

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express for Macintosh - 4.01 (295)

Date: Wed, 06 Sep 2000 15:19:10 -0400

Subject: National Conference Call on NMD - still planned for September 16, 2000

From: "NMD" <NMD@2020vision.org>

To: "Sr. Miriam Spencer" <mirspenc@juno.com>

, Diana Winston <dwinston@bpf.org>  
, Stan Deboe <sdeboe@cmsm.org>  
, jeff mandell <jmandell@rac.org>  
, greg laszakovits <washofc@aol.com>  
, tiffany heath <tlheath@churchwomen.org>  
, jere skipper <jmskipper@aol.com>  
, mary miller <epf@igc.org>  
, russel siler <russ.siler@ecunet.org>  
, ibrahim abdil muid ramey <disarm@forusa.org>  
, kathy guthrie <kathy@fcnl.org>  
, robin ringler <dringler@umc-gbcs.org>  
, lee diamond <ldiamond@Knight-hub.com>  
, marie dennis <chouleMM@aol.com>  
, daryl byler <J\_Daryl\_Byler@mcc.org>  
, howard hallman <mupj@igc.org>  
, rabia <mpf@forusa.org>  
, heather nolen <heather@nccusa.org>  
, "curtiss ramsey-lucas" <ograbc@aol.com>  
, dave robinson <dave@paxchristiusa.org>  
, bill yolton <dengster@aol.com>  
, sroyster@sistersofmercy.org  
, charlotte davenport <csjp@igc.org>  
, dwayne shank <dshank@sojourners.com>  
, lawrence egypt <uuawo@aol.com>  
, ron stief <stiefr@ucc.org>  
, bill price <WorldPeacemakers@compuserve.com>  
, "carolyn tell-hoppenheim" <Ctollop@erols.com>  
, karen donahue <donahuersm@aol.com>  
, mark brown <marsusab@aol.com>  
, "william stuart-whistler" <stuwhis@enter.net>  
, william yates <wmkyates@earthink.net>  
, bill sulzman <bsulzman@juno.com>  
, elizabeth McCalister <disarmnow@erols.com>  
, marty bearston <bearston@ucc.org>  
, daryl fagin <adction@ix.netcom.com>  
, don kraus <dkraus@cunr.org>  
, jennifer taylor <jentaylor@cunr.org>  
, scott nathanson <CRB\_DC@hotmail.com>  
, ann curtiss <acurtiss@networklobby.org>

Dear Friends,

As all of you must know by now, President Clinton decided last Friday to defer to the next President any decision about the deployment of NMD.

We intend to keep the pressure on this important issue and will hold the national conference call as expected on September 16.

The agenda for discussion will be somewhat modified because of the President's recent decision, and we will focus the discussion on:

- the congressional candidates to the Senate and House: invite them to make public statements opposing further funding of NMD, urge them to support reductions of the US and Russian arsenals.
- letters to the editor explaining why the President made the right decision in deferring deployment of NMD, visit to the editorial board.

The guests speakers remain the same: Joseph Cirincione and Joe Volk.

Please let us know as soon as possible (by phone at (202) 833 2020 or by email), and the latest by Thursday September 14th, 5pm whether you will participate in this conference call and if you will be bringing other members and activists to participate in the debate.

We will let you know of the telephone number you will need to call on September 16 for this conference call.

Thank you. We look forward to hearing from you.

Tim Barner - Program Director  
Hop Pham-Thi - NMD Campaign Coordinator

Date: Wed, 6 Sep 2000 09:11:57 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Adam Eidinger <aeidinger@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: My opening statement (final), etc.  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Howard,

I'll be up at 7:00 am. I can come by the press club and help set up, but then I need to go to the State Department for a previous appointment.

C-Span is seriously considering coming. They called. CNN is also very interested. I sure hope you get the Gore responses. I had nice conversation with Steve Myers of NY Times. I need to step out for lunch, but this afternoon. I'll call you about the strategy for the final press release. I have sent the survey questions to dozens of reporters after make a strong pitch. I'm concerned about us delivering the answers.

Cheers,

Adam

--- "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:

> Adam,  
>  
> I'll definitely have the combined document the first  
> thing in the morning.  
> How early will you be available?  
>  
> We can get in the room at the National Press Club as  
> early as 12:30 p.m. to  
> start setting up.  
>  
> Howard  
>  
> A  
> 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.

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Mail - Free email you can access from anywhere!

<http://mail.yahoo.com/>

Date: Wed, 06 Sep 2000 11:36:54 -0400  
From: Jonathan Dushoff <dushoff@votenader.org>  
Organization: Nader 2000  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en]C-CCK-MCD NSCPCD47 (Win98; I)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Nader response to questionnaire

Dear Mr. Hallman:

Please let me know if you have any questions, or problems with the computer file, or if there is anything further that the campaign should do with regard to this questionnaire.

Good luck with your press conference.

Jonathan Dushoff

--

Nader 2000  
202-265-4000  
202-265-0183 (fax)  
[www.votenader.org](http://www.votenader.org)

Paid for by the Nader 2000 General Committee, Inc.

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\Interfaith.doc"

From: "Willett, Don" <DWillett@georgewbush.com>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: Unanswered questions  
Date: Wed, 6 Sep 2000 10:31:46 -0500  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Joel --

Any suggested response to these? If "no", that's fine with me. I've already given them the Arms Control Assoc. response and other disarmament-related items. Please let me know.

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(8) Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

Governor Bush has indicated, "Deterrence remains the first line of defense against nuclear attack." His views are unknown on war-fighting utility of nuclear weapons or specific targeting.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Howard W. Hallman [SMTP:mupj@igc.org]

> Sent: Wednesday, September 06, 2000 10:13 AM

> To: DWillett@georgewbush.com

> Subject: Unanswered questions

>

> Dear Mr. Willett:

>

> For our news conference on Thursday afternoon I am preparing a final  
> document that combines the answers we have received from Governor Bush,  
> Vice President Gore, and Mr. Nader. We will give it to some our news  
> contacts in advance on an embargoed basis, either this evening or the

> first  
> thing in the morning.  
>  
> Will you be able to provide us replies to the unanswered questions on  
> nuclear disarmament issues? I sent them to you yesterday morning. If so,  
> when can I expect them? We need them as soon as possible.  
>  
> We appreciate your cooperation,  
>  
> 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.

To: adam  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Final document  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: C:\My Documents\abolish.292.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Adam,

Here is the final document with the combined answers of Bush, Gore, and Nader. I believe that it is a substantive product even with the gaps. The gaps themselves are a story.

I have offered Bush and Gore campaign staffs an opportunity to provide answers to the unanswered questions and have indicated a 5:00 p.m. today deadline. I didn't give the other candidates' answers to the respective campaigns. You can use this document as is with the understand that there might be an addendum this evening.

Howard

X-EM-Version: 5, 0, 0, 0  
X-EM-Registration: #3003520714B31D032830  
Reply-To: kathyocrandall@earthlink.net  
X-Mailer: EarthLink MailBox 5.01.9 (Windows)  
From: "Kathy Crandall" <kathyocrandall@earthlink.net>  
To: timb@2020vision.org, dkimball@clw.org, syoung@clw.org, kathy@fcnl.org,  
ieer@ieer.org, wand@wand.org, disarmament@igc.org, agallivan@psr.org,  
tcollina@ucsusa.org, estherpank@hotmail.com, sara@fcnl.org,  
ggilhool@ix.netcom.com, kroberts@psr.org, amillar@fourthfreedom.org,  
wilpfdc@wilpf.org, irashorr@hotmail.com, mbutcher@psr.org,  
jbridgman@peace-action.org, fen\_broughton@hotmail.com,  
jspykerman@ucsusa.org, peacelinks1@erols.com, dadelman@nrdc.org,  
mupj@igc.org, cferg@fas.org, dan@clw.org, alise@Taxpayer.net,  
"Esther Pank" <estherpank@hotmail.com>, dculp@fcnl.org  
Subject: RE: NWWG MTG THURS  
Date: Tue, 12 Sep 2000 14:51:38 -0400

Hi NWWG folks - Please let me or Kimberly Roberts (KRoberts@psr.org) know  
what agenda items you would like to include for our meeting this Thurs.  
(9:30 am Mott House)

Kathy Crandall  
Alliance for Nuclear Accountability  
1801 18th Street NW , 2nd Floor  
Washington, DC 20009  
Phone: (202) 833-4668  
Fax: (202) 234-9536  
Web: [www.ananuclear.org](http://www.ananuclear.org)

To: eregehr@ploughshares.ca  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Dealing with nuclear-weapon states  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.306.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Ernie,

I was glad to meet you in person in Brussels and to be part of the gathering of church representatives to consider NATO nuclear policies and other issues.

Delegations calling on selected NATO states will be a good follow-through if can be achieved. I'm wondering if a similar approach might be taken with the nuclear-weapon states.

With that in mind I have offered the attached suggestions to Dwain Epps and Salpy Eskidjian for a possible statement from the WCC Central Committee. This statement would call upon the nuclear-weapon states and other possessors to undertake such actions as a pledge of no use (going beyond merely no first use), de-alerting, deactivation, dismantlement, closing all research, testing and production facilities, and fissile material control

The WCC could appoint a delegation representing church bodies from different continents to call upon the heads or foreign ministers of the nuclear-weapon states and other possessor states and ask them to implement these recommendations.

It would desirable for the Holy See to undertake a similar initiative. This could be a statement by Pope John Paul II in his annual address to the diplomatic corps or a statement from the Pontifical Council on Justice and Peace or some other expression. This would likely be separate statement from a WCC statement. However, the Holy See could appoint Catholic representatives from different continents to join a WCC delegation in calling upon the nuclear-weapon states.

What do you think of this approach? What further ideas do you have about mobilizing the global faith community to push the nuclear-weapon states to truly implement "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

Shalom,  
Howard

To: paul@paxchristi.net  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Dealing with nuclear-weapon states  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.306.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Paul,

I was glad to see you again in Brussels and to be part of the gathering of church representatives to consider NATO nuclear policies and other issues.

Delegations calling on selected NATO states will be a good follow-through if can be achieved. I'm wondering if a similar approach might be taken with the nuclear-weapon states.

With that in mind I have offered the attached suggestions to Dwain Epps and Salpy Eskidjian for a possible statement from the WCC Central Committee. This statement would call upon the nuclear-weapon states and other possessors to undertake such actions as a pledge of no use (going beyond merely no first use), de-alerting, deactivation, dismantlement, closing all research, testing and production facilities, and fissile material control

The WCC could appoint a delegation representing church bodies from different continents to call upon the heads or foreign ministers of the nuclear-weapon states and other possessor states and ask them to implement these recommendations.

It would desirable for the Holy See to undertake a similar initiative. This could be a statement by Pope John Paul II in his annual address to the diplomatic corps or a statement from the Pontifical Council on Justice and Peace or some other expression. This would likely be separate statement from a WCC statement. However, the Holy See could appoint Catholic representatives from different continents to join a WCC delegation in calling upon the nuclear-weapon states.

Based upon your experience with the Holy See, would something like this be feasible? If so, how could it be brought about? If not this, what else can be done to use the combined influence of the Holy See and the World Council of Churches to push the nuclear-weapon states to truly implement "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

I will appreciate getting your ideas.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: djroche@gpu.srv.ualberta.ca  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Dealing with nuclear weapon states  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments: A:\abolish.306.doc;  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Doug,

In early October I was in Brussels for a two-day meeting of church representatives from Europe, Canada, and the United States to develop a common position on dealing with NATO and its nuclear posture. Ernie Regehr was the principal initiator. The outcome was a commitment to form a delegation to call upon a few key NATO states and urge them to provide leadership to modify NATO dependence on nuclear weapons.

Among the participants in the Brussels meeting were Dwain Epps and Salpy Eskidjian from the World Council of Churches. As follow-up, I have written them to offer the attached suggestions for a possible statement from the WCC Central Committee. This statement would call upon the nuclear-weapon states and other possessors to undertake such actions as a pledge of no use (going beyond merely no first use), de-alerting, deactivation, dismantlement, closing all research, testing and production facilities, and fissile material control

The WCC could appoint a delegation representing church bodies from different continents to call upon the heads or foreign ministers of the nuclear-weapon states and other possessor states and ask them to implement these recommendations.

It would be desirable for the Holy See to undertake a similar initiative. This could be a statement by Pope John Paul II in his annual address to the diplomatic corps or a statement from the Pontifical Council on Justice and Peace or some other expression. This would likely be a separate statement from a WCC statement. However, the Holy See could appoint Catholic representatives from different continents to join a WCC delegation in calling upon the nuclear-weapon states.

Based upon your experience with the Holy See, would something like this be feasible? If so, how could it be brought about? If not this, what else can be done to use the combined influence of the Holy See and the World Council of Churches to push the nuclear-weapon states to truly implement "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

I will appreciate getting your ideas.

Shalom,  
Howard

X-eGroups-Return: sentto-1606632-12-973193302-mupj=igc.apc.org@returns.onelist.com  
X-Sender: info@abolition2000.org  
X-Apparently-To: sunflower-napf@egroups.com  
X-Sender: abolition2000@abolition2000.org  
To: sunflower-napf@egroups.com  
From: Abolition 2000 <admin@abolition2000.org>  
X-eGroups-Approved-By: info@abolition2000.org via email; 2 Nov 2000 19:28:20 -0000  
Mailing-List: list sunflower-napf@egroups.com; contact sunflower-napf-owner@egroups.com  
Delivered-To: mailing list sunflower-napf@egroups.com  
List-Unsubscribe: <mailto:sunflower-napf-unsubscribe@egroups.com>  
Date: Thu, 2 Nov 2000 11:36:50 -0800  
Reply-To: sunflower-napf-owner@egroups.com  
Subject: [sunflower-napf] The Sunflower Newsletter No. 42 November 2000

----- eGroups Sponsor ----->

eLerts

It's Easy. It's Fun. Best of All, it's Free!

[http://click.egroups.com/1/9699/5/\\_/405343/\\_/973193302/](http://click.egroups.com/1/9699/5/_/405343/_/973193302/)

----- \_->

The Sunflower Newsletter No. 42 November 2000

Free monthly online newsletter of the  
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

The Sunflower  
November 2000 (No. 42)

The Sunflower is a free, monthly e-newsletter providing educational  
information on nuclear weapons abolition and other issues relating to  
global security. Back issues are available at  
<Http://www.wagingpeace.org/sf/index.html>

I N T H I S I S S U E

ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEMS

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

NUCLEAR MATTERS

BOOK REVIEWS

NUCLEAR INSANITY

NAPF HAPPENINGS

ACTION ALERT

RESOURCES

EVENTS for the year 2000 are now listed at

\*\*\*\*\*  
ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEMS  
\*\*\*\*\*

The following quote is from an article by Bill Yates entitled "National Missile-Defense?". The article appeared in the Fall 2000 issue of The Episcopal Peace Fellowship newsletter.

"Militarism breeds arrogance. National Missile Defense is a product of arrogance. It is arrogance. It is arrogant of the United States to ignore all the warnings against deployment of the NMD. It was arrogant for us to refuse to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and the Treaty to Ban Land Mines. It was arrogance that impelled us to expand NATO and jam it down the throat of the Russians. It is arrogance that impels us to maintain sanctions against Iraq despite the cost in hundreds of thousands of Iraqi lives. It is arrogance that causes us to not pay our dues to the United Nations."

"Each arrogant action taken by the United States is contrary to the true national security interest of our country. The threats and challenges we face at home and abroad can be overcome only by more reasoned and reasonable policies supported by an informed and involved electorate. Apathy and arrogance at home are the real threats to our national security. No weapons can defend us against these threats."

#### Russian Foreign Ministry Denies US Allegations on ABM Abrogation

On 12 October 2000, the Russian Foreign Ministry denied US allegations that a joint statement issued by Presidents Putin and Clinton in Moscow on 4 June 2000 contained provisions stating that the threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, missiles and rocket technologies must be opposed, including considerations to amend the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. The US allegation was included in a document released by the US delegation to a disarmament conference in Geneva, Switzerland.

In response to the allegation, Alexander Yakovenko, a representative of the Russian Foreign Ministry, denied that Russia ever agreed to such a provision in the 4 June document or any other joint-statements adopted by the presidents. Yakovenko stated, "The US knows very well that Russia has not conducted and does not intend to conduct any negotiations with the US on changing the ABM Treaty for the purpose of adapting it to the US national ABM system." Yakovenko commented on the importance of maintaining the integrity of the ABM treaty noting that "such an adaptation is not possible: the central provision of the ABM Treaty is a ban on the deployment of ABM systems on a country's territory, and the creation of a basis for providing such a defense or any other change to this provision would deprive the Treaty of its very meaning."

\*\*\*\*\*

## NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

\*\*\*\*\*

### Russia Repeats Proposal for Arms Reduction

In the most recent session of arms control talks between the US and Russia, Russia repeated its proposal for deep cuts in both countries nuclear arsenals. A Russian Foreign Ministry statement said it supported a reduction in US and Russian strategic nuclear warheads to 1,500 on each side under a START III treaty. START II, which concluded in January 1993, calls for cuts in strategic warheads to 3,000-3,500 on each side and has not yet taken effect. Russia warned that the proposed reduction would depend on US plans to abrogate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty by deploying a National Missile Defense (NMD) system.

The statement was issued by the Russian Foreign Ministry after talks on nuclear disarmament and missile defense concluded between US Undersecretary of State John Holum and Russia's Deputy Foreign Minister Grigory Mamedov. Russia strongly opposes US plans to deploy an anti-missile system and has warned the US that proceeding with missile defense plans could spark a new arms race. President Clinton decided to defer the decision on whether to deploy the controversial NMD system for the next administration. (AP, 19 October 2000)

### New Agenda Resolution Adopted

The New Agenda resolution was overwhelmingly adopted in the UN First Committee in the General Assembly on 1 November 2000 by a vote of 146 to three with eight abstentions. All NATO countries, except France, voted "yes". The US, UK and China voted "yes", while Russia and France abstained. India, Israel and Pakistan, the three nuclear weapons states who are not party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), voted "no". The eight countries who abstained are Bhutan, France, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritius, Monaco, Russia, Uzbekistan. Note most are countries closely tied to Russia, France or India.

The full text of the New Agenda Resolution will be available in the near future on the website of Reaching Critical Will, a project of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom at [Http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org).

\*\*\*\*\*

## NUCLEAR MATTERS

\*\*\*\*\*

### Indian Anti-Nuclear Activists Receive MacBride Prize

On 13 October 2000, the International Peace Bureau awarded its annual peace prize, named after its former President, the Irish

Nobel Peace Laureate Sean MacBride, to two Indian peace activists. Praful Bidwai and Achin Vanaik are leaders in the international campaign to stop the nuclearization of South Asia and joint authors of a recent book-length study of the South Asian nuclear situation entitled *New Nukes: India, Pakistan and Global Disarmament*. The study is available from Interlink Books, Northampton, Massachusetts and Oxford, UK 2000.

Bidwai and Vanaik have also been key figures in the Movement in India for Nuclear Disarmament (MIND), which has articulated public outcry, along with other civil society organizations in the region, against the decisions in May 1998 to test nuclear weapons in India and Pakistan. The recipients have followed the nuclear issue for many years and have also been active in Abolition 2000 and other international disarmament networks. They are involved, with other activists, in organizing the upcoming National Convention for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace that will be held in New Dehli, India from 11-13 November 2000. Tariq Ali, a writer for "The Guardian," has called Bidwai and Vanaik 'two of India's most courageous and radical journalists.'  
(IPB Press Comunique, 9 October 2000)

#### India to Increase Nuclear Power Generation

On 24 October, the India Abroad News Service reported that India will increase its nuclear power generation capacity eight fold in the next 20 years. The country currently generates 2,720 Megawatts of power from 14 nuclear reactors, which fulfills 2.5 percent of its total power requirement. The country's goal is to reach 20,000 Megawatts of nuclear power generation by the year 2020, which will account for approximately eight percent of the country's power requirement. India was the first country in Asia to begin generating nuclear power when it set up two nuclear reactors in 1969. China has the most ambitious plan for nuclear power generation, with eight nuclear reactors under construction.

There are now 436 operating nuclear reactors in 31 countries around the world. Energy produced from nuclear reactors accounts for 16 percent of the world's total electricity generation. While proponents of nuclear energy argue that it is a safe and economical alternative to energy produced from fossil fuels, the truth is that there is no safe method to dispose of radioactive waste. Also, energy produced from environmentally benign sources, such as wind and solar, are practical and increasingly economical alternatives to energy produced from fossil fuels and nuclear reactors.

#### Taiwan's Plans to Scrap Nuclear Power Creates Political Turmoil

After Premier Chang Chun-hsiung announced on 27 October 2000, the government's decision to halt the construction of the island's fourth nuclear reactor on safety and environmental grounds, Taiwan opposition leaders met on Monday to discuss impeaching President Chen Shuibian or dissolve his Cabinet. While the ruling government argues its decision was legal, the opposition Kuomintang party (KMT) is

pushing to recall the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) leader on the grounds that he did not have the legal power to halt the construction of the \$5.6 billion nuclear reactor project. President Chen stated that his decision was a "matter of conscience."

Chen's election in March ended the KMT's 50 year rule of Taiwan. KMT Chairman Lien Chan viewed the decision as a slap in the face and built an alliance among opposition leaders, gaining enough support for a historic recall vote on 31 October 2000. The vote for recall required an endorsement by 25 percent of parliament and now requires an approval by 66 percent, or 147 lawmakers, of Taiwan's legislature. Approval by the legislature will make way for a national referendum. If more than half approve his ouster in a national referendum, elections for a new president would follow suit.

Taiwan currently operates three nuclear reactors, which have generated some 180,000 drums of low-radiation waste since the first plant began commercially operating in 1987.  
(AFP, 27-31 October 2000)

#### UK Recalls Nuclear Sub Fleet

The British Royal Navy recalled its fleet of "hunter killer" nuclear powered submarines after a decision on 20 October 2000 to cancel all operations following the discovery of a serious defect linked to the reactor system. The strike force of 12 nuclear submarines is expected to be out of commission for months. The decision came after a detailed inspection of the HMS Tireless, which has been docked in Gibraltar since May when damage was discovered in the pipework running from its nuclear reactor system.

