

X-Sender: dkimball@[209.8.25.194]
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0 (32)
Date: Wed, 13 Oct 1999 14:05:53 -0400
To: dkimball@clw.org
From: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
Subject: Staying on Message -- PLZ READ

October 13, 1999, 1:50pm

TO: CTBT supporters and friends
FR: Daryl Kimball

RE: suggestions about our message/statements abt. CTBT

One way or another, it looks certain the Senate will decide today to either postpone action on the CTBT or hold a vote and probably defeat the Treaty. At this hour the direction of events is very uncertain. Be prepared for either scenario.

Each and every one of you have done an incredible job in the days since the vote was scheduled. We are about to move into a new phase of the effort for the CTBT.

I would like to kindly offer some talking points for our community in anticipation of calls from reporters, supporters, friends and foes.

Below are 4 public/press messages that we will be emphasizing here at the Coalition office:

- * the SENATE has failed to ratify the CTBT and this failure of leadership will undermine U.S. and international security by giving a green light to other nations to conduct nuclear tests. Prolonged postponement of ratification will also have serious consequences.
- * Senator Lott and other extremist Senators have rushed to judgement on the Test Ban Treaty and played a petty partisan game with a matter that affects the survival of the planet.
- * The postponement/rejection of the Treaty contradicts the will of the American people, our nation's leading military and scientific officials, and the views of our closest allies.
- * Treaty advocates will not relent in our fight to prevent the resumption of nuclear testing by the U.S. or other nations and reduce the threat of nuclear proliferation and nuclear war

I urge each of you to refrain from statements that assign blame anywhere else but the Senate, not even the White House. Why? Because in my personal view, such statements -- true or not -- only undermine our cause and invite strong criticism of our own effort. Reporters will be asking you the "what happened" and question -- be careful not to take the bait. We have all supported the aggressive strategy to bring the CTBT to the fore, but it is

the SENATE that has in the end made the decision to either postpone or reject the Treaty.

Also attached below are two different versions of the press release that we will distribute publicly after a resolution of the question. Further points are contained therein. The first addresses the "postponement" scenario and the second addresses the "rejection" scenario.

Also, please look for a message on your email and your fax inviting you to a "looking back/evaluation" meeting for CTBT supporters, which will be held this Friday at 9:30 at the 7th floor conference room at UCS (1616 P Street NW).

DK

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT -- N E W S R E L E A S E

Senate Failure to Approve Test Ban Treaty Is Setback to Global Non-Proliferation Efforts: CTBT Proponents Vow to Continue Campaign

For Release: October 13, 1999

(WASHINGTON, DC) Today, the Senate agreed to postpone consideration of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), to hold comprehensive hearings on the subject in relevant committees, but not to take up the issue next year barring unforeseen changes in the international situation.

"The failure of the Senate to ratify the CTBT this week sends a dangerous signal to those states who seek to acquire and further develop nuclear weapons," said Daryl Kimball, Executive Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, an alliance of 17 leading nuclear non-proliferation and arms control organizations that has been working to secure approval of the treaty. "Treaty advocates will continue to press for U.S. approval of the CTBT and global entry into force of this vital measure," added Kimball. "It is crucial to recognize that after two years of inaction, the Senate has finally agreed to begin the process of carefully considering the Test Ban — the central purpose of the most recent efforts by Treaty proponents," said Kimball.

"Senator Lott and other extremist critics who have rushed to judgement on the Test Ban Treaty appear to have come to their senses and recognized that rejection of the Treaty would undermine U.S. and international security by giving a green light to other nations to conduct nuclear tests," said Daryl Kimball. "It is important that the Senate has not foreclosed the possibility that it will reconsider the Test Ban Treaty when support for the Treaty is sufficient to secure its approval or if international circumstances warrant," he added. "The overthrow of the Pakistani government this week underscores the importance of establishing effective nuclear restraint measures, including the Test Ban Treaty, in South Asia and elsewhere," noted Kimball.

"Rejection of the Test Ban Treaty by the Senate would have unraveled the

fabric of the international nuclear non-proliferation regime and would leave the door open to other states — like India, Pakistan, Russia and China — to resume nuclear testing," said Thomas Graham, Jr., President of the Lawyers Alliance for World Security and former U.S. Ambassador responsible for securing the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1995. The extension of the NPT was secured on the basis of a commitment to conclude the CTBT.

Indefinite postponement of U.S. ratification of the Test Ban Treaty also has serious and damaging consequences. "It is in the national interest that the President and Senators to stop nuclear testing and proliferation and to approve the Test Ban Treaty in a timely manner," noted Tom Collina, Director of Arms Control and International Security Programs for the Union of Concerned Scientists. "The longer the United States takes to ratify and help implement the Treaty, the more likely it is that one nation may break the existing test moratorium and set in motion a dangerous political and military chain reaction of events that undermines international security," he added.

The CTBT was concluded in September of 1996. Since then 154 nations have signed the pact, which would ban all nuclear weapon test explosions, set up a far-ranging international monitoring system, and allow for short-notice, on-site inspections to ensure compliance. A set of 44 states must ratify the Treaty before it formally enters into force. Thus far, 51 nations have ratified, including 26 of the 44 needed for entry into force. A total of 41 of the 44 key states have signed. Two more — India and Pakistan — have made conditional pledges to sign, but are very unlikely to do so if the U.S. continues to delay ratification of the CTBT.

###

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is an alliance of 17 nuclear non-proliferation and arms control organizations committed to a practical, step-by-step program of action to reduce nuclear dangers.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT -- N E W S R E L E A S E

"Senate Rejection of Test Ban Treaty Is Setback to Nuclear Non-Proliferation Efforts: CTBT Proponents Vow to Continue Campaign"

For Release: October 13, 1999

(WASHINGTON, DC) Today, the Senate failed give its approval to ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) by largely party-line vote of XX-YY.

"The failure of the Senate to ratify the CTBT is a damaging blow to the national security of the United States that will be felt for years to come. The Senate's historic blunder sends a dangerous signal to those states who seek to acquire and further develop nuclear weapons," said Daryl Kimball, Executive Director of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, an alliance of 17 leading nuclear non-proliferation and arms control organizations that

has been working to secure approval of the treaty. "Treaty advocates will not relent in our fight to prevent the resumption of nuclear testing by the U.S. or other nations and to press for the implementation of this vital measure," added Kimball.

"Senator Lott and other extremist critics have rushed to judgement on the Test Ban Treaty and played a petty partisan game with a matter that affects the survival of the planet. The rejection of the Treaty contradicts the will of the American people, our nation's leading military and scientific officials, and the views of our closest allies. Rejection of the Test Ban Treaty will undermine U.S. and international security by giving a green light to other nations to conduct nuclear tests," said Daryl Kimball.

"The overthrow of the Pakistani government this week underscores the importance of establishing effective nuclear restraint measures, including the Test Ban Treaty, in South Asia and elsewhere," noted Kimball.

"Rejection of the Test Ban Treaty by the Senate could unravel the fabric of the international nuclear non-proliferation regime and it leaves the door open to other states — like India, Pakistan, Russia and China — to resume nuclear testing," said Thomas Graham, Jr., President of the Lawyers Alliance for World Security and former U.S. Ambassador responsible for securing the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1995. The extension of the NPT was secured on the basis of a commitment to conclude the CTBT.

Despite the setback, Treaty proponents note that the CTBT can be brought back again for approval when the Senate is not so poisoned by partisan strife and that the U.S. will not conduct nuclear tests any time in the near future. "The United States does not need to conduct nuclear tests to maintain the arsenal or to make new warhead types. In fact, the Joint Chiefs of Staff foresee no need for the production of new types of nuclear warheads and the nuclear laboratory directors have said the arsenal can be maintained without nuclear explosive tests," noted Tom Collina, Director of Arms Control and International Security Programs for the Union of Concerned Scientists. "There is sufficient support in the Senate and the House to block any attempt to renew U.S. nuclear testing," he added.

The CTBT was concluded in September of 1996. Since then 154 nations have signed the pact, which would ban all nuclear weapon test explosions, set up a far-ranging international monitoring system, and allow for short-notice, on-site inspections to ensure compliance. Two more nations — India and Pakistan — have made conditional pledges to sign, but are very unlikely to do so given the Senate rejection of the CTBT.

###

The Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers is an alliance of 17 nuclear non-proliferation and arms control organizations committed to a practical, step-by-step program of action to reduce nuclear dangers.

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

To: Daryl Kimball <dkimball@clw.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Staying on Message -- PLZ READ
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <3.0.32.19991013140552.0075f508@[209.8.25.194]>
References:

At 02:05 PM 10/13/99 -0400, you wrote:

>October 13, 1999, 1:50pm

>

>TO: CTBT supporters and friends

>FR: Daryl Kimball

>

>RE: suggestions about our message/statements abt. CTBT

>

>

Daryl,

Thanks for your suggestions. Personally I have doubts about our attacking "Senator Lott and other extremists senators". The press and informed readers know who defeated the treaty, so we don't need to indulge in partisan attacks. Furthermore, we were seriously damaged by senators who should have been our supportives, such as Senators Lugar and Domenici. We were also hurt by White House disinterest for two years and two weeks. I agree we shouldn't cast blame on the White House. Attacking Lott and the other extremists may "feel good", it doesn't gain us anything.

Shalom,
Howard

From: Josh Noble <jnoble@ReligiousAction.ORG>
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>, ograbc@aol.com,
Jim Matlack
<denhartz@erols.com>, washofc@aol.com,
ann_d.parti@ecunet.org, heathern@nccusa.org, tom.hart@ecunet.org,
jmskipper@aol.com, epf@igc.org, disarm@forusa.org, joe@fcnl.org,
kathy@fcnl.org, rachel@fcnl.org, sara@fcnl.org, mark.brown@ecunet.org,
J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org, mknolldc@igc.org, jsammon@networklobby.org,
network@igc.org, dave@paxchristiusa.org, Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org,
lwyolton@prodigy.net, uuawo@aol.com, jnoble@uahc.org, lintnerj@ucc.org,
Dringler@umc-gbcs.org, gpowers@nccbuscc.org
Subject: RE: CTBT follow-up
Date: Wed, 13 Oct 1999 14:07:48 -0400
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2232.9)

I have not formally met everyone yet. So, I am josh noble at the Religious Action Center.

Having our constituents/networks make follow up calls either thanking or expressing disapproval with their senator is asking too much of our network. We might want to send a letter or post something on our internet sites thanking our individual members for their support and action in recent weeks (something similar to what is currently circulating via e-mail).

I assume that most organizations will be releasing individual press releases in reaction to a vote or postponement. Perhaps, collectively as a coalition, a press release should be issue.

Josh Noble

Legislative Assistant
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism
2027 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington DC, 20036
202-387-2800 (ph)
(202-667-9070 (fax)
jnoble@religiousaction.org
<http://rj.org/rac>

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 1999 8:18 AM
To: ograbc@aol.com; Jim Matlack; washofc@aol.com;
ann_d.parti@ecunet.org; heathern@nccusa.org; tom.hart@ecunet.org;
jmskipper@aol.com; epf@igc.org; disarm@forusa.org; joe@fcnl.org;
kathy@fcnl.org; rachel@fcnl.org; sara@fcnl.org; mark.brown@ecunet.org;
J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org; mknolldc@igc.org; jsammon@networklobby.org;
network@igc.org; dave@paxchristiusa.org; Walter_Owensby@pcusa.org;
lwyolton@prodigy.net; uuawo@aol.com; jnoble@uahc.org; lintnerj@ucc.org;
Dringler@umc-gbcs.org; gpowers@nccbuscc.org; mupj@igc.org
Subject: CTBT follow-up

Dear Colleagues:

The fate of the CTBT in this round will be determined this afternoon. The alternative outcome will apparently be either outright disapproval or postponement until 2001. Neither is what we wanted.

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT will have its monthly meeting next Tuesday, October 19 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m. at the FCNL conference room. This will give us an opportunity to assess our work during the past two years, discuss why we were unsuccessful, and consider what we might do next. Meanwhile, I would like an e-mail exchange on what our immediate follow-up might be.

For discussion purposes, I suggest we might consider having our grassroots folks make one more set of contacts with their senators to (a) thank those who supported treaty ratification, especially Senators Specter and Jeffords, and (b) express disappointment with those who opposed the treaty or who were ready to vote against ratification (if there is no vote).

If there is a vote, we will know the score. If not, we know the opponents who spoke up in the Senate, but many senators did not publicly announce their position. We should therefore work with organizations in the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers to find out how senators would have voted. If we cannot find this out from their offices in Washington, we should have our grassroots contact the senators to ask them how they would have voted.

What do you think of this approach? What other ideas do you have for immediate follow-up? Please "reply to all".

I will offer some ideas on where we go from here in a separate message. Please offer your own views prior to our meeting on October 19.

Shalom,
Howard

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

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

Swing Vote Senators on the CTBT

Address letters to the senator at:

Senate Office Building

Washington, DC 20510

State	Senator	Office Building	Telephone
Alaska	Frank Murkowski	322 Hart	(202) 224-6665
	Ted Stevens	522 Hart	(202) 224-3004
Arizona	John McCain	241 Russell	(202) 224-2235
Colorado	Wayne Allard	513 Hart	(202) 224-5941
	Ben Nighthorse Campbell	380 Russell	(202) 224-5852
Delaware	William Roth, Jr.	104 Hart	(202) 224-2441
Florida	Connie Mack	517 Hart	(202) 224-5274
Georgia	Paul Coverdell	200 Russell	(202) 224-3643
Idaho	Mike Crapo	111 Russell	(202) 224-6142
Indiana	Richard Lugar	306 Hart	(202) 224-4814
Illinois	Peter Fitzgerald	555 Dirksen	(202) 224-2854
Iowa	Chuck Grassley	135 Hart	(202) 224-3744
Kansas	Sam Brownback	303 Hart	(202) 224-6521
	Pat Roberts	302 Hart	(202) 224-4774
Kentucky	Jim Bunning	818 Hart	(202) 224-4343
	Mitch McConnell	361-A Russell	(202) 224-2541
Maine	Susan Collins	172 Russell	(202) 224-2523
	Olympia Snowe	250 Russell	(202) 224-5344
Michigan	Spencer Abraham	329 Dirksen	(202) 224-4822
Minnesota	Rod Grams	257 Dirksen	(202) 224-3244
Missouri	John Ashcroft	316 Hart	(202) 224-6154
	Christopher Bond	274 Dirksen	(202) 224-5721
Montana	Conrad Burns	187 Dirksen	(202) 224-2644
Nebraska	Charles Hagel	346 Russell	(202) 224-4224
New Hampshire	Judd Gregg	393 Russell	(202) 224-3324
New Mexico	Pete Domenici	328 Hart	(202) 224-6621
Ohio	Mike DeWine	140 Russell	(202) 224-2315
	George Voinovich	317 Hart	(202) 224-3353
Oregon	Gordon Smith	404 Russell	(202) 224-3753
Pennsylvania	Rick Santorum	120 Russell	(202) 224-6324
South Carolina	Strom Thurmond	217 Russell	(202) 224-5972
Tennessee	William Frist	567 Dirksen	(202) 224-3344
	Fred Thompson	523 Dirksen	(202) 224-4944
Texas	Kay Bailey Hutchinson	284 Russell	(202) 224-5922
Utah	Robert Bennett	431 Dirksen	(202) 224-5444
	Orrin Hatch	131 Dirksen	(202) 224-5251
Virginia	John Warner	225 Russell	(202) 224-2023
Washington	Slade Gorton	730 Hart	(202) 224-3441
Wyoming	Mike Enzi	290 Russell	(202) 224-3424
	Craig Thomas	109 Hart	(202) 224-6441

Senator Field Office Phone Numbers-106th Congress
StateSenatorOfficesTelephone

ALASKA Ted Stevens Anchorage 907/271-5915
Fairbanks 907/456-0261
Juneau 907/586-7400
Kenai 907/283-5808
Ketchikan 907/225-6880
Wasilla 907/376-7665
Frank Murkowski Anchorage 907/271-3735
Fairbanks 907/456-0233
Juneau 907/586-7400
Kenai 907/283-5808
Ketchikan 907/225-6880
Wasilla 907/376-7665
ALABAMA Jeff Sessions Birmingham 205/731-1500
Huntsville 205/533-0979
Montgomery 334/265-9507
Mobile 334/690-3167
ALABAMA Richard Shelby Birmingham 205/731-1384
Tuscaloosa 205/759-5047
Mobile 334/694-4164
Montgomery 334/223-7303
ARKANSAS Tim Hutchinson Little Rock 501/324-6336
Jonesboro 870/935-3121
Blanche Lincoln Little Rock 501/324-6286
Jonesboro 870/910-6896
Texarkana
Monticello
Fort Smith
ARIZONA John Kyl Phoenix 602/840-1811
Tucson 520/575-8633
John McCain Mesa 602/491-4300
Phoenix 602/952-2410
Tucson 520/670-6334
CALIFORNIA Barbara Boxer San Francisco 415/403-0100
El Segundo 310/414-5700
Fresno 209/497-5109
San Diego 619/239-3884
San Bernardino 909/888-8525
Sacramento 916/448-2787
Dianne Feinstein San Francisco 415/536-6868
San Diego 619/231-9712
Los Angeles 310/914-7300
Fresno 209/485-7430
COLORADO Ben Campbell Denver 303/866-1900
Grand Junction 970/241-6631
Fort Collins 970/224-1909
Pueblo 719/542-6987
Colorado Springs 719/636-9092
Wayne Allard Englewood 303/220-7414
Colorado Springs 719/634-6071
Pueblo 719/545-9751
Grand Junction 970/245-9553
Greeley 970/351-7582
CONNECTICUT Chris Dodd Weathersfield 860/258-6940
Joe Lieberman Hartford 860/549-8463
DELAWARE Joe Biden Wilmington 302/573-6345
Dover 302/678-9483

Georgetown302/856-9689
Bill RothWilmington302/573-6291
Dover302/674-3308
Georgetown302/856-7690
FLORIDABob GrahamTallahassee850/422-6100
Miami305/536-7293
Tampa813/228-2476
Connie MackTampa813/225-7683
Fort Myers941/275-6252
Miami305/530-7100
Tallahassee850/425-1995
Pensacola850/438-8875
Jacksonville904/268-7915
GEORGIAMax ClelandAtlanta404/331-4811
Columbus706/649-7705
Savannah914/652-4687
Albany912/430-7796
Paul CoverdellAtlanta404/347-2202
Augusta706/722-0032
Dalton706/226-1925
Columbus706/322-7920
Savannah912/238-3244
Moultrie912/985-8113
Macon912/742-0205
HAWAIIDaniel InouyeHonolulu808/541-2542
Hilo808/935-0844
Lihue808/245-4610
Daniel AkakaHonolulu808/522-8970
Hilo808/935-1114
IDAHOLarry CraigBoise208/342-7985
Coeur d'Alene208/667-6130
Pocatello208/236-6817
Twin Falls208/734-6780
Idaho Falls208/523-5541
Lewiston208/743-0792
Mike CrapoBoise208/334-1776
Coeur d'Alene208/664-5490
Pocatello208/236-6775
Twin Falls208/734-2515
Idaho Falls208/522-9779
Lewiston208/743-1492
Caldwell208/455-0360
ILLINOISPeter FitzgeraldChicago312/886-3506
Springfield217/492-5089
Others to be determined
Dick DurbinChicago312/353-4952
Springfield217/492-4062
Mt. Vernon618/457-3653
INDIANADick LugarIndianapolis317/226-5555
Merrillville219/736-9084
Ft. Wayne219/422-1505
Jeffersonville812/288-3377
Evansville812/465-6313
Evan BayhIndianapolis317/554-0750
Fort Wayne219/426-3151
Jeffersonville812/218-2317
Evansville
Gary

