millions of dollars in research on steps to contain nuclear weapons and reduce their numbers. Public opinion polls reveal strong support for nuclear disarmament. Yet, the official policy of the United States is to retain nuclear weapons forever and to resist international pressures for their elimination. This happens because of the lack of widespread, persistent, and vocal grassroots mobilization for nuclear disarmament.

During the past year or so several efforts have commenced to develop public support for nuclear abolition, such as the U.S. Campaign To Abolish Nuclear

«Title» «FirstName» «LastName»

September 10, 1999

Page two.

Weapons and Project Abolition, an initiative of the Fourth Freedom Forum. However, they have minimal involvement of the faith community. An effort is underway to develop a joint statement of religious and military leaders and to follow up with educational material for churches, but this lacks the vital element of mobilization of opinion, sharply focused on policy makers.

The nature of the challenge of nuclear disarmament requires a long-term commitment. Thus, we are talking about a five-year campaign, running from 2000 to 2004; it can be extended further if necessary. The year 2000 would encompass completion of Senate ratification of the CTBT, support for START III if it is negotiated, and pushing for de-alerting through executive action. But most importantly 2000 would be spent in expanding the grassroots interfaith network and establishing relationships with present and future members of Congress, the next president, and prospective officials of the next presidential administration.

To do this we would assist in the formation of interfaith groups working for nuclear disarmament in all 50 states and in as many congressional districts as possible in 2000. This would build upon some rudimentary networks we have in a number of states in the CTBT campaign. We would encourage state and local groups to be in touch with candidates running for the House of Representatives and the Senate, such as through nonpartisan questionnaires on pertinent issues and asking questions dealing with nuclear disarmament at campaign appearances. At the national level we would likewise be in touch with presidential candidates and their staffs. This would be accomplished with strict coherence to tax laws pertaining to nonprofit organizations.

Between election day in November 2000 and January 2001 when the next Congress convenes and the next president is inaugurated, participants in the interfaith network would solidify their relationships with newly elected and reelected U.S. representatives and senators, with holdover senators, with the next president, and with incoming cabinet members and executive staff as they are announced.

This year of preparation would place the interfaith community in a position to put constant pressure on the new president and Congress to implement serious measures moving toward the elimination of nuclear weapons. In 2001 and 2002 this might encompass (a) zero alert, (b) very deep cuts in strategic weapons (START III, START IV), and (c) strengthening the global non-proliferation regime. In 2003 and 2004 this effort would try to culminate in achieving a multilateral agreement for the complete and final elimination of all nuclear weapons on Earth. By then we would have in place a strong network manifesting strong public support for these ambitious measures so that Senate ratification of international treaties would be assured.

For this to happen substantial foundation support with a long-term commitment is essential. The present Interfaith Group for the CTBT could evolve into a steering committee for the interfaith network for nuclear disarmament, in the process broadening its participation. Two levels of funding are necessary. First would be to provide a small core staff to assist the steering committee, build connections in the interfaith network, and operate a web site. Annual budget

«Title» «FirstName» «LastName»  
September 10, 1999  
Page three.

would be \$200,000. Secondly denominational offices and religious peace fellowships, now overburdened with many issues, need supplemental staff for outreach to their local churches, synagogues, and meetings and to their regional synods, conferences, and associations. This can be accomplished with grants of \$25,000 to \$50,000/year to twelve to fifteen entities (a total of \$500,000 to \$750,000 a year). These staff persons would work together to achieve a grassroots presence in all the states and every congressional district. This network would be linked through the internet, telephone, faxes, and regular mail. Through e-mail alerts, fax blasts, and telephone trees, rapid mobilization would be possible.

As is the case with the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, we would work closely with secular peace and disarmament organizations. For instance, representatives of 20/20 Vision, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Plutonium Challenge, and Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Danger regularly attend meetings of the Interfaith Group. They provide technical information and participate in strategic discussions, and we carry out joint activities. We also draw upon information provided by the Arms Control Association, Stimson Center, Council for a Livable World, Center for Defense Information, and other organizations. This is a reciprocal relationship, for these organizations realize that the faith community provides the broadest and strongest grassroots support for CTBT ratification. With substantial foundation support the faith community can continue working together among itself and with secular organizations to build effective public support for other measures of nuclear disarmament. This is the missing link in current efforts.