After initial checks, the HMS Tireless problem was thought to be a simple defect in welding. However, experts later realized that the defects were much more serious and the Navy does not know how long it will take to repair the defect nor how much it will cost. Sources stated that the defect appeared to be a "generic" fault, meaning either a design or a control issue, indicating that all 12 submarines could be suffering from the same problem. The crack on the HMS Tireless is said to be at a critical junction of pipes in the pressurized water reactor's cooling system and cannot be isolated.

The British Navy also controls four strategic deterrent Vanguard class submarines armed with Trident missiles. They will remain fully operational as they incorporate a totally different design.  
(The Times, 23 October 2000)

#### Old Russian ICBMs to Launch New Satellites?

As the first International Space Station crew blasted off on 31 October 2000, General Vladimir Yakovlev, Russia's nuclear missile chief, offered hundreds of Russian rockets to launch satellites. Old decommissioned missiles are often used to lift civilian or military satellites and General Yakovlev plans to sell them to raise cash for

the Russian armed forces. The proceeds could reach up to 20 billion rubles, which is equivalent to about one tenth of Russia's 2001 defense budget.

General Yakovlev stated that some 250 Russian intercontinental ballistic missiles were scheduled to be removed from service by 2009 because of US-Russian arms control agreements. The decommissioned rockets would then be available for conversion to take commercial payloads. Profits from the conversion will be used to increase the standard of living for military personnel. Because Russia can not afford to maintain the nuclear arsenal inherited from the Soviet Union, there is an on-going debate between the military and the Kremlin about how to reshape Russia's defenses. General Yakovlev's announcement serves not only as an advertisement to commercial satellite customers, but also as a message to the Kremlin about the usefulness of his outfit, even in a state of decline. (Reuters, 31 October 2000)

### Nader on Nuclear Energy

While many questions about the safety, efficiency and long-term hazards of nuclear energy remain to be answered, both Republican and Democratic administrations in the US have treated nuclear energy as a government-sponsored technology. The fact is that energy from renewable power sources is less damaging to the environment while nuclear reactors produce radioactive waste that will be hazardous for more than 250,000 years. Ralph Nader, Green Party candidate for US President, has outlined the following steps to end the human and environmental threats caused by nuclear power and turn to more environmentally friendly and sustainable forms of energy.

1. Phase out commercial nuclear reactors within five years, and set a timetable for phasing out other dangerous nuclear technologies, nuclear waste incinerators, food irradiation and all military and commercial uses of depleted uranium.
2. Ban long-distance transport of high-level radioactive waste.
3. Assure that stored nuclear waste is continuously monitored, with public access to monitoring data, unless and until a method can be found to assure its isolation from the biosphere for the duration of its hazardous life. The government should not relieve companies that generate nuclear waste from their responsibility for its dangers.
4. Redirect federal funding from nuclear energy research to renewable energy technology.
5. Stop federal government promotion of nuclear energy, and US companies selling nuclear technology internationally.

\*\*\*\*\*  
BOOK REVIEWS  
\*\*\*\*\*

## Prevent War -A New Strategy for America by General Jack Kidd

Prevent War -A New Strategy for America guides the reader through a plan for eliminating nuclear weapons by presenting an ideal US president, a forthright leader who courageously sets in to motion the Rule of Law, makes the UN effective, and most importantly, initiates fast track global nuclear disarmament. General Jack Kidd (USAF, Ret.) has written a bold vision of military peacemaking, creating an easy-to-read blueprint for action, the kind of action that creates a peaceful and safe future for all worldwide. David Krieger comments on Kidd's portrait of an ideal US president, "It will be a great day when an American President is elected who would be guided by the strategy set forth by General Kidd, and an even greater day when the Congress would resolve to support the President's strategy."

What Kidd calls the Rule of Law is a strong vision for the 21st Century that is rooted in reason and common sense principles. The Rule of Law creates a foundation of commitment to rid the world of nuclear weapons and to reform the Security Council by eliminating the UN veto and making member countries abstain from voting when their own actions are under review. De-coupling of warheads, disarming, multi-lateral military peacemaking and rigid fast track disarmament completes Kidd's scenario for effective world stability and security. Instead of focusing energy on world military dominance, Kidd recommends that the US should be exerting effort to lead in diplomatic, economic, and, where necessary, humanitarian arenas. He also urges the US to devote more talent and resources to creating the kind of international system that in the future will have the capability of effectively shouldering more of the burdens of keeping the world at peace.

ISBN# 0-9675786-0-4. \$12.95 + shipping and handling. Available from Three President's Publishing, P.O. Box 174, Earlysville, Virginia 22936 USA

## Lethal Arrogance by Lloyd J. Dumas

This book should be required reading for all citizens of nuclear weapons states, and particularly for the engineers and scientists connected with the nuclear weapons laboratories. It is about the relationship between human fallibility and dangerous technologies, particularly nuclear technologies. Dumas writes in the preface, "So many things can go wrong in so many different ways. Yet the multi-sided problems of human fallibility and technological failure must be explored before we can understand both why we cannot avoid these problems and, more importantly, what positive steps we can take to prevent disaster."

The book includes chapters on terrorism and dangerous technologies; controlling dangerous inventories; accidents; inadvertent war with weapons of mass destruction; the fallibility of individuals; bureaucracy, groupthink and cults; the failure of

technical systems; computers and the technological fix; understanding and assessing risks; and preventing disaster. In the final chapter on preventing disaster, Dumas lays out a plan to abolish weapons of mass destruction and to choose more effective security strategies. He concludes: "We can no more avoid the boundaries imposed by our fallibility than we can revoke the laws of nature. We cannot allow our fascination with the power of what we can do to blind us to what we cannot. It is no longer a matter of humility. It is a matter of survival."

The reasonableness of the approach proposed by Dumas might be contrasted with that of Edward Teller, the Father of the H-bomb and a principle proponent of "Star Wars" missile defense. Speaking about the criticism of the nuclear weapons laboratories, Teller argues that it "comes to a great extent from people who have quite a limited understanding of what really goes on in the labs in a scientific way. They're not only ignorant, they are not aware of the fact that they're ignorant." Teller is a living, breathing example of the human component of "Lethal Arrogance."

Lethal Arrogance was published by Saint Martin Press in 1999.

\*\*\*\*\*  
NUCLEAR INSANITY  
\*\*\*\*\*

The US General Accounting Office (GAO) reported in August 2000 that the Department of Energy (DoE) and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) now estimate that the National Ignition Facility will cost about \$3.3 billion and be completed in 2008, more than \$1 billion above original estimates and six years behind schedule. According to the GAO, the cost increase and delay are due to poor management and inadequate DoE oversight. Despite being briefed to the contrary, the former NIF project manager assured Congress that the project was on schedule and within cost. The DoE has stated that it will reallocate funds from within the existing nuclear weapons budget to pay for NIF overruns.  
(United States General Accounting Office, Month Review, August 2000)

The following is an excerpt from "Unleashing 'Mini-Nukes' Will Bring Dire Consequences," an article by Martin Butcher and Theresa Hitchens. The article appeared on 21 September 2000 in the San Francisco Chronicle.

"Top Senate Republicans already have pushed through a measure that will allow US weapons labs to begin studies on a so-called 'mini-nuke', intended not to deter a potential enemy but for use in small regional wars. The measure is expected to pass when Congress debates the defense budget bill later this month. And even though the Pentagon says it 'has no requirement' for such a new weapon, no one in President Clinton's lame-duck administration is expected to take on the issue.

"Sens. John Warner, R-Va., and Wayne Allard, R-Co., ensured that the Senate version of the Defense Authorization Bill for fiscal year 2001 contains a provision to allow initial development studies on a nuclear weapon with an explosive yield of less than five kilotons. The Senators acted in answer to an Air Force request for permission to explore creation of an earth-burrowing nuclear warhead that could be used in regional wars, such as the Gulf War or Kosovo, to destroy underground bunkers."  
(<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/chronicle/archive/2000/09/21/ED35855.DTL>)

\*\*\*\*\*  
NAPF HAPPENINGS  
\*\*\*\*\*

Wagingpeace.org Update by Jason Sattler\*

Wagingpeace.org is currently in the midst of a major revision. We like to think of what we are constructing now as Wagingpeace 2.0. This updated incarnation of our site will feature the same great content from experts, activists and academics on the abolition of nuclear weapons.

What's new in 2.0 is our emphasis on design and connectivity. We hope you find the new pages friendlier on the eye and easier to use. We are encouraging our friends who live outside the United States to let their friends know that they can sign up to join the Foundation for free through our site. Already we have had individuals from such diverse places as Brazil, Bulgaria, Nepal, Australia, India, Japan, the Philippines and Canada join as participating online members of the Foundation. All members receive The Sunflower and join a developing online community of people working for peace and justice. Wagingpeace.org makes possible our global effort to end the nuclear weapons threat to humanity and to build a safer and saner world

This month the main focus of our articles will be Ballistic Missile Defense. We will explore the impact of US plans to develop a Ballistic Missile Defense from the perspectives of individuals from around the world.

During the month, we will also add more information to the Hiroshima and Nagasaki Exhibit already open on our site at <http://www.wagingpeace.org/exhibit/welcome.htm>

Also check out what you can do to press for nuclear weapons abolition at [http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition\\_overview.html](http://www.wagingpeace.org/abolition_overview.html)

\*Please send any comments regarding the website to Jason Sattler, the Web Developer for NAPF at [wagingpeace@napf.org](mailto:wagingpeace@napf.org).

Calling All Students!

The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation is searching for student

leaders worldwide on interested in joining the Foundation's campaign on high school and college campuses! We offer a free online membership for students at <http://www.com/wagingpeace/mbrshp.html>. Contact Michael A. Coffey <[youth@napf.org](mailto:youth@napf.org)>, the Youth Outreach Coordinator for the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation for more information about student involvement. A forthcoming Student Chapter Start-Up Kit will provide guidance and suggestions for contributing toward a world at peace and free of the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction. Students are also encouraged to explore the youth section of [wagingpeace.org](http://wagingpeace.org) for up-to-date information and ideas for action.

## Nagasaki Global Citizens Assembly

David Krieger, president of the Foundation will be traveling to Nagasaki to attend the upcoming Global Citizens Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. He has been given the distinct honor to open the plenary session. In addition to the formal plenary and workshop sessions of the Nagasaki Assembly, there will also be an Abolition 2000 Review and Strategy Meeting to review the past five years of the Network and discuss our strategies and action programs for the future. The Abolition 2000 Coordinating Committee (ACC), in cooperation with the members of its Global Council (GC) in Japan, would will convene an Abolition 2000 Review and Strategy Meeting. All those planning to attend the Nagasaki Assembly are encouraged to participate in this meeting. Please refer to the website at <<http://www3.ocn.ne.jp/~gca.naga/>> for the program and other details of Nagasaki Assembly. Apart from this Abolition 2000 Review and Strategy Meeting, Abolition 2000 activities will be introduced and discussed in the formal plenary and workshop sessions of Nagasaki Assembly.

\*\*\*\*\*

### ACTION ALERT

\*\*\*\*\*

During the last year, the world has been hearing a lot about nuclear as a possible form of "sustainable" energy. Through the Kyoto Protocol, an international agreement created to address climate change, the nuclear industry hopes to get credit for something it cannot deliver: clean, environmentally friendly, non-polluting, energy production. The nuclear industry is set to argue its position at the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Climate Change Convention, which will be held at The Hague, Netherlands from 13-24 November.

Language in the Kyoto Protocol will allow developed nations to build nuclear reactors in other countries and receive "pollution credits" if the new power plants lead to reduced greenhouse gas emissions. However, the country receiving the credit does not have to reduce its own greenhouse gas emissions. This worldwide pollution credits trading scheme is called a Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). Despite the fact that countries such as Japan, Russia and the US have poor nuclear technology records and a history of sacrificing

democratic principles for nuclear industry profit, they are among the nations eligible for CDM credits.

Take action! Decisions on the CDM policies will take place at the upcoming conference at The Hague. Write a letter to your Head of Government or Environment Minister by 13 November, urging them to commit to actual reductions in greenhouse gases, rather than trading pollution credits. A sample letter for you to personalize and send is posted below. Additional information and talking points are available at the Nuclear Information Resource Service at: [Http://www.nirs.org](http://www.nirs.org).

Dear (Head of Government):

The upcoming Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Climate Change Convention, being held at The Hague, Netherlands from 13-24 November, will make a decision on a pollution credits trading scheme, called a Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). CDM policies will allow the nuclear industry to get credit for something it cannot deliver: clean, environmentally friendly, non-polluting, energy production. While nuclear reactors have only 40 years of "useful" life, the toxic waste they produce must be isolated for hundreds of thousands of years. Additionally, reactors are targets for terrorist activity and have caused tragic accidents, affecting millions of people everywhere.

I urge you to support the prohibition of the inclusion of nuclear energy in the CDM. Instead of merely trading pollution credits, our country must commit to the actual reduction of greenhouse gases.

Sincerely,

\*\*\*\*\*

#### RESOURCES

\*\*\*\*\*

Visit the new and improved website of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation at [Http://www.wagingpeace.org](http://www.wagingpeace.org).

The United States put China back into the strategic war plan last year, after a hiatus of two decades. Now the two countries view each other as potential nuclear adversaries. How did we arrive at this juncture and are we headed toward a nuclear show-down? Visit the Center for Defense Information website and read "Is China a Military Threat?"

WEBSITE: <http://www.cdi.org/adm/1340/>

The Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS) is pleased to announce that estimates of India and Pakistan's fissile material stocks and associated nuclear weapons capabilities through the end of 1999 have been posted on the ISIS website. These estimates may be accessed at: <http://www.isis-online.org/publications/southasia/stocks1000.html>

This week on PeaceNet, Amnesty International's new Campaign to Stop Torture. Check out their FAST ("Fast Action Stops Torture") alert system, and read up on their campaign goals.

[Http://www.igc.org/igc/gateway/pnindex.html](http://www.igc.org/igc/gateway/pnindex.html)

"Solving the North Korean Nuclear Puzzle" is a 324 page book edited by David Albright and Kevin O'Neill. The book describes the decade-long effort to ensure that North Korea does not have nuclear weapons. Selected chapters, ordering information and comments by reviewers are available on the ISIS website at:

[Http://www.isis-online.org/publications/dprk/book/dprkbook.html](http://www.isis-online.org/publications/dprk/book/dprkbook.html)

"Taking National Missile Defense to Sea: A Critique of Sea-Based and Boost Phase Proposals" is a new report on alternatives to National Missile Defense (NMD). The report is available on the Council for a Livable World website at:

[Http://www.clw.org/ef/seanmd.html](http://www.clw.org/ef/seanmd.html)

\*\*\*\*\*

Editors

\*\*\*\*\*

Carah Ong  
David Krieger

--

Carah Lynn Ong  
Coordinator, Abolition 2000

"He aha te nui mea o te ao? He tangata, he tangata, he tangata" (A Maori saying)

Translation: "What is the most important thing in the world? It is the people, the people, the people."

PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Rd, Suite 121  
Santa Barbara, California 93108  
Tel: (805) 965-3443 Fax: (805) 568-0466  
email: [admin@abolition2000.org](mailto:admin@abolition2000.org)  
URL: <http://www.abolition2000.org>

To Unsubscribe, send a blank message to: [sunflower-napf-unsubscribe@eGroups.com](mailto:sunflower-napf-unsubscribe@eGroups.com)

Date: Mon, 06 Nov 2000 12:58:04 -0500  
From: "L. William Yolton" <lwyolton@prodigy.net>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.75 [en] (Win98; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Reminder of November 14 meeting

I plan to attend. I'm in town that day.  
--Bill Yolton

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> Dear Colleagues,  
>  
> The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will meet on Tuesday,  
> November 14, 2000 from 1:00 to 2:30 p.m.

To: "Paul Lansu" <paul@paxchristi.net>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: nuclear disarmament  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <002401c047f0\$e775bcf0\$0400a8c0@04paul>  
References:

Dear Paul,

Thanks for sharing with me your draft statement on nuclear disarmament. I hope that things develop so that the world's religious organizations can join the New Agenda Coalition in pressing the nuclear-weapon states and other possessors to move quickly toward nuclear disarmament.

My one comment on your draft relates to no first use. This demand was in the statement that I helped draft and that Cardinal Danneels and Dr. Raiser presented to the 1998 PrepCom. In attending that session I came to realize that no first use still retains the possibility of second use in retaliation. This is unacceptable. Therefore, I have moved toward advocating a pledge of no use against any adversary at any time under any circumstance.

When the United Methodist bishops dealt with this issue in their 1986 statement, "In Defense of Creation", they put it this way: "While we oppose any use of nuclear weapons, we support, as a transitional measure, a no-first-use policy by the United States and urge its reinforcement in an agreement with other nuclear-weapon states." Perhaps some languages such as this might be encompassed in your statement.

Let's keep in touch.

Shalom,  
Howard

To: epf@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Two attachments  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Mary,

Here are the two attachments in plain text form.

See you on Tuesday.

Howard

##

Draft - November 10, 2000

To: President-elect, members of incoming 107th Congress

From: Representatives of Religious Organizations

Re: A Bipartisan Approach to Nuclear Disarmament

Now that the 2000 election is over, the ballots counted and re-counted, it is time for our nation to get down to the serious business of governing. The election returns reveal that citizens are nearly equally divided in their political preference for president, senators, and representatives. But even so there is an strong underlying desire to end partisan bickering and to search for the common good that cuts across party lines.

We believe that a bipartisan approach is especially needed in the quest to eliminate nuclear weapons throughout the world.

Nonpartisan Support for Nuclear Disarmament

Numerous religious bodies and religious leaders have long advocated the elimination of nuclear weapons. Attachment A contains excerpts from such statements.

Many retired military leaders have testified that nuclear weapons have no military utility and favor their elimination. Appendix B contains a sample of their views.

Furthermore, the United States has a legal obligation under Article VI the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which went into effect in March 1970, "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament". In the ratification process this treaty was supported by President Lyndon Johnson and President Richard Nixon. It was ratified by the U.S. Senate on March 13, 1969 by a vote of 83 to 15. Supporters included Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D, MT) and Minority Leader Everett Dirksen (R, IL) and also Robert Byrd (D, WV), Howard Baker (R, TN), and Robert Dole (R, KS), who later held posts as majority and minority leaders.

In 1995 the United States agreed to an unlimited extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. At the 2000 NPT Review Conference the United States, the other nuclear-weapon states, and other parties to the treaty agreed upon a

Final Document that contains 13 practical steps to implement Article VI (see Attachment C.) This included a commitment by the nuclear weapon states to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals". These practical steps and other measures leading toward nuclear disarmament were encompassed in a resolution on "the need for a new agenda" supported by the United States and approved by the First Committee of the United General Assembly in October 2000.

In sum, elimination of nuclear weapons has widespread support from the faith community and from retired military leaders. The law of the land in the form of the ratified Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty requires the United States to achieve nuclear disarmament. Therefore, this is an issue that deserves broad bipartisan support.

## Steps Toward Nuclear Disarmament

During the next four years we believe that the following steps should be undertaken by the United States and other nuclear-weapon states to make substantial progress toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Some of these steps can occur through national initiatives, some through treaties and other agreements. Although consideration of one or two of these steps may generate partisan disagreement, we believe that most of these measures can receive substantial bipartisan support.

### 1. Nuclear Weapon Testing

- a) Continue the moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions.
- b) Ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- c) Curtail research, development, and sub-critical testing of new nuclear weapons and significant modifications of existing warheads.

### 2. De-alerting

- a) Take the entire global strategic nuclear arsenal off hair-trigger alert as quickly as possible. Stages might consist of (i) missiles scheduled for elimination under START II, (ii) missiles encompassed by START III, and (iii) remaining strategic nuclear weapons.
- b) Remove congressional restrictions on de-alerting.

### 3. Strategic arms reduction

- a) Complete the ratification of START II.
- b) Quickly negotiate and ratify START III with a level no higher than 1,000 warheads remaining on each side.
- c) Dismantle warheads and delivery vehicles covered by these agreements.

### 4. Non-strategic weapons

Remove all nuclear weapons based on foreign soil and return them to their homeland.

### 5. Nuclear weapons convention

Initiate multilateral negotiations of a nuclear weapons convention that outlaws and abolishes all nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control.

### 6. No use

Pending the adoption of a nuclear weapons convention, the nuclear-weapon states should make a good faith pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance. As a step toward this commitment, nuclear weapon states could initially make a pledge of no first use.

## 7. ABM Treaty

The ABM Treaty should be preserved as a cornerstone of strategic stability and as a basis for further reduction of nuclear weapons.

## 8. National Missile Defense

Efforts to develop a national missile defense should be curtailed because of its unproven technical feasibility, the extremely high cost, and the instability it causes with allies and other nuclear-weapon states. The protection of the United States from ballistic missile attack can be more readily achieved through diplomacy, reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, and an international regime of ballistic missile control.

## 9. Fissile material control

Establish a global system of fissile material control with international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards.

## 10. Nuclear weapon free zones

- a) Ratify existing nuclear weapon free zone treaties.
- b) Support establishment of other nuclear weapon free zones.

This draft was written by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice. To offer comments, contact him by phone at 301 896-0013 or by e-mail at [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).

###

## PRACTICAL STEPS ON ARTICLE VI

Excerpts from Final Document of the 2000 Review of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

15. The Conference agrees on the following practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and paragraphs 3 and 4(c) of the 1995 Decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament":

1. The importance and urgency of signatures and ratifications without delay and without conditions and in accordance with constitutional processes, to achieve the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.
2. A moratorium on nuclear-weapon-test explosions or any other nuclear explosions pending entry into force of that Treaty.
3. The necessity of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices in accordance with the statement of the Special Coordinator in 1995 and the mandate contained therein, taking into consideration both nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation objectives. The Conference on Disarmament is urged to agree on a programme of work which includes the immediate commencement of negotiations on such a treaty with a view to their conclusion within five years.
4. The necessity of establishing in the Conference on Disarmament an Appropriate subsidiary body with a mandate to

deal with nuclear disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament is urged to agree on a programme of work which includes the immediate establishment of such a body.

5. The principle of irreversibility to apply to nuclear disarmament, nuclear and other related arms control and reduction measures.