IOWA Chuck Grassley Waterloo 319/232-6657
Davenport 319/322-4331
Cedar Rapids 319/363-6832
Des Moines 515/284-4890
Sioux City 712/233-1860
Council Bluffs 712/322-7103
Tom Harkin Des Moines 515/284-4574
Cedar Rapids 319/365-4504
Davenport 319/322-1338
Dubuque 319/582-2130
Sioux City 712/252-1550
KANSAS Sam Brownback Topeka 913/233-2503
Overland Park 913/492-6378
Pittsburg 316/231-6040
Wichita 316/264-8066
Garden City 316/275-1124
Pat Roberts Dodge City 316/227-2244
Wichita 316/263-0416
Prairie Village 913/648-3103
Topeka 913/295-2745
KENTUCKY Mitch McConnell Louisville 502/582-6304
Bowling Green 502/781-1673
Paducah 502/442-4554
London 606/864-2026
Lexington 606/224-8286
Jim Bunning Ft. Wright 606/341-2602
Owensboro 502/689-9085
Others to be determined
LOUISIANA Jim Breaux New Orleans 504/589-2531
Baton Rouge 504/382-2050
Lafayette 318/262-6871
Monroe 318/325-3320
Mary Landrieu New Orleans 504/589-2427
Baton Rouge 504/389-0395
Shreveport 318/676-3085
Lake Charles 318/436-6650
MAINE Olympia Snowe Portland 207/874-0883
Bangor 207/945-0432
Auburn 207/786-2451
Augusta 207/622-8292
Biddeford 207/282-4144
Presque Isle 207/764-5124
Susan Collins Bangor 207/945-0417
Augusta 207/622-8414
Biddeford 207/283-1101
Lewiston 207/874-6969
Portland 207/780-3575
Caribou 207/493-7873
MARYLAND Paul Sarbanes Baltimore 410/962-4436
Salisbury 410/860-2131
Silver Spring 301/589-0797
Cumberland 301/724-0695
Cobb Island 301/259-2404
Barbara Mikulski Baltimore 410/962-4510
Annapolis 410/263-1805
Salisbury 410/546-7711
College Park 301/345-5517
Hagerstown 301/797-2826

MASSACHUSETTS John Kerry Boston 617/565-8519
Fall River 508/677-0522
Springfield 413/785-4610
Worcester 508/831-7380
Ted Kennedy Boston 617/565-3170
MICHIGAN Spencer Abraham Grand Rapids 616/975-1112
Lansing 517/484-1984
Saginaw 517/752-4400
Southfield 810/350-0510
Marquette 906/226-9466
Carl Levin Saginaw 517/754-2494
Alpena 517/354-5520
Lansing 517/377-1509
Escanaba 906/789-0052
Grand Rapids 616/456-2531
Traverse City 616/947-9569
Detroit 313/226-6020
Southgate 313/285-8596
Warren 810/573-9145
MINNESOTA Paul Wellstone St. Paul 612/645-0325
Willmar 320/231-0001
Virginia 218/741-1074
Rod Grams Anoka 612/427-5921
MISSISSIPPI Trent Lott Jackson 601/965-4644
Pascagoula 601/762-5400
Gulfport 601/863-1988
Oxford 601/234-3774
Greenwood 601/453-5681
Thad Cochran Jackson 601/965-4459
Oxford 601/236-1018
MISSOURI Kit Bond St. Louis 314/727-7773
Jefferson City 573/634-2488
Cape Girardeau 573/334-7044
Springfield 417/881-7068
John Aschcroft Jefferson City 573-634-2488
MONTANA Max Baucus Helena 406/449-5480
Missoula 406/329-3123
Billings 406/657-6790
Butte 406/782-8700
Great Falls 406/761-1574
Bozeman 406/586-6104
Kalispell 406/756-1150
Conrad Burns Helena 406/449-5401
Billings 406/252-0550
Missoula 406/329-3528
Great Falls 406/452-9585
Glendive 406/365-2391
Bozeman 406/586-4450
Butte 406/725-3277
Kalispell 406/257-3360
NEBRASKA Chuck Hagel Lincoln 402/476-1400
Omaha 402/758-8981
North Platte 308/534-2006
Scottsbluff 308/632-6032
Kearney 308/236-7602
Bob Kerrey Omaha 402/391-3411
Lincoln 402/437-5246
Scottsbluff 308/632-3595

NEVADA Harry Reid Las Vegas 702/474-0041
Reno 702/686-5750
Carson City 702/882-7343
Richard Bryan Reno 702/686-5770
Carson City 702/885-9111
Las Vegas 702/388-6605
NEW HAMPSHIRE Judd Gregg Concord 603/225-7115
Manchester 603/622-7979
Portsmouth 603/431-2171
Berlin 603/752-2604
Robert Smith Manchester 603/634-5000
Portsmouth 603/433-1667
Berlin 603/752-2600
NEW JERSEY Frank Lautenberg Newark 201/645-3030
Barrington 609/757-5353
Robert Torricelli Newark 973/624-5555
Bellmawr 609/933-2245
NEW MEXICO Pete Domenici Albuquerque 505/766-3481
Roswell 505/623-6170
Santa Fe 505/988-6511
Las Cruces 505/526-5475
Jeff Bingaman Santa Fe 505/988-6647
Albuquerque 505/766-3636
Roswell 505/622-7113
Las Cruces 505/523-6561
Las Vegas 505/454-8824
NEW YORK Pat Moynihan Manhattan 212/661-5150
Oneonta 607/433-2310
Buffalo 716/551-4097
Chuck Schumer Manhattan 212/486-4430
Buffalo 716/846-4111
Rochester 716/263-5866
Albany 518/431-4070

Syracuse 315/423-5471

Binghamton

N. CAROLINA John Edwards Raleigh 919/856-4245
Others to be determined
Jesse Helms Raleigh 919/856-4630
Hickory 704/322-5170
NORTH DAKOTA Byron Dorgan Fargo 701/239-5389
Bismarck 701/250-4618
Minot 701/852-0703
Kent Conrad Bismarck 701/258-4648
Minot 701/852-0703
Grand Forks 701/775-9601
Fargo 701/232-8030
OHIO Mike DeWine Cincinnati 513/763-8260
Columbus 614/469-6774
Marietta 614/373-2317
Cleveland 216/522-7272
Toledo 419/259-7535
Xenia 937/376-3080
George Voinovich Columbus 614/469-6697
Cleveland 216/522-7095
Cincinnati 513/684-3265
Toledo

OKLAHOMADon NicklesOklahoma City405/231-4941
Ponca City405/767-1270
Lawton405/357-9878
Tulsa918/581-7651
Jim InhofeTulsa918/748-5111
McAlester918/426-0933
Oklahoma City405/231-4381
Enid405/234-5105
OREGONGordon SmithPortland503/326-3386
Pendleton541/278-1129
Medford541/608-9102
Eugene541/465-6750
Bend541/318-1298
Ron WydenPortland503/326-7525
Eugene541/431-0229
Medford541/858-5122
La Grande541/962-7691
Bend541/330-9142
Salem503/589-4555
PENNSYLVANIARick SantorumPhiladelphia215/864-6900
Pittsburgh412/562-0533
Erie814/454-7114
Altoona814/946-7023
Harrisburg717/231-7540
Scranton717/344-8799
Allentown610/770-0142
Arlen SpecterPhiladelphia215/597-7200
Allentown610/434-1444
Pittsburgh412/644-3400
Erie814/453-3010
Harrisburg717/782-3951
Scranton717/346-2006
Wilkes-Barre717/826-6265
RHODE ISLANDJohn ChafeeProvidence401/528-5294
Jack ReedCranston401/943-3100
Providence401/528-5200
S. CAROLINAStrom ThurmondColumbia803/765-5494
Aiken803/649-2591
Charleston803/727-4282
Florence803/662-8873
Fritz HollingsColumbia803/765-5731
Charleston803/727-4525
Spartanburg864/585-3702
Greenville864/233-5366
SOUTH DAKOTATom DaschleSioux Falls605/334-9596
Rapid City605/348-7551
Aberdeen605/225-8823
Tim JohnsonSioux Falls605/332-8896
Rapid City605/341-3990
Aberdeen605/226-3440
TENNESSEEBill FristNashville615/352-9411
Chattanooga423/894-2203
Knoxville423/602-7977
Kingsport423/323-1252
Memphis901/683-1910
Jackson901/424-9655
Fred ThompsonNashville615/736-5129
Knoxville423/545-4253

Chattanooga423/752-5337
Blountville423/325-6217
Memphis901/544-4224
Jackson901/423-9344
TEXASPhil GrammDallas214/767-3000
Tyler903/593-0902
San Antonio120/366-9494
Harlingen210/423-6118
Houston713/718-4000
Lubbock806/743-7533
El Paso915/534-6896
Kay HutchinsonAbilene915/676-2839
Austin512/916-5834
Dallas214/361-3500
Houston713/653-3456
San Antonio210/340-2885
UTAHRobert BennettSalt Lake City801/524-5933
Provo801/379-2525
Ogden801/625-5676
St. George801/628-5514
Orrin HatchSalt Lake City801/524-4380
Provo801/375-7881
Ogden801/625-5672
Cedar City801/586-8435
St. George801/634-1795
VIRGINIAJohn WarnerRichmond804/771-2579
Norfolk757/441-3079
Abingdon540/628-8158
Roanoke540/857-2676
Chuck RobbRichmond804/771-2221
Norfolk757/441-3124
Danville804/791-0330
Roanoke540/985-0130
Clintwood540/926-4104
VERMONTJim JeffordsMontpelier802/223-5273
Rutland802/773-3875
Burlington802/658-6001
Pat LeahyBurlington802/863-2523
Montpelier802/229-0569
WASHINGTONSlade GortonBellevue425/451-0103
Vancouver360/696-7838
Spokane509/353-2507
Wenatchee509/884-1266
Yakima509/248-8084
Kennewick509/783-0640
Lakewood253/581-1646
Patty MurraySeattle206/553-5545
Vancouver360/696-7797
Spokane509/624-9515
Yakima509/453-7462
Everett425/259-6515
WEST VIRGINIARobert ByrdCharleston304/342-5855
Jay RockefellerCharleston304/347-5372
Beckley304/253-9704
Fairmont304/367-0122
WISCONSINHerb KohlMilwaukee414/297-4451
Appleton920/738-1640
Madison608/264-5338

Eau Claire715/832-8424
Russ FeingoldMiddleton608/828-1200
La Crosse608/782-5585
Milwaukee414/276-7282
Green Bay414/465-7508
Wausau715/848-5660
WYOMINGCraig ThomasCasper307/261-6413
Cheyenne307/772-2451
Rock Springs307/362-5012
Riverton307/856-6642
Sheridan307/672-6456
Mike EnziGillette307/682-6268
Cheyenne307/772-2477
Casper307/261-6572
Cody307/527-9444
Jackson307/739-9507

Compiled by Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision,

Senator Field Office Phone Numbers-106th Congress

StateSenatorOfficesTelephone

ALASKA Ted Stevens Anchorage 907/271-5915

Fairbanks 907/456-0261

Juneau 907/586-7400

Kenai 907/283-5808

Ketchikan 907/225-6880

Wasilla 907/376-7665

Frank Murkowski Anchorage 907/271-3735

Fairbanks 907/456-0233

Juneau 907/586-7400

Kenai 907/283-5808

Ketchikan 907/225-6880

Wasilla 907/376-7665

ALABAMA Jeff Sessions Birmingham 205/731-1500

Huntsville 205/533-0979

Montgomery 334/265-9507

Mobile 334/690-3167

ALABAMA Richard Shelby Birmingham 205/731-1384

Tuscaloosa 205/759-5047

Mobile 334/694-4164

Montgomery 334/223-7303

ARKANSAS Tim Hutchinson Little Rock 501/324-6336

Jonesboro 870/935-3121

Blanche Lincoln Little Rock 501/324-6286

Jonesboro 870/910-6896

Texarkana

Monticello

Fort Smith

ARIZONA John Kyl Phoenix 602/840-1811

Tucson 520/575-8633

John McCain Mesa 602/491-4300

Phoenix 602/952-2410

Tucson 520/670-6334

CALIFORNIA Barbara Boxer San Francisco 415/403-0100

El Segundo 310/414-5700

Fresno 209/497-5109

San Diego 619/239-3884

San Bernardino 909/888-8525

Sacramento 916/448-2787

Dianne Feinstein San Francisco 415/536-6868

San Diego 619/231-9712

Los Angeles 310/914-7300

Fresno 209/485-7430

COLORADO Ben Campbell Denver 303/866-1900

Grand Junction 970/241-6631

Fort Collins 970/224-1909

Pueblo 719/542-6987

Colorado Springs 719/636-9092

Wayne Allard Englewood 303/220-7414

Colorado Springs 719/634-6071

Pueblo 719/545-9751

Grand Junction 970/245-9553

Greeley970/351-7582
CONNECTICUTChris DoddWeathersfield860/258-6940
Joe LiebermanHartford860/549-8463
DELAWAREJoe BidenWilmington302/573-6345
Dover302/678-9483
Georgetown302/856-9689
Bill RothWilmington302/573-6291
Dover302/674-3308
Georgetown302/856-7690
FLORIDABob GrahamTallahassee850/422-6100
Miami305/536-7293
Tampa813/228-2476
Connie MackTampa813/225-7683
Fort Myers941/275-6252
Miami305/530-7100
Tallahassee850/425-1995
Pensacola850/438-8875
Jacksonville904/268-7915
GEORGIAMax ClelandAtlanta404/331-4811
Columbus706/649-7705
Savannah914/652-4687
Albany912/430-7796
Paul CoverdellAtlanta404/347-2202
Augusta706/722-0032
Dalton706/226-1925
Columbus706/322-7920
Savannah912/238-3244
Moultrie912/985-8113
Macon912/742-0205
HAWAIIDaniel InouyeHonolulu808/541-2542
Hilo808/935-0844
Lihue808/245-4610
Daniel AkakaHonolulu808/522-8970
Hilo808/935-1114
IDAHOLarry CraigBoise208/342-7985
Coeur d'Alene208/667-6130
Pocatello208/236-6817
Twin Falls208/734-6780
Idaho Falls208/523-5541
Lewiston208/743-0792
Mike CrapoBoise208/334-1776
Coeur d'Alene208/664-5490
Pocatello208/236-6775
Twin Falls208/734-2515
Idaho Falls208/522-9779
Lewiston208/743-1492
Caldwell208/455-0360
ILLINOISPeter FitzgeraldChicago312/886-3506
Springfield217/492-5089
Others to be determined
Dick DurbinChicago312/353-4952
Springfield217/492-4062
Mt. Vernon618/457-3653
INDIANADick LugarIndianapolis317/226-5555

Merrillville219/736-9084
Ft. Wayne219/422-1505
Jeffersonville812/288-3377
Evansville812/465-6313
Evan BayhIndianapolis317/554-0750
Fort Wayne219/426-3151
Jeffersonville812/218-2317
Evansville
Gary
IOWAChuck GrassleyWaterloo319/232-6657
Davenport319/322-4331
Cedar Rapids319/363-6832
Des Moines515/284-4890
Sioux City712/233-1860
Council Bluffs712/322-7103
Tom HarkinDes Moines515/284-4574
Cedar Rapids319/365-4504
Davenport319/322-1338
Dubuque319/582-2130
Sioux City712/252-1550
KANSASSam BrownbackTopeka913/233-2503
Overland Park913/492-6378
Pittsburg316/231-6040
Wichita316/264-8066
Garden City316/275-1124
Pat RobertsDodge City316/227-2244
Wichita316/263-0416
Prairie Village913/648-3103
Topeka913/295-2745
KENTUCKYMitch McConnellLouisville502/582-6304
Bowling Green502/781-1673
Paducah502/442-4554
London606/864-2026
Lexington606/224-8286
Jim BunningFt. Wright606/341-2602
Owensboro502/689-9085
Others to be determined
LOUISIANAJim BreauxNew Orleans504/589-2531
Baton Rouge504/382-2050
Lafayette318/262-6871
Monroe318/325-3320
Mary LandrieuNew Orleans504/589-2427
Baton Rouge504/389-0395
Shreveport318/676-3085
Lake Charles318/436-6650
MAINEOlympia SnowePortland207/874-0883
Bangor207/945-0432
Auburn207/786-2451
Augusta207/622-8292
Biddeford207/282-4144
Presque Isle207/764-5124
Susan CollinsBangor207/945-0417
Augusta207/622-8414
Biddeford207/283-1101

Lewiston207/874-6969
Portland207/780-3575
Caribou207/493-7873
MARYLANDPaul SarbanesBaltimore410/962-4436
Salisbury410/860-2131
Silver Spring301/589-0797
Cumberland301/724-0695
Cobb Island301/259-2404
Barbara MikulskiBaltimore410/962-4510
Annapolis410/263-1805
Salisbury410/546-7711
College Park301/345-5517
Hagerstown301/797-2826
MASSACHUSETTSJohn KerryBoston617/565-8519
Fall River508/677-0522
Springfield413/785-4610
Worcester508/831-7380
Ted KennedyBoston617/565-3170
MICHIGANSpencer AbrahamGrand Rapids616/975-1112
Lansing517/484-1984
Saginaw517/752-4400
Southfield810/350-0510
Marquette906/226-9466
Carl LevinSaginaw517/754-2494
Alpena517/354-5520
Lansing517/377-1509
Escanaba906/789-0052
Grand Rapids616/456-2531
Traverse City616/947-9569
Detroit313/226-6020
Southgate313/285-8596
Warren810/573-9145
MINNESOTAPaul WellstoneSt. Paul612/645-0325
Willmar320/231-0001
Virginia218/741-1074
Rod GramsAnoka612/427-5921
MISSISSIPPIrent LottJackson601/965-4644
Pascagoula601/762-5400
Gulfport601/863-1988
Oxford601/234-3774
Greenwood601/453-5681
Thad CochranJackson601/965-4459
Oxford601/236-1018
MISSOURIKit BondSt. Louis314/727-7773
Jefferson City573/634-2488
Cape Girardeau573/334-7044
Springfield417/881-7068
John AschcroftJefferson City573-634-2488
MONTANAMax BaucusHelena406/449-5480
Missoula406/329-3123
Billings406/657-6790
Butte406/782-8700
Great Falls406/761-1574
Bozeman406/586-6104

Kalispell406/756-1150
Conrad BurnsHelena406/449-5401
Billings406/252-0550
Missoula406/329-3528
Great Falls406/452-9585
Glendive406/365-2391
Bozeman406/586-4450
Butte406/725-3277
Kalispell406/257-3360
NEBRASKAChuck HagelLincoln402/476-1400
Omaha402/758-8981
North Platte308/534-2006
Scottsbluff308/632-6032
Kearney308/236-7602
Bob KerreyOmaha402/391-3411
Lincoln402/437-5246
Scottsbluff308/632-3595
NEVADAHarry ReidLas Vegas702/474-0041
Reno702/686-5750
Carson City702/882-7343
Richard BryanReno702/686-5770
Carson City702/885-9111
Las Vegas702/388-6605
NEW HAMPSHIREJudd GreggConcord603/225-7115
Manchester603/622-7979
Portsmouth603/431-2171
Berlin603/752-2604
Robert SmithManchester603/634-5000
Portsmouth603/433-1667
Berlin603/752-2600
NEW JERSEYFrank LautenbergNewark201/645-3030
Barrington609/757-5353
Robert TorricelliNewark973/624-5555
Bellmawr609/933-2245
NEW MEXICOPete DomeniciAlbuquerque505/766-3481
Roswell505/623-6170
Santa Fe505/988-6511
Las Cruces505/526-5475
Jeff BingamanSanta Fe505/988-6647
Albuquerque505/766-3636
Roswell505/622-7113
Las Cruces505/523-6561
Las Vegas505/454-8824
NEW YORKPat MoynihanManhattan212/661-5150
Oneonta607/433-2310
Buffalo716/551-4097
Chuck SchumerManhattan212/486-4430
Buffalo716/846-4111
Rochester716/263-5866
Albany518/431-4070