I will follow up this inquiry letter with a telephone call so that we can learn of your possible interest in our ideas. If you are interested in obtaining a third party perspective on the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, several references are attached.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

<b>Title</b>	<b>FirstName</b>	<b>LastName</b>	<b>JobTitle</b>	<b>Programunit</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Address1</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>PostalCode</b>
Ms.	Christine B.	Wing	Program Officer	Human Rights and International Cooperation	The Ford Foundation	320 East 43rd Street	New York	NY	10017
Ms.	Kennette M.	Benedict	Director	Arms Reduction and Security Policy	The MacArthur Foundation	140 South Dearborn Street	Chicago	IL	60603
Ms.	Edith T.	Eddy	Executive Director		Compton Foundation	545 Middlefield Road, Suite 178	Menlo Park	CA	94025

September 10, 1999

Ms. Christine B. Wing, Program Officer  
Human Rights and International Cooperation  
The Ford Foundation  
320 East 43rd Street,  
New York, NY 10017

Dear Ms. Wing:

I would like to inquire whether the Ford Foundation would consider making a substantial, five-year investment in the interfaith community in the United States for the purpose of mobilizing public support for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Particular emphasis would be upon developing and utilizing an interfaith action network that would function in every state and every congressional district. The purpose would be to provide timely information so that persons in the interfaith community can express their views to the President, other officers of the Executive Branch, and Congress on matters pertaining to nuclear disarmament.

This effort would build upon the experience of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which I chair and which is carrying out nationwide, grassroots mobilization to generate support for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (see enclosure). We have begun discussions on how to broaden this effort to encompass other issues of nuclear disarmament. Although this hasn't gone far enough to submit a formal request for a foundation grant, it would be helpful to have an indication of potential foundation support.

For decades prominent religious leaders and major religious denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Recently prominent retired military officers and civilian leaders have joined this call. Foundations like yours have invested millions of dollars in research on steps to contain nuclear weapons and reduce their numbers. Public opinion polls reveal strong support for nuclear disarmament. Yet, the official policy of the United States is to retain nuclear weapons forever and to resist international pressures for their elimination. This happens because of the lack of widespread, persistent, and vocal grassroots mobilization for nuclear disarmament.

During the past year or so several efforts have commenced to develop public support for nuclear abolition, such as the U.S. Campaign To Abolish Nuclear

Ms. Christine B. Wing  
September 10, 1999  
Page two.

Weapons and Project Abolition, an initiative of the Fourth Freedom Forum. However, they have minimal involvement of the faith community. An effort is underway to develop a joint statement of religious and military leaders and to follow up with educational material for churches, but this lacks the vital element of mobilization of opinion, sharply focused on policy makers.

The nature of the challenge of nuclear disarmament requires a long-term commitment. Thus, we are talking about a five-year campaign, running from 2000 to 2004; it can be extended further if necessary. The year 2000 would encompass completion of Senate ratification of the CTBT, support for START III if it is negotiated, and pushing for de-alerting through executive action. But most importantly 2000 would be spent in expanding the grassroots interfaith network and establishing relationships with present and future members of Congress, the next president, and prospective officials of the next presidential administration.

To do this we would assist in the formation of interfaith groups working for nuclear disarmament in all 50 states and in as many congressional districts as possible in 2000. This would build upon some rudimentary networks we have in a number of states in the CTBT campaign. We would encourage state and local groups to be in touch with candidates running for the House of Representatives and the Senate, such as through nonpartisan questionnaires on pertinent issues and asking questions dealing with nuclear disarmament at campaign appearances. At the national level we would likewise be in touch with presidential candidates and their staffs. This would be accomplished with strict coherence to tax laws pertaining to nonprofit organizations.

Between election day in November 2000 and January 2001 when the next Congress convenes and the next president is inaugurated, participants in the interfaith network would solidify their relationships with newly elected and reelected U.S. representatives and senators, with holdover senators, with the next president, and with incoming cabinet members and executive staff as they are announced.

This year of preparation would place the interfaith community in a position to put constant pressure on the new president and Congress to implement serious measures moving toward the elimination of nuclear weapons. In 2001 and 2002 this might encompass (a) zero alert, (b) very deep cuts in strategic weapons (START III, START IV), and (c) strengthening the global non-proliferation regime. In 2003 and 2004 this effort would try to culminate in achieving a multilateral agreement for the complete and final elimination of all nuclear weapons on Earth. By then we would have in place a strong network manifesting strong public support for these ambitious measures so that Senate ratification of international treaties would be assured.