6. An unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament to which all States parties are committed under Article VI.

7. The early entry into force and full implementation of START II and the conclusion of START III as soon as possible while preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability and as a basis for further reductions of strategic offensive weapons, in accordance with its provisions.

8. The completion and implementation of the Trilateral Initiative between the United States of America, the Russian Federation and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

9. Steps by all the nuclear-weapon States leading to nuclear disarmament in a way that promotes international stability, and based on the principle of undiminished security for all:

- Further efforts by the nuclear-weapon States to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally.

- Increased transparency by the nuclear-weapon States with regard to their nuclear weapons capabilities and the implementation of agreements pursuant to Article VI and as a voluntary confidence-building measure to support further progress on nuclear disarmament.

- The further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons, based on unilateral initiatives and as an integral part of the nuclear arms reduction and disarmament process.

- Concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems.

- A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination.

- The engagement as soon as appropriate of all the nuclear-weapon States in the process leading to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

10. Arrangements by all nuclear-weapon States to place, as soon as practicable, fissile material designated by each of them as no longer required for military purposes under IAEA or other relevant international verification and arrangements for the disposition of such material for peaceful purposes, to ensure that such material remains permanently outside of military programmer.

11. Reaffirmation that the ultimate objective of the efforts of States in the disarmament process is general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

12. Regular reports, within the framework of the NPT strengthened review process, by all States parties on the implementation of Article VI and paragraph 4 (c) of the 1995 Decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", and recalling the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 8 July 1996.

13. The further development of the verification capabilities that will be required to provide assurance of compliance with nuclear disarmament agreements for the achievement and maintenance of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

May 20, 2000

To: mmoran@cbstevens.com, "Kris Hoxha" <bethesdaum@aol.com>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Deposits  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Today I deposit \$15 in cash and a bag of coins estimated in the \$40 to \$50 range for the Pennies into Potatoes project.

Mike, do you know the amounts of the two bag of coin deposits in October in addition to the \$46 in currency? I would like to update the chart and put a report in the bulletin.

Thanks,  
Howard

From: "Mike Moran" <mmoran@cbstevens.com>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: Deposits  
Date: Mon, 13 Nov 2000 11:31:09 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300

Howard...I haven't see the October bank statment, but I think it's in my box. I'll take a look Thursday if not before..

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2000 11:31 AM  
To: mmoran@cbstevens.com; Kris Hoxha  
Subject: Deposits

Today I deposit \$15 in cash and a bag of coins estimated in the \$40 to \$50 range for the Pennies into Potatoes project.

Mike, do you know the amounts of the two bag of coin deposits in October in addition to the \$46 in currency? I would like to update the chart and put a report in the bulletin.

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

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

From: "Paul Lansu" <paul@paxchristi.net>  
To: "'AEFJN (E-mail)'" <aefjn@innet.be>,  
"Atwood David (E-mail)" <dpatwood@igc.apc.org>,  
"Beyers Jan (E-mail)" <Jan.Beyers@soc.kuleuven.ac.be>,  
"Camilleri Joseph Prof (E-mail)" <j.camilleri@latrobe.edu.au>,  
"Comiskey Joan Vince (E-mail)" <IntlPaxChr@aol.com>,  
"Cordaro Tom (E-mail)" <pcusachair@juno.com>,  
"Coughlan John (E-mail 2)" <john.coughlan@comece.org>,  
"De Vrieze Franklin (E-mail)" <franklin.devrieze@paxchristi.be>,  
"Delahaye Jos (E-mail)" <jos.delahaye@soc.kuleuven.ac.be>,  
"Dell'Olio Antonio (E-mail 2)" <a.dellolio@tiscalinet.it>,  
"Dell'Olio Antonio (E-mail)" <a.dellolio@ba.nettuno.it>,  
"Gaffney Pat (E-mail)" <p.gaffney@paxchristi.freemove.co.uk>,  
"Hallman W. Howard (E-mail)" <mupj@igc.org>,  
"Hally Cyril (E-mail)" <cmi@columban.org.au>,  
"Heidegger Klaus (E-mail)" <k.heidegger@tirol.com>,  
"IANSAs Coordinator" <coordinator@iansa.org>,  
"Ireland (E-mail)" <paxtdc@indigo.ie>,  
"Isis Europe (E-mail)" <isis-europe@ping.be>,  
"Kerremans Bart (E-mail)" <bart.kerremans@soc.kuleuven.ac.be>,  
"Lafouasse Michel (E-mail)" <mmj.lafouasse@wanadoo.fr>,  
"Meeusen Frank (E-mail)" <frank.meeussen@planetinternet.be>,  
"Mellon Christian (E-mail)" <Justice.Paix@wanadoo.fr>,  
"Morvan Guy (E-mail)" <gmorvan@club-internet.fr>,  
"Pagnucco Ronald (E-mail)" <RPagnucco@CSBSJU.EDU>,  
"Robinson Dave (E-mail)" <dave@paxchristiusa.org>,  
"Rothbauer Holger (E-mail)" <Rothbauer@holger.tue.schwaben.de>,  
"Ryzenko Jakub (E-mail)" <ryzenko@poczta.onet.pl>,  
"Schennink Ben (E-mail)" <b.schennink@bw.kun.nl>,  
"Schneckenleitner Meinrad (E-mail)" <meinrad@khg-heim.uni-linz.ac.at>,  
"Theunis Bart (E-mail)" <bart.theunis@cgrs.mibz.fgov.be>,  
"Van Hecken Jef (E-mail)" <Jef.Vanhecken@paxchristi.be>,  
"Van Kemseke Peter (E-mail)" <peter.vankemseke@arts.kuleuven.ac.be>,  
"Wakim David (E-mail)" <Wakim.Fam@xtra.co.nz>,  
"Wicker Brian (E-mail)" <Brian.Wicker@ukgateway.net>,  
"Yasutomi Atsushi (E-mail)" <atsushi.yasutomi@student.kuleuven.ac.be>  
CC: "Simonse Simon (E-mail)" <simonse@paxchristi.nl>,  
"Simonse Simon (E-mail 2)" <simonse@wxs.nl>  
Subject: Small Arms  
Date: Mon, 13 Nov 2000 14:09:35 +0100  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook CWS, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2314.1300  
Importance: Normal  
X-MDAemon-Deliver-To: mupj@igc.org  
X-Return-Path: paul@paxchristi.net

## Geneva Conference on Small Arms

“Setting Course for the 2001 Conference on Small Arms” was the title of a seminar that took place in Geneva on 9 and 10 November 2000. The NGO Committee on Disarmament, the International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA), the Geneva branch of IANSA, Small Arms Survey, and several more

NGOs sponsored the meeting. The aim of the seminar was to focus both the diplomatic community and NGOs on the upcoming 2001 “UN World Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All its Aspects.”

During the first day, the seminar focussed on providing information, exchanging a diverse range of views and experiences, and discussing potential outcomes for UN 2001 with governmental decision-makers. On the second day, NGO representatives, together with experts from IANSA, discussed, exchanged ideas, identified priorities for future work, and debated strategies for UN 2001. Ambassador Carlos Dos Santos, Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the UN in New York and the Chair of the UN 2001 Conference Preparatory Committee attended the seminar. Paul Lansu of the International Secretariat participated in this Geneva seminar.

Important steps in the preparatory process are the next two PrepComs (8 – 19 January and 19 – 30 March 2001). The UN World Conference will take place in New York (and not in Geneva), 9 – 20 July 2001.

Paul Lansu

Pax Christi International  
Rue du Vieux Marché aux Grains 21  
1000 Brussels  
Belgium

phone: +32 (-2) 502.55.50  
fax: +32 (-2) 502.46.26  
mobile: +32 (0475) -382170  
e-mail: paul@paxchristi.net  
url: <http://www.paxchristi.net>

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

September 6, 2000

To: Tyler Beardsley  
Office of Vice President Gore

Fax: 202 456-9500

No. of pages: 5

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Questions on nuclear disarmament

Dear Mr. Beardsley:

Time is running out for us to prepare for the news conference we have scheduled for 2:00 p.m. tomorrow to present replies from presidential candidates on questions asked by 48 religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues.

In absence of a reply from Vice President Gore, I have derived the following answers from information available on web sites. It's all I have been able to find. Unless I receive different or more complete answers by mid-afternoon today, I will incorporate what I have into a document that also presents the responses from Governor Bush and Ralph Nader.

I regret having to do it in this manner, for I know that Vice President Gore has well-developed ideas on nuclear disarmament issues. But we seem to have no other choice.

With best regards,

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

September 6, 2000

To: Bishop Thomas Gumbleton

Fax: 313 897-2980

No. of pages: 7

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Tom:

Here are the responses to our questions from Governor Bush, Vice President Gore, and Ralph Nader. Only Nader gave us a full set of answers. For the other two I had to construct answers from material provided by campaign staff and picked up from web sites. I have offered the Bush and Gore campaigns an opportunity to fill in the blanks if they will get back to me by the end of the day. If they do, we will have a modified version of this document tomorrow.

You and Bishop Dale White will be our two presenters. I will make brief opening remarks then ask you and Dale to each speak briefly to offer the religious perspective of your faith on nuclear weapons. Then I would like the two of you to alternate in presenting the candidates' responses to the questions. Will you take the odd numbers?

It would be in order to comment briefly on the candidates' responses. For example, on the first question on the morality of nuclear weapons, you could express disappointment that Governor Bush and Vice President Gore have not answered the question and that you hope they will consider the matter further and offer their views during the election campaign. I may draft some suggested comments on all the questions. We're not trying to bash the candidates or favor anyone, but we want to exert some gentle pressure to have our issues thoroughly considered in the campaign.

After we go through the questions, we will open up proceedings to the floor. We are expecting a reasonable good turnout from the press.

I look forward to seeing you at the National Press Club.

Shalom,

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

September 9, 2000

To: Signers of Letter to Presidential Candidates

On September 7 we released the responses of presidential candidates to the ten questions from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. A copy is attached.

Ralph Nader provided a full set of answers to our questions. The Bush campaign staff furnished material for us to extract the answers. The Gore staff provided nothing, so we had to dig into other sources for Gore's views, including the campaign web site. The morning before the news conference I sent the Gore staff the answers I had formulated and offered them an opportunity to make corrections and fill in the blanks. I had no reply. Similarly I sent the Bush staff a list of the unanswered questions and requested answers. I had no reply.

Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton and United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White spoke at the news conference. We had religious news services representatives in attendance, but no mainline media showed up in spite of strong promotion. Our media consultant believes that this is due to lack of news in the form of candidates' answers to questions they hadn't previously addressed.

We will continue to seek answers and will enlist reporters to ask our questions to the candidates.

You yourself may want to write the candidates. You can express your disappointment to Vice President Gore and Governor Bush that they didn't reply to our questions on these important issues and ask for their views on the three following unanswered questions. You can incorporate your own faith perspective into the letter.

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons?

(2) If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

(3) Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons?

Addresses for the candidates are listed on the next page. Ralph Nader's address is included in case you want to write "thank you" for his full cooperation. Senator Lieberman's address is listed if you want to write and urge that he, being concerned with moral values, may want to be certain that the Gore-Lieberman ticket addresses this issue.

To: Signers of Letter to Presidential Candidates  
September 9, 2000  
Page two.

Addresses of Candidates

The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.  
Attn: Mr Leon Fuerth  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable George W. Bush  
State Capitol  
100 E. 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, TX 78701

Mr. Ralph Nader  
Nader for President Headquarters  
1225 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005

The Honorable Joseph I. Lieberman  
706 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

If you get any replies, please share them with me. Again thanks for your cooperation.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

September 11, 2000

Mr. Brian Moran  
Office of Senator Dorgan  
713 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Brian:

I would like to share with you the attached responses from presidential candidates to questions nuclear disarmament issues from 48 religious leaders. Also attached is Ralph Nader's response in its entirety. I believe that they will be of interest to Senator Dorgan and you.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

September 12, 2000

Mr. Leon Fuerth  
Office of the Vice President  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. Fuerth:

On August 18, 2000 48 religious leaders wrote Vice President Gore to your attention with a series of questions on nuclear disarmament issues. We wrote other presidential candidates at the same time. As the enclosure indicates, we received a full set of answers from Ralph Nader. We were able to find some answers for Governor Bush from material his campaign staff provided us. For Vice President Gore we received nothing but were able to construct some answers from the campaign web site and answers received by another organization during the primary campaign. We sent these to Jeremy Bash in Nashville (he had contacted us at the last minute) with a request for additional information, but received nothing by the time we released the responses on September 7.

We are still interested in Vice President Gore's answers to these important questions. In particular we are seeking answers to the questions about the morality of nuclear weapons (#1), their utility (#8), and nuclear disarmament plans under the NPT commitment (#2). We would also be interested in elaboration of Vice President Gore's views on other issues, such as de-alerting (#5).

The survey results are now on the web site of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society: [www.umc-cbcs.org/whatsnew.htm](http://www.umc-cbcs.org/whatsnew.htm). We would be pleased to update this with additional answers from Vice President Gore. We would also share additional replies with various faith-based networks.

We will appreciate whatever assistance you can provide.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

September 23, 2000

Mr. Jim Lehrer  
NewsHour with Jim Lehrer  
2775 South Quincy Street  
Arlington, VA 22206

Re: Presidential Candidates' Debates

Dear Mr. Lehrer:

I propose the following two questions for you to ask Vice President Gore and Governor Bush in one of the presidential candidates' debates. They deal with a very important issue that the candidates are ignoring.

**(1) In this year's presidential campaign, there is much talk about moral values. What are your views on the morality of the use of nuclear weapons and the threatened use through the doctrine of nuclear deterrence?**

As follow up in case a candidate expresses the need for nuclear weapons:

**(2) It has been more than fifty-five years since a U.S. president has authorized the use of nuclear weapons. If elected president, in what circumstance would you authorize actual use of nuclear weapons? What category of targets would you consider it legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons?**

More than a month ago 48 religious leaders from a cross-section of denominations and geographic areas posed these and related questions to the presidential candidates. Only Ralph Nader answered all questions. The two Reform Party candidates didn't reply. Vice President Gore and Governor Bush avoided these two crucial questions. This is shown in the enclosed composite of their responses. Related background material is also enclosed.

We believe that the American people should know how the candidates stand on this crucial issue. Therefore, we strongly urge you to ask these two questions in the course of one of the presidential debates.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

## **Enclosures for Mr. Jim Lehrer**

Presidential Candidates' Views on Nuclear Disarmament Issues: Responses of George W. Bush, Albert Gore, Jr., and Ralph Nader to Ten Questions Posed by 48 Religious Leaders

The Candidates' Views on Nuclear Disarmament. Comments by Bishop Thomas J. Gumbleton and Bishop C. Dale White

### Policy Statements on Nuclear Disarmament

- General Board, American Baptist Churches (1985)
- Episcopal Church, General Convention (1997)
- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (1995)
- Unitarian Universalist Association (various dates)
- United Church of Christ (1979)
- United Methodist Church (2000)
- Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. (2000)
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops (1994)
- Pax Christi Bishops in the United States (1998)

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement  
by Military Professionals and Religious Leaders (2000)

### What Military Commanders Say about Utility of Nuclear Weapons

- Admiral Noel Gayler
- General Colin Powell
- General Charles Horner
- General Lee Butler
- Postscript: A Religious Perspective

For further information, contact:

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

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

September 26, 2000

Bishop C. Dale White  
117 Eustis Avenue  
Newport, RI 02840

Dear Dale,

Here is a check to reimburse you for your travel expenses for participation in the news conference.

We still haven't placed the op-ed piece, but we're still trying. We haven't heard any more from the Bush and Gore campaigns. They seem to want to avoid nuclear weapons issues.

We're trying to get a question on this subject into the TV candidates' debate.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

October 25, 2000

Mr. Walter Pincus  
The Washington Post  
1150 15<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Mr. Pincus:

I greatly appreciate the way in which you persistently follow issues of nuclear weapons, most recently in your article in the Washington Post of October 24, "Nuclear Expert Challenges U.S. Thinking on Warheads".

I urge you to write another article on the moral challenge to nuclear weapons by religious leaders, religious organizations, and in recent years by retired military leaders. Unfortunately the Washington Post and other mainstream media have consistently ignored this critique of nuclear weapons. So have the two main presidential candidates.

As an enclosure indicate, we tried to get Vice President Gore and Governor Bush to deal with the morality of nuclear weapons in a campaign that has a lot of concern for moral values. They refused. We tried to get various elements of the media, including the Washington Post, to take up this issue with the candidates, and they, too, declined. In June a group of top religious leaders and top military leaders issued a joint statement condemning nuclear weapons on both moral and utilitarian grounds, but their views were also ignored by the media.

I hope that you might overcome this neglect by writing a survey article of the views of the world faith community on the morality of nuclear weapons. The enclosures provide some of this information. I am willing to offer further suggestions, such as on the positions of the Holy See and the World Council of Churches and some other sources.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

November 10, 2000

Mr. Wade Greene  
Philanthropic Advisor  
30 Rockefeller Plaza, Room 5600  
New York, NY 10112

Dear Mr. Greene:

We have now completed our work under a contribution of \$15,000 from an anonymous member of the Rockefeller Family. These funds were used in support of the leadership role I play in the faith community on nuclear disarmament issues. Activities have included action on National Missile Defense, nonpartisan questions to presidential and congressional candidates on nuclear weapons issues, and participation in a meeting of faith representatives in Brussels on NATO nuclear posture. Enclosed is a report of these activities and an accounting of the expenditures.

We would now like to request further financial support from the Rockefeller Family for activities of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair. It now has the participation of more than 30 faith-based organizations, both denominational organizations and unofficial peace fellowships. We expect others to join as we gear up for the next presidential administration and the new Congress.

To help define what we would like to achieve during the next four years, I have drafted the enclosed "A Bipartisan Approach to Nuclear Disarmament", which will be discussed at a November 14 meeting of the Interfaith Committee. This statement will be further developed and refined during the next month. We will also determine which particular issues we will focus on most in the coming months.

We expect to make contact with the transition team of the president-elect and with persons designated to fill particular national security positions. We will also be in touch with members of Congress and their staffs, and we will encourage grassroots interfaith delegations to contact their senators and representatives before Congress convenes and throughout the session.

Mr. Wade Greene  
November 10, 2000  
Page two.

I will continue to play a catalytic, leadership role with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. For this activity we are seeking funds to support an annual budget of \$50,000. Would it be possible to obtain half of this amount -- \$25,000 -- from a Rockefeller donor?

To raise the balance we have proposals pending with the Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program, the Compton Foundation, and the John Merck Fund for the balance. If we are quite successful, our next priority in funding is support for a web site on interfaith work for nuclear disarmament. Beyond that it would be useful to have a full-time field coordinator to help with grassroots mobilization. All three "asking" budgets are enclosed.

If you need further information, please let me know. If you wish, I'm willing to go to New York to talk with you directly.

With best regards,

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**

### **Activities and Financial Report for a Rockefeller Grant**

On June 19, 2000 an anonymous member of the Rockefeller Family made a contribution of \$15,000 to Methodists United for Peace with Justice in support of its leadership role with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. It was agreed that \$10,000 would be assigned to the MUPJ General Fund, which has 501(c)(4) status under the Internal Revenue Code. The other \$5,000 would go to the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, a 501(c)(3) entity. This money was used to support three activities led by Howard W. Hallman, chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

#### **NMD Postcard**

At a May planning the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which Hallman chairs, decided to focus on opposition to deployment of a national missile defense (NMD). Having worked with 20/20 Vision on postcard alerts during the CTBT ratification campaign, we invited their representatives to attend our June meeting to consider how we might work together on the NMD issue. Following the meeting two members of the Interfaith Committee worked with 20/20 staff to develop the text of an NMD postcard (copy attached). Hallman and 20/20 staff reached out to religious organizations and got 28 of them to cosponsor the postcard and distribute it to their constituents. The cosponsors distributed more than 40,000 postcards in a short period, and some sent the message out by e-mail. This occurred during the final six weeks before President Clinton made a decision not to deploy an NMD at this time. Many civic-sector organizations have been working on this issue. We were able to add opposition from the faith community at a crucial time.

#### **Nonpartisan Election Questions**

Through e-mail exchange and discussion at a meeting the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament developed and distributed a set of questions on issue of nuclear disarmament for candidates for the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. They are attached.

Through a separate initiative Methodists United for Peace with Justice worked with Pax Christi USA on a set of questions on nuclear disarmament addressed to the presidential candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. The letter to the candidates was signed by 48 religious leaders from a cross-section of denominations and geographic regions. The candidates' responses were released at a news conference on September 7 at the National Press Club with presentations by Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton and United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White. Afterwards the candidates' responses were distributed by faith-based groups and civic-sector organizations. Several documents related to this initiative are attached.

## **International Faith Community**

In early October Hallman participated in a meeting in Brussels, Belgium that brought together representatives from European, Canadian, and U.S. churches, the World Council of Churches, and unofficial religious organizations, such as Pax Christi International. The primary purpose was to formulate a common position on NATO nuclear posture, now under review, and to organize delegations to key NATO non-nuclear states which will can influence NATO policy. The communiqué of this meeting is attached.

The meeting in Brussels gave Hallman an opportunity to talk with staff of the World Council of Churches and Pax Christi International about a possible global initiative to get church leaders from different continents to call upon the heads of nuclear-weapon states and insist that they move ahead with their NPT obligation to eliminate their nuclear arsenals. Attached is Hallman's suggestions for a statement and implementation by the World Council of Churches.