Syracuse315/423-5471

Binghamton

N. CAROLINA John Edwards Raleigh 919/856-4245
Others to be determined
Jesse Helms Raleigh 919/856-4630
Hickory 704/322-5170
NORTH DAKOTA Byron Dorgan Fargo 701/239-5389
Bismarck 701/250-4618
Minot 701/852-0703
Kent Conrad Bismarck 701/258-4648
Minot 701/852-0703
Grand Forks 701/775-9601
Fargo 701/232-8030
OHIO Mike DeWine Cincinnati 513/763-8260
Columbus 614/469-6774
Marietta 614/373-2317
Cleveland 216/522-7272
Toledo 419/259-7535
Xenia 937/376-3080
George Voinovich Columbus 614/469-6697
Cleveland 216/522-7095
Cincinnati 513/684-3265
Toledo
OKLAHOMA Don Nickles Oklahoma City 405/231-4941
Ponca City 405/767-1270
Lawton 405/357-9878
Tulsa 918/581-7651
Jim Inhofe Tulsa 918/748-5111
McAlester 918/426-0933
Oklahoma City 405/231-4381
Enid 405/234-5105
OREGON Gordon Smith Portland 503/326-3386
Pendleton 541/278-1129
Medford 541/608-9102
Eugene 541/465-6750
Bend 541/318-1298
Ron Wyden Portland 503/326-7525
Eugene 541/431-0229
Medford 541/858-5122
La Grande 541/962-7691
Bend 541/330-9142
Salem 503/589-4555
PENNSYLVANIA Rick Santorum Philadelphia 215/864-6900
Pittsburgh 412/562-0533
Erie 814/454-7114
Altoona 814/946-7023
Harrisburg 717/231-7540
Scranton 717/344-8799
Allentown 610/770-0142
Arlen Specter Philadelphia 215/597-7200
Allentown 610/434-1444
Pittsburgh 412/644-3400
Erie 814/453-3010
Harrisburg 717/782-3951
Scranton 717/346-2006
Wilkes-Barre 717/826-6265

RHODE ISLAND John Chafee Providence 401/528-5294
Jack Reed Cranston 401/943-3100
Providence 401/528-5200
S. CAROLINA Strom Thurmond Columbia 803/765-5494
Aiken 803/649-2591
Charleston 803/727-4282
Florence 803/662-8873
Fritz Hollings Columbia 803/765-5731
Charleston 803/727-4525
Spartanburg 864/585-3702
Greenville 864/233-5366
SOUTH DAKOTA Tom Daschle Sioux Falls 605/334-9596
Rapid City 605/348-7551
Aberdeen 605/225-8823
Tim Johnson Sioux Falls 605/332-8896
Rapid City 605/341-3990
Aberdeen 605/226-3440
TENNESSEE Bill Frist Nashville 615/352-9411
Chattanooga 423/894-2203
Knoxville 423/602-7977
Kingsport 423/323-1252
Memphis 901/683-1910
Jackson 901/424-9655
Fred Thompson Nashville 615/736-5129
Knoxville 423/545-4253
Chattanooga 423/752-5337
Blountville 423/325-6217
Memphis 901/544-4224
Jackson 901/423-9344
TEXAS Phil Gramm Dallas 214/767-3000
Tyler 903/593-0902
San Antonio 120/366-9494
Harlingen 210/423-6118
Houston 713/718-4000
Lubbock 806/743-7533
El Paso 915/534-6896
Kay Hutchinson Abilene 915/676-2839
Austin 512/916-5834
Dallas 214/361-3500
Houston 713/653-3456
San Antonio 210/340-2885
UTAH Robert Bennett Salt Lake City 801/524-5933
Provo 801/379-2525
Ogden 801/625-5676
St. George 801/628-5514
Orrin Hatch Salt Lake City 801/524-4380
Provo 801/375-7881
Ogden 801/625-5672
Cedar City 801/586-8435
St. George 801/634-1795
VIRGINIA John Warner Richmond 804/771-2579
Norfolk 757/441-3079
Abingdon 540/628-8158
Roanoke 540/857-2676

Chuck RobbRichmond804/771-2221
Norfolk757/441-3124
Danville804/791-0330
Roanoke540/985-0130
Clintwood540/926-4104
VERMONTJim JeffordsMontpelier802/223-5273
Rutland802/773-3875
Burlington802/658-6001
Pat LeahyBurlington802/863-2523
Montpelier802/229-0569
WASHINGTONSlade GortonBellevue425/451-0103
Vancouver360/696-7838
Spokane509/353-2507
Wenatchee509/884-1266
Yakima509/248-8084
Kennewick509/783-0640
Lakewood253/581-1646
Patty MurraySeattle206/553-5545
Vancouver360/696-7797
Spokane509/624-9515
Yakima509/453-7462
Everett425/259-6515
WEST VIRGINIARobert ByrdCharleston304/342-5855
Jay RockefellerCharleston304/347-5372
Beckley304/253-9704
Fairmont304/367-0122
WISCONSINHerb KohlMilwaukee414/297-4451
Appleton920/738-1640
Madison608/264-5338
Eau Claire715/832-8424
Russ FeingoldMiddleton608/828-1200
La Crosse608/782-5585
Milwaukee414/276-7282
Green Bay414/465-7508
Wausau715/848-5660
WYOMINGCraig ThomasCasper307/261-6413
Cheyenne307/772-2451
Rock Springs307/362-5012
Riverton307/856-6642
Sheridan307/672-6456
Mike EnziGillette307/682-6268
Cheyenne307/772-2477
Casper307/261-6572
Cody307/527-9444
Jackson307/739-9507

Compiled by Marie Rietmann, 20/20 Vision,

Senators Field Offices & Phone Numbers -- 106th Congress

State	Senator	Offices	Telephone		
ALASKA	Ted Stevens	Anchorage	907/271-5915		
		Fairbanks	907/456-0261		
		Juneau	907/586-7400		
		Kenai	907/283-5808		
		Ketchikan	907/225-6880		
		Wasilla	907/376-7665		
	Frank Murkowski	Anchorage	907/271-3735		
		Fairbanks	907/456-0233		
		Juneau	907/586-7400		
		Kenai	907/283-5808		
		Ketchikan	907/225-6880		
		Wasilla	907/376-7665		
		ARIZONA	John McCain	Mesa	602/491-4300
				Phoenix	602/952-2410
COLORADO	Ben Campbell	Tucson	520/670-6334		
		Denver	303/866-1900		
		Grand Junction	970/241-6631		
		Fort Collins	970/224-1909		
		Pueblo	719/542-6987		
	Wayne Allard	Colorado Springs	719/636-9092		
		Englewood	303/220-7414		
		Colorado Springs	719/634-6071		
		Pueblo	719/545-9751		
		Grand Junction	970/245-9553		
DELAWARE	Bill Roth	Greeley	970/351-7582		
		Wilmington	302/573-6291		
		Dover	302/674-3308		
		Georgetown	302/856-7690		
FLORIDA	ConnieMack	Tampa	813/225-7683		
		Fort Myers	941/275-6252		
		Miami	305/530-7100		
		Tallahassee	850/425-1995		
		Pensacola	850/438-8875		
		Jacksonville	904/268-7915		
		GEORGIA	Paul Coverdell	Atlanta	404/347-2202
Augusta	706/722-0032				
Dalton	706/226-1925				
Columbus	706/322-7920				
Savannah	912/238-3244				
Moultrie	912/985-8113				
Macon	912/742-0205				
IDAHO	Mike Crapo			Boise	208/334-1776
				Coeur d'Alene	208/664-5490
		Pocatello	208/236-6775		
		Twin Falls	208/734-2515		
		Idaho Falls	208/522-9779		
		Lewiston	208/743-1492		
		Caldwell	208/455-0360		

INDIANA	Dick Lugar	Indianapolis	317/226-5555
		Merrillville	219/736-9084
		Ft. Wayne	219/422-1505
		Jeffersonville	812/288-3377
ILLINOIS	Peter Fitzgerald	Chicago	312/886-3506
		Springfield	217/492-5089
IOWA	Chuck Grassley	Waterloo	319/232-6657
		Davenport	319/322-4331
		Cedar Rapids	319/363-6832
		Des Moines	515/284-4890
		Sioux City	712/233-1860
		Council Bluffs	712/322-7103
		Topeka	913/233-2503
KANSAS	Sam Brownback	Overland Park	913/492-6378
		Pittsburg	316/231-6040
		Wichita	316/264-8066
		Garden City	316/275-1124
	Pat Roberts	Dodge City	316/227-2244
		Wichita	316/263-0416
		Prairie Village	913/648-3103
		Topeka	913/295-2745
		Louisville	502/582-6304
		Bowling Green	502/781-1673
KENTUCKY	Mitch McConnell	Paducah	502/442-4554
		London	606/864-2026
		Lexington	606/224-8286
	Jim Bunning	Ft. Wright	606/341-2602
		Owensboro	502/689-9085
		Portland	207/874-0883
		Bangor	207/945-0432
MAINE	Olympia Snowe	Auburn	207/786-2451
		Augusta	207/622-8292
		Biddeford	207/282-4144
		Presque Isle	207/764-5124
		Bangor	207/945-0417
	Susan Collins	Augusta	207/622-8414
		Biddeford	207/283-1101
		Lewiston	207/874-6969
		Portland	207/780-3575
		Caribou	207/493-7873
MICHIGAN	Spencer Abraham	Grand Rapids	616/975-1112
		Lansing	517/484-1984
		Saginaw	517/752-4400
		Southfield	810/350-0510
		Marquette	906/226-9466
		Anoka	612/427-5921
MINNESOTA	Rod Grams	St. Louis	314/727-7773
	MISSOURI Kit Bond	Jefferson City	573/634-2488
Cape Girardeau		573/334-7044	
Springfield		417/881-7068	
John Aschcroft		Jefferson City	573-634-2488

MONTANA	Conrad Burns	Helena	406/449-5401
		Billings	406/252-0550
		Missoula	406/329-3528
		Great Falls	406/452-9585
		Glendive	406/365-2391
		Bozeman	406/586-4450
		Butte	406/725-3277
		Kalispell	406/257-3360
NEBRASKA	Chuck Hagel	Lincoln	402/476-1400
		Omaha	402/758-8981
		North Platte	308/534-2006
		Scottsbluff	308/632-6032
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Judd Gregg	Kearney	308/236-7602
		Concord	603/225-7115
		Manchester	603/622-7979
		Portsmouth	603/431-2171
NEW MEXICO	Pete Domenici	Berlin	603/752-260
		Albuquerque	505/766-3481
		Roswell	505/623-6170
		Santa Fe	505/988-6511
OHIO	Mike DeWine	Las Cruces	505/526-5475
		Cincinnati	513/763-8260
		Columbus	614/469-6774
		Marietta	614/373-2317
		Cleveland	216/522-7272
	George Voinovich	Toledo	419/259-7535
		Xenia	937/376-3080
		Columbus	614/469-6697
		Cleveland	216/522-7095
		Cincinnati	513/684-3265
OREGON	Gordon Smith	Portland	503/326-3386
		Pendleton	541/278-1129
		Medford	541/608-9102
		Eugene	541/465-6750
		Bend	541/318-129
PENNSYLVANIA	Rick Santorum	Philadelphia	215/864-6900
		Pittsburgh	412/562-0533
		Erie	814/454-7114
		Altoona	814/946-7023
		Harrisburg	717/231-7540
		Scranton	717/344-8799
SOUTH CAROLINA	Strom Thurmond	Allentown	610/770-0142
		Columbia	803/765-5494
		Aiken	803/649-2591
TENNESSEE	Bill Frist	Charleston	803/727-4282
		Florence	803/662-8873
		Nashville	615/352-9411
		Chattanooga	423/894-2203
		Knoxville	423/602-7977
		Kingsport	423/323-1252
		Memphis	901/683-1910
Jackson	901/424-9655		

	Fred Thompson	Nashville	615/736-5129
		Knoxville	423/545-4253
		Chattanooga	423/752-5337
		Blountville	423/325-6217
		Memphis	901/544-4224
		Jackson	901/423-9344
TEXAS	Kay Hutchinson	Abilene	915/676-2839
		Austin	512/916-5834
		Dallas	214/361-3500
		Houston	713/653-3456
		San Antonio	210/340-2885
UTAH	Robert Bennett	Salt Lake City	801/524-5933
		Provo	801/379-2525
		Ogden	801/625-5676
		St. George	801/628-5514
	Orrin Hatch	Salt Lake City	801/524-4380
		Provo	801/375-7881
		Ogden	801/625-5672
		Cedar City	801/586-8435
		St. George	801/634-1795
VIRGINIA	John Warner	Richmond	804/771-2579
		Norfolk	757/441-3079
		Abingdon	540/628-8158
		Roanoke	540/857-2676
WASHINGTON	Slade Gorton	Bellevue	425/451-0103
		Vancouver	360/696-7838
		Spokane	509/353-2507
		Wenatchee	509/884-1266
		Yakima	509/248-8084
		Kennewick	509/783-0640
		Lakewood	253/581-1646
WYOMING	Craig Thomas	Casper	307/261-6413
		Cheyenne	307/772-2451
		Rock Springs	307/362-5012
		Riverton	307/856-6642
		Sheridan	307/672-6456
	Mike Enzi	Gillette	307/682-6268
		Cheyenne	307/772-2477
		Casper	307/261-6572
		Cody	307/527-9444
		Jackson	307/739-9507

October 1, 1999

To: State Council of Churches Executives

From: Jay Lintner, Associate General Secretary for Public Policy

Re: Campaign Finance and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Greetings! Since April 1 I have been functioning as half time (interim) Director of the Washington Office of the NCCC as well as continuing as Director of the UCC Washington Office.

Things are moving very fast right now in Washington on a couple of dozen issues vital to the religious community. This is to give you a heads up on two of those where grassroots mobilization is key. In October the Senate should vote on both Campaign Finance and the CTBT. Campaign Finance needs 60 votes to cut off a filibuster, while the CTBT needs 67 votes to pass. Hence, the swing lists are almost identical.

I'm enclosing the UCC action alert sent out this week, which served as a model for a dozen other action alerts going out through other denominational/faith group networks. This should bring you up to speed on this issue. Some of you know that we are trying to get bishops, regional execs and state council execs to do sign-on letters in the key nine states. High level delegations to visit the ten senators will be put together over the Columbus Day weekend, and we are giving Common Cause and other regional people the names of those signing on, to see if any of you can join those delegations. And congratulations to the Ohio Council of Churches (where two of the ten critical Senators are located) for doing a mailing to 13,000 on their list!

Also enclosed is an action alert on the CTBT. Just yesterday Senator Lott agreed to schedule a vote on this next Wednesday, Oct. 6, and Senator Helms says this is a take it or leave it offer. Senator Biden (Minority leader on Foreign Relations) was inclined to take it (even if it meant losing), but Senator Daschle, Minority Leader for the Senate, refused, and it looks like Senator Daschle may win the 12 hours of negotiations that have been going on since yesterday, and the vote will most likely be scheduled in 2 or 3 weeks after campaign finance. However, the deal is not yet final.

Last Winter we approached 35 of you with our CTBT petition drive. Some of you offered key leadership and some of you said you could not focus on this. The grassroots campaign for the last 8 months has concentrated on getting moderate senators to pressure Helms and Lott to schedule a vote. Now we need to mobilize others to get to 67 votes. We are enclosing the swing lists for campaign finance and CTBT, so that you can see the overlap in your state.

Some of you are in a position to be very helpful on both these issues. If you need more information, please be in touch.

Shalom.

October 4, 1999

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Issue After months of delay and stonewalling, Senators Lott and Helms agreed Oct. 1 to put the CTBT treaty on the floor of the Senate October 12. Their hope is to get a quick vote before CTBT supporters can mobilize grassroots to gather the 67 votes needed to pass the treaty. 82% of the public supports the treaty, but if the Senate Republican leadership can turn this into a partisan issue and vote, the treaty may fail. Most Republican senators have not yet declared their position, while all Democratic senators support the Treaty.

Action Write or phone your Senators now, and urge their vote for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Dear Senator _____
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-3121 (Capitol Switchboard)

Background A global halt to nuclear weapons test explosions has been a central objective of the United States since it was proposed by President Dwight Eisenhower in 1958. After forty years of bipartisan effort, President Bill Clinton became the first world leader to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on September 24, 1996, calling it "the longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control."

Why is the test ban so popular? The Test Ban Treaty will make America and the world safer for our children and grandchildren. The Treaty will strengthen our security by helping to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations, now among the greatest threats to the United States. And it will help prevent the renewal of a superpower nuclear arms race.

How does the Test Ban Treaty make America safer? The Test Ban Treaty strengthens the United States' ability to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations and helps prevent a new nuclear arms race from starting. It reduces the nuclear danger to the American people.

* The Test Ban Treaty makes it much harder for the countries with advanced nuclear weapons, including Russia and China, to produce new and more threatening types of nuclear warheads. And it helps prevent nations with smaller arsenals - like India and Pakistan - and nations seeking nuclear arms--like Iran and Iraq--from making advanced nuclear warheads, which are more easily deliverable by ballistic missiles.

* U.S. ratification of the Test Ban Treaty will strengthen international support for the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the bedrock of all efforts to stop the spread of the atomic bomb. In 1995, the U.S. and the other nuclear powers promised to deliver the Test Ban in exchange for the permanent extension of the NPT - a good deal that must be honored.

* The U.S. has not conducted a nuclear weapon test explosion since 1992, when President Bush

announced the U.S. would halt development of new types of nuclear warheads and Congress mandated a 9- month moratorium on nuclear tests. Each year since then, the U.S. has renewed the moratorium and the nuclear weapons laboratories have certified that the existing weapons will work as designed. With or without the Treaty, it is unlikely that the U.S. will ever conduct another nuclear explosive test. Thus, it is in America's interest to ensure that other nations are not conducting nuclear tests. U.S. ratification will encourage other nations to ratify the Treaty, and our nation's capability to detect cheating by others will be far better with the Treaty in force than without it.

What would happen if the U.S. Senate failed to approve the Test Ban? We would miss an historic opportunity to make the world safer for future generations.

* The U.S. would weaken the effectiveness of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, since some key member nations would feel swindled if the Test Ban faltered due to U.S. inaction. This would undermine efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons worldwide.

* Military and political pressure would build to resume nuclear testing. It would be more difficult to verify compliance with the Test Ban Treaty, because the monitoring system would not be fully in place. Allegations of cheating might arise that could not be resolved in the absence of inspections provided for under the Treaty. Leaving the Treaty unratified would increase uncertainty and reduce U.S. security.

Who supports the Test Ban Treaty? The General Synod of the United Church of Christ has several times called for its ratification. Presidents Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Jimmy Carter, and Bill Clinton, current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Henry Shelton and former chairmen, Generals John Shalikashvili, Colin Powell, David Jones and Admiral William Crowe, all endorse the Treaty. These military leaders served under Presidents Clinton, Bush, Reagan and Carter.

Can the U.S. maintain its current nuclear arsenal without nuclear explosive tests? Yes. The United States does not need nuclear explosive tests to maintain its current arsenal. The arsenal will be sustained through non-nuclear tests and evaluations. Worn out parts will be replaced. A nationwide infrastructure of production sites and laboratories will be maintained and enhanced for this purpose. The directors of the three national nuclear weapons laboratories - Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandia - as well as leading nuclear weapons scientists, have determined that America's nuclear arsenal can be maintained without nuclear testing through their nuclear weapons "stockpile stewardship" program.