For this to happen substantial foundation support with a long-term commitment is essential. The present Interfaith Group for the CTBT could evolve into a steering committee for the interfaith network for nuclear disarmament, in the process broadening its participation. Two levels of funding are necessary. First would be to provide a small core staff to assist the steering committee, build connections in the interfaith network, and operate a web site. Annual budget

Ms. Christine B. Wing  
September 10, 1999  
Page three.

would be \$200,000. Secondly denominational offices and religious peace fellowships, now overburdened with many issues, need supplemental staff for outreach to their local churches, synagogues, and meetings and to their regional synods, conferences, and associations. This can be accomplished with grants of \$25,000 to \$50,000/year to twelve to fifteen entities (a total of \$500,000 to \$750,000 a year). These staff persons would work together to achieve a grassroots presence in all the states and every congressional district. This network would be linked through the internet, telephone, faxes, and regular mail. Through e-mail alerts, fax blasts, and telephone trees, rapid mobilization would be possible.

As is the case with the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, we would work closely with secular peace and disarmament organizations. For instance, representatives of 20/20 Vision, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Plutonium Challenge, and Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Danger regularly attend meetings of the Interfaith Group. They provide technical information and participate in strategic discussions, and we carry out joint activities. We also draw upon information provided by the Arms Control Association, Stimson Center, Council for a Livable World, Center for Defense Information, and other organizations. This is a reciprocal relationship, for these organizations realize that the faith community provides the broadest and strongest grassroots support for CTBT ratification. With substantial foundation support the faith community can continue working together among itself and with secular organizations to build effective public support for other measures of nuclear disarmament. This is the missing link in current efforts.

I will follow up this inquiry letter with a telephone call so that we can learn of your possible interest in our ideas. If you are interested in obtaining a third party perspective on the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, several references are attached.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

September 10, 1999

Ms. Kennette M. Benedict, Director  
Arms Reduction and Security Policy  
The MacArthur Foundation  
140 South Dearborn Street,  
Chicago, IL 60603

Dear Ms. Benedict:

I would like to inquire whether the MacArthur Foundation would consider making a substantial, five-year investment in the interfaith community in the United States for the purpose of mobilizing public support for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Particular emphasis would be upon developing and utilizing an interfaith action network that would function in every state and every congressional district. The purpose would be to provide timely information so that persons in the interfaith community can express their views to the President, other officers of the Executive Branch, and Congress on matters pertaining to nuclear disarmament.

This effort would build upon the experience of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which I chair and which is carrying out nationwide, grassroots mobilization to generate support for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (see enclosure). We have begun discussions on how to broaden this effort to encompass other issues of nuclear disarmament. Although this hasn't gone far enough to submit a formal request for a foundation grant, it would be helpful to have an indication of potential foundation support.

For decades prominent religious leaders and major religious denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Recently prominent retired military officers and civilian leaders have joined this call. Foundations like yours have invested millions of dollars in research on steps to contain nuclear weapons and reduce their numbers. Public opinion polls reveal strong support for nuclear disarmament. Yet, the official policy of the United States is to retain nuclear weapons forever and to resist international pressures for their elimination. This happens because of the lack of widespread, persistent, and vocal grassroots mobilization for nuclear disarmament.

During the past year or so several efforts have commenced to develop public support for nuclear abolition, such as the U.S. Campaign To Abolish Nuclear

Ms. Kennette M. Benedict  
September 10, 1999  
Page two.

Weapons and Project Abolition, an initiative of the Fourth Freedom Forum. However, they have minimal involvement of the faith community. An effort is underway to develop a joint statement of religious and military leaders and to follow up with educational material for churches, but this lacks the vital element of mobilization of opinion, sharply focused on policy makers.

The nature of the challenge of nuclear disarmament requires a long-term commitment. Thus, we are talking about a five-year campaign, running from 2000 to 2004; it can be extended further if necessary. The year 2000 would encompass completion of Senate ratification of the CTBT, support for START III if it is negotiated, and pushing for de-alerting through executive action. But most importantly 2000 would be spent in expanding the grassroots interfaith network and establishing relationships with present and future members of Congress, the next president, and prospective officials of the next presidential administration.