## **Expenditures**

Methodists United for Peace with Justice has expended the contribution from the Rockefeller Family member as follows:

### **MUPJ General Fund (501-c-4)**

Contribution	\$10,000.00
<u>Expenditures</u>	
Personnel	6,000.00
Media consultant	2,516.92
National Press Club	529.27
Travel (Bishop White, Hallman)	712.23
Office expenses	<u>241.58</u>
	\$10,000.00

### **Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund (501-c-3)**

Contribution	\$ 5,000.00
<u>Expenditures</u>	
Personnel	\$ 5,000.00

November 10, 2000

## **Budget for Interfaith Mobilization on Nuclear Disarmament**

### **I. Committee Chair**

Personnel	
Hallman (part time) 12 months @ \$3,000/mo.	\$36,000
Fringe benefits 15% of salary	<u>5,400</u>
	41,400
Communications (phone, internet, postage)	3,000
Printing, photocopy	2,400
Supplies	600
Travel	<u>2,600</u>
	\$50,000

### **II. Web Site**

Set-up: consultant, domain name	\$ 4,000
Operations: web server and internet fees, part-time staff	<u>18,000</u>
	\$22,000

### **III. Field Coordination**

Personnel	
Field Coordinator	\$40,000
Fringe benefit 15% of salary	<u>6,000</u>
	46,000
Communications	6,000
Office expenses	4,000
Printing, photocopy	6,000
Travel	<u>4,000</u>
	\$66,000

## **Faith-based Organizations Participating in Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament**

Alliance of Baptists  
American Baptists Churches, USA  
American Friends Service Committee  
Baptist Peace Fellowship  
Buddhist Peace Fellowship  
Central Conference of America Rabbis  
Church of the Brethren  
Church Women United  
Church World Service  
Conference of Major Superiors of Men  
Disciples Peace Fellowship  
Episcopal Church  
Episcopal Peace Fellowship  
Fellowship of Reconciliation  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Jewish Peace Fellowship  
Lutheran Office of Governmental Affairs  
(Evangelical Lutheran Church in America)  
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns  
Mennonite Central Committee  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
Muslim Peace Fellowship  
National Council of Churches  
Pax Christi USA  
Presbyterian Church U.S.A.  
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship  
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism  
Sisters of Saint Joseph of Peace  
Sisters of Mercy of the Americas  
Sojourners Peace Ministry  
Unitarian Universalist Association  
United Church of Christ  
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society  
U.S. Catholic Conference  
World Peacemakers

Some of these are denominational offices, others are religious associations focusing on peace and justice issues. The former provide access to the denominational structure and official channels of communication. The latter are able to cut through hierarchical order and directly reach the strongest peace advocates. This "both-and" arrangement creates a strong coalition.

September 11, 2000

Mr. Lowell Unger  
Office of Senator Harkin  
731 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Unger:

I would like to share with you the attached responses from presidential candidates to questions nuclear disarmament issues from 48 religious leaders. Also attached is Ralph Nader's response in its entirety. I believe that they will be of interest to Senator Dorgan and you.

I would like to talk with you about this matter.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

## Contacts for the Interfaith Group for the CTBT

Jim Matlack  
American Friends Service Committee  
1822 R Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20009  
Tel: 202 483-3341  
Fax: 202 232-3197  
E-mail: denhartz@erols.com

Pam Genise  
Church of the Brethren,  
Washington Office  
337 North Carolina Ave., SE  
Washington, DC 20003  
Tel: 202 546-3202  
Fax: 202 544-5852  
E-mail: washofc@aol.com

Ann Delorey  
Church Women United  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 544-8747  
Fax: 202 544-9133  
E-mail: ann\_d.parti@ecunet.org

Heather Nolen  
ChurchWorld Service  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 543-6336  
Fax: 202 546-6232  
E-mail: heathern@nccusa.org

Tom Hart, Jere Skipper  
Episcopal Church, Washington Office  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 547-7300  
Fax: 202 547-4457  
E-mail: tom.hart@ecunet.org  
jmskipper@aol.com

Mary H. Miller  
Episcopal Peace Fellowship  
P.O. Box 28156  
Washington, DC 20039-8156  
Tel: 202 783-3380  
Fax: 202 393-3695  
E-mail: epf@igc.apc.org

Clayton Ramey  
Fellowship of Reconciliation  
Box 271  
Nyack, NY 10960  
Tel: 914 358-4601  
Fax: 914 358-4924  
E-mail: disarm@forusa.org

Joe Volk, Kathy Guthrie, Rachel Phillips  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
245 Second Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 547-6000  
Fax: 202 547-6019  
E-mail: joe[kathy, rachel]@fcnl.org

Mark Brown  
Lutheran Office of Governmental Affairs  
122 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
Tel: 202 626-7932  
Fax: 202 783-7502  
E-mail: mark.brown@ecunet.org

Daryl Byler  
Mennonite Central Committee  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 544-6564, x. 2  
Fax: 202 544-2820  
E-mail: J.\_Daryl\_Byler@mcc.org

Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office  
401 Michigan Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20017  
Tel: 202 832-1780  
Fax: 202 832-5195  
E-mail: mknolldc@igc.apc.org

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

Lisa Wright  
National Council of Churches  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20001  
Tel: 202 543-6336  
Fax: 202 543-1297  
E-mail:

Jean Sammon  
NETWORK: A National Catholic  
Social Justice Lobby  
801 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE, #460  
Washington, DC 20003  
Tel: 202 547-5556, x.17  
Fax: 202 547-5510  
E-mail: jsammon@networkloby.org

Dave Robinson  
Pax Christ USA  
532 W. 8<sup>th</sup> Street  
Erie, PA 16502  
Tel: 814 453-4955, x.235  
Fax: 814 452-4784  
e-mail: dave@paxchristiusa.org

Walter Owensby  
Presbyterian Church (USA)  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 543-1126  
Fax: 202 543-7755  
E-mail: Walter\_Owensby@pcusa.org

L. William Yolton  
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship  
3825 Gibbs Street  
Alexandria, VA 22309-2252  
Tel: 703 360-3657  
Fax: 703 360-1992  
E-mail: lwolton@prodigy.net

Joshua Noble  
Union of American Hebrew Congregations  
2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: 202 387-2800  
Fax: 202 667-9070  
E-mail: jnoble@uahc.org

Lawrence Egbert  
Unitarian Universalist Association  
2026 P Street, NW, Suite 3  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: 202 296-4672  
Fax: 202 296-4673  
E-mail: uuawo@aol.com

Jay Lintner  
United Church of Christ  
Office for Church in Society  
110 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 543-1517  
Fax: 202 543-5994  
E-mail: lintnerj@ucc.org

Robin Ringler  
United Methodist General Board  
of Church and Society  
100 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202 488-5647  
Fax: 202 488-5639  
E-mail: Dringler@umc-gbcs.org

Gerard F. Powers  
U.S Catholic Conference  
3211 4<sup>th</sup> Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20017  
Tel: 202 541-3196  
Fax: 202 541-3339  
E-mail: gpowers@nccbuscc.org

September 23, 1999

## Nuclear Abolition for PeaceLeaf

There's been a convergence of thought the last few years that nuclear weapons are both immoral and useless. Therefore, the only right and sensible course is to eliminate them entirely. That being the case, let's get on with the task.

### **Moral Condemnation**

Numerous religious leaders and religious bodies have concluded that both the use and the threat to use nuclear weapons under a deterrence doctrine is morally wrong. Three can serve as illustration.

In 1986 the United Methodist Council of Bishops, based upon biblical and theological study, stated, "We say a clear and unconditional *No* to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing."

In October 1997 Archbishop Renato Martino, speaking for the Holy See at the United Nations, criticized the nuclear weapon states for "for clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence." He indicated, "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation."

This spring in advance of the 1998 session of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee, the Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, sent the delegates a statement that said:

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. ...As an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt."

### **Uselessness**

Not only are nuclear weapons morally wrong, a variety of military leaders have indicated that they have no utility in warfare. This finding was summarized by the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons, an international body composed of retired military officers, scientists, and civilian leaders, in its 1996 report, as follows:

Nuclear weapons have long been understood to be too destructive and non-discriminatory to secure discrete objectives on the battlefield. The destructiveness of nuclear weapons is so great that they have no military utility against a comparably equipped opponent, other than the belief that they deter that opponent from using nuclear weapons. Possession of nuclear weapons has not prevented wars, in various regions, which directly or indirectly involve the major powers. They were deemed unsuitable for use even when those powers suffered humiliating military setbacks.

Thus, we note that all five declared nuclear weapons states have suffered defeat or stalemate in regional wars rather than use nuclear weapons against their adversaries: United States (Korea, Vietnam), Soviet Union (Afghanistan), then Russia (Chechnya), China (Vietnam), United Kingdom (Egypt during the Suez crisis), and France (Algiers).

The Canberra Commission further observed, "No nuclear weapon state has been or is prepared to declare as a matter of national policy that it would respond to the use of chemical or biological weapons with nuclear weapons." We can note that the United States has recently been ambiguous about this possibility, but most military experts believe that nuclear retaliation is an unsuitable response to chemical or biological weapons.

Accordingly, the Canberra Commission concluded:

Thus, the only apparent military utility that remains is for nuclear weapons is deterring their use by others. That utility implies the continued existence of nuclear weapons. It would disappear if nuclear weapons were eliminated."

### **False Security**

In spite of the lack of military utility and the immorality of nuclear deterrence, United States, Russia, China, United Kingdom, and France want to maintain their nuclear arsenal. India and Pakistan have publicly joined the nuclear club, in part because of the national honor and prestige they think it bestows.

Rather than enhancing national security, possession of nuclear weapons makes these seven nations less secure. That's because their cities and military bases are on the target lists of their adversaries.

Although Israel with its hidden nuclear arsenal may feel more secure, it could face a choice of using nuclear weapons on its own territory to thwart an invader or destroying enemy cities in retaliation. Would a nation which came into existence in part because world opinion's reaction to genocide committed against Jews itself want to perpetrate genocide against its adversaries?

## **STEPS TOWARD NUCLEAR ABOLITION**

As there is a growing consensus that nuclear weapons can and should be eliminated, so also there is an emerging consensus of steps to take along the road to nuclear abolition.

### **Halt the Nuclear Arms Race**

There has long been a desire to halt the nuclear arms race. This was the intent of efforts to achieve an end to nuclear weapons testing. It was an objective of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1970. It was the focus of the nuclear weapons freeze movement of the 1980s.

Success came with the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in September 1996. However, U.S. ratification of this treaty is held up by an obstructive Senate, which is unresponsive to the favorable view of 80 percent.

## First Draft

### A Call for NATO to Relinquish Nuclear Weapons

We, the undersigned, leaders of religious bodies in Europe and North America, note that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is approaching its fiftieth anniversary. We also note that the political and military situation has changed significantly since NATO was founded.

In 1949 Europe was the focus of intense conflict between two antagonistic blocs of nations: the United States and West European allies and the Soviet Union and East European allies. In the following decades the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, stationed large numbers of military forces armed with nuclear weapons in Western Europe and Eastern Europe. Central Europe became the primary focal point of the Cold War.

In contrast in 1999 the Soviet Union no longer exists. With Soviet troops withdrawn nations in Eastern Europe have created new forms of government and are no longer allied with Russia in a military bloc. Russia is absorbed in the enormous task of economic change following the collapse of the communist system. Spared the threat of outside aggression, Western Europe is engaged in developing new forms of economic and political cooperation. Although the United States retains a military presence in Europe, its military forces and weaponry there have been substantially diminished. The challenge in Europe today is not the danger of confrontation from two military superpowers but rather the resolution of ancient ethnic conflicts within particular nations. For these situations nuclear weapons have absolutely no relevance.

In view of this situation it is time for NATO to relinquish its reliance on nuclear weapons. Although some persons urge NATO to change to a no-first-use policy, we find this to be faulty because it retains the possibility of second use. Any use of nuclear weapons in Europe, whether first or second, would yield devastating results for the people and the environment. The correct posture for NATO, therefore, is no use and no threatened use of nuclear weapons, none whatever. Such a policy makes sense because nuclear weapons have lost any utility they may have had for deterrence and war-fighting purposes.

Not only is NATO's nuclear posture outmoded, it is morally corrupt. The doctrine of nuclear deterrence holds innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. This is clearly wrong. The actual use of nuclear weapons would slaughter the innocent and leave lasting effects harmful to future generations. This would be pure, unmitigated evil.

Therefore, we ask the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as an alliance to renounce unequivocally the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons.

We call for withdrawal of all nuclear weapons from Europe beyond the borders of the present nuclear weapons states: United Kingdom, France, and Russia. We advocate creation of a permanent nuclear weapons free zone for all of Europe outside the boundaries of these three states.

Furthermore, we call upon all states possessing nuclear weapons -- United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, China, Israel, India, and Pakistan -- to embark upon a systematic process to achieve total elimination of all nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, under strict and

effective international control. As an initial step, we ask all nuclear weapon states to de-alert their nuclear arsenals by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and other means.

Finally, we support a strong global regime to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to any other nation or organization.

Signed by:

This first draft was written by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036. Telephone/fax: 301 896-0013.  
E-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org). Comments are invited.

## Letter to U.S. Presidential Candidates from U.S. Religious Leaders

To be sent to nominees of Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties after the nomination process has been completed (mid-August)

Sample for Vice President Al Gore. To be adapted for other candidates.

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Congratulations on your nomination by the Democratic Party for the office of President of the United States. We look forward to a wholesome debate among the candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people.

Among these issues one of the most important is the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. We hope you share this view.

In this letter we pose a series of questions on this matter. We would greatly appreciate receiving a reply from you by Tuesday, September 5, which is two months before the election. We will hold a news conference on September 7 to release your answers to our questions along with the replies of candidates of the Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Excerpts from these statements are attached. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to

the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?

(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?

(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?

(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?

(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.

(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President George Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?

(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?

We will greatly appreciate your response to these questions by September 5 prior to our news conference on September 7. If your busy schedule permits, a delegation of the signers would welcome an opportunity to meet with you to discuss these issues in greater detail.

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement by military professionals and religious leaders.

Statements of retired military leaders on the lack of utility of nuclear weapons for war-fighting.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, with assistance of Dave Robinson, Program Director, Pax Christi USA.

July 21, 2000

# **Presidential Candidates Views on Nuclear Disarmament Issues**

## **Responses of**

### **George W. Bush, Albert Gore, Jr., and Ralph Nader**

#### **to Ten Questions Posed by 48 Religious Leaders**

On August 18, 2000 forty-eight religious leaders from a cross-section faith groups and geographic areas wrote to the presidential candidates of the Democratic, Green, Reform, and Republican parties, asking a series of questions on nuclear disarmament issues. From the responses of the candidates and their campaign staffs we obtained the views of Governor George W. Bush (Republican), Vice President Albert Gore, Jr. (Democratic), and Mr. Ralph Nader (Green). The two Reform Party candidates declined to respond. The questions and the candidates' answers (and lack of answers) are presented below.

#### **Religious Leader's Perspective**

We look forward to a wholesome debate among the presidential candidates on significant issues that are of great importance to the American people. Among these issues one of the most important is the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Our own perspective is that the time has come for the United States to provide creative leadership to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons

For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons and have called for their elimination.

Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See, Archbishop Renato Martino in October 1997 told the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.... The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority."

In a message on January 1, 2000 His Holiness the Dalai Lama called for a step-by-step approach to external disarmament. He stated, "We must first work on the total abolishment of nuclear weapons and gradually work up to total demilitarization throughout the world."

In the United States numerous denominations have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Recently 21 heads of communion and other religious leaders joined with 18 retired general and admirals to point out that "the long-term reliance of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

## Questions to the Candidates and Their Replies

*(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?*

Governor Bush: Views unknown.

Vice President Gore: Views unknown.

Mr. Nader: "Nuclear weapons have no moral or practical use for any purpose except as a deterrent to nuclear threats. The U.S. government's refusal to adopt a no-first-use policy is a striking example of political immorality. If elected President, I would immediately adopt a policy that the US will never be the first to use a nuclear weapon in any conflict, and would urge other nuclear powers to do the same.

"More broadly, as the first country to use nuclear weapons, and the perennial leader in new technologies for these horrifying weapons of mass destruction, the United States has a moral obligation to take the lead in working for their elimination. The 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty gives us a legal obligation to work for elimination, as well. Gen. George Lee Butler, the retired former commander of both the Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Strategic Command has been eloquent in support of abolition."

*(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?*

Governor Bush: Views unknown.

Vice President Gore: Views unknown.

Mr. Nader: "I would:

- Take all nuclear missiles off 'hair-trigger' high-alert status, and urge the Russian President to do the same. The greatest danger of a global nuclear disaster is an accidental launch. De-alerting will *not* undermine the United States' ability to deter a nuclear strike. There are over 3,000 nuclear warheads on American submarines. Enough are at sea and on alert at any time to assure sufficient retaliation capacity even after a massive first strike.
- Adopt a no-first use policy, and urge other nuclear powers to do the same.
- Stop nuclear testing, including sub-critical and virtual testing. I would make the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) one of my top legislative priorities.
- Prohibit the deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons outside the United States.

- Push for the ratification of the START II treaty, which Russia has already ratified, work with Congress and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to further reduce the US nuclear arsenal to around 1500 warheads as expeditiously as possible, and begin negotiating a START III agreement that will bring missile levels below 1,000.
- Begin talks with all nuclear nations to develop a framework and a final date for the abolition of nuclear weapons."

*(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?*

Governor Bush: Views unknown.

Vice President Gore: Views unknown.

Mr. Nader: "Yes. Working toward total elimination is the only moral and rational course. The United States, as the sole superpower, has the responsibility to take the lead in such negotiations."

*(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?*

Governor Bush: "Our nation should continue its moratorium on testing. But in the hard work of halting proliferation, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is not the answer. The CTBT does not stop proliferation, especially to renegade regimes. It is not verifiable. It is not enforceable. And it would stop us from ensuring the safety and reliability of our nation's deterrent, should the need arise. On these crucial matters, it offers only words and false hopes and high intentions – with no guarantees whatever. We can fight the spread of nuclear weapons, but we cannot wish them away with unwise treaties."

Vice President Gore: "I support ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and I will continue to fight for its ratification. Because of the Treaty's importance to the long-term national security interests of our country, I intend to take this issue to the American people during my campaign for the Presidency, and if elected, my first act as President will be to put the Treaty back before the Senate with a demand from the American people for its ratification."

Mr. Nader: "Nuclear testing poses a grave threat to the environment and public health, and increases the danger of nuclear war by promoting the development of new nuclear-weapons technology. I would both immediately halt all U.S. nuclear test explosions, including sub-critical and virtual testing, and make the ratification of the CTBT a high priority."

*(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.*

Governor Bush: "The United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status -- another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation. Preparation for quick launch -- within minutes after warning or an attack -- was the rule during the era of superpower rivalry. But today, for two nations at peace, keeping so many on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch. So, as president, I will ask for an assessment of what we can safely do to lower the alert status of our forces."

Vice President Gore: In another questionnaire when asked about Admiral Stansfield Turner's proposal that the U.S. take the initiative to create a reciprocal reduction in nuclear alert status by separating warheads from delivery systems and moving the components hundreds of miles away to a storage sites monitored by verification teams, Vice President Gore responded as follows: "Right now, U.S. nuclear warheads are not targeted against Russian targets, and the Russians are similarly "de-targeted." I have concerns about Admiral Turner's ideas because of the way in which they might work out in a period of crisis if either side tried to reunite warheads with their delivery systems. This issue is one that requires further detailed study."

Mr. Nader: "Due to Russia's collapsing military infrastructure, the danger of an accidental nuclear launch is greater now than it was at any time during the Cold War. I would immediately take all U.S. nuclear missiles off of 'hair-trigger' high-alert status, and strongly urge President Putin to do the same. Again, this will not undermine the country's ability to effectively deter a nuclear strike. Taking nuclear weapons off high-alert status is the single most important step we could take towards preventing a nuclear disaster."

*(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President George Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?*

Governor Bush: "America should rethink the requirements for nuclear deterrence in a new security environment. The premises of Cold War nuclear targeting should no longer dictate the size of our arsenal. As president, I will ask the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of our nuclear force posture and determine how best to meet our security needs. While the exact number of weapons can come only from such an assessment, I will pursue the lowest possible number consistent with national security. It should be possible to reduce the number of American nuclear weapons significantly further than what has already been agreed to under START II, without compromising our security in any way. We should not keep weapons that our military planners do not need. These unneeded weapons are the expensive relics of dead conflicts. And they do nothing to make us more secure."

Vice President Gore: "I believe in the value of nuclear deterrence for the foreseeable future, but I do not think that we need incremental increases in our nuclear arsenal. In fact, I am interested in seeing our nuclear arsenal reduced substantially through arms control. This Administration is

working on the entry into force of the START II Treaty, negotiation of a START III Treaty providing for even deeper reduction in weapons pointed at the United States, and an agreement with Russia to adjust the ABM Treaty to make it possible to defend ourselves against rogue states."

Mr. Nader: "I would push for immediate ratification of START II, and immediately begin negotiations of a START III agreement that will bring missile levels below 1,000. Once we have achieved this level of disarmament we would be in a position to begin talks with all nuclear nations for the negotiation of deeper cuts and the eventual abolition of nuclear weapons.

"The Center for Defense Information reports that the Pentagon's remarkably bloated list of targets for nuclear warheads has actually *grown* since the end of the Cold War. I would provide the presidential leadership that has been lacking to reduce the target list, which is a major technical barrier to the negotiation of a START III agreement."

*(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.*

Governor Bush: "These changes to our forces should not require years and years of detailed arms control negotiation. There is a precedent that proves the power of leadership. In 1991, the United States invited the Soviet Union to join it in removing tactical nuclear weapons from the arsenal. Huge reductions were achieved in a matter of months, making the world much safer, more quickly. Similarly, in the area of strategic nuclear weapons, we should invite the Russian government to accept the new vision I have outlined, and act on it. But the United States should be prepared to lead by example, because it is in our best interest and the best interest of the world."

Vice President Gore: Views unknown.

Mr. Nader: "I would use reciprocal initiatives in parallel with treaty negotiation. In particular, as discussed earlier, I would act immediately to take all nuclear weapons off of high alert, and work to reduce the number of deployed, strategic warheads to 1500. Both of these could safely be done unilaterally, with strong urging that Russia follow suit"

*(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.*

Governor Bush: "Deterrence remains the first line of defense against nuclear attack." Governor Bush's views are unknown on war-fighting utility of nuclear weapons or specific targeting.

Vice President Gore: "America must maintain its nuclear strength, with adequate offensive forces to ensure deterrence." Vice President Gore's views are unknown on war-fighting utility of nuclear weapons or specific targeting.

Mr. Nader: "The only practical use of nuclear weapons is as a deterrent to nuclear threats from other countries. They should not be used for any other purpose whatsoever."

*(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?*

Governor Bush: No comment.

Vice President Gore: No comment.