"No major international treaty has been defeated in the U.S. Senate since the Treaty of Versailles (in 1920). That defeat caused immeasurable consequences over the next decade and helped eventually to lead to World War Two," said John Isaacs of the Council for a Liveable World. "The nuclear arms race is over," said John Holum, Under Secretary of State specializing in arms control. "Nuclear arsenals are shrinking.... We don't need tests. Proliferators do and the longer we go without the CTBT fully enforced, the greater the risk that proliferators will get what they want."

Prepared by: Jay Lintner, UCC OCIS, with material from the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

**Activities of Faith Community in Building Support for CTBT
October 1 to 10, 1999**

Beginning Friday, October 1 the following denominational officials and religious associations sent out alerts via e-mail, fax, and regular mail with particular emphasis upon 30 states with 40 undecided senators: U.S. Catholic Conference, National Council of Churches (to state councils of churches), American Baptist Churches Washington Office, Episcopal Church Washington Office, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, Presbyterian Church (USA) Washington Office, United Church of Christ Washington Office, United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Unitarian Universalist Association, American Friends Service Committee, Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL), Church of the Brethren Washington Office, Mennonite Central Committee, Church Women United, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby, Pax Christ USA, Presbyterian Peace Fellowship. Many of these alerts reached key contacts in the various states, who in turn sent out their own alerts to their members. The Lutheran bishop of the Washington area called his counterparts across the country. Several religious organizations operated phone banks for follow-up calls to their members. As a result of these efforts, calls and letters from these constituents poured into senate offices.

Bishops were asked to personally call and write to senators of the same denomination, as follows: Catholic: Collins, Santorum, Mack, Bunning, DeWine, Voinovich, Fitzgerald, Bond, Domenici, and Murkowski. United Methodist: Coverdell, Lugar, Brownback, Roberts, and Thomas. Episcopal: Roth, Warner, Hagel, McCain, Gorton, and Stevens. Lutheran: Grams and Burns. In denominations without bishops, top denominational officials in the state were asked to make similar contacts, as follows: Presbyterian: Frist and Enzi. United Church of Christ: Gregg.

An interfaith news conference was held with President Clinton on the White House grounds on Thursday, October 7 with participation of National Council of Churches, Catholic, Lutheran, Jewish, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Quaker leaders along with Senators Jeffords and Dorgan. The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) distributed 100 press packets.

Thursday October 7 a religious leaders' letter with 200 signatures and a compendium of denominational statements were hand-delivered to all senators. On October 7 an ad appeared in *Roll Call*, a newspaper distributed on Capitol Hill, containing the religious leaders' statement with 14 signatures. On October 8 a packet of letters from 21 denominations and religious associations was delivered to all senators. FCNL coordinated these activities.

While the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society was meeting in Washington from October 7 to 10, its members, including bishops, made contact with the offices of their senators in behalf of the CTBT. Religious leaders from other denominations were part of delegations who came to Washington that week from several key states. The president of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) spoke out for the CTBT at the denomination's annual conference in Cincinnati and urged delegates to call their senators.

Prepared by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC. Phone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: mupj@igc.org. Hallman is also chair of the 22-member Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

November 8, 1999

After the CTBT Was Shelved, What Should the Faith Community Do Now?

Some Thoughts of Howard W. Hallman

It is very disappointing that the U.S. Senate put aside ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). It is also distressing to realize that ratification of the treaty would have been defeated if a vote had been held. Furthermore, it is discouraging to see the wide disjuncture between public opinion and action by the U.S. Senate.

At a deeper level it is disheartening to observe how strongly acceptance of nuclear deterrence by both proponents and opponents of the treaty was embedded in the debate. Opponents claimed that the treaty would undermine U.S. nuclear deterrence. Proponents countered that U.S. nuclear superiority would be retained and even enhanced by the CTBT. Although this wasn't necessarily the place to stage a debate on the moral legitimacy of nuclear deterrence, remarks by treaty proponents indicate that they are willing to support U.S. possession of nuclear weapons and application of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence for the indefinite future. Many citizen advocates of the CTBT do likewise. This means that there is a huge challenge for those of us in the faith community who believe that the possession, use, and threatened use of nuclear weapons is morally and spiritually wrong.

In response I suggest that we take some time to survey the situation and then develop a long-term plan of education and action to achieve U.S. policy that sets the course for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. I suggest an initial time frame of five years and a willingness to work longer until all nuclear weapons are eliminated. Five years would carry us through the 2000 election, the next presidential term, and two Congresses.

Policy Objectives

From a variety of reports and individual proposals a fairly broad consensus has emerged that the main policy components of a program to eliminate nuclear weapons are as follows:

- Comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban.
- Take all existing nuclear weapons off alert.
- As an intermediate measure, achieve a substantial reduction of U.S. and Russian strategic weapons (such as reduction to 1,000 on each side).
- Complete the task through a multilateral nuclear weapons convention that eliminates all nuclear weapons on earth.
- Carry out a stringent regime of fissile material control.

In addition to these policies the faith community should call upon all possessors of nuclear weapons to immediately adopt a no-use policy, that is, to pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary under any circumstance. Although the above steps could be achieved without the pledge, a commitment to no-use would greatly facilitate negotiations for the set of agreements that chart the course to nuclear abolition.

The faith community in the United States can work for these policies through three modes of action: grassroots education and mobilization, direct contact with U.S. policymakers in Washington, D.C., and international citizen diplomacy.

Grassroots Education and Mobilization

Each participating denomination and religious association should work through its own channels to (a) educate people in local congregations on issues of nuclear disarmament and (b) mobilize them for nonpartisan political action to influence U.S. policy. In addition, we should seek to create a "peace and disarmament network" (or whatever name might be used) with horizontal connections between congregations and denominations in all fifty states and in every congressional district. We made a start at the state level during the CTBT ratification campaign and can build upon this experience.

We can start on this task during 2000. One focus can be nonpartisan contact with candidates for Congress and the presidency to determine how they stand on our policy objectives. After the election the network units in each congressional district can meet with the winners in order to establish relationships that will continue when Congress convenes. State committees can do likewise with elected and reelected senators and with holdovers.

National Activities

A national unit on nuclear disarmament can engage in similar activities during 2000: be in touch with candidates for President and their staff and after the election build relationships with the president-elect, cabinet officers as they are appointed, and executive staff as they become identified. These relationships would continue during the ensuing four years. The national unit would also be in direct touch with members of Congress.

The present Interfaith Group for the CTBT might involve into the steering committee for the national interfaith campaign for nuclear disarmament. Other organizational models can be considered. There is also a need to achieve involvement of heads of communions and headquarters staff located outside of Washington, D.C.

A substantial communications network should be established through use of e-mail, fax blasts, telephone trees, and regular mail to distribute educational material and action alerts. This can be handled partly by each denomination communicating with its own constituents and partly under the auspices of the steering committee for common matters. Web pages and chat rooms can also be used.

International Citizen Diplomacy

President Eisenhower once remarked, "I like to believe that people, in the long run, are going to do more to promote peace than our governments. Indeed, I think that people want peace so much that one of these days governments had better get out of the way and let them have it."

Based upon this philosophy, interfaith leaders could articulate specific demands upon the states possessing nuclear weapons, such as those stated above: no use policy, zero alert, test ban, deep cuts in strategic weapons, nuclear weapons convention, fissile material control. Delegations of faith leaders could call upon heads of states and legislative leaders to press these demands. U.S. faith leaders could ask similar leaders in other nuclear weapons states to join them, and also representative of the Holy See and the World Council of Churches.

Because the faith community lacks technical expertise on disarmament measures, it will need to rely upon other organizations for technical details. In keeping with the notion of citizen diplomacy, the steering committee, or some other organization on its behalf, might create a series of chat rooms on the internet to develop specific proposals to present to the nuclear weapons states. For instance, a chat room on de-alerting could develop and refine several alternative proposals on how to achieve a multilateral zero alert. This would draw in informed persons from around the world and might even entice insiders from the military and government civilian sector to join in the discussion.

Finance

To carry out the ideas presented here would require a substantial increase in resources now available in the faith community for work on nuclear disarmament. The steering committee would need a small, supportive staff. It would be useful to add a staff person to each major denominational office participating in this endeavor and to some of the religious associations as well. Funds will be needed for joint publications and communications networks. There also should be funds available for citizen diplomacy activities.

Accordingly, the faith community should approach major foundations interested in nuclear disarmament. Among them these foundations have spent millions of dollars during the last decade on research and education related to nuclear disarmament but without much change in public policy. The faith community through nonpartisan, non-electoral activities can influence policy makers to adopt public policies that move toward elimination of nuclear weapons. A united approach from the faith community might appeal to foundations.

What Next for the Interfaith Group for the CTBT?

Now that the CTBT has been put aside until 2001, what should the Interfaith Group for the CTBT do? Among the possibilities are three choices.

- (1) We can say we did the best we could and disband.
- (2) We can recess until the CTBT comes up again and then reconvene.
- (3) We can stay together and take up other issues related to nuclear disarmament.

I would like to present a case for the third choice. Other proposals are welcome prior to our meeting on October 19.

What We Must Overcome

During Senate debate on the CTBT it was disheartening to observe the strong acceptance of nuclear deterrence by both opponents and proponents of the treaty. Opponents claimed that the treaty would undermine U.S. nuclear deterrence; some of them advocated vigorous development of a new generation of nuclear weapons. Proponents countered that U.S. nuclear superiority would be retained and even enhanced by the CTBT; they were willing to adopt the ten-year stockpiled stewardship program as a treaty condition. Both sides registered support for U.S. possession of nuclear weapons and application of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence for the indefinite future.

This means that there is a huge challenge for those of us in the faith community who believe that the possession, use, and threatened use of nuclear weapons is morally and spiritually wrong.

Long Term Response

In response I suggest that we work together to develop and implement a long-term plan of education and action to achieve U.S. policy that sets the course for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. I suggest an initial time frame of five years and a willingness to work longer until all nuclear weapons are eliminated. Five years would carry us through the 2000 election, the next presidential term, and two Congresses.

From a variety of reports and individual proposals a fairly broad consensus has emerged that the main policy components of a program to eliminate nuclear weapons are as follows:

- Comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban.
- Take all existing nuclear weapons off alert.
- As an intermediate measure, achieve a substantial reduction of U.S. and Russian strategic weapons (such as reduction to 1,000 on each side).
- Complete the task through a multilateral nuclear weapons convention that eliminates all nuclear weapons on earth.
- Carry out a stringent regime of fissile material control.

In addition to these policies the faith community should call upon all possessors of nuclear weapons to immediately adopt a no-use policy, that is, to pledge never to use nuclear weapons

against any adversary under any circumstance. Although the above steps could be achieved without the pledge, a commitment to no-use would greatly facilitate negotiations for the set of agreements that chart the course to nuclear abolition.

An Interfaith Partnership

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT has demonstrated its capacity to stage a strong campaign that combines advocacy in Washington and grassroots mobilization around the country. Denominational offices and religious associations have mobilized their grassroots constituents simultaneously and have worked together to form nascent, interfaith grassroots network in half or more of the states. This effort could be continued and augmented to take on other issues of nuclear disarmament and return to the CTBT when it comes up again.

Our experience indicates that we do best when we focus on specific issues rather than the general goal of nuclear disarmament. Yet there is a need for long-term education and development of greater organizational capacity.

Issues for 2000

In 2000 the most salient issues of nuclear disarmament are likely to be (a) bilateral deep cuts in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenal, expressed in a START III agreement and (b) de-alerting the global nuclear arsenal.

Both the U.S. and Russian governments are inclined to negotiate a START III agreement that would reduce the strategic arsenal to 1,500 to 2,000 warheads on each side (with some advocates pressing for 1,000). There are many obstacles: election of the Russian Duma in December, the Russian president in June 2000, the U.S. Congress and president in November 2000; lack of START II ratification by the Russian Duma; uncertainty of support by the Duma and the Congress. Of these we can push and support the Clinton Administration to act and develop public support for Congress to ratify any agreement.

There are solid proposals around to take the nuclear arsenal off hair-trigger alert. They have potentially strong appeal because this action would greatly enhance the safety of the United States, Russia, and the other nuclear weapons states. Thus, there is a strong element of self-interest. However, governments of the nuclear weapon states have been unwilling to embrace the idea of de-alerting. Some civilian advocates, who adhere to the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, would go only part way by keeping part of the nuclear arsenal on continued alert.

To push for de-alerting we would have to educate ourselves and our constituents on the details and the merits of this course of action. Then we could press the Clinton Administration (and its successor) to pursue this course. We could develop support for de-alerting in Congress and seek to remove restrictions contained in the Defense Appropriations Act.

Developing the Grassroots Network

We can use these issues as a focus for developing our grassroots network. At its most ambitious this could be the creation of a framework for interfaith action in every state and in as many congressional districts as possible.

In addition to work on the issues of deep cuts, de-alerting, and the CTBT when it comes up again, network development could occur through nonpartisan contact with candidates for Congress and the presidency in 2000. Such contacts would set the stage for developing ongoing relationships with the winners as they take office.

Ways and Means

Our current Interfaith Group for the CTBT could evolve into a steering committee for this broader endeavor. To be most effective a small supportive staff would be desirable. It would also be useful to have resources so that denominational offices and some of the religious associations can add a staff person to work exclusively on nuclear disarmament issues. Most of the outreach would occur through denominational and religious association networks, but there might be a central web site for the steering committee.

If we agree to go in this direction or in something like it, we should approach major foundations interested in nuclear disarmament.

We should note that the National Cathedral is developing a Nuclear Disarmament Initiative that will feature (a) a joint statement by religious and military leaders and (b) preparation of educational packets for congregational use. They have prospects for foundation support. What I am proposing is more direct action and interfaith mobilizing at national, state, and local levels. The two are complementary.

Comments Invited

I invite your comments via e-mail through "reply to all" and in some initial discussion at our meeting on October 19. Please communicate your own ideas in advance and at the meeting.

Shalom,
Howard

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

Some Ideas for Future of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT
Offered by Howard W. Hallman

As a point of departure for discussion I offer the following ten possibilities for consideration by the Interfaith Group for the CTBT. Some of these could be packaged together.

1. Disband.
2. Recess until the CTBT comes up again and then reconvene.
3. Stay together and take up other nuclear disarmament issues, such as de-alerting, deep cuts in strategic weapons, nuclear weapons convention, and return to CTBT later.
4. Broaden participation by drawing in other segments of the faith community.
5. Develop an ongoing interfaith grassroots action network on nuclear disarmament issues, first at the state level and then in congressional districts.
6. Take a five-year perspective of what we want to accomplish, encompassing the 2000 election, the next presidential term, and two Congresses. Campaign for 21st century thinking on a nuclear-weapons-free world to replace outmoded 20th century reliance on nuclear deterrence.
7. Have a retreat to develop plans for the future.
8. Convene a religious leaders summit in response to such negative trends as defeat of CTBT, isolationist leanings, commitment to nuclear weapons forever. Covenant to work together and engage in public policy processes until all nuclear weapons are eliminated from Earth. (Relate this to the statement of religious and military leaders, now in the works.)
9. Religious leaders engage in citizen diplomacy to offer nuclear disarmament proposals to the nuclear weapons states that reflect both the moral imperative and the self-interest of all sides in the elimination of nuclear weapons.
10. Seek substantial foundation support for a small core staff, augmentation of staff of denominational offices and religious associations, and operation of a common web site.

October 15, 1999

Interfaith Group for the CTBT
Meeting of Tuesday, October 19, 1999
1:00 to 2:30 p.m., FCNL Conference Room

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. CTBT vote
 - a. Comments
 - b. Follow-up
3. Interfaith campaign
 - a. Strengths
 - b. Weaknesses
4. What should we do now?
 - a. Ideas for the future (handout)
 - b. Other suggestions
5. Other matters
6. Next meeting (if we are continuing)

THIS SEARCH

Next Hit
Prev Hit
Hit List

THIS DOCUMENT

[Forward](#)
[Back](#)
Best Sections
[Doc Contents](#)

THIS CR ISSUE

Next Document
Prev Document
Daily Digest

GO TO

[New CR Search](#)
[HomePage](#)
[Help](#)

COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY (Senate - October 12, 1999)

I quote Dr. Paul Robinson of Sandia National Laboratory in his testimony last week:

[Page: S12372] [GPO's PDF](#)

Confidence in the reliability and safety of the nuclear weapons stockpile will eventually decline without nuclear testing. . . . Whether the risk that will arise from this decline in confidence will be acceptable or not is a policy issue that must be considered in light of the benefits expected to be realized [if you have a] test ban.

Are we ready today to accept a decline in confidence of our nuclear deterrent? Can we today accurately weigh the benefits on either side of the issue? I do not think so. On the other hand, we risk complete collapse of ongoing disarmament initiatives by prematurely rejecting this treaty. That is why I believe it is not inconsistent that I am not for it, but I would not like it to be voted on.

There are substantial risks with unknown consequences. Success of the Stockpile Stewardship Program requires recruiting the brightest young scientists. We have to begin to substitute for the older heads who know everything there is about it and contain all of the so-called corporate memory with reference to the science testing and the like.

My colleagues all know that I have fought very hard to get the money for the Stockpile Stewardship Program. We came perilously close this year to having this part of our budget cut by as much as \$1 billion by the House. I think after weeks of saying we would not go to conference--it is not worth going to conference to fight--it was believed it would be better to stay at last year's level. They finally came to the point where we have a Stockpile Stewardship Program funded, but in an almost irreverent way.

Dr. Browne of Los Alamos said:

I am confident that a fully supported and sustained program will enable us to continue to maintain America's nuclear deterrent without nuclear testing. However, I am concerned about several trends that are reducing my confidence level each year. These include annual shortfalls in planned budgets, increased numbers of findings in the stockpile that need resolution, an augmented workload beyond our original plans, and unfunded mandates that cut into the program.

It is pretty clear that it is not what they would like it to be.

He also said he was

concerned about other significant disturbances this year in the stability of the support from the government, partially in response to concerns about espionage. This has sent a mixed message to the Laboratory that will make it more difficult to carry out

the stewardship program. According to this good doctor who heads Los Alamos, the task of recruiting and training the requisite talent is hindered by the current security climate at the laboratories.

I strongly believe that the establishment of a semi-independent agency for nuclear weapons activities will significantly enhance efforts to ensure the success of the Stockpile Stewardship Program. At the same time, this reorganization will require many months to accomplish. I ask my colleagues the following question: Should we make an international declaration regarding U.S. nuclear tests in the midst of a complete overhaul of the Department responsible for those

weapons? I don't think so. Such an action would be premature.

Lastly, today we cannot clearly define the direction the world will take on nuclear issues. This concern speaks both for and against the treaty. Treaty proponents believe that U.S. ratification and the treaty's entry into force will curb proliferation. This treaty, if fully implemented, would enhance our ability to detect nuclear tests and create a deterrent to nations that may aspire to possess nuclear weapons capabilities.

However, others say, without question, this treaty is not a silver bullet. The administration has touted it as such. This treaty is only one measure of many that should comprise a solid nonproliferation agenda. For example, this treaty would be acceptable if accompanied by substantive bilateral commitments with Russia and multilateral commitments among the declared nuclear powers. A framework for international disarmament, nonproliferation, and stability may very well include a Test Ban Treaty, but it should also be accompanied by binding commitments on future disarmament objectives, such as the Fissile Materials Cutoff Regime, and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

THIS SEARCH

Next Hit
Prev Hit
Hit List

THIS DOCUMENT

[Forward](#)
[Back](#)
Best Sections
[Doc Contents](#)

THIS CR ISSUE

Next Document
Prev Document
Daily Digest

GO TO

[New CR Search](#)
[HomePage](#)
[Help](#)

THIS SEARCH THIS DOCUMENT THIS CR ISSUE GO TO
Next Hit Forward Next Document New CR Search
Prev Hit Back Prev Document HomePage
Hit List Best Sections Daily Digest Help
Doc Contents

COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY (Senate - October 12, 1999)

I quote Dr. Paul Robinson of Sandia National Laboratory in his testimony last week:

[Page: S12372] GPO's PDF

Confidence in the reliability and safety of the nuclear weapons stockpile will eventually decline without nuclear testing. . . . Whether the risk that will arise from this decline in confidence will be acceptable or not is a policy issue that must be considered in light of the benefits expected to be realized [if you have a] test ban.