To do this we would assist in the formation of interfaith groups working for nuclear disarmament in all 50 states and in as many congressional districts as possible in 2000. This would build upon some rudimentary networks we have in a number of states in the CTBT campaign. We would encourage state and local groups to be in touch with candidates running for the House of Representatives and the Senate, such as through nonpartisan questionnaires on pertinent issues and asking questions dealing with nuclear disarmament at campaign appearances. At the national level we would likewise be in touch with presidential candidates and their staffs. This would be accomplished with strict coherence to tax laws pertaining to nonprofit organizations.

Between election day in November 2000 and January 2001 when the next Congress convenes and the next president is inaugurated, participants in the interfaith network would solidify their relationships with newly elected and reelected U.S. representatives and senators, with holdover senators, with the next president, and with incoming cabinet members and executive staff as they are announced.

This year of preparation would place the interfaith community in a position to put constant pressure on the new president and Congress to implement serious measures moving toward the elimination of nuclear weapons. In 2001 and 2002 this might encompass (a) zero alert, (b) very deep cuts in strategic weapons (START III, START IV), and (c) strengthening the global non-proliferation regime. In 2003 and 2004 this effort would try to culminate in achieving a multilateral agreement for the complete and final elimination of all nuclear weapons on Earth. By then we would have in place a strong network manifesting strong public support for these ambitious measures so that Senate ratification of international treaties would be assured.

For this to happen substantial foundation support with a long-term commitment is essential. The present Interfaith Group for the CTBT could evolve into a steering committee for the interfaith network for nuclear disarmament, in the process broadening its participation. Two levels of funding are necessary. First would be to provide a small core staff to assist the steering committee, build connections in the interfaith network, and operate a web site. Annual budget

Ms. Kennette M. Benedict  
September 10, 1999  
Page three.

would be \$200,000. Secondly denominational offices and religious peace fellowships, now overburdened with many issues, need supplemental staff for outreach to their local churches, synagogues, and meetings and to their regional synods, conferences, and associations. This can be accomplished with grants of \$25,000 to \$50,000/year to twelve to fifteen entities (a total of \$500,000 to \$750,000 a year). These staff persons would work together to achieve a grassroots presence in all the states and every congressional district. This network would be linked through the internet, telephone, faxes, and regular mail. Through e-mail alerts, fax blasts, and telephone trees, rapid mobilization would be possible.

As is the case with the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, we would work closely with secular peace and disarmament organizations. For instance, representatives of 20/20 Vision, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Plutonium Challenge, and Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Danger regularly attend meetings of the Interfaith Group. They provide technical information and participate in strategic discussions, and we carry out joint activities. We also draw upon information provided by the Arms Control Association, Stimson Center, Council for a Livable World, Center for Defense Information, and other organizations. This is a reciprocal relationship, for these organizations realize that the faith community provides the broadest and strongest grassroots support for CTBT ratification. With substantial foundation support the faith community can continue working together among itself and with secular organizations to build effective public support for other measures of nuclear disarmament. This is the missing link in current efforts.

I will follow up this inquiry letter with a telephone call so that we can learn of your possible interest in our ideas. If you are interested in obtaining a third party perspective on the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, several references are attached.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

September 10, 1999

Ms. Edith T. Eddy, Executive Director  
Compton Foundation  
545 Middlefield Road, Suite 178,  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Dear Ms. Eddy:

I would like to inquire whether the Compton Foundation would consider making a substantial, five-year investment in the interfaith community in the United States for the purpose of mobilizing public support for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Particular emphasis would be upon developing and utilizing an interfaith action network that would function in every state and every congressional district. The purpose would be to provide timely information so that persons in the interfaith community can express their views to the President, other officers of the Executive Branch, and Congress on matters pertaining to nuclear disarmament.

This effort would build upon the experience of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which I chair and which is carrying out nationwide, grassroots mobilization to generate support for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (see enclosure). We have begun discussions on how to broaden this effort to encompass other issues of nuclear disarmament. Although this hasn't gone far enough to submit a formal request for a foundation grant, it would be helpful to have an indication of potential foundation support.

For decades prominent religious leaders and major religious denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Recently prominent retired military officers and civilian leaders have joined this call. Foundations like yours have invested millions of dollars in research on steps to contain nuclear weapons and reduce their numbers. Public opinion polls reveal strong support for nuclear disarmament. Yet, the official policy of the United States is to retain nuclear weapons forever and to resist international pressures for their elimination. This happens because of the lack of widespread, persistent, and vocal grassroots mobilization for nuclear disarmament.

During the past year or so several efforts have commenced to develop public support for nuclear abolition, such as the U.S. Campaign To Abolish Nuclear

Ms. Edith T. Eddy  
September 10, 1999  
Page two.