Mr. Nader: "I agree completely. As I have said above, we should set complete elimination of nuclear weapons as a long-term goal, and immediately begin taking concrete steps to de-alert, deactivate and eliminate nuclear weapons."

*(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?*

Governor Bush: "If elected President, one of my highest foreign policy priorities will be to check the contagious spread of weapons of mass destruction, and the means to deliver them. We must work to constrict the supply of nuclear materials and the means to deliver them by making this a priority with Russia and China. Our nation must cut off the demand for nuclear weapons by addressing the security concerns of those who renounce these weapons. And our nation must diminish the evil attraction of these weapons for rogue states by rendering them useless with missile defense.

"In an act of foresight and statesmanship, Sen. Richard Lugar and Sen. Sam Nunn realized that existing Russian nuclear facilities were in danger of being compromised. Under the Nunn-Lugar program, security at many Russian nuclear facilities has been improved and warheads have been destroyed. I'll ask the Congress to increase substantially our assistance to dismantle as many of Russia's weapons as possible, as quickly as possible."

Vice President Gore: "I support the program that our Administration has developed with North Korea to forestall plutonium production development, a central element of which is to support the financing of a non-threatening type of reactor for nuclear energy. I also support our efforts to work with Russia to reduce the size of its nuclear weapons establishment, such as the Nuclear Cities Initiative, and I have personally engaged, through the U.S-Russia Binational Commission, in efforts that have resulted in the safe demilitarization of over 1500 Russian nuclear warheads. Similarly, I have worked for removal of nuclear weapons, plutonium, and enriched uranium from the states of the former Soviet Union."

Mr. Nader: "I would phase out the use of nuclear power in the United States, stop the US government from promoting nuclear power abroad, and work toward the global abolition of nuclear energy. History shows that it is impossible to separate the "peaceful atom" from the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons. As part of the phase-out, I would immediately ban

the conversion of plutonium into Mixed Oxide (MOX) fuel, a particularly ill-advised procedure. I would push for a global ban on the production of weapons-usable fissile materials.

"I would halt all research into the design of new nuclear weapons, including improving existing types and creating new types. The U.S. has all the nuclear weapons that it ever needs. Further research is likely to destabilize our position by making other countries feel threatened, and could damage our security directly when our ideas leak out and are copied. There are no benefits except to contractors at our national labs and military contractors in general. It is time to put the interests of the people of this country and the world above the profits of General Dynamics and Lockheed-Martin.

"I would abandon research into the useless and wasteful National Missile Defense program, and re-confirm the United States' support for the ABM treaty.

"I would cancel the Department of Energy's plans to produce tritium, and push for legislation to ban the production of tritium in the United States. Current tritium plans assume no progress on arms control. The U.S. has a sizable inventory of tritium, and tritium can be recovered from scrapped nuclear warheads. If we can even approach levels already negotiated in START II, or discussed for START III, there will be no need for new tritium far into the future. If elected President, I will devote my energy to making sure that nuclear arms are reduced lower still."

## **Sources**

Governor George W. Bush. Information provided by campaign staff: (1) Speech on "New Leadership on National Security" given in Washington, D.C. on May 23, 2000; (2) not yet published answers to questions from an arms control organization.

Vice President Albert Gore, Jr. (1) Answers to questions posed by Council for a Livable World, November 1999; (2) speech at International Press Institute, Boston, MA, April 30, 2000; (3) Al Gore web site.

Mr. Ralph Nader. Statement entitled "Ralph Nader's Response to Interfaith Questionnaire on Elimination of Nuclear Weapons", received September 6, 2000.

## Signers of Letter to Presidential Candidates

Gary Baldrige, Global Missions Coordinator  
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship  
Atlanta, GA

The Most Reverend Victor H. Balke  
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of Crookston  
Crookston, MN

Bruce Birchard, General Secretary  
Friends General Conference  
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)  
Philadelphia, PA

The Rev. Leonard B. Bjorman, Co-Chair  
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship  
Syracuse, NY

The Right Reverend Frederick H. Borsch  
Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles  
Los Angeles, CA

J. Daryl Byler, Director  
Washington Office  
Mennonite Central Committee U.S.

Bishop Kenneth L. Carder  
Nashville Area, United Methodist Church  
Nashville, TN

C. Wayne Carter, General Secretary (Interim)  
Friends United Meeting  
Richmond, IN

The Rev. Dr. Forrest Church, Senior Minister  
All Saints Unitarian Church  
New York, NY

The Most Reverend Matthew H. Clark  
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of Rochester  
Rochester, NY

The Right Reverend John P. Croneberger  
Bishop Coadjutor, Episcopal Diocese of Newark  
Newark, NJ

The Rev. Dr. James Dunn, Visiting Professor  
Wake Forest Divinity School  
Winston-Salem, NC

The Most Reverend Patrick F. Flores  
Archbishop, Catholic Archdiocese of San Antonio  
San Antonio, TX

The Rev. Dr. James Forbes, Jr., Senior Minister  
Riverside Church  
New York, NY

Rabbi Arthur Green  
Professor, Brandeis University  
Waltham, MA

The Most Reverend Thomas Gumbleton  
Auxiliary Bishop, Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit  
Detroit, MI

The Right Reverend Ronald H. Haines  
Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Washington  
Washington, DC

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

The Right Reverend Sanford Z.K. Hampton  
Assistant Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Olympia  
Seattle, WA

Dr. Susannah Heschel  
Eli Black Professor of Jewish Studies  
Dartmouth College  
Hanover, NH

Kathleen S. Hurty, Executive Director  
Church Women United  
New York, NY

Thomas J. Jeavons, General Secretary  
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting  
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)  
Philadelphia, PA

Rabbi Mordechai Liebling  
Jewish Reconstructionist Federation  
and The Shefa Fund

Rabbi Michael Lerner  
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine  
San Francisco, CA

Rabbi Richard N. Levy,  
Director of Rabbinical Studies, Hebrew Union  
College-Jewish Institute of Religion  
Los Angeles, CA

The Most Reverend Raymond A. Lucker  
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of New Ulm  
New Ulm, MN

Bishop Ernest S. Lyght  
New York Area, United Methodist Church  
White Plains, NY

The Rev. Dr. Clinton M. Marsh, Former Moderator  
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)  
Atlanta, GA

Bishop Joel B. Martinez  
Nebraska Area, United Methodist Church  
Lincoln, NE

Rabbi Paul Menitoff, Executive Vice President  
Central Conference of American Rabbis  
New York, NY

The Right Reverend William D. Persell  
Bishop, Episcopal Diocese of Chicago  
Chicago, IL

Don Reeves, General Secretary (Interim)  
American Friends Service Committee  
Philadelphia, PA

Judy Mills Reimer, Executive Director  
Church of the Brethren General Board  
Elgin, IL

The Rev. Meg A. Riley, Director  
Washington Office for Faith in Action  
Unitarian Universalist Association  
Washington, DC

Rabbi David Saperstein, Director  
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism  
Washington, DC

Dr. Ronald J. Sider, President  
Evangelicals for Social Action  
Wynnewood, PA

Dr. Glen Stassen, Professor  
Fuller Theological Seminary  
Pasadena, CA

The Rev. Ron Stief, Director  
Justice and Witness Ministries  
United Church of Christ  
Washington, DC

The Most Reverend Walter F. Sullivan  
Bishop, Catholic Diocese of Richmond  
Richmond, VA

Bishop Melvin G. Talbert  
California-Nevada Area, United Methodist Church  
West Sacramento, CA

The Rev. John H. Thomas  
General Minister and President  
United Church of Christ  
Cleveland, OH

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director  
The Shalom Center  
Philadelphia, PA

The Rev. Dr. Daniel W. Weiss, General Secretary  
American Baptist Churches USA  
Valley Forge, PA

Bishop C. Dale White  
United Methodist Church  
Newport, RI

Marilyn M. White, Co-Chair  
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship  
League City, TX

The Right Reverend Arthur B. Williams, Jr.  
Bishop Suffragan, Episcopal Diocese of Ohio  
Cleveland, OH

The Rev. Dr. Albert C. Winn, Former Moderator  
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)  
Winston-Salem, NC

The Rev. L. William Yolton, Executive Secretary  
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship  
Alexandria, VA

September 7, 2000

For further information, contact the facilitator of this project:

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
6508 Wilmett Road  
Bethesda, MD 20817

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

Vice President Albert Gore's views on ten questions asked by 48 religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues.

1. Views unknown.

2. Views unknown.

3. Views unknown.

4. I support ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and I will continue to fight for its ratification. Because of the Treaty's importance to the long-term national security interests of our country, I intend to take this issue to the American people during my campaign for the Presidency, and if elected, my first act as President will be to put the Treaty back before the Senate with a demand from the American people for its ratification.

5. When asked about Admiral Stansfield Turner's proposal that the U.S. take the initiative to create a reciprocal reduction in nuclear alert status by separating warheads from delivery systems and moving the components hundreds of miles away to a storage sites monitored by verification teams, Vice President Gore responded as follows: "Right now, U.S. nuclear warheads are not targeted against Russian targets, and the Russians are similarly "de-targeted." I have concerns about Admiral Turner's ideas because of the way in which they might work out in a period of crisis if either side tried to reunite warheads with their delivery systems. This issue is one that requires further detailed study."

6. " I believe in the value of nuclear deterrence for the foreseeable future, but I do not think that we need incremental increases in our nuclear arsenal. In fact, I am interested in seeing our nuclear arsenal reduced substantially through arms control. This Administration is working on the entry into force of the START II Treaty, negotiation of a START III Treaty providing for even deeper reduction in weapons pointed at the United States, and an agreement with Russia to adjust the ABM Treaty to make it possible to defend ourselves against rogue states."

7. Views unknown.

8. "America must maintain its nuclear strength, with adequate offensive forces to ensure deterrence." Vice President Gore's views are unknown on war-fighting utility of nuclear weapons or specific targeting.

9. No comment.

10. "I support the program that our Administration has developed with North Korea to forestall plutonium production development, a central element of which is to support the financing of a non-threatening type of reactor for nuclear energy. I also support our efforts to work with Russia to reduce the size of its nuclear weapons establishment, such as the Nuclear Cities Initiative, and I have personally engaged, through the U.S.-Russia Binational Commission, in efforts that have resulted in the safe demilitarization of over 1500 Russian nuclear warheads. Similarly, I have worked for removal of nuclear weapons, plutonium, and enriched uranium from the states of the former Soviet Union."

Sources: (1) Answers to questions posed by Council for a Livable World, November 1999; (2) speech at International Press Institute, Boston, MA, April 30, 2000; (3) Al Gore web site.



P.O. Box 18002  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Phone: 202-265-4000  
Fax: 202-265-0183

## **Ralph Nader's Response to Interfaith Questionnaire On Elimination of Nuclear Weapons**

7 Sep 2000

*(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?*

Nuclear weapons have no moral or practical use for any purpose except as a deterrent to nuclear threats. The U.S. government's refusal to adopt a no-first-use policy is a striking example of political immorality. If elected President, I would immediately adopt a policy that the US will never be the first to use a nuclear weapon in any conflict, and would urge other nuclear powers to do the same.

More broadly, as the first country to use nuclear weapons, and the perennial leader in new technologies for these horrifying weapons of mass destruction, the United States has a moral obligation to take the lead in working for their elimination. The 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty gives us a legal obligation to work for elimination, as well. Gen. George Lee Butler, the retired former commander of both the Strategic Air Command and the U.S. Strategic Command has been eloquent in support of abolition.

*(2) We are encouraged that the United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This occurred in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This commitment carries forward the obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament as expressed in Article VI of the NPT, an agreement signed by the United States in July 1968 and ratified by the U.S. Senate in March 1969. If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?*

I would:

- Take all nuclear missiles off 'hair-trigger' high-alert status, and urge the Russian President to do the same. The greatest danger of a global nuclear disaster is an accidental launch. De-alerting will *not* undermine the United States' ability to deter a nuclear strike. There are over 3,000 nuclear warheads on American submarines. Enough are at sea and on alert at any time to assure sufficient retaliation capacity even after a massive first strike.
- Adopt a no-first use policy, and urge other nuclear powers to do the same.
- Stop nuclear testing, including sub-critical and virtual testing. I would make the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) one of my top legislative priorities.
- Prohibit the deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons outside the United States.
- Push for the ratification of the START II treaty, which Russia has already ratified, work with Congress and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to further reduce the US nuclear arsenal to

around 1500 warheads as expeditiously as possible, and begin negotiating a START III agreement that will bring missile levels below 1,000.

- Begin talks with all nuclear nations to develop a framework and a final date for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

*(3) For instance, do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?*

Yes. Working toward total elimination is the only moral and rational course. The United States, as the sole superpower, has the responsibility to take the lead in such negotiations.

*(4) There are interim steps to take in the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) provides a means of controlling the spread of nuclear weapons. If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?*

Nuclear testing poses a grave threat to the environment and public health, and increases the danger of nuclear war by promoting the development of new nuclear-weapons technology. I would both immediately halt all U.S. nuclear test explosions, including sub-critical and virtual testing, and make the ratification of the CTBT a high priority.

*(5) Many experts have pointed out the inherent danger of keeping U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.*

Due to Russia's collapsing military infrastructure, the danger of an accidental nuclear launch is greater now than it was at any time during the Cold War. I would immediately take all U.S. nuclear missiles off of 'hair-trigger' high-alert status, and strongly urge President Putin to do the same. Again, this will not undermine the country's ability to effectively deter a nuclear strike. Taking nuclear weapons off high-alert status is the single most important step we could take towards preventing a nuclear disaster.

*(6) During the past fifteen years progress has been made in reduction of nuclear weapons through treaties between the United States and the Soviet Union, then Russia. Two treaties were negotiated under President Ronald Reagan: the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons and the first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). Another treaty, START II, was negotiated under President George Bush. Russian President Vladimir Putin has indicated a willingness to negotiate a START III agreement to reduce the number of deployed strategic warheads to 1,000 on each side. However, we understand that the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff insist upon keeping 2,500 warheads in active service because of the targeting requirements of current U.S. policy. If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?*

I would push for immediate ratification of START II, and immediately begin negotiations of a START III agreement that will bring missile levels below 1,000. Once we have achieved this level of disarmament we would be in a position to begin talks with all nuclear nations for the negotiation of deeper cuts and the eventual abolition of nuclear weapons.

The Center for Defense Information reports that the Pentagon's remarkably bloated list of targets for nuclear warheads has actually *grown* since the end of the Cold War. I would provide the presidential leadership that has been lacking to reduce the target list, which is a major technical barrier to the negotiation of a START III agreement.

*(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.*

I would use reciprocal initiatives in parallel with treaty negotiation. In particular, as discussed earlier, I would act immediately to take all nuclear weapons off of high alert, and work to reduce the number of deployed, strategic warheads to 1500. Both of these could safely be done unilaterally, with strong urging that Russia follow suit.

*(8) We note that numerous retired generals, admirals, and national security civilian officials have indicated that nuclear weapons have no war-fighting utility. (See attached statements.) We also know that Presidents Truman and Eisenhower chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Korean War and that Presidents Johnson and Nixon chose not to use nuclear weapons in the Vietnam War. Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.*

The only practical use of nuclear weapons is as a deterrent to nuclear threats from other countries. They should not be used for any other purpose whatsoever.

*(9) If your reply indicates that nuclear weapons are useful only to deter other nuclear weapons, would not the wisest and safest course of action be to achieve the universal elimination of nuclear weapons through such measures as previously identified?*

I agree completely. As I have said above, we should set complete elimination of nuclear weapons as a long-term goal, and immediately begin taking concrete steps to de-alert, deactivate and eliminate nuclear weapons.

*(10) Are there other initiatives you plan to undertake for the elimination of nuclear weapons?*

I would phase out the use of nuclear power in the United States, stop the US government from promoting nuclear power abroad, and work toward the global abolition of nuclear energy. History shows that it is impossible to separate the "peaceful atom" from the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons. As part of the phase-out, I would immediately ban the conversion of plutonium into Mixed Oxide (MOX) fuel, a particularly ill-advised procedure. I would push for a global ban on the production of weapons-usable fissile materials.

I would halt all research into the design of new nuclear weapons, including improving existing types and creating new types. The U.S. has all the nuclear weapons that it ever needs. Further research is likely to destabilize our position by making other countries feel threatened, and could damage our security directly when our ideas leak out and are copied. There are no benefits

except to contractors at our national labs and military contractors in general. It is time to put the interests of the people of this country and the world above the profits of General Dynamics and Lockheed-Martin.

I would abandon research into the useless and wasteful National Missile Defense program, and re-confirm the United States' support for the ABM treaty.

I would cancel the Department of Energy's plans to produce tritium, and push for legislation to ban the production of tritium in the United States. Current tritium plans assume no progress on arms control. The U.S. has a sizable inventory of tritium, and tritium can be recovered from scrapped nuclear warheads. If we can even approach levels already negotiated in START II, or discussed for START III, there will be no need for new tritium far into the future. If elected President, I will devote my energy to making sure that nuclear arms are reduced lower still.

---

Paid for by the Nader 2000 General Committee, Inc.

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

Tuesday, May 23, 2000

**CONTACT:** Ari Fleischer,

Mindy Tucker, Scott

McClellan 512/637-7777

## **GOVERNOR BUSH PROPOSES NEW LEADERSHIP ON NATIONAL SECURITY**

### ***Bush Seeks Deployment of Missile Defense and Reduction of Missiles***

WASHINGTON, DC—Saying America needs a “new approach to nuclear security that matches a new era,” Texas Governor George W. Bush today called for a national security policy focused on creating a missile defense system to protect all 50 states and U.S. friends and allies, combined with reductions in the number of nuclear missiles consistent with America’s national security.

Governor Bush spoke after meeting with a group of national security experts including George Shultz, former Secretary of State; Henry Kissinger, former Secretary of State and architect of the U.S.-Soviet Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty; Donald Rumsfeld, former Secretary of Defense; Colin Powell, retired general and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Brent Scowcroft, former National Security Advisor.

“Today I am here with some of our nation’s leading statesmen and defense experts,” Governor Bush said. “And there is broad agreement that our nation needs a new approach to nuclear security that matches a new era. It is time to leave the Cold War behind, and defend against the new threats of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.”

To meet the challenges of the new post-Cold War era, Governor Bush called for America’s national security to be based on two goals:

- ◆ **Creation of an effective missile defense to protect all 50 states, U.S. forces abroad and American friends and allies from limited missile attacks by rogue nations or accidental launches.**
- ◆ **Prompt review of American military requirements, leading to reductions in the number of American nuclear weapons, consistent with America’s post - Cold War national security needs.**

Governor Bush explained: “America must build effective missile defenses, based on the best available options, at the earliest possible date. Our missile defense must be designed to protect all 50 states — and our friends and allies and deployed forces overseas — from missile attacks by rogue nations, or accidental launches.”

Governor Bush continued: “America should rethink the requirements for nuclear deterrence in a new security environment. As President, I will ask the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of our nuclear force posture and determine how best to meet our security needs. While the exact number of weapons can come only from such an assessment, I will pursue the lowest possible number consistent with our national security. It should be possible to reduce the number of American nuclear weapons significantly further than what has already been agreed to under START II, without compromising our security in any way. We should not keep weapons that our military planners do not need. These unneeded weapons are the relics of dead conflicts. And they do nothing to make us more secure.”

Governor Bush also called for the United States to “remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status—another dangerous vestige of Cold War confrontation. As President, I will ask for an assessment of what we can do to lower the alert status of our forces.”

A text of Governor Bush’s full remarks can be obtained on the Bush for President website at [www.georgewbush.com](http://www.georgewbush.com), or by contacting the Bush press office at (512) 637-7777.

###

**ARMS CONTROL ASSOCIATION**  
**Responses of Governor George W. Bush**

1. **Should the United States deploy a national missile defense, and what factors should influence the decision? If the United States does need an NMD, would you proceed with the proposed limited system, or would you change the program's architecture?**

America must build effective missile defenses, based on the best available options, at the earliest possible date. Our missile defense must be designed to protect all 50 states – and our friends and allies and deployed forces overseas – from missile attacks by rogue nations, or accidental launches.

The Clinton-Gore administration at first denied the need for a national missile defense system. Then it delayed. Now the approach it proposes is flawed – a system initially based on a single site, when experts say that more is needed. A missile defense system should not only defend our country, it should defend our allies, with whom I will consult as we develop our plans.

2. **Are you prepared to go ahead with an NMD that violates that ABM Treaty without Russian agreements or amendments? Should the United States consider Russian President Vladimir Putin's proposal for cooperation on a limited missile defense to counter the threat from rogue states?**

If elected President, I will offer Russia the necessary amendments to the ABM Treaty so as to make our deployment of effective missile defenses consistent with the treaty. Both sides know that we live in a different world from 1972, when that treaty was signed. If Russia refuses the changes we propose, I will give prompt notice, under the provisions of the treaty, that the United States can no longer be a party to it.

President Putin's suggestion regarding U.S.-Russian cooperation in the area of missile defense was encouraging, because it was an acknowledgment of the need for missile defenses. We should give President Putin the benefit of the doubt, and his proposal may be an opening for discussion. Under the mutual threat of rogue nations, there is a real possibility the Russians could join with us and our friends and allies to cooperate on missile defense systems. But there is a condition. Russia must break its dangerous habit of proliferation.

3. **Do the developments in North Korea open the door for a diplomatic resolution to the North Korean missile threat, and if successful, how would such a resolution affect U.S. missile defense plans?**

Developments at the summit between the leaders of the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were encouraging. The summit did not resolve critical security issues – such as Pyongyang's massive conventional threat to the Republic of Korea and American troops stationed there, or North Korea's nuclear

program and its development and export of ballistic missiles. But the apparent moves toward greater openness by the communist leadership in Pyongyang represent a major success for Kim Dae-jung and the people of South Korea. It will be important to watch closely whether North Korea follows through on its promises.

4. **What should U.S. arms control policy toward China be? Should a U.S. national missile defense be designed to counter China's strategic missiles in addition to those of the rogue states, and, if not, how would you convince China of this so as to avoid an arms buildup by Beijing and loss of its cooperation on other arms control matters, including nonproliferation?**

Russia, our allies and other nations of the world – including China – need to understand our intentions. America's development of missile defenses is a search for security, not a search for advantage. The Cold War era is history. Our nation must recognize new threats, not fixate on old ones. On the issue of nuclear weapons, the United States has an opportunity to lead to a safer world – both to defend against nuclear threats and reduce nuclear tensions. It is possible to build a missile defense, and defuse confrontation. America should do both.