Are we ready today to accept a decline in confidence of our nuclear deterrent? Can we today accurately weigh the benefits on either side of the issue? I do not think so. On the other hand, we risk complete collapse of ongoing disarmament initiatives by prematurely rejecting this treaty. That is why I believe it is not inconsistent that I am not for it, but I would not like it to be voted on.

There are substantial risks with unknown consequences. Success of the Stockpile Stewardship Program requires recruiting the brightest young scientists. We have to begin to substitute for the older heads who know everything there is about it and contain all of the so-called corporate memory with reference to the science testing and the like.

My colleagues all know that I have fought very hard to get the money for the Stockpile Stewardship Program. We came perilously close this year to having this part of our budget cut by as much as \$1 billion by the House. I think after weeks of saying we would not go to conference--it is not worth going to conference to fight--it was believed it would be better to stay at last year's level. They finally came to the point where we have a Stockpile Stewardship Program funded, but in an almost irreverent way.

Dr. Browne of Los Alamos said:

I am confident that a fully supported and sustained program will enable us to continue to maintain America's nuclear deterrent without nuclear testing. However, I am concerned about several trends that are reducing my confidence level each year. These include annual shortfalls in planned budgets, increased numbers of findings in the stockpile that need resolution, an augmented workload beyond our original plans, and unfunded mandates that cut into the program. It is pretty clear that it is not what they would like it to be.

He also said he was

concerned about other significant disturbances this year in the stability of the support from the government, partially in response to concerns about espionage. This has sent a mixed message to the Laboratory that will make it more difficult

to carry out

the stewardship program. According to this good doctor who heads Los Alamos, the task of recruiting and training the requisite talent is hindered by the current security climate at the laboratories.

I strongly believe that the establishment of a semi-independent agency for nuclear weapons activities will significantly enhance efforts to ensure the success of the Stockpile Stewardship Program. At the same time, this reorganization will require many months to accomplish. I ask my colleagues the following question: Should we make an international declaration regarding U.S. nuclear tests in the midst of a complete overhaul of the Department responsible for those weapons? I don't think so. Such an action would be premature.

Lastly, today we cannot clearly define the direction the world will take on nuclear issues. This concern speaks both for and against the treaty. Treaty proponents believe that U.S. ratification and the treaty's entry into force will curb proliferation. This treaty, if fully implemented, would enhance our ability to detect nuclear tests and create a deterrent to nations that may aspire to possess nuclear weapons capabilities.

However, others say, without question, this treaty is not a silver bullet. The administration has touted it as such. This treaty is only one measure of many that should comprise a solid nonproliferation agenda. For example, this treaty would be acceptable if accompanied by substantive bilateral commitments with Russia and multilateral commitments among the declared nuclear powers. A framework for international disarmament, nonproliferation, and stability may very well include a Test Ban Treaty, but it should also be accompanied by binding commitments on future disarmament objectives, such as the Fissile Materials Cutoff Regime, and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

THIS SEARCH	THIS DOCUMENT	THIS CR ISSUE	GO TO
Next Hit	Forward	Next Document	New CR Search
Prev Hit	Back	Prev Document	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Daily Digest	Help
Doc Contents			

THIS SEARCH

Next Hit
Prev Hit
Hit List

THIS DOCUMENT

[Forward](#)
[Back](#)
Best Sections
[Doc Contents](#)

THIS CR ISSUE

Next Document
Prev Document
Daily Digest

GO TO

[New CR Search](#)
[HomePage](#)
[Help](#)

COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY (Senate - October 12, 1999)

€We have only one treaty--one facet of a complex picture--before us today. It may contribute to achieving other disarmament objectives, but we are being asked to wager our nuclear deterrent on the hope that formal commitments from other nuclear powers and threshold states will be forthcoming. We sign on the dotted line that we will not utilize testing to maintain our stockpile, and we plead with the world to follow suit.

Or we reject the Treaty now and eliminate others' potential hesitation regarding future tests.

Only 23 of the 44 nations required for the Treaty's entry into force have ratified it. India, Pakistan, North Korea, Russia and China have not ratified it. Neither India nor Pakistan have even signed the treaty.

We should not rush to vote on this matter.

Regardless of the vote count, we risk either permanent damage to our non-proliferation objectives or the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Continuing our moratorium on nuclear testing and not acting on this Treaty is the best course of action for now.

We have time. Time to observe international changes and formulate a nuclear posture suitable for a new era. Time to evaluate the future of our bilateral relations with Russia and China. And time to first ensure the success of Stockpile Stewardship.

U.S. ratification would provide a positive signal and increase our leverage at the negotiating table in our pursuit of many non-proliferation objectives. If the Senate does not ratify this Treaty, which appears highly likely at the present, many of our current foreign policy initiatives will unravel.

Most importantly, a negative vote on the CTBT will further erode the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, NPT, itself. We secured indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995 by committing to lead negotiations, sign and ratify the Test Ban Treaty. There is an explicit link between our Article VI commitments to disarm and the CTBT.

Many other steps could be taken to demonstrate a good faith effort toward nuclear disarmament. The Test Ban Treaty is just one element of a comprehensive strategy to reduce nuclear dangers. The U.S. and Russia have already radically reduced stockpiles from their Cold War levels. Progress has been made in the negotiations for a fissile materials cutoff regime. Currently, all of the declared nuclear powers have a moratorium on testing, and two of those, Britain and France, have signed and ratified the Test Ban Treaty.

If the Senate votes against this Treaty, we will send the signal to the world that the U.S. has no intent to make good on its earlier commitments. START II will wither in the Duma; negotiations with Russia on START III and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty will most likely falter. We would most likely witness a rash of nuclear tests in response. Killing this Treaty would inevitably also impact upcoming elections in Russia. To the Russians our actions in Kosovo underscored NATO's willingness to engage in out-of-area operations, even in violation of sovereignty. Anti-U.S. sentiments in Russia soared. Not only would a down vote on this Treaty play into the hands of the Communists and Nationalists, U.S. actions would essentially give Russia the go-ahead to begin testing a new generation of tactical nuclear weapons to secure its border against NATO.

We risk little by postponing consideration of this Treaty. We put our most vital security interests at stake by rushing to judgement on it.

In sum, defeat of this Treaty at this point will have a devastating impact on numerous current foreign policy initiatives that are clearly in the U.S. national interest. We can anticipate an unraveling of initiatives toward bilateral disarmament with Russia, and we will forfeit any remaining hope of preventing a nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan. We will open wide the door for China to proceed with tests to validate any nuclear designs based on the alleged stolen W-88 blueprints.

THIS SEARCH

Next Hit
Prev Hit
Hit List

THIS DOCUMENT

[Forward](#)
[Back](#)
Best Sections
[Doc Contents](#)

THIS CR ISSUE

Next Document
Prev Document
Daily Digest

GO TO

[New CR Search](#)
[HomePage](#)
[Help](#)

THIS SEARCH THIS DOCUMENT THIS CR ISSUE GO TO
Next Hit Forward Next Document New CR Search
Prev Hit Back Prev Document HomePage
Hit List Best Sections Daily Digest Help
 Doc Contents

COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY (Senate - October 12, 1999)

We have only one treaty--one facet of a complex picture--before us today. It may contribute to achieving other disarmament objectives, but we are being asked to wager our nuclear deterrent on the hope that formal commitments from other nuclear powers and threshold states will be forthcoming. We sign on the dotted line that we will not utilize testing to maintain our stockpile, and we plead with the world to follow suit.

Or we reject the Treaty now and eliminate others' potential hesitation regarding future tests.

Only 23 of the 44 nations required for the Treaty's entry into force have ratified it. India, Pakistan, North Korea, Russia and China have not ratified it. Neither India nor Pakistan have even signed the treaty.

We should not rush to vote on this matter.

Regardless of the vote count, we risk either permanent damage to our non-proliferation objectives or the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Continuing our moratorium on nuclear testing and not acting on this Treaty is the best course of action for now.

We have time. Time to observe international changes and formulate a nuclear posture suitable for a new era. Time to evaluate the future of our bilateral relations with Russia and China. And time to first ensure the success of Stockpile Stewardship.

U.S. ratification would provide a positive signal and increase our leverage at the negotiating table in our pursuit of many non-proliferation objectives. If the Senate does not ratify this Treaty, which appears highly likely at the present, many of our current foreign policy initiatives will unravel.

Most importantly, a negative vote on the CTBT will further erode the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, NPT, itself. We secured indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995 by committing to lead negotiations, sign and ratify the Test Ban Treaty. There is an explicit link between our Article VI commitments to disarm and the CTBT.

Many other steps could be taken to demonstrate a good faith effort toward nuclear disarmament. The Test Ban Treaty is just one element of a comprehensive strategy to reduce nuclear dangers. The U.S. and Russia have already radically reduced stockpiles from their Cold War levels. Progress has been made in the negotiations for a fissile materials cutoff regime. Currently, all of the declared nuclear powers have a moratorium on testing, and two of those, Britain and France, have signed and ratified the Test Ban Treaty.

If the Senate votes against this Treaty, we will send the signal to the world

that the U.S. has no intent to make good on its earlier commitments. START II will wither in the Duma; negotiations with Russia on START III and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty will most likely falter. We would most likely witness a rash of nuclear tests in response. Killing this Treaty would inevitably also impact upcoming elections in Russia. To the Russians our actions in Kosovo underscored NATO's willingness to engage in out-of-area operations, even in violation of sovereignty. Anti-U.S. sentiments in Russia soared. Not only would a down vote on this Treaty play into the hands of the Communists and Nationalists, U.S. actions would essentially give Russia the go-ahead to begin testing a new generation of tactical nuclear weapons to secure its border against NATO.

We risk little by postponing consideration of this Treaty. We put our most vital security interests at stake by rushing to judgement on it.

In sum, defeat of this Treaty at this point will have a devastating impact on numerous current foreign policy initiatives that are clearly in the U.S. national interest. We can anticipate an unraveling of initiatives toward bilateral disarmament with Russia, and we will forfeit any remaining hope of preventing a nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan. We will open wide the door for China to proceed with tests to validate any nuclear designs based on the alleged stolen W-88 blueprints.

At the same time, Stockpile Stewardship is as yet unproven. We still do not fully understand the aging effects on our nuclear arsenal. Such aging effects relate both to the components which comprise the nuclear weapons and the scientific experts who initially designed and tested them. Also, as witnessed again this year, the budget for the full implementation of Stockpile Stewardship is anything but secure. In light of the current situation, ratification of this Treaty may put us at risk.

THIS SEARCH	THIS DOCUMENT	THIS CR ISSUE	GO TO
Next Hit	Forward	Next Document	New CR Search
Prev Hit	Back	Prev Document	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Daily Digest	Help
Doc Contents			

Senator Pete Domenici in Senate debate on CTBT, October 12, 1999

Lastly, today we cannot clearly define the direction the world will take on nuclear issues. This concern speaks both for and against the treaty. Treaty proponents believe that U.S. ratification and the treaty's entry into force will curb proliferation. This treaty, if fully implemented, would enhance our ability to detect nuclear tests and create a deterrent to nations that may aspire to possess nuclear weapons capabilities.

However, others say, without question, this treaty is not a silver bullet. The administration has touted it as such. This treaty is only one measure of many that should comprise a solid nonproliferation agenda. For example, this treaty would be acceptable if accompanied by substantive bilateral commitments with Russia and multilateral commitments among the declared nuclear powers. A framework for international disarmament, nonproliferation, and stability may very well include a Test Ban Treaty, but it should also be accompanied by binding commitments on future disarmament objectives, such as the Fissile Materials Cutoff Regime, and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

We have only one treaty--one facet of a complex picture--before us today. It may contribute to achieving other disarmament objectives, but we are being asked to wager our nuclear deterrent on the hope that formal commitments from other nuclear powers and threshold states will be forthcoming. We sign on the dotted line that we will not utilize testing to maintain our stockpile, and we plead with the world to follow suit.

Or we reject the Treaty now and eliminate others' potential hesitation regarding future tests. Only 23 of the 44 nations required for the Treaty's entry into force have ratified it. India, Pakistan, North Korea, Russia and China have not ratified it. Neither India nor Pakistan have even signed the treaty.

We should not rush to vote on this matter. Regardless of the vote count, we risk either permanent damage to our non-proliferation objectives or the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Continuing our moratorium on nuclear testing and not acting on this Treaty is the best course of action for now.

We have time. Time to observe international changes and formulate a nuclear posture suitable for a new era. Time to evaluate the future of our bilateral relations with Russia and China. And time to first ensure the success of Stockpile Stewardship.

U.S. ratification would provide a positive signal and increase our leverage at the negotiating table in our pursuit of many non-proliferation objectives. If the Senate does not ratify this Treaty, which appears highly likely at the present, many of our current foreign policy initiatives will unravel.

Most importantly, a negative vote on the CTBT will further erode the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, NPT, itself. We secured indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995 by committing to lead negotiations, sign and ratify the Test Ban Treaty. There is an explicit link between our Article VI commitments to disarm and the CTBT.

Many other steps could be taken to demonstrate a good faith effort toward nuclear disarmament. The Test Ban Treaty is just one element of a comprehensive strategy to reduce nuclear dangers. The U.S. and Russia have already radically reduced stockpiles from their Cold War levels. Progress has been made in the negotiations for a fissile materials cutoff regime. Currently, all of the declared nuclear powers have a moratorium on testing, and two of those, Britain and France, have signed and ratified the Test Ban Treaty.

If the Senate votes against this Treaty, we will send the signal to the world that the U.S. has no intent to make good on its earlier commitments. START II will wither in the Duma; negotiations with Russia on START III and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty will most likely falter. We would most likely witness a rash of nuclear tests in response. Killing this Treaty would inevitably also impact upcoming elections in Russia. To the Russians our actions in Kosovo underscored NATO's willingness to engage in out-of-area operations, even in violation of sovereignty. Anti-U.S. sentiments in Russia soared. Not only would a down vote on this Treaty play into the hands of the Communists and Nationalists, U.S. actions would essentially give Russia the go-ahead to begin testing a new generation of tactical nuclear weapons to secure its border against NATO.

We risk little by postponing consideration of this Treaty. We put our most vital security interests at stake by rushing to judgement on it.

In sum, defeat of this Treaty at this point will have a devastating impact on numerous current foreign policy initiatives that are clearly in the U.S. national interest. We can anticipate an unraveling of initiatives toward bilateral disarmament with Russia, and we will forfeit any remaining hope of preventing a nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan. We will open wide the door for China to proceed with tests to validate any nuclear designs based on the alleged stolen W-88 blueprints.

A Call for Prophecy and Action on Nuclear Abolition

**A Proposal to the Faith Community
from
Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice**

An alarm has sounded on nuclear weapons. It happened on October 13, 1999 when the United States Senate by a vote of 51 to 48 rejected ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). With strict party discipline that only four Republican senators had the courage to ignore, the Republican majority voted against a global ban on nuclear weapons testing.

In the debate the leading Republicans insisted that the United States should maintain its nuclear superiority for the foreseeable future and should therefore retain the ability to develop and test new weapons. They repudiated the idea that the United States has a significant leadership role in halting the spread of nuclear weapons and in promoting restraint by the current nuclear weapons states. They were not persuaded by the argument that defeat of the CTBT could have grave consequences for the global nuclear nonproliferation regime. The message was keep America strong and let the rest of the world be damned.

The 48 senators who vote for ratification of the CTBT deserve praise, for they stood up for nuclear restraint and world responsibility. Yet, they said some troublesome things during the Senate debate. Democratic supporters of the CTBT asserted that the \$4.5 billion-a-year Stockpile Stewardship Program will indeed assure continuation of U.S. nuclear superiority. They acted under the assumption that nuclear weapons will be a part of the U.S. military posture forever. In this respect they reflected the official policy of the Clinton Administration. Throughout the debate not a voice of doubt was raised by either side concerning the legitimacy of nuclear weapons or the morality of nuclear deterrence. This is the second alarm to heed.

This dual wake-up call is a tremendous challenge to the faith community in the United States and the rest of the world. Prominent religious leaders and study commissions have repeatedly denounced the doctrine of nuclear deterrence. Numerous denominations and ecumenical bodies have proclaimed that all nuclear weapons on Earth should be eliminated. Yet, the United States Government is unwilling to move steadfastly in that direction. Nor are the other nuclear weapons states. Judging by their actions they have no intent to put aside their nuclear arms and dismantle their production and delivery systems.

What Then Shall We Do?

The faith community should respond in two ways. First, we should speak as prophets to proclaim that possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons is morally wrong. Second, we should put our faith into action by becoming thoroughly engaged in the policy-making processes that determine the course toward or away from achieving a world free from the curse of nuclear weapons.

Voice of Prophecy

In our prophetic voice we should affirm once again our conviction 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 should call upon the nuclear weapon states to renounce unconditionally the use of nuclear weapons for war-fighting purpose, to pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary under any circumstance, to cease threatening adversaries with their use, and to carry out actions that achieve their elimination under strict and effective international control.

We should state our position unequivocally even though so-called realists would respond that our vision is unachievable. We can speak through sermons, resolutions, and public statements. We have done this before and should do so again. Indeed, a new interfaith statement on nuclear disarmament is in the works, this one jointly with military leaders.

To be truly valuable such statements should be accompanied by a pledge of the signers committing themselves, their denominations, and their associations to work together until all nuclear weapons are abolished. This is where our second task comes to the fore, making our vision achievable by putting our faith into action.

Faith into Action

Focus for engagement. Because all nuclear weapons (as far as we know) are in the control of governments, their abolition requires changing governmental policies. This means influencing decisions of governmental policy-makers, elected and appointed. In the United States they consist of the president, members of Congress, cabinet officers and other top civilian officials, and top military leaders. There are similar officials in the other nuclear weapons states, though the relationship between the chief executive and the legislative body varies.

Because this proposal is addressed primarily to the faith community in the United States, the focus here is upon influencing the U.S. government. This is where we have access. Moreover, in international forums the United States is the most reluctant of the nuclear weapons states to start multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament.

In the United States the top elected and appointed officials can be influenced in a number of ways: the electoral process; lobbying public officials directly and through grassroots mobilization; legal processes in some instances; the mass media; protest and demonstrations; and other expressions of public opinion.

These are the arenas where faith interfaces with action. Different segments of the faith community will feel called to work in different ways, but in our totality we need engagement in all of these arenas.

Time frame. Since nuclear weapons have been with us a long time, it will take a number of years to eliminate them all. Even obtaining all the necessary policy decisions is likely to be a multi-year process. As a start for interfaith activities, a five year period is suggested: 2000 through 2004. This will take us through the 2000 election, the next presidential term, and two Congresses.

Structure. As the faith community is pluralistic so also a faith-based quest for nuclear abolition should be pluralistic. Each denomination, each religious association has contributions to make through its own membership and institutional structure. But for the tremendous strength of the faith community to be adequately asserted there should be a structural framework for working together.

For this purpose I propose that we establish an **Interfaith Partnership for Nuclear Abolition.**¹ Participants would pledge to work together until all nuclear weapons are eliminated from Earth. This partnership could have two operational components: a Leadership Council and a Working Group.