Weapons and Project Abolition, an initiative of the Fourth Freedom Forum. However, they have minimal involvement of the faith community. An effort is underway to develop a joint statement of religious and military leaders and to follow up with educational material for churches, but this lacks the vital element of mobilization of opinion, sharply focused on policy makers.

The nature of the challenge of nuclear disarmament requires a long-term commitment. Thus, we are talking about a five-year campaign, running from 2000 to 2004; it can be extended further if necessary. The year 2000 would encompass completion of Senate ratification of the CTBT, support for START III if it is negotiated, and pushing for de-alerting through executive action. But most importantly 2000 would be spent in expanding the grassroots interfaith network and establishing relationships with present and future members of Congress, the next president, and prospective officials of the next presidential administration.

To do this we would assist in the formation of interfaith groups working for nuclear disarmament in all 50 states and in as many congressional districts as possible in 2000. This would build upon some rudimentary networks we have in a number of states in the CTBT campaign. We would encourage state and local groups to be in touch with candidates running for the House of Representatives and the Senate, such as through nonpartisan questionnaires on pertinent issues and asking questions dealing with nuclear disarmament at campaign appearances. At the national level we would likewise be in touch with presidential candidates and their staffs. This would be accomplished with strict coherence to tax laws pertaining to nonprofit organizations.

Between election day in November 2000 and January 2001 when the next Congress convenes and the next president is inaugurated, participants in the interfaith network would solidify their relationships with newly elected and reelected U.S. representatives and senators, with holdover senators, with the next president, and with incoming cabinet members and executive staff as they are announced.

This year of preparation would place the interfaith community in a position to put constant pressure on the new president and Congress to implement serious measures moving toward the elimination of nuclear weapons. In 2001 and 2002 this might encompass (a) zero alert, (b) very deep cuts in strategic weapons (START III, START IV), and (c) strengthening the global non-proliferation regime. In 2003 and 2004 this effort would try to culminate in achieving a multilateral agreement for the complete and final elimination of all nuclear weapons on Earth. By then we would have in place a strong network manifesting strong public support for these ambitious measures so that Senate ratification of international treaties would be assured.

For this to happen substantial foundation support with a long-term commitment is essential. The present Interfaith Group for the CTBT could evolve into a steering committee for the interfaith network for nuclear disarmament, in the process broadening its participation. Two levels of funding are necessary. First would be to provide a small core staff to assist the steering committee, build connections in the interfaith network, and operate a web site. Annual budget

Ms. Edith T. Eddy  
September 10, 1999  
Page three.

would be \$200,000. Secondly denominational offices and religious peace fellowships, now overburdened with many issues, need supplemental staff for outreach to their local churches, synagogues, and meetings and to their regional synods, conferences, and associations. This can be accomplished with grants of \$25,000 to \$50,000/year to twelve to fifteen entities (a total of \$500,000 to \$750,000 a year). These staff persons would work together to achieve a grassroots presence in all the states and every congressional district. This network would be linked through the internet, telephone, faxes, and regular mail. Through e-mail alerts, fax blasts, and telephone trees, rapid mobilization would be possible.

As is the case with the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, we would work closely with secular peace and disarmament organizations. For instance, representatives of 20/20 Vision, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Plutonium Challenge, and Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Danger regularly attend meetings of the Interfaith Group. They provide technical information and participate in strategic discussions, and we carry out joint activities. We also draw upon information provided by the Arms Control Association, Stimson Center, Council for a Livable World, Center for Defense Information, and other organizations. This is a reciprocal relationship, for these organizations realize that the faith community provides the broadest and strongest grassroots support for CTBT ratification. With substantial foundation support the faith community can continue working together among itself and with secular organizations to build effective public support for other measures of nuclear disarmament. This is the missing link in current efforts.

I will follow up this inquiry letter with a telephone call so that we can learn of your possible interest in our ideas. If you are interested in obtaining a third party perspective on the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, several references are attached.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

September 22, 1999

Mr. Tony Blaylock  
Office of Senator Dorgan  
713 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Tony:

In preparation of today's meeting with Senator Dorgan on the CTBT, I have prepared the enclosed material about interfaith support for treaty ratification. It includes (1) a list of denominations and religious associations engaged in the ratification campaign, (2) a tentative listing of states and senators we will focus on intensely as soon as a vote is scheduled (in the meantime we are concentrating on a smaller list of key senators), (3) the membership of denominations, and (4) an indication of relative membership of denominations in the various states.