5. **Do you agree with the intelligence community's assessment that the United States is "more likely to be attacked with weapons of mass destruction from non-missile delivery means (most likely from non-state entities) than by missiles." If so, how do you propose to defend against those threats?**

The protection of America itself will assume a high priority in a new century. Once a strategic afterthought, homeland defense has become an urgent duty. For most of our history, America felt safe behind two great oceans. But with the spread of technology, distance no longer means security. North Korea is proving that even a poor and backward country, in the hands of a tyrant, can reach across oceans to threaten us. Iran has made rapid strides in its missile program, and Iraq persists in a race to do the same. Add to this the threat of biological, chemical and nuclear terrorism – barbarism emboldened by technology. These weapons can be delivered, not just by ballistic missiles, but by everything from airplanes to cruise missiles, from shipping containers to suitcases. There is also the prospect of information warfare, in which hacker terrorists may try to disrupt finance, communication, transportation and public health.

Our first line of defense is a simple message: Every group or nation must know, if they sponsor such attacks, our response will be devastating. But we must do more. At the earliest possible date, my administration will deploy anti-ballistic missile systems, both theater and national, to guard against attack and blackmail.

We will defend the American homeland by strengthening our intelligence community – focusing on human intelligence and the early detection of terrorist operations both here and abroad. And when direct threats to America are discovered, I know that the best defense can be a strong and swift offense – including the use of Special Operations Forces and long-range strike capabilities.

And there is more to be done preparing here at home. I will put a high priority on detecting and responding to terrorism on our soil. The federal government must take this threat seriously – working closely with researchers and industry to increase surveillance and develop treatments for chemical and biological agents.

**6. Should the United States pursue further strategic reductions in its arsenal and those of the other nuclear-weapon states through negotiated agreements or unilateral reductions? What level of strategic nuclear warheads do you believe the United States should seek by the end of the decade?**

America should rethink the requirements for nuclear deterrence in a new security environment. The premises of Cold War nuclear targeting should no longer dictate the size of our arsenal. As president, I will ask the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of our nuclear force posture and determine how best to meet our security needs. While the exact number of weapons can come only from such an assessment, I will pursue the lowest possible number consistent with our national security. It should be possible to reduce the number of American nuclear weapons significantly further than what has already been agreed to under START II, without compromising our security in any way. We should not keep weapons that our military planners do not need. These unneeded weapons are the expensive relics of dead conflicts. And they do nothing to make us more secure.

In addition, the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status – another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation. Preparation for quick launch – within minutes after warning of an attack – was the rule during the era of superpower rivalry. But today, for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch. So, as president, I will ask for an assessment of what we can safely do to lower the alert status of our forces.

These changes to our forces should not require years and years of detailed arms control negotiations. There is a precedent that proves the power of leadership. In 1991, the United States invited the Soviet Union to join it in removing tactical nuclear weapons from the arsenal. Huge reductions were achieved in a matter of months, making the world much safer, more quickly.

Similarly, in the area of strategic nuclear weapons, we should invite the Russian government to accept the new vision I have outlined, and act on it. But the United States should be prepared to lead by example, because it is in our best interest and the best interest of the world. This would be an act of principled leadership – a chance to seize the moment and begin a new era of nuclear security. A new era of cooperation on proliferation and nuclear safety.

**7. What is your position on the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty? If the treaty is not ratified, should the United States continue the current testing moratorium?**

Our nation should continue its moratorium on testing. But in the hard work of halting proliferation, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is not the answer. The CTBT does not stop proliferation, especially to renegade regimes. It is not verifiable. It is not enforceable. And it would stop us from ensuring the safety and reliability of our nation's deterrent, should the need arise. On these crucial matters, it offers only words and false hopes and high intentions – with no guarantees whatever. We can fight the spread of nuclear weapons, but we cannot wish them away with unwise treaties.

**8. Does the NPT remain important to U.S. national security, and if so, what priority should be given to sustaining it? What new steps would you take to reduce the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery vehicles?**

If elected President, one of my highest foreign policy priorities will be to check the contagious spread of weapons of mass destruction, and the means to deliver them. We must work to constrict the supply of nuclear materials and the means to deliver them by making this a priority with Russia and China. Our nation must cut off the demand for nuclear weapons by addressing the security concerns of those who renounce these weapons. And our nation must diminish the evil attraction of these weapons for rogue states by rendering them useless with missile defense.

With regard to Russia, both our nations face a changed world. Instead of confronting each other, we confront the legacy of a dead ideological rivalry -- thousands of nuclear weapons, which, in the case of Russia, may not be secure. And together we also face an emerging threat – from rogue nations, nuclear theft and accidental launch. All this requires nothing short of a new strategic relationship to protect the peace of the world.

In an act of foresight and statesmanship, Sen. Richard Lugar and Sen. Sam Nunn realized that existing Russian nuclear facilities were in danger of being compromised. Under the Nunn-Lugar program, security at many Russian nuclear facilities has been improved and warheads have been destroyed. Even so, the Energy Department warns us that our estimates of Russian nuclear stockpiles could be off by as much as 30 percent. In other words, a great deal of Russian nuclear material cannot be accounted for. The next president must press for an accurate inventory of all this material. And we must do more. I'll ask the Congress to increase substantially our assistance to dismantle as many of Russia's weapons as possible, as quickly as possible.

**9. How should the United States deal with Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and missile programs?**

It is important for the United States and our allies to keep the pressure on Saddam Hussein. We must insist that Iraq complies with the cease-fire arrangement agreed to at the end of the Persian Gulf War. I am very concerned that Saddam Hussein has not

been held to the terms of the arrangement. If elected President, I would not ease the current sanctions on Iraq, and would continue to insist that inspectors be allowed into the country. I would be helping Iraqi opposition groups. And if I found that Saddam Hussein was in any way, shape or form building weapons of mass destruction, I would take them out.

**10. Should the United States try to roll back India and Pakistan's nuclear capabilities, or should it simply seek to stabilize the nuclear balance in South Asia? How would you implement your policy?**

I've said that our nation should continue its moratorium on testing. America must make it clear that we expect India and Pakistan to refrain from testing as well. It will take leadership by the United States and its friends and allies to help reduce tensions between India and Pakistan and pursue steps to prevent nuclear conflict between the two nations. This coming century will see democratic India's arrival as a force in the world. India is now debating its future and its strategic path, and the United States must pay it more attention. We should work with the Indian government, ensuring it is a force for stability and security in Asia. This should not undermine our longstanding relationship with Pakistan, which remains crucial to the peace of the region.

**11. With the globalization of the defense industry, how would your administration ensure that U.S. national security interests would take priority over commercial interests in the export of weapons systems?**

First and foremost, we must strengthen America's intelligence and counterintelligence capabilities to staunch the theft of sensitive military technology at home, and identify threats abroad before they arise. The United States must also lead its allies in establishing new, binding rules to prevent the export of sensitive military technology. America must no longer be alone in keeping dangerous technologies and products away from those who do not wish us well.

**12. In general, what is the role of arms control as the world enters the new millennium? What would be the arms control priorities of your administration?**

When it comes to nuclear weapons, the world has changed faster than U.S. policy. The emerging security threats to the United States, its friends and allies, and even to Russia, now come from rogue states, terrorist groups and other adversaries seeking weapons of mass destruction, and the means to deliver them. Threats also come from insecure nuclear stockpiles and the proliferation of dangerous technologies. Russia itself is no longer our enemy. The Cold War logic that led to the creation of massive stockpiles on both sides is now outdated. Our mutual security need no longer depend on a nuclear balance of terror.

While deterrence remains the first line of defense against nuclear attack, the standoff of the Cold War was born of a different time. That was a time when our arsenal also served to check the conventional superiority of the Warsaw Pact. Then, the Soviet

Union's power reached deep into the heart of Europe - to Berlin, Warsaw, Budapest, Prague. Today, these are the capitals of NATO countries. Yet almost a decade after the end of the Cold War, our nuclear policy still resides in that already distant past. The Clinton-Gore administration has had over seven years to bring the U.S. force posture into the post-Cold War world. Instead, they remain locked in a Cold War mentality. It is time to leave the Cold War behind, and defend against the new threats of the 21st century.

**Governor George W. Bush**  
**New Leadership on National Security**  
**Washington, D.C.**  
**May 23, 2000**

**Note: Governor frequently deviates from text.**

Today, I am here with some of our nation's leading statesmen and defense experts. And there is broad agreement that our nation needs a new approach to nuclear security that matches a new era.

When it comes to nuclear weapons, the world has changed faster than U.S. policy. The emerging security threats to the United States, its friends and allies, and even to Russia, now come from rogue states, terrorist groups and other adversaries seeking weapons of mass destruction, and the means to deliver them. Threats also come from insecure nuclear stockpiles and the proliferation of dangerous technologies. Russia itself is no longer our enemy. The Cold War logic that led to the creation of massive stockpiles on both sides is now outdated. Our mutual security need no longer depend on a nuclear balance of terror.

While deterrence remains the first line of defense against nuclear attack, the standoff of the Cold War was born of a different time. That was a time when our arsenal also served to check the conventional superiority of the Warsaw Pact. Then, the Soviet Union's power reached deep into the heart of Europe - to Berlin, Warsaw, Budapest, Prague. Today, these are the capitals of NATO countries. Yet almost a decade after the end of the Cold War, our nuclear policy still resides in that already distant past. The Clinton-Gore administration has had over seven years to bring the U.S. force posture into the post-Cold War world. Instead, they remain locked in a Cold War mentality.

It is time to leave the Cold War behind, and defend against the new threats of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

America must build effective missile defenses, based on the best available options, at the earliest possible date. Our missile defense must be designed to protect all 50 states – and our friends and allies and deployed forces overseas – from missile attacks by rogue nations, or accidental launches.

The Clinton administration at first denied the need for a national missile defense system. Then it delayed. Now the approach it proposes is flawed – a system initially based on a single site, when experts say that more is needed. A missile defense system should not only defend our country, it should defend our allies, with whom I will consult as we develop our plans. And any change in the ABM treaty must allow the technologies and experiments required to deploy adequate missile defenses. The administration is driving toward a hasty decision, on a political timetable. No decision would be better than a flawed agreement that ties the hands of the next President and prevents America from defending itself.

Yet there are positive, practical ways to demonstrate to Russia that we are no longer enemies. Russia, our allies and the world need to understand our intentions. America's development of missile defenses is a search for security, not a search for advantage.

America should rethink the requirements for nuclear deterrence in a new security environment. The premises of Cold War nuclear targeting should no longer dictate the size of our arsenal. As president, I will ask the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of our nuclear force posture and determine how best to meet our security needs. While the exact number of weapons can come only from such an assessment, I will pursue the lowest possible number consistent with our national security. It should be possible to reduce the number of American nuclear weapons significantly further than what has already been agreed to under START II, without compromising our security in any way. We should not keep weapons that our military planners do not need. These unneeded weapons are the expensive relics of dead conflicts. And they do nothing to make us more secure.

In addition, the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status – another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation. Preparation for quick launch – within minutes after warning of an attack – was the rule during the era of superpower rivalry. But today, for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch. So, as president, I will ask for an assessment of what we can safely do to lower the alert status of our forces.

These changes to our forces should not require years and years of detailed arms control negotiations. There is a precedent that proves the power of leadership. In 1991, the United States invited the Soviet Union to join it in removing tactical nuclear weapons from the arsenal. Huge reductions were achieved in a matter of months, making the world much safer, more quickly.

Similarly, in the area of strategic nuclear weapons, we should invite the Russian government to accept the new vision I have outlined, and act on it. But the United States should be prepared to lead by example, because it is in our best interest and the best interest of the world. This would be an act of principled leadership – a chance to seize the moment and begin a new era of nuclear security. A new era of cooperation on proliferation and nuclear safety.

The Cold War era is history. Our nation must recognize new threats, not fixate on old ones. On the issue of nuclear weapons, the United States has an opportunity to lead to a safer world – both to defend against nuclear threats and reduce nuclear tensions. It is possible to build a missile defense, *and* defuse confrontation with Russia. America should do both.



## Mintwood Media Collective

Sarah Austin Adam Eidinger Kadd Stephens

1858 Mintwood Pl. NW, #4  
Washington, DC 20009  
Ph: 202-232-8997  
Fax: 202-232-8340  
www.mintwood.com

**NEWS ADVISORY**  
September 5, 2000

**CONTACT:** Adam Eidinger or Howard Hallman  
202-986-6186 or 301-896-0013

### **RELIGIOUS LEADERS RELEASE SURVEY OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

WASHINGTON, DC – For decades numerous religious denominations, interfaith organizations, and religious leaders have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons. **On Thursday, September 7, Bishop Thomas Gumbleton and Bishop C. Dale White** will release a new ten question survey of presidential candidates on the threatened use, possession, and proposed efforts towards nuclear disarmament during a news conference at the **National Press Club at 2:00 PM in the First Amendment Room.**

- WHO:** Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit  
Bishop C. Dale White, United Methodist Church  
Howard Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice
- WHAT:** Release of Presidential Candidate Survey on Nuclear Weapons
- WHEN:** Thursday, September 7 at 2:00 PM
- WHERE:** First Amendment Room, National Press Club, Washington, DC

In mid-August nearly 50 leading religious leaders sent the survey to the four major presidential candidates. They were asked to respond by September 5. **Some of the survey questions include:**

- What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?
- The United States has joined with Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China in making a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill this commitment?
- Do you favor multilateral negotiations to achieve a global nuclear weapons convention that provides for total elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework with effective verification and enforcement?
- If elected president, will you seek ratification of the CTBT by the United States Senate?
- If elected president, will you embark upon a de-alerting initiative to take strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert? If so, please provide specifics.
- If elected president, will you change U.S. policy so that deeper bilateral cuts in strategic weapons can occur? Will you negotiate a START III agreement with Russia? What level of strategic warheads will you seek?
- Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

*For a copy of the survey please contact Adam Eidinger at 202-986-6186 or Howard Hallman at 301-896-0013.*

###

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

September 6, 2000

To: Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, Bishop Dale White

From: Howard W. Hallman

Re: Possible comments on candidates' replies

I'm suggesting that you take turns presenting the candidates answers to our questions. Tom can take the odd numbered questions, Dale the even numbered. You may read or summarize the questions. For longer answers you may want to summarize or paraphrase because reporters will have the full text in their hands.

If you wish, you may offer a brief comment on the replies. Here are some suggestions to consider. Please feel free to use these, modify them, or originate your own.

1. We're disappointed that Governor Bush and Vice President Gore haven't addressed the question of the morality of nuclear weapons. In a campaign that has a lot of emphasis upon moral values, we hope that they will take up this matter as the campaign progresses. You members of the press may want to question them on this.
  2. We're disappointed that Vice President Gore and Governor Bush haven't told us how they will carry out the obligation under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to achieve nuclear disarmament. The treaty was ratified by the U.S. Senate in 1969 by a bipartisan vote of 83 to 15. Among those voting in favor of ratification were Kansas Senator Robert Dole and Illinois Senator Everett Dirksen. It is the law of the land. This is another area for the press to seek answers from the candidates.
- As to Mr. Nader's response, we would favor a no-use policy. While no-first-use would be an advance, it implies second use in retaliation, which we consider morally wrong.
3. The world has a Chemical Weapons Convention and a Biological Weapons Convention that outlaw these weapons of mass destruction. It would be appropriate for the United States to take the lead in negotiations for a multilateral Nuclear Weapons Convention, as Mr. Nader has said. We hope that Governor Bush and Vice President Gore will consider this possibility.
  4. As you can see Vice President Gore and Mr. Nader favor Senate ratification of the CTBT, and Governor Bush opposes it. Most faith groups favor ratification.
  5. We are pleased that Governor Bush and Mr. Nader look favorably on the idea of de-alerting the nuclear arsenal. We hope that Vice President Gore will study the matter and come up with a sensible approach to de-alerting.

6. All three candidates favor further reductions in the strategic arsenal. We urge them to work with Russia to achieve reductions as deep and as quickly as possible.

7. Governor Bush and Mr. Nader look favorably upon using reciprocal initiatives to achieve nuclear disarmament objectives. We hope that Vice President Gore will consider and support this approach.

8. Our own position is that use of nuclear weapons for deterrence is morally wrong. Actual use of nuclear weapons would be even more grievous. We urge all three candidates to consider the desirability of no use at any time against any adversary under any circumstance. The next president should provide leadership to get all nuclear weapon states to adopt a no use policy.

9. We believe that the completion elimination of all nuclear weapons on Earth is the way to go. This will do far more for U.S. security than the spurious dream of a leak-proof national missile defense. We urge the candidates to offer and debate plans for nuclear disarmament rather than competing over schemes for missile defense.

10. We are glad to note the candidates' concern for fissile material control. That's an important part of nuclear disarmament. We also believe that Mr. Nader's ideas about halting the development of nuclear weapons deserve consideration.



## Mintwood Media Collective

Sarah Austin

Adam Eiding

Kadd Stephens

1858 Mintwood Pl. NW, #4  
Washington, DC 20009  
Ph: 202-232-8997  
Fax: 202-232-8340  
www.mintwood.com

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

September 7, 2000

**CONTACT:** Adam Eiding or Howard Hallman

202-986-6186 or 301-896-0013

# **SURVEY OF PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES EXPOSES DIFFERENCES ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

## ***Bush and Gore Fail to Answer Morality Question***

WASHINGTON, DC – On behalf of 48 religious leaders from a cross-section of faith groups, Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton and United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White have released a new ten question survey of presidential candidates on nuclear weapons and disarmament. Replies from George W. Bush, Al Gore, and Ralph Nader reveal policy differences on several issues. Only Nader answered all ten questions of the survey. Neither Reform Party candidate responded. **The complete survey with candidate responses can be found online at <http://www.umc-gbcs.org/whatsnew.htm>.**

During a news conference today, the religious leaders expressed concern that neither George W. Bush nor Al Gore answered a question on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons. “It’s disappointing when faith and values are commonly used to describe the guiding philosophy of the major party candidates neither Bush nor Gore will address the question of the morality of nuclear weapons,” said Howard Hallman, coordinator of the survey and chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Nader responded by saying, “Nuclear weapons have no moral or practical use for any purpose except as a deterrent to nuclear threats.” Calling the U.S. refusal to adopt a no-first-use policy “political immorality”, Mr. Nader said that if elected president, the “U.S. will never be the first to use a nuclear weapon in any conflict.”

Another question left unanswered by Bush and Gore was how they plan to carry out the obligation under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to achieve nuclear disarmament. A review of the treaty on its 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary at the United Nations last May produced the strongest commitment to total elimination of nuclear weapons. Yet the Clinton/Gore Administration has not laid out a plan to achieve this goal. As a presidential campaigner, Vice President Gore has offered no proposal, nor has Governor Bush. Nader, though, presented a six point plan that over time would meet the goals of the NPT.

Other questions exposed sharp disagreements. Both Gore and Nader favor Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) as an important step to stopping the spread of nuclear weapons. Bush opposes ratification, saying that the treaty “offers only words and false hopes and high intentions.”

On the possibility of taking nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert, Bush and Nader agree that the U.S. should commence de-alerting its nuclear stockpile. Gore emphasized that the U.S. and Russia at this time do not have nuclear weapons targeted at one another. But on the possibility of separating warheads from delivery vehicles, Gore expressed a concern of what might happen in a period of crisis if either side tried to reunite warheads with their delivery systems.

On the START III negotiations the survey reveals a strong commitment by all three candidates to further reductions of the U.S. strategic arsenal, but only Nader specifically said he would be willing to reduce the number of nuclear weapons below the Russian proposed limit of 1,000 warheads

*For a copy of the survey results please contact Adam Eiding at 202-986-6186 or Howard Hallman at 301-896-0013.*

###

To: Signers of Letter to Presidential Candidates

Yesterday we released the responses of presidential candidates to the ten questions from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. A copy is attached.

Ralph Nader provided a full set of answers to our questions (copy attached). The Bush campaign staff furnished material for us to extract the answers. The Gore staff provided nothing, so we had to dig into other sources for Gore's views, including the campaign web site. The morning before the news conference I sent the Gore staff the answers I had formulated and offered them an opportunity to make corrections and fill in the blanks. I had no reply. Similarly I sent the Bush staff a list of the unanswered questions and requested answers. I had no reply.

Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton and United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White spoke at the news conference. We had religious news services representatives in attendance, but no mainline media showed up in spite of strong promotion. Our media consultant believes that this is due to lack of news in the form of candidates' answers to questions they hadn't previously addressed.

We will continue to seek answers and will enlist reporters to ask our questions to the candidates.

You yourself may want to write the candidates. You can express your disappointment that they didn't reply to our questions on these important issues and ask for their views on the following unanswered questions. You can incorporate your own faith perspective into the letter.

What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons?

If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?

Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories of targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons?

Addresses for the candidates are as follows:

The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.  
Attn: Mr Leon Fuerth  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

The Honorable George W. Bush  
State Capitol  
100 E. 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, TX 78701

On the first question in particular you may want to write to Senator Lieberman, indicating that with his concern for moral values, you are interested in the approach of the Gore-Lieberman ticket to the morality of nuclear weapons. His address is:

The Honorable Joseph I. Lieberman  
706 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

If you get any replies, please share them with me.

With best regards,  
Howard

# **Candidates Views on Nuclear Disarmament**

**by Bishop Thomas J. Gumbleton and Bishop C. Dale White**

Among the significant issues that deserve consideration during this year's presidential campaign, none is more important than the future of the world's nuclear arsenal. Therefore, immediately after the presidential nominating conventions 48 religious leaders from a cross-section of faith groups and geographic areas of the United States wrote to the presidential candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties, asking ten questions on nuclear disarmament issues.

Ralph Nader of the Green Party replied to all ten questions. The other candidates declined to answer our questions. However, for Governor George W. Bush and Vice President Al Gore we were able to construct answers to some of the questions from the candidates' speeches, replies to other questionnaires, and information on their web sites. But we can find nothing on record on three crucial issues regarding nuclear weapons. Because the campaign still has more than six weeks remaining we here publicly address the two major party candidates, Vice President Gore and Governor Bush, and ask them for their answers to these very important questions.