The **Leadership Council** would consist of representatives of religious denominations and other major religious bodies that are committed to the elimination of nuclear weapons and are willing to work together to achieve this goal. Members would be bishops and other such prelates rather than denominational staff. The Leadership Council could meet two or three times a year to set the course for the Interfaith Partnership and to consider and adopt policy statements. To assist in its decision-making, the Leadership Council would be provided background reports and would receive briefings from experts on nuclear disarmament and from governmental officials.

Delegations of the Leadership Council and individual members would call upon public officials to press the case for nuclear abolition. Representatives of the Leadership Council would speak at public gatherings and participate in media events. Members of the Leadership Council would confer and work with their counterparts from other sectors (military leaders, scientists, physicians, and others) who are working for nuclear abolition.

The **Interfaith Working Group for Nuclear Abolition** would consist of staff from denominations and staff and voluntary leaders from other religious associations that are part of the Partnership. It would meet monthly to plan partnership activities, guide implementation, and evaluate the results. (Thus, an alternative name would be "steering committee".) Sub-groups would function as appropriate to plan and carry out particular tasks or work on specific issues. Most of the implementation would be carried out by partnership denominations and associations, working together cooperatively.

The Working Group would particularly focus on promoting public advocacy for nuclear abolition through direct contact with public officials and through grassroots networks of the participating organizations. The Working Group would encourage and assist interfaith advocacy within the 50 states and other geographic units. Such outreach would occur largely through denominational channels and membership networks of religious associations, but there should be

¹ This name is suggested as a point of departure. "Religious" could be substituted for "interfaith". Instead of "partnership" it could be called a "coalition", "alliance", or some other description. "Disarmament" could be substituted for "abolition". Most important is the commitment and spirit of cooperation, not the name.

a common effort to bring about interfaith cooperation for nuclear abolition at the state and local levels.

To foster education on nuclear abolition issues, the Working Group could also encourage the development and production of study guides, worship material, and audio-visual resources. Distribution would occur primarily through networks of participating organizations.

The Working Group should facilitate internet linkage on nuclear abolition matters, both among its members and through contacts with secular organizations working for the elimination of nuclear weapons. As appropriate the Working Group could invite representatives of secular organizations to participate in its meetings and could carry out joint projects with such organizations.

The Interfaith Partnership for Nuclear Abolition should have a **media component**. Its purpose would be to get the faith perspective on nuclear abolition into television and radio news and analysis and into the print media, both national and local. Also, use would be made of denominational and other religious publications to articulate the necessity of nuclear abolition, to explain ways for achieving this objective, and to encourage public advocacy.

Issue focus. The Interfaith Partnership for Nuclear Abolition should deal simultaneously with the long-range goal of total elimination of nuclear weapons and with short- and intermediate-term steps that move toward that goal. Among the latter the following objectives are suggested as a five-year agenda for action:

- Ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- De-alerting the world's nuclear arsenal by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and other means.
- Deep cuts in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenal on an interim basis until they go to zero (say, to 1,000 warheads on each side but de-alerted).
- Curtailment of the weapons development features of the U.S. Stockpile Stewardship Program.
- Negotiation and adoption of a global Nuclear Weapons Convention that outlaws and abolishes all nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control.
- Achievement of an international system of fissile material control.

Items on this agenda can and should be pursued in 2000, though the present stalemate in Washington will make progress difficult. As the presidential and congressional elections proceed, we should strive to bring nuclear disarmament issues into public policy debate. At the same time, we should develop a strong grassroots network that will be prepared to deal with the next president and the next Congress.

Now is time to answer the wake-up call. Now is the time for the faith community to make a renewed commitment and to work together until all nuclear weapons are eliminated.

October 25, 1999

To offer your comments on these ideas, please contact Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. Phone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: mupj@igc.org.

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."

Article I of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights specifies that "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights." Article III states: "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person."

Although the Universal Declaration of Human Rights does not 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.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
October 25, 1999

Nuclear Abolition as a Human Rights Issue

We have become accustomed to thinking of nuclear abolition as a peace issue. That it is. At the fundamental level nuclear disarmament is also 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."

Article I of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights specifies that "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights." Article III states: "Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person."

Although the Universal Declaration of Human Rights does not 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.

Senate Rejection of the CTBT A Wake-up Call for the Faith Community

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

An alarm has sounded on nuclear weapons. It happened on October 13, 1999 when the United States Senate by a vote of 51 to 48 rejected ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). With strict party discipline that only four Republican senators had the courage to ignore, the Republican majority voted against a global ban on nuclear weapons testing.

In the debate the leading Republicans insisted that the United States should maintain its nuclear superiority for the foreseeable future and should therefore retain the ability to develop and test new weapons. They repudiated the idea that the United States has a significant leadership role in halting the spread of nuclear weapons and in promoting restraint by the current nuclear weapons states. They were not persuaded by the argument that defeat of the CTBT could have grave consequences for the global nuclear nonproliferation regime. The message was keep America strong and let the rest of the world be damned.

The 48 senators who vote for ratification of the CTBT deserve praise, for they stood up for nuclear restraint and world responsibility. Yet, they said some troublesome things during the Senate debate. Democratic supporters of the CTBT asserted that the \$4.5 billion-a-year Stockpile Stewardship Program will indeed assure continuation of U.S. nuclear superiority. They acted under the assumption that nuclear weapons will be a part of the U.S. military posture forever. In this respect they reflected the official policy of the Clinton Administration. Throughout the debate not a voice of doubt was raised by either side concerning the legitimacy of nuclear weapons or the morality of nuclear deterrence. This is the second alarm to heed.

This dual wake-up call is a tremendous challenge to the faith community in the United States and the rest of the world. Prominent religious leaders and study commissions have repeatedly denounced the doctrine of nuclear deterrence. Numerous denominations and ecumenical bodies, including the United Methodist General Conference, have proclaimed that all nuclear weapons on Earth should be eliminated. Yet, the United States Government is unwilling to move steadfastly in that direction. Nor are the other nuclear weapons states. Judging by their actions they have no intent to put aside their nuclear arms and dismantle their production and delivery systems.

What Then Shall We Do?

The faith community should respond in two ways. First, we should speak as prophets to proclaim that possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons is morally wrong. Second, we should put our faith into action by becoming thoroughly engaged in the policy-making processes that determine the course toward or away from achieving a world free from the curse of nuclear weapons.

Voice of Prophecy

In our prophetic voice we should affirm once again our conviction 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 should call upon the nuclear weapon states to renounce unconditionally the use of nuclear weapons for war-fighting purpose, to pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary under any circumstance, to cease threatening adversaries with their use, and to carry out actions that achieve their elimination under strict and effective international control.

We should state our position unequivocally even though so-called realists would respond that our vision is unachievable. We can speak through sermons, resolutions, and public statements. We have done this before and should do so again. Indeed, a new interfaith statement on nuclear disarmament is in the works, this one jointly with military leaders.

To be truly valuable such statements should be accompanied by a pledge of the signers committing themselves, their denominations, and their associations to work together until all nuclear weapons are abolished. This is where our second task comes to the fore, making our vision achievable by putting our faith into action.

Faith into Action

Focus for engagement. Because all nuclear weapons (as far as we know) are in the control of governments, their abolition requires changing governmental policies. This means influencing decisions of governmental policy-makers, elected and appointed. In the United States they consist of the president, members of Congress, cabinet officers and other top civilian officials, and top military leaders. There are similar officials in the other nuclear weapons states, though the relationship between the chief executive and the legislative body varies.

In the United States the top elected and appointed officials can be influenced in a number of ways: the electoral process; lobbying public officials directly and through grassroots mobilization; legal processes in some instances; the mass media; protest and demonstrations; and other expressions of public opinion.

These are the arenas where faith interfaces with action. Different segments of the faith community will feel called to work in different ways, but in our totality we need engagement in all of these arenas.

Time frame. Since nuclear weapons have been with us a long time, it will take a number of years to eliminate them all. Even obtaining all the necessary policy decisions is likely to be a multi-year process. For a new round of interfaith activities, I suggest a five year period: 2000 through 2004. This will take us through the 2000 election, the next presidential term, and two Congresses.

Structure. As the faith community is pluralistic so also a faith-based quest for nuclear abolition should be pluralistic. Each denomination, each religious association has contributions to make through its own membership and institutional structure. But for the tremendous strength of the faith community to be adequately asserted there should be some kind of structural framework for working together for nuclear abolition.

Needed is an interfaith partnership (or coalition) for nuclear abolition. Participants would pledge to work together until all nuclear weapons are eliminated from Earth. This partnership might have two operational components: a leadership council and a working group.

The leadership council would consist of representatives of religious denominations and other major religious bodies that are committed to the elimination of nuclear weapons and are willing to work together to achieve this goal. Members would be bishops and other such prelates rather than denominational staff. The leadership council could meet annually to set the course for the interfaith partnership and to consider and adopt policy statements. Throughout the year members of the leadership council would be provided background reports and as appropriate could receive briefings from experts on nuclear disarmament and from governmental officials.

Delegations of the leadership council and individual members would call upon public officials to press the case for nuclear abolition. Representatives of the leadership council would speak at public gatherings and participate in media events. Members of the leadership council would confer and work with their counterparts from other sectors (military leaders, scientists, physicians, and others) who are working for nuclear abolition.

An interfaith working group for nuclear abolition would consist of staff from denominations and staff and voluntary leaders from other religious associations that are part of the partnership. It would meet monthly to plan partnership activities, guide implementation, and evaluate the results. (Thus, an alternative name would be "steering committee".) Sub-groups would function as appropriate to plan and carry out particular tasks or work on specific issues. Most of the implementation would be carried out by partnership denominations and associations, working together cooperatively.

The working group would particularly focus on promoting public advocacy for nuclear abolition through direct contact with public officials and through grassroots networks of the participating organizations. The working group would encourage and assist interfaith advocacy within the 50 states and other geographic units. Such outreach would occur largely through denominational channels and membership networks of religious associations, but there should be a common effort to bring about interfaith cooperation for nuclear abolition at the state and local levels. In this sense it would build upon the experience of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which develop widespread, grassroots support within the faith community for ratification of the CTBT.

To foster education on nuclear abolition issues, the working group could also encourage the development and production of study guides, worship material, and audio-visual resources. Distribution would occur primarily through networks of participating organizations.

The working group should facilitate internet linkage on nuclear abolition matters, both among its members and through contacts with secular organizations working for the elimination

of nuclear weapons. As appropriate the working group could invite representatives of secular organizations to participate in its meetings and could carry out joint projects with such organizations.

The interfaith partnership for nuclear abolition should have a media component. Its purpose would be to get the faith perspective on nuclear abolition into television and radio news and analysis and into the print media, both national and local. Also, use would be made of denominational and other religious publications to articulate the necessity of nuclear abolition, to explain ways for achieving this objective, and to encourage public advocacy.

Issue focus. The interfaith partnership for nuclear abolition should deal simultaneously with the long-range goal of total elimination of nuclear weapons and with short- and intermediate-term steps that move toward that goal. Among the latter the following objectives are suggested as a five-year agenda for action:

- Ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- De-alerting the world's nuclear arsenal by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and other means.
- Deep cuts in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenal on an interim basis until they go to zero (say, to 1,000 warheads on each side but de-alerted).
- Curtailment of the weapons development features of the U.S. Stockpile Stewardship Program.
- Negotiation and adoption of a global Nuclear Weapons Convention that outlaws and abolishes all nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control.
- Achievement of an international system of fissile material control.

Items on this agenda can and should be pursued in 2000, though the present stalemate in Washington will make progress difficult. As the presidential and congressional elections proceed, we should strive to bring nuclear disarmament issues into public policy debate. At the same time, we should develop a strong grassroots network that will be prepared to deal with the next president and the next Congress.

Now is time to answer the wake-up call. Now is the time for the faith community to make a renewed commitment and to work together until all nuclear weapons are eliminated.

To offer your comments on these ideas, please contact Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. Phone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: mupj@igc.org.

Interfaith Activities to Support CTBT Ratification

A Report by

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Organized interfaith support for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) began in June 1997, three months before President Clinton submitted the treaty to the Senate. A series of exploratory meetings led to the formation of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT. It has been chaired by Howard W. Hallman, chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

Twenty-two denominations, peace fellowships, and religious associations have participated in this undertaking. They include American Friends Service Committee, Church of the Brethren, Church Women United, Church World Service, Episcopal Church, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Mennonite Central Committee, Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, National Council of Churches, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby, Pax Christi USA, Presbyterian Church (USA), Presbyterian Peace Fellowship, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Unitarian Universalist Association, United Church of Christ, United Methodist Church, and U.S. Catholic Conference. Other faith groups have participated in particular activities. Their names are listed in an attachment.

In addition representatives of secular peace organizations have participated in the monthly meetings of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT and have served as resource persons and advisors to the religious community. They include Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, 20/20 Vision, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and Plutonium Challenge.

. As chair of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, Hallman has functioned primarily as a catalyst and mobilizer of co-equal organizations, not as a director in a hierarchical sense or as a coordinator in a formal administrative sense. The Interfaith Group is a cooperative endeavor. Different participants volunteer to take the lead in particular activities. Hallman's role is to preside at meetings, keep in touch with participants, facilitate cooperative relationships, fill gaps as necessary, and serve as liaison with peace and disarmament organizations.

ACTIVITIES: JUNE 1997 TO SEPTEMBER 1998

What evolved into the Interfaith Group for the CTBT started with a series of exploratory meetings, beginning in June 1997 and continuing through the fall on a monthly basis.

In December 1997 the Interfaith Group for the CTBT met with staff of a Republican senator and a Democratic senator for a briefing on the status of the CTBT in the Senate and a discussion of what was needed to achieve ratification. This led the Interfaith Group to focus particularly on members of the Foreign Relations Committee in order to build support for committee hearings, a necessary early step in the ratification process.

In January and February 20/20 Vision worked with us to produce a postcard action alert with an interfaith message, calling for Senate committee action on the CTBT. It was individualized for eight states with senators on the Foreign Relations Committee, including the chair, the ranking minority member, and six senators considered to be undecided on the treaty. A dozen religious organizations sponsored the alert and sent it to their members in these states. Subsequently we gave attention to grassroots outreach in the home state of the Senate majority leader.

In the early months of 1998 religious organizations published articles in denominational publications on the CTBT, put information on their web pages, and sent out their own legislative alerts on the CTBT. They distributed the pamphlet "For a Safe America: The Case for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty" published by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Danger and the "Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Now!" pins produced by the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

In February the CTBT was on the agenda of the U.S. Catholic Conference's annual Washington briefing for justice and peace advocates. In March the annual Interfaith Legislation Briefing organized by the Washington Interreligious Staff Council (WISC) held a workshop on the CTBT and distributed CTBT information to the 500+ attendees. Also in March a training session for United Methodist peace with justice coordinators from geographic conferences around the country had a CTBT workshop.

During this period peace organizations began organizing grassroots networks in about a dozen states. We helped form linkages with religious activists in those states so that they would be part of the CTBT advocacy network. When the peace organizations held regional training workshops in some of these states, national religious organizations urged their state and local contacts to participate. When 20/20 produced a postcard alert for peace organizations in March, five religious organizations were co-sponsors.

The religious network provided local participants for state conference calls arranged by 20/20, sent out information on national call-in days organized by Peace Action and others, and publicized radio call-in efforts developed by 20/20. In the summer of 1998 when peace organizations received funding for grassroots organizers in several states, we provided names of contacts within the religious community of those states. When 20/20 organized a conference call in Mississippi, representatives of religious organizations made up the majority of local participants.

Simultaneously with the extensive grassroots activities for CTBT ratification, the Interfaith Group for the CTBT focused its attention directly on the Senate. In February representatives of 18 religious organizations wrote a joint letter to Senator Jesse Helms, chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, urging him to schedule hearings. They wrote to Senator Trent Lott, asking him to use his role as Senate majority leader to schedule hearings and a floor vote. They wrote to all members of the Foreign Relations Committee, urging hearings, and to all other senators, asking them to press their colleagues on the committee to hold hearings.

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) took the lead in developing and gaining signers for "A Statement by American Religious Leaders: Ratify the CTBT." This statement gained the endorsement of 56 national religious leaders (including 23 heads of communion), over 50 regional religious leaders (including heads of state councils of churches in

six key states), and nearly 100 local leaders of congregations. Methodists United for Peace with Justice helped obtain signers from Black churches and the Evangelical community. In May FCNL distributed the statement to the 100 senators, and we handled the news release.

Because Senator Helms continued to resist holding hearings, Senator Arlen Specter drafted a sense-of-the-senate resolution, calling for hearings and a scheduled floor vote on the CTBT. In support of this resolution, representatives of 14 religious organizations wrote to 35 senators, requesting them to become co-sponsors. Methodists United for Peace with Justice contacted the 13 United Methodist members of the Senate, urging them to support CTBT ratification.

WISC'S Military and Foreign Policy Committee meets monthly to schedule meetings with Senate staff on current issues. During the spring and summer of 1998 the CTBT was a major focus of these visits.

In mid-September the Interfaith Group for the CTBT staged a breakfast meeting with Senator James Jeffords on the CTBT. Steve Andreasen of the White House national security staff also participated. The purpose was to consider ways to push for progress toward ratification in the remaining days of the current session of Congress and to look ahead to continuing efforts in the next Congress. Marie Rietmann of 20/20 Vision made a presentation on action ideas. We used this occasion to draw in representatives of denominations and religious associations which have not yet been very active in the CTBT ratification campaign. To broaden our outreach, we set up a telephone conference call that enabled persons at 17 sites in 13 states to listen in to the discussion.

In addition to bringing representatives from peace organizations into the meetings of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, Howard Hallman is a regular participant in meetings of other groups working for CTBT ratification, including the Working Group on the CTBT, set up by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers; the Grassroots Working Group, which brings together organizations with field outreach; and the Nuclear Weapons Working Group of the Monday Lobby.

ACTIVITIES: OCTOBER 1998 TO SEPTEMBER 1999

Grassroots Activities

At an interfaith breakfast meeting on the CTBT with Senator James Jeffords (R-VT) in September 1998 a proposal for an interfaith petition drive for the CTBT was offered. Subsequent meetings of the Interfaith Group for the CTBT developed details for this effort, and the United Church of Christ Office for Church in Society agreed to take the lead. We decided to focus on about 35 states with one or more senators considered swing votes for the CTBT. Various participants developed a list of key contacts in these states who could organize interfaith delegations to call upon senators. Participating faith-based organizations sent petitions to their constituents and encouraged them to work through state contacts. The Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs agreed to put the petition and information about the petition drive on its web page. Petitions went out for circulation in January and February 1997 and culminated in presentations to home-state offices of senators in March and April. In some states the petition continued in use.

In several states, such as Virginia, Indiana, Mississippi, Kansas, and New Mexico, letters signed by faith leaders have gone to their senators in support of the CTBT. One to Senator Trent Lott (R-MS), the Senate majority leader.

Because Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) is blocking hearings on the CTBT, several faith-based organizations plus some secular peace organizations have asked their members in North Carolina to send Senator Helms pictures of children, asking him to move forward on the CTBT "for the sake of our children".

Twelve faith-based organizations were among the co-sponsors and distributors of a postcard alert developed by 20/20 Vision. A number of faith-based organizations publicized a CTBT call-in day to senators on July 16, organized by the Disarmament Clearinghouse.

Senators often participate in town meetings and other events open to the public in their home states. These events present opportunities to ask questions about the CTBT. For the July 3-11 recess we endeavored to find whether 16 senators in 12 states would be having such meetings. None were scheduled. We picked up this effort during the August recess and added more states.

Hill Activities

In April 1999 representatives of 16 faith-based organizations signed a letter to all members of the Senate, urging them to work for prompt hearings on the CTBT. The message varied for Senator Lott, Senator Helms, and members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The CTBT was included on the agenda of the annual Interfaith Legislative Briefing which took place April 25-28. This event brought in over 500 persons from around the country for workshops and visits to congressional offices.