This information shows the widespread support we are capable of generating for Senate ratification of the CTBT when we enter the stage when a vote is scheduled. Thus, Senator Dorgan can be assured that the faith community is solidly behind his efforts to force a vote on the CTBT.

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**

September 23, 1999

To: Charlotte M. Johnson, Grants Manager  
Compton Foundatoin

Fax: 650 328-0171

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Ms. Johnson:

As requested, I have completed your proposal outline, including a project description. If you are interested in our ideas, we will be pleased to develop a more complete proposal.

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**

September 23, 1999

To: Marie Rietmann

Fax: 202 833-5307

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Marie:

Here is an up-to-date listing of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

## **Methodists United for Peace with Justice**

**6508 Wilmett Road  
Bethesda, MD 20817  
Phone/Fax: 301 896-0013  
E-mail: mupj@igc.apc.org**

September 7, 1999

The Honorable Paul S. Sarbanes  
309 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Attn: Vince Sanfuentes

Dear Senator Sarbanes:

In April a number of religious leaders in Maryland wrote you in support of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). They asked you to use your influence to achieve hearings on the treaty by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (copy of letter enclosed). As a follow up, several of us met with Vince Sanfuentes to discuss this matter.

Now that the Senate is back in session, I would like to repeat that request. Now is the moment for senators to insist that the CTBT be given fair consideration. It is inappropriate, indeed undemocratic, for one senator to block a treaty that is supported by 82 percent of the American people.

Specifically we urge you to speak out for the CTBT on the Senate floor. Please insist that hearings be held and that a vote be scheduled.

We note Senator Dorgan's leadership to achieve ratification of the CTBT. He has indicated that he may use Senator procedures to bring about an agreement for a scheduled vote on the CTBT. We asked you to join him in this endeavor.

I personally have appreciated your many years of service in the Senate. I hope that you can use your leadership skills to move the CTBT to a favorable vote for ratification.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

September 8, 1999

The Rev. Dr. Don Fortenberry  
Millsaps College  
Box 150803  
Jackson, MS 39210

Dear Don:

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

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

Senator Lott remains a key player because as majority leader he has the power to schedule a vote and to force Senator Helms to hold hearings. Because of that we are working with Marie Rietmann of 20/20 Vision and several denominational offices to distribute the enclosed flyer and petition to our contacts in Mississippi. We believe it would be valuable for the three bishops you work with to again contact Senator Lott and ask him to schedule a vote on the CTBT. This could be another letter (to S-230, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC 20510), or one of them could phone him directly at 202 224-3135. Sometimes senators return phone calls from prominent persons in their state. Even if Senator Lott doesn't, having a bishop leave a message reveals the persistent concern of the faith community for action on the CTBT.

If you need further information, please call me at 301 896-0013. Thanks for all you are doing.

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**

September 9, 1999

To: Tom Hart

Fax: 202 547-4457

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: CTBT Campaign

Dear Tom:

As I mentioned on the phone, there is a strong effort to break Senator Helms hold on the CTBT and get a Senate vote scheduled. Among others, Senator Dorgan has indicated that he will tie up the Senate unless a vote is scheduled.

That makes it very important for key senators to hear from their constituents in support of the treaty within the next two weeks . We are concentrating on senators and states shown on the attached list.

Would you please alert persons in your network in these states and make follow up calls to be assured that people are calling and writing their senators. If there are bishops in those states who might have a relationship with their senators, please have them call the senator directly.

Even if you have been in touch with these folks before and even though they have written their senators previously, we can be instructed by the story that Jesus told of the widow who kept going back to the judge until she received justice (Luke 18).

A flyer for the September 14 rally on the Capitol steps is also attached.

Thanks for your efforts.

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**

September 29, 1999

Dear Colleagues:

We want to continue building support for the CTBT in Mississippi and to get Mississippians to contact Senator Trent Lott to register their support for the treaty.

With that in mind Marie Rietmann at 20/20 Vision has developed the enclosed new postcard alert. She can supply you as many copies as you need. You might send some directly to people in Mississippi on your mailing list. You may also want to get in touch with your key contacts in that state and offer to supply them with cards for their own mailing lists.

To order cards, call Marie at 202 833-2020. If she is unavailable, ask for Don Koslofsky.

Thanks for your continued efforts,

Howard W. Hallman