*(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?*

Clearly the world faith community has condemned nuclear weapons. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 declared that "the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity." Pope John Paul II has called for the abolition of nuclear weapons. So has the Dalai Lama.

In the United States many denominations have spoken against nuclear weapons and called for their elimination. The National Council of Catholic Bishops in 1983 condemned any use of nuclear weapons, even in retaliation for a nuclear attack because it "would indiscriminately take many wholly innocent lives, lives of people who are in no way responsible for reckless action of their government." Three years later the United Methodist Council of Bishops joined in this condemnation of any use of nuclear weapons and also denounced the doctrine nuclear deterrence.

Just this May the United Methodist General Conference, the denomination's official governing body, declared: "We reaffirm the finding that nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. When used as instruments of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt and spiritually bankrupt

This is what the churches say. What do you say, Vice President Gore and Governor Bush?

*(2) If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?*

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has been effect since 1970 and is signed by more than 180 nations. During the ratification process the NPT had the support of both President Lyndon Johnson and President Richard Nixon. The U.S. Senate ratified the treaty by a nonpartisan vote of 83 to 15. Voting in favor were such well-known Republican conservatives as Senator Robert Dole of Kansas and Senator Everett Dirksen of Illinois. As a treaty, the NPT is the law of the land and should be observed.

Article VI of the NPT states: "Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." In 1996 the International Court of Justice unanimously ruled, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control." At the May 2000 NPT Review Conference the United States agreed to the Final Document containing the unequivocal commitment quoted above.

General Colin Powell, when he was chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "I declare my hope that we will eventually see the time when the number of nuclear weapons is down to zero and the world is a much better place." Ralph Nader has provided a six-point action program to move toward this goal. Governor Bush and Vice President Gore, what are your plans?

*(3) Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories or targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons?*

Numerous admirals and general have stated that nuclear weapons have no military utility. When Admiral Noel Gayler was commander-in-chief in the Pacific in the 1970s, he could find no area under his command "where it would conceivably have made sense to explode nuclear weapons in order to carry out our military objectives." His command encompassed maritime Russia, the Korean peninsula, Vietnam, the Middle East.

When General Charles Horner was the allied air forces commander in the Gulf War, he saw no utility for nuclear weapons. Prior to his retirement he explained to a group of defense writers, "What are nuclear weapons good for? Busting cities. What president of the United States is going to take out Pyongyang." General Lee Butler, who served as commander-of-chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, opposes retaliation with nuclear weapons. "What target would warrant such retaliation?" he asks. "Would we hold an entire society accountable for the decision of single demented leader?"

Vice President Gore and Governor Bush, how would you answer General Butler's question? What use of nuclear weapons are you prepared to authorize?

We eagerly await your response.







# **The Candidates Views on Nuclear Disarmament**

## **by Bishop Thomas J. Gumbleton and Bishop C. Dale White**

Last week on behalf of 48 religious leaders from a variety of faiths and denominations we released a survey of the presidential candidates' views on nuclear disarmament. Although Vice President Al Gore has said that "there is no issue more important than nuclear weapons", neither he nor Governor George W. Bush provided answers to all ten questions we asked. Ralph Nader, the Green Party candidate, did, but both Reform Party candidates, Patrick Buchanan and John Hagelin, ignored our request.

The two major party candidates avoided the three most crucial issues: the morality of nuclear weapons, their utility, and the treaty obligation the United States has to eliminate them. With more than seven weeks remaining in the presidential election, we publicly repeat our questions to the candidates on these issues.

*(1) What are your views on the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons? To what extent do you agree or disagree with the broad consensus that has emerged within the faith community on the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons?*

Clearly the world faith community has condemned nuclear weapons. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 declared that "the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity." Pope John Paul II has called for the abolition of nuclear weapons. So has the Dalai Lama.

In the United States many denominations have spoken against nuclear weapons and called for their elimination. In 1983 Catholic Bishops condemned any use of nuclear weapons, even in retaliation for a nuclear attack because it "would indiscriminately take many wholly innocent lives, lives of people who are in no way responsible for reckless action of their government." Three years later United Methodist Bishops joined in this condemnation and added denunciation of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence.

Persons of many faiths would agree with the statement adopted by the United Methodist General Conference this past May: "We reaffirm the finding that nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. When used as instruments of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt and spiritually bankrupt."

This is what the churches say. What do you say, Vice President Gore and Governor Bush?

*(2) Do you see any utility for nuclear weapons in war? If so, please tell us the categories or targets you as commander-in-chief would consider legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons?*

Numerous admirals and general have stated that nuclear weapons have no military utility. When Admiral Noel Gayler was commander-in-chief in the Pacific in the 1970s, he could find no area under his command "where it would conceivably have made sense to explode nuclear

weapons in order to carry out our military objectives." His command encompassed maritime Russia, the Korean peninsula, Vietnam, the Middle East.

When General Charles Horner was the allied air forces commander in the Gulf War, he saw no utility for nuclear weapons. Prior to his retirement in 1994 he asked rhetorically: "What are nuclear weapons good for? Busting cities. What president of the United States is going to take out Pyongyang." General Lee Butler, who served as commander-of-chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, opposes retaliation with nuclear weapons. "What target would warrant such retaliation?" he inquires. "Would we hold an entire society accountable for the decision of single demented leader?"

Vice President Gore and Governor Bush, how would you answer the generals' questions? What use of nuclear weapons are you prepared to authorize?

*(3) If elected president, what specifically will you do during your four-year term to fulfill the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to join the other nuclear weapon states in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals"?*

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has been effect since 1970 and is signed by more than 180 nations. During the ratification process the NPT had the support of both President Lyndon Johnson and President Richard Nixon. The U.S. Senate ratified the treaty by a bipartisan vote of 83 to 15. As a treaty, the NPT is the law of the land and should be observed.

Article VI of the NPT commits the parties of the treaty "to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament". In 1996 the International Court of Justice unanimously ruled, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control." At the May 2000 NPT Review Conference the United States agreed to the Final Document containing the unequivocal commitment quoted above.

General Colin Powell, in 1983 when he was chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "I can declare my hope that we will eventually see the time when the number of nuclear weapons is down to zero and the world is a much better place." Ralph Nader has provided a six-point action program to move toward this goal. Governor Bush and Vice President Gore, what are your plans?

We eagerly await your response.

###

*Bishop Thomas J. Gumbleton of the Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit was a member of the committee of Catholic Bishops that in 1983 wrote the pastoral letter, "The Challenge of Peace". Bishop C. Dale White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that in 1986 developed the pastoral letter and foundation document, "In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace".*

Presidential Election Forum:  
The Candidates on Arms Control

Since 1976, Arms Control Today has offered presidential candidates an opportunity to articulate their views on arms control and security issues by responding to an Arms Control Association questionnaire. In this issue, ACT presents its seventh candidates forum, featuring the Republican nominee, Texas Governor George W. Bush, and the Democratic nominee, Vice President Al Gore.

Arms control has emerged as a front-page issue in this year's campaign, and with President Bill Clinton's September 1 announcement that he would defer a deployment decision on missile defense to the next administration, the 2000 election has taken on even greater significance.

The next president will face crucial security choices, not only on national missile defense, but also about the future of arms control itself.

The following are the candidates' responses to the 12 questions posed by ACT.

ACT: Should the United States deploy a national missile defense (NMD), and what factors should influence the decision? If the United States does need an NMD, would you proceed with the proposed limited system, or would you change the program's architecture?

Bush: America must build effective missile defenses, based on the best available options, at the earliest possible date. Our missile defense must be designed to protect all 50 states—and our friends and allies and deployed forces overseas—from missile attacks by rogue nations, or accidental launches.

The Clinton-Gore administration at first denied the need for a national missile defense system. Then it delayed. Now the approach it proposes is flawed—a system initially based on a single site, when experts say that more is needed. A missile defense system should not only defend our country, it should defend our allies, with whom I will consult as we develop our plans.

Gore: I agree with the president's decision to defer the decision to deploy a national missile defense for the next administration. The United States faces the

real possibility that countries such as North Korea or Iran will succeed in acquiring weapons of mass destruction [WMD] and ballistic missiles able to deliver these weapons at intercontinental range.

The limited national missile defense system which the Clinton-Gore administration has under development is meant to be deployed in a timely way and is explicitly designed to handle the type of threat that we could expect if our estimates are realized and we have to face a small number of deployed ICBMs with WMD warheads.

The president's decision allows time for additional testing of our NMD system. I welcome the opportunity to be more certain that these technologies actually work together properly. As the president said, there are 16 additional intercept tests already scheduled. One could decide to proceed with deployment at any point along that process, once fully convinced that the technologies are ready.

ACT: Are you prepared to go ahead with an NMD that violates the ABM Treaty without Russian agreement on amendments? Should the United States consider Russian President Vladimir Putin's proposal for cooperation on a limited missile defense to counter the threat from so-called rogue states?

Bush: If elected president, I will offer Russia the necessary amendments to the ABM Treaty so as to make our deployment of effective missile defenses consistent with the treaty. Both sides know that we live in a different world from 1972, when that treaty was signed. If Russia refuses the changes we propose, I will give prompt notice, under the provisions of the treaty, that the United States can no longer be a party to it.

President Putin's suggestion regarding U.S.-Russian cooperation in the area of missile defense was encouraging because it was an acknowledgment of the need for missile defenses. We should give President Putin the benefit of the doubt, and his proposal may be an opening for discussion. Under the mutual threat of rogue nations, there is a real possibility the Russians could join with us and our friends and allies to cooperate on missile defense systems. But there is a condition. Russia must break its dangerous habit of proliferation.

Gore: I would be prepared to work hard to persuade the government of the Russian Federation to modify the ABM Treaty. And I would also look for very creative approaches for joint U.S.-Russian responses

to a threat that can be aimed at either one or both of us.

But, at the end of the day, I would not be prepared to let Russian opposition to this system stand in the way of its deployment if I should conclude that the technologies are mature enough to deploy and are both affordable and needed. I would also work to persuade the Chinese that a U.S. NMD system is not intended to threaten them and to allay the concerns of our allies.

ACT: Do developments in North Korea (e.g., the North-South Korean summit, North Korea's reaffirmation of its moratorium on the testing of longer-range missiles, and its apparent willingness to give up its missile program altogether in exchange for financial and technological assistance) open the door for a diplomatic resolution to the North Korean missile threat; and, if successful, how would such a resolution affect U.S. missile defense plans?

Bush: Developments at the summit between the leaders of the Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea were encouraging. The summit did not resolve critical security issues—such as Pyongyang's massive conventional threat to the Republic of Korea and American troops stationed there, or North Korea's nuclear program and its development and export of ballistic missiles. But the apparent moves toward greater openness by the communist leadership in Pyongyang represent a major success for [South Korean President] Kim Dae Jung and the people of South Korea. It will be important to watch closely whether North Korea follows through on its promises.

Gore: I am hopeful that the recent summit between the North and South Koreans is the beginning of a process of reconciliation that will bring freedom, economic prosperity, and eventually a reunification on terms that spread economic and political and religious freedom throughout the peninsula. If that happens, it will have a profound impact on the role that North Korea now plays in the debate over nuclear weaponry. It is possible that North Korea will at some point change their intentions and remove this threat. We should be alert to such possibilities, but they are not in our grasp at this moment.

ACT: What arms control policy should the United States have toward China? Should a U.S. national missile defense be designed to counter China's strategic missiles in addition to those of the rogue states, and if not, how would you convince China of

this so as to avoid an arms buildup by Beijing and loss of its cooperation on other arms control matters, including non-proliferation?

Bush: Russia, our allies, and other nations of the world—including China—need to understand our intentions. America’s development of missile defenses is a search for security, not a search for advantage. The Cold War era is history. Our nation must recognize new threats, not fixate on old ones. On the issue of nuclear weapons, the United States has an opportunity to lead to a safer world—both to defend against nuclear threats and reduce nuclear tensions. It is possible to build a missile defense and defuse confrontation. America should do both.

Gore: The limited NMD architecture we are developing is not intended to threaten China. We need to continue to build a strategic dialogue with China to address their concerns. Over the last eight years, the Clinton-Gore administration has worked with China to address proliferation concerns. The administration won an agreement from China in May 1996 to stop all assistance to non-safeguarded nuclear programs and strengthen China’s nuclear export control system. In September 1997, China agreed to halt its nuclear cooperation with Iran. In 1998, the administration secured China’s pledge to further strengthen its export regime for dual-use chemicals and related production equipment. The administration also worked successfully to secure China’s signature of the Chemical Weapons Convention in 1993 and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1996. If elected president, I will build upon these efforts and work with China where possible to advance our non-proliferation and arms control goals.

ACT: Do you agree with the intelligence community’s assessment that the United States is “more likely to be attacked with weapons of mass destruction from non-missile delivery means (most likely from non-state entities) than by missiles”? If so, how do you propose to defend against these threats?

Bush: The protection of America itself will assume a high priority in a new century. Once a strategic afterthought, homeland defense has become an urgent duty. For most of our history, America felt safe behind two great oceans. But with the spread of technology, distance no longer means security. North Korea is proving that even a poor and backward country, in the hands of a tyrant, can reach across oceans to threaten us. Iran has made rapid strides in its missile program, and Iraq persists in a race to

do the same. Add to this the threat of biological, chemical, and nuclear terrorism—barbarism emboldened by technology. These weapons can be delivered, not just by ballistic missiles, but by everything from airplanes to cruise missiles, from shipping containers to suitcases. There is also the prospect of information warfare, in which hacker terrorists may try to disrupt finance, communication, transportation, and public health.

Our first line of defense is a simple message: Every group or nation must know, if they sponsor such attacks, our response will be devastating. But we must do more. At the earliest possible date, my administration will deploy anti-ballistic missile systems, both theater and national, to guard against attack and blackmail.

We will defend the American homeland by strengthening our intelligence community—focusing on human intelligence and the early detection of terrorist operations both here and abroad. And when direct threats to America are discovered, I know that the best defense can be a strong and swift offense—including the use of Special Operations Forces and long-range strike capabilities.

And there is more to be done preparing here at home. I will put a high priority on detecting and responding to terrorism on our soil. The federal government must take this threat seriously—working closely with researchers and industry to increase surveillance and develop treatments for chemical and biological agents.

Gore: As a matter of policy, we should continue our efforts to develop a national missile defense to protect the United States from a small-scale ballistic missile attack. We should also work to block all of the avenues of attack involving weapons of mass destruction. That certainly applies to terrorism. Under the Clinton-Gore administration, annual funding for the FBI's counterterrorism program has grown significantly from \$78.5 million in 1993 to \$301.2 million in 1999. Last year, the administration unveiled a comprehensive plan to safeguard Americans from the threat of terrorism. We must combine strengthened law enforcement efforts, intelligence efforts, and vigorous diplomacy with a willingness to use military force when necessary to combat terrorism.

Countering WMD terrorism requires disrupting terrorist networks before they are ready to attack. It also means tightening and upgrading airport and

border security. We must also improve coordination internationally and domestically to share intelligence and develop operational plans. We must follow a comprehensive national strategy that will involve all arms and levels of our government working together. We should continue to target the sources of terrorist financing and dismantle their support operations and infrastructure. We should also utilize diplomatic pressure to isolate nations harboring terrorists.

ACT: Should the United States pursue further strategic reductions in its arsenal and those of the other nuclear-weapon states through negotiated agreements or unilateral reductions? What level of strategic nuclear warheads do you believe the United States should seek by the end of the decade?

Bush: America should rethink the requirements for nuclear deterrence in a new security environment. The premises of Cold War nuclear targeting should no longer dictate the size of our arsenal. As president, I will ask the secretary of defense to conduct an assessment of our nuclear force posture and determine how best to meet our security needs. While the exact number of weapons can come only from such an assessment, I will pursue the lowest possible number consistent with our national security. It should be possible to reduce the number of American nuclear weapons significantly further than what has already been agreed to under START II, without compromising our security in any way. We should not keep weapons that our military planners do not need. These unneeded weapons are the expensive relics of dead conflicts. And they do nothing to make us more secure.

In addition, the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status—another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation. Preparation for quick launch—within minutes after warning of an attack—was the rule during the era of superpower rivalry. But today, for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch. So, as president, I will ask for an assessment of what we can safely do to lower the alert status of our forces.

These changes to our forces should not require years and years of detailed arms control negotiations. There is a precedent that proves the power of leadership. In 1991, the United States invited the Soviet Union to join it in removing tactical nuclear

weapons from the arsenal. Huge reductions were achieved in a matter of months, making the world much safer, more quickly.

Similarly, in the area of strategic nuclear weapons, we should invite the Russian government to accept the new vision I have outlined, and act on it. But the United States should be prepared to lead by example, because it is in our best interest and the best interest of the world. This would be an act of principled leadership—a chance to seize the moment and begin a new era of nuclear security, a new era of cooperation on proliferation and nuclear safety.

Gore: As president, I would aim for another round of deep negotiated reductions to levels agreed between the United States and Russia at the Helsinki summit. If the Russians wish to reduce unilaterally below that level for economic reasons, they certainly can and should. But for the United States to go lower requires a thorough re-examination of the official nuclear doctrine which to this point guides our military in its planning. As president, I would initiate such a review and engage deeply in the process.

ACT: What is your position on the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)? If the treaty is not ratified, should the United States continue the current testing moratorium?

Bush: Our nation should continue its moratorium on testing. But in the hard work of halting proliferation, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is not the answer. The CTBT does not stop proliferation, especially to renegade regimes. It is not verifiable. It is not enforceable. And it would stop us from ensuring the safety and reliability of our nation's deterrent, should the need arise. On these crucial matters, it offers only words and false hopes and high intentions—with no guarantees whatever. We can fight the spread of nuclear weapons, but we cannot wish them away with unwise treaties.

Gore: I believe the Senate's rejection of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty last year was an act of massive irresponsibility damaging to the security interests of the United States, and if elected president, I will immediately revive the ratification process and seek to rally the full force of American public opinion behind it.

ACT: Does the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) remain important to U.S. national security, and if

so, what priority should be given to sustaining it? What new steps would you take to reduce the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery vehicles?

Bush: If elected president, one of my highest foreign policy priorities will be to check the contagious spread of weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them. We must work to constrict the supply of nuclear materials and the means to deliver them by making this a priority with Russia and China. Our nation must cut off the demand for nuclear weapons by addressing the security concerns of those who renounce these weapons. And our nation must diminish the evil attraction of these weapons for rogue states by rendering them useless with missile defense.

With regard to Russia, both our nations face a changed world. Instead of confronting each other, we confront the legacy of a dead ideological rivalry—thousands of nuclear weapons, which, in the case of Russia, may not be secure. And together we also face an emerging threat—from rogue nations, nuclear theft, and accidental launch. All this requires nothing short of a new strategic relationship to protect the peace of the world.

In an act of foresight and statesmanship, Senator Richard Lugar and Senator Sam Nunn realized that existing Russian nuclear facilities were in danger of being compromised. Under the Nunn-Lugar program, security at many Russian nuclear facilities has been improved and warheads have been destroyed. Even so, the Energy Department warns us that our estimates of Russian nuclear stockpiles could be off by as much as 30 percent. In other words, a great deal of Russian nuclear material cannot be accounted for. The next president must press for an accurate inventory of all this material. And we must do more. I'll ask the Congress to increase substantially our assistance to dismantle as many of Russia's weapons as possible, as quickly as possible.

Gore: The NPT is a pillar of our global arms control and non-proliferation efforts. Recognizing its importance, in 1995, I worked to forge an international consensus for a permanent extension of the treaty. Although commitment to the NPT regime is nearly universal, there are steps we can take to strengthen the NPT and to contribute to our non-proliferation goals. We can work toward universal adherence to the NPT and convince states who have not yet acceded to the treaty to do so. We should strengthen the International Atomic Energy Agency's

safeguards system. Another priority must be to ratify the CTBT and see that it enters into force. We should also enhance compliance with the Biological Weapons Convention and begin negotiations on a fissile material cutoff treaty. This administration has pursued an aggressive arms control and non-proliferation agenda. In the former Soviet Union, the U.S. has helped deactivate 5,000 nuclear weapons through the Cooperative Threat Reduction program and other initiatives. I am committed to continuing this work and to diminishing the threat of weapons of mass destruction by cutting stockpiles and ensuring that weapons and weapons-grade material do not fall into the wrong hands.

ACT: How should the United States deal with Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and missile programs?

Bush: It is important for the United States and our allies to keep the pressure on Saddam Hussein. We must insist that Iraq comply with the cease-fire arrangement agreed to at the end of the Persian Gulf War. I am very concerned that Saddam Hussein has not been held to the terms of the arrangement. If elected president, I would not ease the current sanctions on Iraq and would continue to insist that inspectors be allowed into the country. I would be helping Iraqi opposition groups. And if I found that Saddam Hussein was in any way, shape, or form building weapons of mass destruction, I would take them out.

Gore: By maintaining United Nations sanctions on Iraq for eight years, the Clinton-Gore administration has worked to prevent Saddam Hussein from acquiring weapons of mass destruction. A Gore-Lieberman administration will work for the resumption of arms inspections in Iraq and to ensure that they are credible and effective. We should maintain comprehensive international pressure on Saddam Hussein until Iraq complies with all relevant UN Security Council resolutions.

ACT: Should the United States try to roll back India's and Pakistan's nuclear capabilities, or should it simply seek to stabilize the nuclear balance in South Asia? How would you implement your policy?

Bush: I've said that our nation should continue its moratorium on testing. America must make it clear that we expect India and Pakistan to refrain from testing as well. It will take leadership by the United States and its friends and allies to help reduce tensions between India and Pakistan and pursue

steps to prevent nuclear conflict between the two nations. This coming century will see democratic India's arrival as a force in the world. India is now debating its future and its strategic path, and the United States must pay it more attention. We should work with the Indian government, ensuring it is a force for stability and security in Asia. This should not undermine our longstanding relationship with Pakistan, which remains crucial to the peace of the region.