Small interfaith delegations met with staff of Majority Leader Lott, Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD), Senator Joseph Biden (D-DE), ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD), second ranking Democrat. Senator Helms' staff turned down our request for a meeting.

Dealing with Clinton Administration

The Interfaith Group for the CTBT has continuously tried to get the Clinton Administration to step up its advocacy for the CTBT.

In April 1999 the entire Interfaith Group met with Robert Bell and Steve Adreasen, top staff of the National Security Council, to exchange information, register our commitment to CTBT ratification, and urge the Administration to be more assertive. We followed through with a letter to Samuel "Sandy" Berger, national security advisor to the President, offering concrete suggestions of what the Administration could do.

We unsuccessfully sought meetings with John Podesta, chief of staff to the President, Vice President Albert Gore or his representative, and First Lady Hillary Clinton to show them

that there is strong political support for the CTBT within the faith community around the country.

ACTIVITIES: OCTOBER 1 to 10, 1999

In September we continued to press for Senate action on the CTBT.

Suddenly Senate leadership decided to bring the CTBT to the floor for a vote with exceedingly short notice. Having built an infrastructure for two years, we sprang into action

Beginning Friday, October 1 the following denominational officials and religious associations sent out alerts via e-mail, fax, and regular mail with particular emphasis upon 30 states with 40 undecided senators: U.S. Catholic Conference, National Council of Churches (to state councils of churches), American Baptist Churches Washington Office, Episcopal Church Washington Office, Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs, Presbyterian Church (USA) Washington Office, United Church of Christ Washington Office, United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Unitarian Universalist Association, American Friends Service Committee, Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL), Church of the Brethren Washington Office, Mennonite Central Committee, Church Women United, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby, Pax Christ USA, Presbyterian Peace Fellowship. Many of these alerts reached key contacts in the various states, who in turn sent out their own alerts to their members. The Lutheran bishop of the Washington area called his counterparts across the country. Several religious organizations operated phone banks for follow-up calls to their members. As a result of these efforts, calls and letters from these constituents poured into senate offices.

Bishops were asked to personally call and write to senators of the same denomination, as follows: Catholic: Collins, Santorum, Mack, Bunning, DeWine, Voinovich, Fitzgerald, Bond, Domenici, and Murkowski. United Methodist: Coverdell, Lugar, Brownback, Roberts, and Thomas. Episcopal: Roth, Warner, Hagel, McCain, Gorton, and Stevens. Lutheran: Grams and Burns. In denominations without bishops, top denominational officials in the state were asked to make similar contacts, as follows: Presbyterian: Frist and Enzi. United Church of Christ: Gregg.

An interfaith news conference was held with President Clinton on the White House grounds on Thursday, October 7 with participation of National Council of Churches, Catholic, Lutheran, Jewish, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Quaker leaders along with Senators Jeffords and Dorgan. The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) distributed 100 press packets.

Thursday October 7 a religious leaders' letter with 200 signatures and a compendium of denominational statements were hand-delivered to all senators. On October 7 an ad appeared in *Roll Call*, a newspaper distributed on Capitol Hill, containing the religious leaders' statement with 14 signatures. On October 8 a packet of letters from 21 denominations and religious associations was delivered to all senators. FCNL coordinated these activities.

While the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society was meeting in Washington from October 7 to 10, its members, including bishops, made contact with the offices of their senators in behalf of the CTBT. Religious leaders from other denominations were part of delegations who came to Washington that week from several key states. The president of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) spoke out for the CTBT at the denomination's annual conference in Cincinnati and urged delegates to call their senators.

The Senate defeated CTBT ratification 51 to 48 in a largely partisan vote. Of the four Republicans who voted for the treaty, Senators Specter and Jeffords are long-time supporters. Of the other two, Senators Chafee and Smith of Oregon, we were especially active in Oregon. Even though partisan pressure foredoomed defeat of the CTBT, many Republican senators were uncomfortable in turning aside a treaty that has strong, manifested grassroots support. Accordingly 24 Republicans joined 38 Democrats in signing a letter developed by Senators Warner and Moynihan urging delay. All but one of the 20 Republicans who signed the letter but voted against the treaty are from states where the interfaith campaign was very active.

We are regrouping for continuing efforts to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT in 2001.

November 12, 1999

Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

October 2, 1999

Urgent Message on CTBT

To: United Methodist Bishops, Conference Council Directors, Church and Society Chairs, and Peace with Justice Coordinators

The United States Senate will vote whether to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on October 12. The senators on the enclosed list, including one or both senators from your state, are undecided on whether to support the treaty. Please get in touch with them immediately and ask them to vote "yes" for ratification. Please mobilize others to do likewise so that the Senate will approve this treaty to halt nuclear weapons worldwide. This has long been the goal of the United Methodist Church, as expressed in successive resolutions of the General Conference.

President Clinton submitted the CTBT to the Senate on September 24, 1997. For two years Senator Jesse Helms, chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, has refused to hold hearings on the treaty, and Senator Trent Lott, Senate majority leader, has refused to schedule a vote. All of a sudden Senator Lott has scheduled a vote on the treaty on October 12. This will occur without any hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee. The clear intent is to give treaty supporters (82 percent of the American public) insufficient time to express their support for the treaty to their senators

It is imperative that we respond to this challenge. Bishops, we ask you to personally call your senator on the swing list. Ask your district superintendents to call the senator's and to get others in their districts to do likewise. Encourage conference staff and committees to mobilize support.

Council directors, church and society chairs (or whatever your title now is), and peace with justice coordinators, we ask you to activate your action alert network and quickly get hundreds of calls to the senator. Get local church peace advocates to pass the word to members of their congregations on Sunday, October 10.

If you need more information, please get in touch with me or visit the web site of the General Board of Church and Society, www.umc-gbcs.org.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Abolitionists:

You will recall that in the Abolition 2000 Statement, the third item calls for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. On October 12 the U.S. Senate will decide whether the United States will ratify the CTBT. Sixty-seven votes are required for ratification. At the moment all 45 Democrats and three Republicans have announced support for the treaty. This means at least another 19 Republicans must vote for the CTBT if ratification is to occur. There are approximately 40 undecided Republicans from 30 states who should be pressed by voters in their states to vote for the CTBT. This list is attached.

If you live in one of the 30 states, please get in touch with your senator. Get your friends, relatives, and other members of your organization to contact the senator. If you know people in other states with swing-vote senators, get in touch with them.

Defeat of the CTBT would be a serious setback for the cause of nuclear abolition. It would make it much more difficult to achieve adoption of other steps leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. Please join those of us who are working hard to achieve Senate ratification of the CTBT.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

##

Swing Vote Senators on the CTBT

Address letters to the senator at:

_____ Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

State	Senator	Office Building	Telephone
Alaska	Frank Murkowski	322 Hart	(202) 224-6665
	Ted Stevens	522 Hart	(202) 224-3004
Arizona	John McCain	241 Russell	(202) 224-2235
Colorado	Wayne Allard	513 Hart	(202) 224-5941
	Ben Nighthorse Campbell	380 Russell	(202) 224-5852
Delaware	William Roth, Jr.	104 Hart	(202) 224-2441
Florida	Connie Mack	517 Hart	(202) 224-5274
Georgia	Paul Coverdell	200 Russell	(202) 224-3643
Idaho	Mike Crapo	111 Russell	(202) 224-6142
Indiana	Richard Lugar	306 Hart	(202) 224-4814
Illinois	Peter Fitzgerald	555 Dirksen	(202) 224-2854
Iowa	Chuck Grassley	135 Hart	(202) 224-3744
Kansas	Sam Brownback	303 Hart	(202) 224-6521
	Pat Roberts	302 Hart	(202) 224-4774
Kentucky	Jim Bunning	818 Hart	(202) 224-4343
	Mitch McConnell	361-A Russell	(202) 224-2541

Maine	Susan Collins	172 Russell	(202) 224-2523
	Olympia Snowe	250 Russell	(202) 224-5344
Michigan	Spencer Abraham	329 Dirksen	(202) 224-4822
Minnesota	Rod Grams	257 Dirksen	(202) 224-3244
Missouri	John Ashcroft	316 Hart	(202) 224-6154
	Christopher Bond	274 Dirksen	(202) 224-5721
Montana	Conrad Burns	187 Dirksen	(202) 224-2644
Nebraska	Charles Hagel	346 Russell	(202) 224-4224
New Hampshire	Judd Gregg	393 Russell	(202) 224-3324
New Mexico	Pete Domenici	328 Hart	(202) 224-6621
Ohio	Mike DeWine	140 Russell	(202) 224-2315
	George Voinovich	317 Hart	(202) 224-3353
Oregon	Gordon Smith	404 Russell	(202) 224-3753
Pennsylvania	Rick Santorum	120 Russell	(202) 224-6324
South Carolina	Strom Thurmond	217 Russell	(202) 224-5972
Tennessee	William Frist	567 Dirksen	(202) 224-3344
	Fred Thompson	523 Dirksen	(202) 224-4944
Texas	Kay Bailey Hutchinson	284 Russell	(202) 224-5922
Utah	Robert Bennett	431 Dirksen	(202) 224-5444
	Orrin Hatch	131 Dirksen	(202) 224-5251
Virginia	John Warner	225 Russell	(202) 224-2023
Washington	Slade Gorton	730 Hart	(202) 224-3441
Wyoming	Mike Enzi	290 Russell	(202) 224-3424
	Craig Thomas	109 Hart	(202) 224-6441

October 1, 1999

To: State Council of Churches Executives

From: Jay Lintner, Associate General Secretary for Public Policy

Re: Campaign Finance and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Greetings! Since April 1 I have been functioning as half time (interim) Director of the Washington Office of the NCCC as well as continuing as Director of the UCC Washington Office.

Things are moving very fast right now in Washington on a couple of dozen issues vital to the religious community. This is to give you a heads up on two of those where grassroots mobilization is key. In October the Senate should vote on both Campaign Finance and the CTBT. Campaign Finance needs 60 votes to cut off a filibuster, while the CTBT needs 67 votes to pass. Hence, the swing lists are almost identical.

I'm enclosing the UCC action alert sent out this week, which served as a model for a dozen other action alerts going out through other denominational/faith group networks. This should bring you up to speed on this issue. Some of you know that we are trying to get bishops, regional execs and state council execs to do sign-on letters in the key nine states. High level delegations to visit the ten senators will be put together over the Columbus Day weekend, and we are giving Common Cause and other regional people the names of those signing on, to see if any of you can join those delegations. And congratulations to the Ohio Council of Churches (where two of the ten critical Senators are located) for doing a mailing to 13,000 on their list!

Also enclosed is an action alert on the CTBT. Just yesterday Senator Lott agreed to schedule a vote on this next Wednesday, Oct. 6, and Senator Helms says this is a take it or leave it offer. Senator Biden (Minority leader on Foreign Relations) was inclined to take it (even if it meant losing), but Senator Daschle, Minority Leader for the Senate, refused, and it looks like Senator Daschle may win the 12 hours of negotiations that have been going on since yesterday, and the vote will most likely be scheduled in 2 or 3 weeks after campaign finance. However, the deal is not yet final.

Last Winter we approached 35 of you with our CTBT petition drive. Some of you offered key leadership and some of you said you could not focus on this. The grassroots campaign for the last 8 months has concentrated on getting moderate senators to pressure Helms and Lott to schedule a vote. Now we need to mobilize others to get to 67 votes. We are enclosing the swing lists for campaign finance and CTBT, so that you can see the overlap in your state.

Some of you are in a position to be very helpful on both these issues. If you need more information, please be in touch.

Shalom.

October 4, 1999

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

Issue After months of delay and stonewalling, Senators Lott and Helms agreed Oct. 1 to put the CTBT treaty on the floor of the Senate October 12. Their hope is to get a quick vote before CTBT supporters can mobilize grassroots to gather the 67 votes needed to pass the treaty. 82% of the public supports the treaty, but if the Senate Republican leadership can turn this into a partisan issue and vote, the treaty may fail. Most Republican senators have not yet declared their position, while all Democratic senators support the Treaty.

Action Write or phone your Senators now, and urge their vote for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Dear Senator _____
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510
(202) 224-3121 (Capitol Switchboard)

Background A global halt to nuclear weapons test explosions has been a central objective of the United States since it was proposed by President Dwight Eisenhower in 1958. After forty years of bipartisan effort, President Bill Clinton became the first world leader to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on September 24, 1996, calling it "the longest-sought, hardest-fought prize in the history of arms control."

Why is the test ban so popular? The Test Ban Treaty will make America and the world safer for our children and grandchildren. The Treaty will strengthen our security by helping to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations, now among the greatest threats to the United States. And it will help prevent the renewal of a superpower nuclear arms race.

How does the Test Ban Treaty make America safer? The Test Ban Treaty strengthens the United States' ability to stop the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations and helps prevent a new nuclear arms race from starting. It reduces the nuclear danger to the American people.

* The Test Ban Treaty makes it much harder for the countries with advanced nuclear weapons, including Russia and China, to produce new and more threatening types of nuclear warheads. And it helps prevent nations with smaller arsenals - like India and Pakistan - and nations seeking nuclear arms--like Iran and Iraq--from making advanced nuclear warheads, which are more easily deliverable by ballistic missiles.

* U.S. ratification of the Test Ban Treaty will strengthen international support for the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the bedrock of all efforts to stop the spread of the atomic bomb. In 1995, the U.S. and the other nuclear powers promised to deliver the Test Ban in exchange for the permanent extension of the NPT - a good deal that must be honored.

* The U.S. has not conducted a nuclear weapon test explosion since 1992, when President Bush

announced the U.S. would halt development of new types of nuclear warheads and Congress mandated a 9- month moratorium on nuclear tests. Each year since then, the U.S. has renewed the moratorium and the nuclear weapons laboratories have certified that the existing weapons will work as designed. With or without the Treaty, it is unlikely that the U.S. will ever conduct another nuclear explosive test. Thus, it is in America's interest to ensure that other nations are not conducting nuclear tests. U.S. ratification will encourage other nations to ratify the Treaty, and our nation's capability to detect cheating by others will be far better with the Treaty in force than without it.

What would happen if the U.S. Senate failed to approve the Test Ban? We would miss an historic opportunity to make the world safer for future generations.

* The U.S. would weaken the effectiveness of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, since some key member nations would feel swindled if the Test Ban faltered due to U.S. inaction. This would undermine efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons worldwide.

* Military and political pressure would build to resume nuclear testing. It would be more difficult to verify compliance with the Test Ban Treaty, because the monitoring system would not be fully in place. Allegations of cheating might arise that could not be resolved in the absence of inspections provided for under the Treaty. Leaving the Treaty unratified would increase uncertainty and reduce U.S. security.

Who supports the Test Ban Treaty? The General Synod of the United Church of Christ has several times called for its ratification. Presidents Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, Jimmy Carter, and Bill Clinton, current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Henry Shelton and former chairmen, Generals John Shalikashvili, Colin Powell, David Jones and Admiral William Crowe, all endorse the Treaty. These military leaders served under Presidents Clinton, Bush, Reagan and Carter.

Can the U.S. maintain its current nuclear arsenal without nuclear explosive tests? Yes. The United States does not need nuclear explosive tests to maintain its current arsenal. The arsenal will be sustained through non-nuclear tests and evaluations. Worn out parts will be replaced. A nationwide infrastructure of production sites and laboratories will be maintained and enhanced for this purpose. The directors of the three national nuclear weapons laboratories - Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandia - as well as leading nuclear weapons scientists, have determined that America's nuclear arsenal can be maintained without nuclear testing through their nuclear weapons "stockpile stewardship" program.

"No major international treaty has been defeated in the U.S. Senate since the Treaty of Versailles (in 1920). That defeat caused immeasurable consequences over the next decade and helped eventually to lead to World War Two," said John Isaacs of the Council for a Liveable World. "The nuclear arms race is over," said John Holum, Under Secretary of State specializing in arms control. "Nuclear arsenals are shrinking.... We don't need tests. Proliferators do and the longer we go without the CTBT fully enforced, the greater the risk that proliferators will get what they want."

Prepared by: Jay Lintner, UCC OCIS, with material from the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers

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

October 4, 1999

To: Garnett Day

Fax: 317 351-1170

No. of pages: 6

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: CTBT

Dear Garnett:

Here is the swing list of senators on the CTBT. I'm also sending alerts put out by the United Church of Christ and the U.S. Catholic Conference. You can draw upon this material for your own alert.

Thanks for what you are doing.

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

October 5, 1999

To: Jeanette Holt
Alliance of Baptists

Fax: 303 745-0023

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: CTBT

Dear Jeanette:

As I mentioned on the phone, the Senate will vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on Tuesday, October 12. As part of our campaign to generate support for the treaty, we plan to deliver a packet of letters from religious organizations to all the senators on Thursday afternoon, October 7. We would like to have a letter from the Alliance of Baptists on your letterhead for this package.

The letter can be brief, making the points that the CTBT is an important measure and the Alliance of Baptists favors ratification. A letter sent last April from a variety of religious groups provides a sample. But write yours as you see fit.

If possible we would like you to deliver 105 copies of the letter to the Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street, NE no later than 12 noon, Thursday, October 7. If you can't arrange for such a delivery, let me know, and I'll work out some arrangement.

Thanks for your help,

Howard W. Hallman

October 7, 1999

Dear Senator:

We strongly urge you to vote in favor of ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). This is a very important treaty because it will help stem the spread of nuclear weapons. This will make a significant contribution to the cause of nuclear weapons nonproliferation.

As a national association of laity and clergy, we point out that the official position of the United Methodist Church, as adopted by the quadrennial General Conference is that "a global Comprehensive Test Ban should be agreed upon, honored, and enforced." A previous General Conference endorsed the 1986 report of the United Methodist Council of Bishops entitled "In Defense of Creation." That report, too, called for "a treaty banning all nuclear weapons testing."

We would like to emphasize that CTBT is an important measure in defense of creation, to use the bishops' phrase. We are talking about God's creation. The Earth. Its people. The use of nuclear weapons would be an affront to God's creation. We hope and pray that this will never occur. Over the decades nuclear weapons testing has done grave damage to human beings and the environment in countries around the world. Further testing would cause further damage, for even underground tests produce leakage into the air and ground water. Nuclear weapons produced as a result of new tests would be a threat to global security.

A vote for the CTBT is a vote for a better world for our children and our grandchildren. This is a concern that far transcends party lines. Therefore, we ask that the CTBT be ratified by a strong, bipartisan majority.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 6, 1999

To: Members of United Methodist General Board of Church and Society

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty

On Tuesday, October 12 the U.S. Senate will vote whether to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). This is a measure long advocated by the United Methodist Church, as expressed in successive General Conference resolutions and the continuous support of the General Board of Church and Society.

Forty senators from thirty states are undecided on the treaty, as shown on the attached list. If you are from one of those states, would you please get in touch with the senator's office while you are in Washington? You can call the office during a break in board proceedings. Or perhaps you could squeeze in a few minutes to stop by the senator's office when you are at the Methodist Building on Thursday for the rededication ceremonies. The senate office buildings are only one block away.

If you need more information about the CTBT, Robin Ringler can help you.

Thanks for your efforts.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

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

October 6, 1999

To: Bishop Kenneth Carder

Fax: 615 742-3726

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: CTBT

Dear Bishop Carder:

I'm faxing you a copy of the communication I sent earlier regarding action needed on the CTBT. I hope you can talk personally with Senator Frist and Thompson about the treaty. They are still undecided on ratification. The vote will occur on Tuesday, October 12. Also, I hope the peace with justice networks in your conferences will reach out to peace advocates and get calls to the two senators.

Thanks,

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

October 6, 1999

To: Randy DeValk

Fax: 202 224-7895

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Faith community's support for CTBT

Dear Randy:

As background for consideration of Democratic leadership on what to do about the CTBT, I am sending you a list of activities underway by the faith community to build grassroots support for the treaty. Our efforts are beginning to be felt in the offices of undecided senators, but we haven't yet peaked.

We are prepared to hang in there until the Senate votes.

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

October 6, 1999

To: Edward P. Levine

Fax: 202 228-3612

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Faith community's support for CTBT

Dear Ed:

As background for consideration of Democratic leadership on what to do about the CTBT, I am sending you a list of activities underway by the faith community to build grassroots support for the treaty. Our efforts are beginning to be felt in the offices of undecided senators, but we haven't yet peaked.

We are prepared to hang in there until the Senate votes.

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

October 6, 1999

To: Steve Andreasen

Fax: 202 456-9190

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Faith community's support for CTBT

Dear Steve:

I am sending you a list of activities underway by the faith community to build grassroots support for the treaty. Our efforts are beginning to be felt in the offices of undecided senators, but we haven't yet peaked.

We are prepared to hang in there until the Senate votes.

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

October 6, 1999

To: Daryl Kimball

Fax: 202 546-5142

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Faith community's support for CTBT

Dear Daryl:

I am sending you a list of activities underway by the faith community to build grassroots support for the treaty. Our efforts are beginning to be felt in the offices of undecided senators, but we haven't yet peaked.

We are prepared to hang in there until the Senate votes.

Shalom,

If you would like an e-mail version of this listing, please let me know.

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

October 7, 1999

To: Tony Blaylock

Fax: 202 224-1193

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Faith community's support for CTBT

Dear Tony:

As background for consideration of Democratic leadership on what to do about the CTBT, I am sending you a list of activities underway by the faith community to build grassroots support for the treaty. Our efforts are beginning to be felt in the offices of undecided senators, but we haven't yet peaked.

We are prepared to hang in there until the Senate votes.

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

October 7, 1999

To: Kathy Guthrie

Fax: 202 547-6019

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Kathy,

Here is listing of interfaith activities I produced and sent to Randy DeValk, Ed Levine, Tony Blaylock, Steve Andreasen, and Daryl Kimball. I hope this encourages them.

October 14, 1999

Dear CTBT Advocate:

As you know, the U.S. Senate defeated ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on October 13 by a vote of 51 to 48 with one abstention. We feel deep regret because this treaty, long advocated by the United Methodist Church, is an important building block in stopping the spread of nuclear weapons. Its rejection by the U.S. Senate has grave international repercussions because such nations as India, Pakistan, North Korea, and others will be less likely to ratify the treaty. In the case of India and Pakistan this could lead to a nuclear arms race in South Asia.

Forty-four Democrats and four Republicans voted for the treaty, 51 Republicans voted against the treaty, and Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV) voted present. We encourage you to write to senators from your state who voted in the affirmative to thank them for their support. We particularly request commendatory letters for the Republicans who broke away from strict party discipline and supported the treaty: Senator John Chafee of Rhode Island, Senator James Jeffords of Vermont, Senator Gordon Smith of Oregon, and Senator Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania.

If your senator voted against the treaty, we ask that you to write to him or her and express your deep disappointment for this vote. Point out the importance of the treaty in halting the spread of nuclear weapons. Express your regret at this retreat from world leadership. Ask the senator to reconsider his or her position the next time the treaty comes before the Senate.

If you receive a response that provides insight on your senator's thinking, please share it with us.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 20, 1999

The Honorable Gordon Smith
404 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Smith:

We thank you for your courageous vote for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. There seemed to be enormous pressure for party conformity. You resisted and voted your conscience. We wish there were more like you in the Senate.

From our contacts with Methodists in Oregon we know there are numerous supporters of the CTBT. They, too, were pleased with your vote.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 20, 1999

The Honorable Joseph Biden
221 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Biden:

We thank you for your leadership in seeking Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We were greatly distressed with the outcome of the vote, but it wasn't for lack of effort on your part.

This isn't the end of the quest for Senate approval of the CTBT. We will continue to work with you and others in support of ratification and will maintain our efforts to build grassroots support for the treaty, especially in states where one or more senators are now in opposition to the treaty.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 20, 1999

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

Dear Senator Dorgan:

We thank you for your leadership in seeking Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We were greatly distressed with the outcome of the vote, but it wasn't for lack of effort on your part.

This isn't the end of the quest for Senate approval of the CTBT. We will continue to work with you and others in support of ratification and will maintain our efforts to build grassroots support for the treaty, especially in states where one or more senators are now in opposition to the treaty.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 20, 1999

The Honorable John Chafee
505 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Chafee:

We thank you for your vote for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It is always heartening to see a senator vote his conscience rather than strictly follow adherence to the party line.

This isn't the end of the quest for Senate approval of the CTBT. We and many others will continue to work on this issue until the treaty is ratified.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 20, 1999

The Honorable James Jeffords
728 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Jeffords:

We thank you for your vote for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We also thank you for your leadership in advocating Senate action during the last two years. It is always heartening to see a senator vote his conscience rather than strictly follow adherence to the party line.

This isn't the end of the quest for Senate approval of the CTBT. We and many others will continue to work on this issue until the treaty is ratified.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 20, 1999

The Honorable Arlen Specter
711 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Specter:

We thank you for your vote for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. We also thank you for your leadership in advocating Senate action during the last two years. It is always heartening to see a senator vote his conscience rather than strictly follow adherence to the party line.

This isn't the end of the quest for Senate approval of the CTBT. We and many others will continue to work on this issue until the treaty is ratified.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 25, 1999

Dear Friend:

U.S. Senate rejection of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on October 13 was a real shocker. It demonstrated how much harder we have to work to move toward the abolition of nuclear weapons. This is a special challenge for the faith community, which has long and steadily called for nuclear disarmament.

I would like to share with you some ideas on how we might respond. Please forgive the form letter, but it's the most practicable way to communicate with a variety of people.

As the enclosed proposal indicates, I suggest establishment of an Interfaith Partnership for Nuclear Abolition (though the name could be different) to bring together denominations and religious associations committed to nuclear disarmament. It would have (1) a Leadership Council composed of bishops and other prelates representing denominations and ecumenical associations and (2) a Working Group consisting of denominational staff and staff and voluntary leaders of religious associations.

I propose an initial commitment of five years (2000 to 2004) to advocate the long-range goal of total nuclear abolition and to work for such intermediate steps as CTBT ratification, de-alerting, deep cuts in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenal, curtailment of new weapons development, and commencement of negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

The Interfaith Partnership would seek to influence policy decisions of the U.S. Government on these matters. It would engage in direct advocacy in Washington and grassroots mobilization. I believe that we could generate substantial foundation support to supplement existing resources of the faith community.

Would your organizational unit be interested in getting involved in such an endeavor? If so, please offer your suggestions for developing my proposal further or making modifications.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 26, 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 follow up my September 10 letter inquiring about possible Ford Foundation support for interfaith activities on nuclear disarmament by reporting where we stand now that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) has been rejected by the U.S. Senate.

First, I can report (if I may be immodest) that we did a tremendous job on short notice in the brief period from October 1 to 13, as summarized in an enclosure. We were able to respond rapidly in great depth because we had built an infrastructure in Washington and around the country in the previous two years. Given the political circumstances, the treaty was foredoomed to fail. However, we can note that among the 24 Republicans who signed the Warner-Moynihan letter asking postponement of the vote, 23 of them were senators we had focused on in our grassroots activities.

Second, after this was over I discussed with the Interfaith Group for the CTBT whether they would consider expanding the group's mission to encompass other nuclear disarmament issues. The majority preferred to stick to the CTBT as a single issue for that particular working group until the treaty is ratified.

Third, that being the case I have turned to a broader base within the faith community to explore how we can work together on a full agenda of nuclear disarmament issues. This is expressed in the enclosed "A Call for Prophecy and Action on Nuclear Abolition". This proposal has gone to heads of communion of 22 denominations, peace and justice directors at denominational headquarters, heads of Washington offices, and heads of a variety of peace fellowships and other religious associations.

I would like to discuss this proposal with you and explore whether the Ford Foundation might consider substantial funding to the coordinating structure and to participating denominations and religious associations. Since this package may take some time to put together, would you consider making a

Ms. Christine B. Wing
October 26, 1999
Page two.

seed grant of \$25,000 to Methodist United for Peace with Justice so that I can assemble this array of denominations and religious associations in a concerted, long-term campaign for nuclear disarmament?

I would welcome an opportunity to go to New York and discuss this matter with you in person.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 26, 1999

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

Dear Ms. Benedict:

Re: Proposal 60874

I would like to follow up my September 10 letter inquiring about possible MacArthur Foundation support for interfaith activities on nuclear disarmament by reporting where we stand now that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) has been rejected by the U.S. Senate.

First, I can report (if I may be immodest) that we did a tremendous job on short notice in the brief period from October 1 to 13, as summarized in an enclosure. We were able to respond rapidly in great depth because we had built an infrastructure in Washington and around the country in the previous two years. Given the political circumstances, the treaty was foredoomed to fail. However, we can note that among the 24 Republicans who signed the Warner-Moynihan letter asking postponement of the vote, 23 of them were senators we had focused on in our grassroots activities.

Second, after this was over I discussed with the Interfaith Group for the CTBT whether they would consider expanding the group's mission to encompass other nuclear disarmament issues. The majority preferred to stick to the CTBT as a single issue for that particular working group until the treaty is ratified.

Third, that being the case I have turned to a broader base within the faith community to explore how we can work together on a full agenda of nuclear disarmament issues. This is expressed in the enclosed "A Call for Prophecy and Action on Nuclear Abolition". This proposal has gone to heads of communion of 22 denominations, peace and justice directors at denominational headquarters, heads of Washington offices, and heads of a variety of peace fellowships and other religious associations.

I would like to discuss this proposal with you and explore whether the MacArthur Foundation might consider substantial funding to the coordinating structure and to participating denominations and religious associations. Since this package may take some time to put together, would you consider making a

Ms. Kennette M. Benedict
October 26, 1999
Page two.

seed grant of \$25,000 to Methodist United for Peace with Justice so that I can assemble this array of denominations and religious associations in a concerted, long-term campaign for nuclear disarmament?

I would welcome an opportunity to discuss this proposal with you on the phone. I am willing to go to Chicago if you would like a face-to-face discussion.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

October 26, 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 follow up my September 10 letter inquiring about possible Compton Foundation support for interfaith activities on nuclear disarmament by reporting where we stand now that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) has been rejected by the U.S. Senate.

First, I can report (if I may be immodest) that we did a tremendous job on short notice in the brief period from October 1 to 13, as summarized in an enclosure. We were able to respond rapidly in great depth because we had built an infrastructure in Washington and around the country in the previous two years. Given the political circumstances, the treaty was foredoomed to fail. However, we can note that among the 24 Republicans who signed the Warner-Moynihan letter asking postponement of the vote, 23 of them were senators we had focused on in our grassroots activities.

Second, after this was over I discussed with the Interfaith Group for the CTBT whether they would consider expanding the group's mission to encompass other nuclear disarmament issues. The majority preferred to stick to the CTBT as a single issue for that particular working group until the treaty is ratified.

Third, that being the case I have turned to a broader base within the faith community to explore how we can work together on a full agenda of nuclear disarmament issues. This is expressed in the enclosed "A Call for Prophecy and Action on Nuclear Abolition". This proposal has gone to heads of communion of 22 denominations, peace and justice directors at denominational headquarters, heads of Washington offices, and heads of a variety of peace fellowships and other religious associations.

I would like to discuss this proposal with you and explore whether the Compton Foundation might consider substantial funding to the coordinating structure and to participating denominations and religious associations. Since this package may take some time to put together, would you consider making a

Ms. Edith T. Eddy
October 26, 1999
Page two.

seed grant of \$25,000 to Methodist United for Peace with Justice so that I can assemble this array of denominations and religious associations in a concerted, long-term campaign for nuclear disarmament?

I would welcome an opportunity to discuss this proposal with you or one of your staff on the phone.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Title	FirstName	LastName	JobTitle	Company	Address	City	State	PostalCode
The Rev.	Brian	Grieves	Peace and Justice Officer	The Episcopal Church	815 Second Avenue	New York	NY	10017
Rev.	Wallace Ryan	Kuroiwa	Office for Church in Society	United Church of Christ	700 Prospect Avenue	Cleveland	OH	44115
Rev.	Eleanor Giddings	Ivory		Presbyterian Church, Washington Office	110 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washington	DC	20002
Rabbi	David	Saperstein	Director	Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism	2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW	Washington	DC	20036
Rev. Dr.	Thom White Wolf	Fassett	General Secretary	United Methodist General Board of Church and Society	100 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washington	DC	20002
	Jaydee	Hanson		United Methodist General Board of Church and Society	100 Maryland Avenue, NE	Washington	DC	20002
Bishop	C. Dale	White			117 Eustis Avenue	Newport	RI	02840
The Rev.	Alan	Geyer		Washington National Cathedral	Massachusetts & Wisconsin	Washington	DC	20016

Title	FirstNa me	LastNa me	JobTitl e	Compa ny al	Address 1 Avenues ,NW	City	State	PostalC ode
-------	---------------	--------------	--------------	-------------------	--------------------------------	------	-------	----------------

The Most Reverend Joseph A. Fiorenza
President
National Conference of Catholic Bishops
1700 San Jacinto Street
Houston, TX 77002-8291

The Most Reverend Theodore E. McCarrick
Chairman
Committee on International Policy
National Conference of Catholic Bishops
P.O. Box 9500
Newark, NJ 07104

Dr. William Shaw
President
National Baptist Convention, USA
5240 Chestnut Street
Philadelphia, PA 19139

Dr. E. Edward Jones
President
National Baptist Convention of America
1327 Pierre Avenue
Shreveport, LA 71103

Dr. W. T. Snead, Jr.
President
National Missionary Baptist Convention
1404 E. Firestone
Los Angeles, CA 90001

Dr. Tyrone S. Pitts
General Secretary
Progressive National Baptist Convention
601 50th Street, NE
Washington, DC 20019

Dr. Daniel E. Weiss
General Secretary
American Baptist Churches
P.O. Box 851
Valley Forge, PA 19482

Bishop Robert C. Morgan
President
United Methodist Council of Bishops
2000 Warrington Way
Louisville, KY 40222-3407

Bishop Charles Jordan
President
UM General Board of Church and Society
500 E. Court Avenue, Suite C
Des Moines, IA 50309-2019

Bishop William Boyd Grove
Ecumenical Officer
The United Methodist Church
109 David Lane
Charleston, WV 25311

Bishop McKinley Young
Ecumenical Officer
African Methodist Episcopal Church
700 Martin Luther King Drive, SW
Atlanta, GA 30314-4143

Bishop Cecil Bishop
Senior Bishop
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
2663 Oakmeade Drive
Charlotte, NC 28270

Bishop Nathaniel L. Linsey
Senior Bishop
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
31 Sheffield Road
Cincinnati, OH 45420

Rev. Dr. H. George Anderson
Presiding Bishop
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
8765 W. Higgins Road
Chicago, IL 60631

Most Rev. Frank Griswold III
Presiding Bishop
The Episcopal Church
815 Second Avenue
New York, NY 10017

Dr. John Thomas
President
United Church of Christ
700 Prospect Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44115

Dr. Richard L. Hamm
President
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
P.O. Box 1986
Indianapolis, IN 46206

Dr. Wesley Granberg-Michaelson
General Secretary
Reformed Church in America
475 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10115

Bruce Birchard
General Secretary
Friends General Conference
1216 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Johan Maurer
General Secretary
Friends United Meeting
101 Quaker Hill Drive
Richmond, IN 47374-1980

Dr. John P. Williams
General Superintendent
Evangelical Friends International
5350 Broadmoor Circle, NW
Canton, OH 44709

Dr. John Buehrens
President
Unitarian Universalist Association
25 Beacon Street
Boston, MA 02108

Rev. Dr. Clifton Kirkpatrick
Stated Clerk
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)
100 Witherspoon Street
Louisville, KY 40202

November 1, 1999

The Rev. Brian Grieves
Peace and Justice Officer
The Episcopal Church
815 Second Avenue
New York, NY10017

Rev. Wallace Ryan Kuroiwa
Office for Church in Society
United Church of Christ
700 Prospect Avenue
Cleveland, OH44115

Rev. Eleanor Giddings Ivory
Presbyterian Church, Washington Office
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC20002

Rabbi David Saperstein
Director
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism
2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC20036

Rev. Dr. Thom White Wolf Fassett
General Secretary
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society
100 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC20002

Jaydee Hanson
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society
100 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC20002

Bishop C. Dale White
117 Eustis Avenue
Newport, RI02840

The Rev. Alan Geyer
Washington National Cathedral
Massachusetts & Wisconsin Avenues, NW
Washington, DC20016

Dear Colleagues:

In these post-vote-on-the-CTBT days and what-do-we-do-next discussion, I suggest that our community take up de-alerting in a major way. Virtually every major study group on nuclear disarmament has advocated de-alerting. A wide array of retired military officers (such as General Butler) and civilian officials (such as former Senator Sam Nunn) favor de-alerting. Most of the organizations in the arms control/disarmament community include de-alerting on their agenda for action even though most have done little so far to promote the practice. Fewer organizations in the faith community have policies on de-alerting, but it's an issue they would rally around. Although de-alerting is not a well-known issue among the wider public, it is one which people can understand and support.

I'm not hopeful that President Clinton or President Yeltsin would be courageous enough to embark upon de-alerting in the waning months of their terms, but you never know. However, it's a good issue to introduce into the U.S. presidential campaign. Furthermore, on the legislative front we have a clearcut issue in getting rid of congressional restrictions on the opportunity to take missiles off hair-trigger alert. I believe that this is winnable in 2000. Without diminishing the importance of keeping the CTBT on the table, I believe we should make de-alerting our major issue for 2000 on the legislative front. Rather than tucking de-alerting into a few minutes discussion by the Nuclear Weapons Working Group every two weeks, we might want to create a special De-alerting Working Group. Also, we might want to use Coolfont as an opportunity to complete plans for a de-alerting campaign for 2000.

In addition to our customary tactics, I suggest that we create a De-alerting Discussion Group on somebody's web site. As a focus for discussion, we can put out a request-for-proposals for plans to achieve zero alert for the global strategic arsenal. As background we can provide a listing of the strategic arsenal, country by country, and a list of de-alerting methods that have been suggested (with an opportunity for others to add new methods). We can tap into the wisdom of persons affiliated with FAS, UCS, PSR, Student Pugwash, and other organizations in the United States and around the world to offer their best thinking on the subject. When proposals are posted, they will automatically be open for comments by others. We should try to draw in members of Congress, the Russian Duma, other national legislative bodies, President Clinton as a readers, other persons from the Executive Branch in the U.S. and elsewhere, persons in the Pentagon and other military establishments (even if they use pseudonyms), skeptics and opponents. The goal would be to come up with several alternatives that achieve zero alert as quickly as possible with proper respect for the security concerns of nuclear weapons states at all moments along the line. There could even be drafts of several model executive orders to be used in reciprocal initiatives and drafts of multilateral understandings. We ought to stress executive action and not treaties that require legislative approval.

We could take another step by engaging in citizen diplomacy. We could organize a delegation of prominent scientists, retired military leaders, religious leaders, and other well-known citizens and have them present alternative de-alerting plans to heads of the nuclear weapon states. After the election of the new Russian president, we could ask President Clinton to work out mutual de-alerting. If we do our preparatory work well, we might get an endorsement of the Democratic and Republican presidential nominees. (Remember: President Bush provided our best example of de-alerting through unilateral initiative.)

De-alerting is an idea whose time has come. Let's make this our major issue push for 2000.

I would welcome your comments.

Shalom,
Howard