Gore: India's and Pakistan's 1998 tests were a great source of international concern and a reminder that nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia poses a continuing challenge. Cognizant of regional dynamics and insecurities, we should work with India and Pakistan to guard against a nuclear arms race on the subcontinent. We must persuade them to join the NPT regime and sign the CTBT. A Gore administration will seek to convince India and Pakistan to refrain from weaponization or deployment of nuclear weapons, testing or deploying missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons, and further production of fissile material for nuclear weapons purposes.

ACT: With the "globalization" of the defense industry, how would your administration ensure that U.S. national security interests take priority over commercial interests in the export of weapons systems?

Bush: First and foremost, we must strengthen America's intelligence and counterintelligence capabilities to staunch the theft of sensitive military technology at home and identify threats abroad before they arise. The United States must also lead its allies in establishing new, binding rules to prevent the export of sensitive military technology. America must no longer be alone in keeping dangerous technologies and products away from those who do not wish us well.

Gore: Exports of weapons technology or systems should be governed by considerations related to proliferation concerns and a review of threats to our security. We have and will continue to promote responsible arms and technology transfers.

ACT: In general, what is the role of arms control as the world enters the new millennium? What would be the arms control priorities of your administration?

Bush: When it comes to nuclear weapons, the world has changed faster than U.S. policy. The emerging



**Suggestions for a Statement on Nuclear Abolition  
by the World Council of Churches  
Offered by Howard W. Hallman**

**Preamble**

Indicate that in these opening days of the 21<sup>st</sup> century Earth should free itself from nuclear weapons.

Point out that the possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons is *morally wrong*. Draw upon previous WCC statements to amplify this statement.

Note that numerous military experts indicate that nuclear weapons have *no military utility*. (I have a supply of such statements if you need them.)

Indicate that although some persons say that nuclear weapons have political utility to deter nuclear weapons (that's what the NATO representative said in Brussels), this condition exists only as long as other states possess nuclear weapons.

Observe that the nuclear weapons states have a treaty commitment for nuclear disarmament under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, that the International Court of Justice has ruled that is a binding obligation, and that the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference records a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon states to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

**Recommended Action**

Call upon the nuclear-weapon states and other possessors of nuclear weapons:

(a) to make a good faith beginning to their unequivocal undertaking by mutually pledging never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance.

(b) to avoid any unintended use by taking all nuclear weapons off alert with mutual and international verification.

(c) to deactivate all nuclear weapons as quickly as possible by separating warheads from delivery vehicles with safe storage under mutual and international verification.

(d) to dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles through an expeditious and balanced schedule that assures security for all with international and mutual inspection.

(e) to close and dismantle all facilities used for research, development, testing, and production of nuclear weapons.

(f) to establish an international system of fissile material control with effective accounting, monitoring, and safeguards.

## **Implementation**

Appoint a delegation of representatives of churches of different regions of the world to call upon the heads of states and foreign ministers of the nuclear-weapon states and other possessor states and demand that they carry out these steps as part of their unequivocal undertaking to eliminate their nuclear weapons.

For further information, contact:

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036 U.S.A.

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

October 11, 2000

**STATEMENT BY H.E. ARCHBISHOP RENATO R. MARTINO  
APOSTOLIC NUNCIO, PERMANENT OBSERVER OF THE HOLY SEE  
TO THE UNITED NATIONS  
BEFORE THE FIRST COMMITTEE  
OF THE 55<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
ON ITEM 74  
GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT**

**6 OCTOBER 2000**

Check against delivery

STATEMENT BY H.E. ARCHBISHOP RENATO R. MARTINO  
APOSTOLIC NUNCIO, PERMANENT OBSERVER OF THE HOLY SEE TO THE UNITED NATIONS  
BEFORE THE FIRST COMMITTEE  
OF THE 55<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
ON ITEM 74  
GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT  
6 OCTOBER 2000

Mr. Chairman,

At this first meeting of the Disarmament Committee in the new century, let us resolve at the outset to develop the concept of a culture of peace as an integral approach to preventing violence and armed conflicts. That is indeed the goal of the International Year for the Culture of Peace.

At the basis of a culture of peace is respect for life and for all human rights. Constructing such a culture requires comprehensive educational, social and civic action. This will lead to the "civilization of love," as described by Pope John Paul II, and it is this aspiration at the dawn of the Third Millennium that the peoples of the world so ardently long for.

Since the first duty of the United Nations is to preserve and promote peace throughout the world, this Committee has a vital role to play in establishing political norms for peace. The nations of the world pledged at the recent Millennium Summit to "spare no effort to free our peoples from the scourge of war, whether within or between States, which has claimed more than five million lives in the past decade." To carry out this pledge, nations must build respect for the rule of law, and ensure compliance with the U.N. Charter and the decisions of the International Court of Justice.

How easy it is to say these words; yet how difficult to practice them. After three years of steady decline, the number of wars fought world-wide increased significantly in 1999, when there were no less than forty armed conflicts being fought on the territories of 36 countries. Sixteen of these conflicts took place in Africa, 14 in Asia, 6 in the Middle East, 2 in Europe and 2 in the Americas. These conflicts, fed by arms dealers with a rapacious appetite for money, are a scandal of modern civilization.

The widespread availability of small arms and light weapons contributes towards intensifying conflicts by increasing the lethality and duration of violence; they generate a vicious circle of a greater sense of insecurity, which in turn leads to a greater demand for the use of these weapons. It is an even greater shame that many small arms are readily obtainable by

children who are enslaved into being combatants and porters by warring factions.

It is no accident that the vast majority of states experiencing war are among the most poverty-stricken. These conflicts, which consume large amounts of resources needed for economic and social development, are responsible for the displacement of people, the vast majority civilian, mostly women and children. The easy availability of small arms and light weapons has led to the targeting of U.N. peacekeeping and humanitarian field staff. The U.N.'s development projects and those of donor countries are often destroyed when groups carrying these weapons ransack towns and villages.

All this has been the study of a number of expert groups, preparing the way for the 2001 Conference on "Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in all Its Aspects." The Holy See gives its full support to this Conference in the hope that it will develop and strengthen international efforts to prevent, combat and eradicate the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.

While norms and international measures need to be advanced, most of all it is political will throughout the world that must be developed to stop the trafficking in weapons, licit and illicit. States must exercise their responsibility with regard to the export, import, transit and re-transfer of small arms and light weapons. Let the international community at least implement the Millennium Declaration pledge "to take concerted action to end illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons, especially by making arms transfers more transparent and supporting regional disarmament measures."

Despite the immense suffering still caused by wars, we should not lose sight of the gains that are being made in reducing weaponry. Since the Anti-Personnel Landmines Treaty went into effect in 1999, 10 million stockpiled anti-personnel mines have been destroyed, bringing the total, so far, to 22 million. It is true that an estimated 250 million mines remain stockpiled in 105 nations, but at least the trade in such evil instruments has almost completely halted. The treaty that has brought this about has been signed by 139 governments and ratified by 105. Some major countries are still outside the treaty, and the Holy See appeals to them to join this important movement in the world community to avert even more human suffering by so many innocent victims of warfare.

This past year has also seen the *Sixth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (April 27, 2000)*, in which 187 States made "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." The Conference also agreed on 13 practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty.

In his intervention to this Conference, Archbishop Tauran, Secretary for the Holy See's Relations with States, noted that: "The actual stage of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament indicates that at the dawn of a new century many still believe in the use of force and count on nuclear weapons. This means that the rule of law, confidence in others and the will to dialogue are not yet priorities. It also indicates the relative value of a concept like "nuclear deterrence", a distressing solution for a world overwhelmed with weapons, which should be turning instead toward progressive and effective disarmament".

Why should it be so difficult for the Nuclear Weapons States to take leadership in implementing these progressive steps to nuclear disarmament? Such a question brings us face to face with a searing question for modern humanity: "Do we really want peace? If we reply yes, then we are bound to verify it: there will be no peace in a world which continues to produce more and more sophisticated arms, which prepares itself for their use or where peace is only maintained by a balance of terror. The time has come to get rid of the inherited mind-sets of the Cold War and to resolve the problems connected with the establishment of mutual security" (ibid.).

The Holy See welcomes the U.N. Millennium Summit Declaration, which resolved "to strive for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons..." The Secretary-General's proposal for a global conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers should be taken into consideration.

The United Nations must play a leading role in advancing measures for nuclear disarmament because the Organization has the ability to gather together the world community and express its collective will for peace and human security.

My Delegation would like to repeat here the words of Angelo Cardinal Sodano, Secretary of State, at the Millennium Summit: "...the U.N. needs to develop its capacities in the area of preventive diplomacy. For its part, the Holy See will always support initiatives in favour of peace, including those aimed to strengthening respect for international law and controlling arms proliferation."

Moreover, at the Millennium Summit, the leaders of the world have solemnly renewed their commitment to promote the building of a new century based on a culture of peace. We really believe the peoples of the world want a culture of peace. To achieve this lofty goal States must work to develop and extend policies that promote human security, new coalitions and negotiations, the rule of law, initiatives at peacemaking, democratic decision-making and humanitarian intervention mandated by the Security Council. In such a culture, there would be a reversal of present policies in which billions of dollars are spent on arms and militarization while worthwhile development initiatives and programs for peace and human security are starved for lack of funds.

A culture of peace is possible, but first we must develop the moral and political will.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## PRACTICAL STEPS ON ARTICLE VI

### Excerpts from Final Document of the 2000 Review of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

15. The Conference agrees on the following practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and paragraphs 3 and 4(c) of the 1995 Decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament":

1. The importance and urgency of signatures and ratifications without delay and without conditions and in accordance with constitutional processes, to achieve the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.
2. A moratorium on nuclear-weapon-test explosions or any other nuclear explosions pending entry into force of that Treaty.
3. The necessity of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices in accordance with the statement of the Special Coordinator in 1995 and the mandate contained therein, taking into consideration both nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation objectives. The Conference on Disarmament is urged to agree on a programme of work which includes the immediate commencement of negotiations on such a treaty with a view to their conclusion within five years.
4. The necessity of establishing in the Conference on Disarmament an Appropriate subsidiary body with a mandate to deal with nuclear disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament is urged to agree on a programme of work which includes the immediate establishment of such a body.
5. The principle of irreversibility to apply to nuclear disarmament, nuclear and other related arms control and reduction measures.
6. An unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament to which all States parties are committed under Article VI.
7. The early entry into force and full implementation of START II and the conclusion of START III as soon as possible while preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability and as a basis for further reductions of strategic offensive weapons, in accordance with its provisions.
8. The completion and implementation of the Trilateral Initiative between the United States of America, the Russian Federation and the International Atomic Energy Agency.
9. Steps by all the nuclear-weapon States leading to nuclear disarmament in a way that promotes international stability, and based on the principle of undiminished security for all:

- Further efforts by the nuclear-weapon States to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally.
- Increased transparency by the nuclear-weapon States with regard to their nuclear weapons capabilities and the implementation of agreements pursuant to Article VI and as a voluntary confidence-building measure to support further progress on nuclear disarmament.
- The further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons, based on unilateral initiatives and as an integral part of the nuclear arms reduction and disarmament process.
- Concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems.
- A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination.
- The engagement as soon as appropriate of all the nuclear-weapon States in the process leading to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

10. Arrangements by all nuclear-weapon States to place, as soon as practicable, fissile material designated by each of them as no longer required for military purposes under IAEA or other relevant international verification and arrangements for the disposition of such material for peaceful purposes, to ensure that such material remains permanently outside of military programmer.

11. Reaffirmation that the ultimate objective of the efforts of States in the disarmament process is general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

12. Regular reports, within the framework of the NPT strengthened review process, by all States parties on the implementation of Article VI and paragraph 4 (c) of the 1995 Decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", and recalling the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice of 8 July 1996.

13. The further development of the verification capabilities that will be required to provide assurance of compliance with nuclear disarmament agreements for the achievement and maintenance of a nuclear-weapon-free world.

May 20, 2000

## **Names of 62 Senators asking for a delay on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty**

From the Congressional Record of October 13, 1999 - p.S12549

U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC, October 12, 1999.

Hon. Trent Lott  
Majority Leader.

Hon. Tom Daschle  
Democratic Leader.  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Leaders:

The Senate Leadership has received a letter from President Clinton requesting 'that you postpone consideration of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on the Senate Floor.' We write in support of putting off final consideration until the next Congress.

Were the Treaty to be voted on today, Senator Warner and Senator Lugar would be opposed. Senator Moynihan and Senator Biden would be in support. But we all agree on seeking a delay. We believe many colleagues are of a like view, irrespective of how they would vote at this point.

We recognize that the Nation's best interests, the Nation's vital business, is and must always be the first concern of the Presidency and the Congress.

But we cannot foresee at this time an international crisis of the magnitude, that would persuade the Senate to revisit a decision made now to put off a final consideration of the Treaty until the 107th Congress.

However, we recognize that throughout history the Senate has had the power, the duty to reconsider prior decisions.

Therefore, if Leadership takes under consideration a joint initiative to implement the President's request--and our request--for a delay, then we commit our support for our Leaders taking this statesmanlike initiative.

### **REPUBLICANS**

Warner, Lugar, Roth, Domenici, Hagel, Gordon Smith, Collins, McCain, Snowe, Sessions, Stevens, Chafee, Brownback, Bennett, Jeffords, Grassley, DeWine, Specter, Hatch, Voinovich, Gorton, Burns, Gregg, Santorum.

### **DEMOCRATS**

Moynihan, Biden, Lieberman, Levin, Feingold, Kohl, Boxer, Cleland, Dodd, Wyden, Rockefeller, Bingaman, Inouye, Baucus, Hollings, Kennedy, Harry Reid, Robb, Jack Reed, Mikulski, Torricelli, Feinstein, Schumer, Breaux, Bob Kerrey, Evan Bayh, John Kerry, Landrieu, Murray, Tim Johnson, Byrd, Lautenberg, Harkin, Durbin, Leahy, Wellstone, Akaka, Edwards.

## Gaining U.S. Senate Support for Strategic Arms Reduction

The reduction of strategic nuclear weapons will be an important issue with the next presidential administration and the next two Congresses. The U.S. Senate will play a crucial role because of the Senate's power to ratify treaties and its power, along with the House of Representatives to facilitate, and not block, executive initiatives. Therefore, it is important for the faith community to help develop bipartisan support in the Senate for strategic arms reduction.

### The Arsenal

Military experts make a distinction between strategic and tactical (or non-strategic) nuclear weapons. Strategic weapons are designed to attack an adversary's homeland from afar. They included submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICMBs), and bombs carried on long-range bombers. Tactical weapons are intended primarily for battlefield use or to attack military installations from short- to mid-range.

The Center for Defense Information estimates the global nuclear arsenal to be as follows:

<b>Country</b>	<b>Strategic</b>	<b>Non-strategic</b>	<b>Total</b>
United States	7,300	4,700-11,700	12,000-19,000
Russia	6,000	6,000-13,000	12,000-19,000
France	482	0	482
China	290	120	410
United Kingdom	100	100	200

In addition, Israel possesses an 100 or more nuclear weapons. India and Pakistan have tested nuclear weapons and may have built some.

### Treaties

Over the years the United States and the Soviet Union, now Russia, have entered into treaties to limit and reduce the number of strategic nuclear weapons. In the 1970s there were two Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties (SALT I and II). In the early 1990s the administration of President George Bush negotiated two Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties with Russia. Under START I the United States and Russia agreed to a reduction in deployed strategic nuclear warheads to about 8,500 for the United States and about 6,500 for Russia. Under START II, signed in January 1993, both sides agreed to cut their deployed strategic forces to 3,000-3,500 warheads apiece. The treaty also bans deployment of land-based missiles with more than one warhead.

The United States Senate ratified START II in January 1996 by a vote of 87 to 4. The Russian Duma ratified the treaty in April 2000 by a vote of 288 to 131. Russian approval was contingent on U.S. ratification of a 1997 protocol that extends the time period for the complete of START II reductions from 2003 to 2007 and some Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) related agreements. The Clinton Administration has not submitted the protocol and ABM agreements to the U.S. Senate because they have become intertwined with the debate on deployment of national missile defense (NMD).

At a 1997 meeting in Helsinki President Clinton and Russian President Boris Yeltsin agreed to negotiate a START III agreement that would further reduce the nuclear arsenal to 2,000 to 2,500 strategic warheads on each side. Subsequently the new Russian President, Vladimir Putin has proposed a level of 1,500. The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff do not support this lower level because of the targeting needs of the current U.S. nuclear posture. Moreover, the Clinton wants to link START III with changes in the ABM treaty to permit limited national missile defense, but Russia is reluctant to accept ABM modifications. Consequently START III negotiations have not commenced.

## **Reciprocal Initiatives**

Another approach to strategic arms reduction is through executive initiatives by one side with a reciprocal response by the other. President George Bush used this approach in September 1991 when he ordered a stand-down of many U.S strategic bombers and removal and storage of their nuclear bombs. He also ended alert status for strategic missiles destined for elimination by START I: 450 silo-based rockets and missiles on 10 submarines. Soviet President Mikail Gorbachev by ordering deactivation of more than 500 land-based rockets and six strategic submarines, by placing strategic bombers in a low level of readiness, and by putting rail-based missiles in garrison. In the next several months both nations withdrew tactical nuclear warheads deployed with the arms and navies and placed them central storage depots.

During the 2000 presidential campaign Governor George W. Bush stated, "It should be possible to reduce the number of American weapons significantly further than what has already been agreed to under START II." He indicated that "the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status." Citing the 1991 experience, Bush said, "These changes to our forces should not require years and years of detailed arms control negotiations." He indicated that "the United States should be prepared to lead by example." Vice President Al Gore advocated "another round of deep negotiated reductions to levels agreed between the United States and Russia at the Helsinki summit." Gore has not offered his views on reciprocal national initiatives along the lines of the 1991 example.

## **Nuclear Posture Review**

Both candidates conditioned their proposed actions on strategic nuclear reductions on a nuclear posture review that would survey U.S. nuclear policy, including number of weapons needed to cover the official target list. Congress has mandated that such a review be completed by December 2001.

**Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL)  
Sign On Letter to the Faith Based Community**

(This is currently being circulated to the heads of 40 denominations, after which it will be circulated throughout the faith-based community.)

November 2000

Dear President-elect

We are leaders of national religious congregations, joining together in an interfaith appeal for you to take action to reduce the threat of accidental nuclear war. Specifically we ask for your commitment to work with the Russians to take all nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert.

Although the Cold war ended over a decade ago, the U.S and Russia still have some five thousand nuclear weapons on hyper-alert status—the equivalent of 100,000 Hiroshima bombs ready to be fired at a moment's notice. In a time of crisis or perceived attack, decision makers on both sides have just minutes to decide whether to launch a massive nuclear strike.

A single miscalculation or computer error could lead to nuclear war. We have already come too close to this ultimate catastrophe. In 1995, Russia mistakenly identified a scientific rocket as a nuclear missile moving toward Moscow. The Russians came within minutes of launching their nuclear missiles at U.S. cities.

The continued deterioration of Russia's radar and early warning systems only increases the danger.

It's time for the U.S. and Russia to move together to end the threat of accidental nuclear war, by "de-alerting" their arsenals—taking them off the hair-trigger. De-alerting means lengthening the time needed to prepare nuclear missiles for launch. It would give U.S. and Russian leaders ample time to make the safest and most accurate assessment of any threat. It would provide a critical margin of safety in the event of a failure of early warning systems or nuclear command and control.

Lengthening the launch time of nuclear missiles from minutes to hours, days, or even weeks is like putting a safety lock on nuclear weapons.

To protect the world from nuclear disaster, the U.S. can and should take the lead on de-alerting. There is a precedent. In 1991, president Bush removed hundred of U.S. warheads from high-alert status, which prompted President Gorbachev to do the same.

Within our faith communities, policies concerning nuclear weapons raise profound questions about our moral responsibilities, the integrity of God's creation, and human destiny. These moral questions persist as long as the threat of nuclear war continues. As an interfaith coalition, we assert that the de-alerting of all nuclear weapons is a prudent and necessary step towards eliminating the threat of nuclear war.

As President of the United States, we urge you to take action to get all nuclear weapons off hair-trigger status. We await your response.  
Sincerely,

# A Grant Request to Ploughshares Fund

## I. SUMMARY

- A. Organization: Methodists United for Peace with Justice
- B. Contact person: Howard W. Hallman, Chair
- C. Address: 1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
Phone: 301 896-0013 Fax: same E-mail: [mupj@igc.apc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.apc.org)
- D. Fiscal sponsor: not applicable
- E. Amount requested: \$20,000
- F. Project budget: \$20,000 Organization budget for other activities: \$18,000
- G. Project title: Mobilizing Grassroots Support for Ratification of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- H. Summary description of organization and project:

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a national association of laity and clergy, organized in 1987 to work for nuclear disarmament, better US-Soviet relationships (in that period), and other peace and justice concerns. Although most members are United Methodists, the organization seeks participation from all denominations in the Methodist family. We work cooperatively with other religious organizations and with numerous peace and disarmament organizations.

The purpose of this project is to help mobilize grassroots support for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Our contribution will be fourfold:

- In key states where one or both senators are considered swing votes for ratification, reach out to United Methodists, provide them with educational material on the CTBT, and encourage them to engage in public advocacy activities with their senators.
- Form linkages with other religious organizations engaged in similar grassroots mobilization, including Mainline Protestant denominations, historic peace churches, the Catholic Church, and Jewish organizations.
- Seek involvement of persons from religious denominations traditionally not active on arms control and disarmament issues, including three Black Methodist denominations, three Black Baptist denominations, Southern Baptists (selectively), other Evangelical Christians, Orthodox Christians, and Mormons.
- Help bring the religious community into a close working relationship with peace, disarmament, and professional organizations working for CTBT ratification, especially those that compose the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

## II. FULL PROPOSAL

### A. Description of Organization

Methodists United for Peace with Justice organized in 1987 as a national association of laity and clergy. Stimulation for organizing was the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. This document offered a theological basis for saying “no” to nuclear deterrence, and it set forth policy recommendations for moving toward nuclear disarmament. It also called for greater witness and action for peace and justice. We organized in response to this call.

#### Issue Focus

From the beginning nuclear abolition has been our central focus. Initially we worked for better US-Soviet relations in the waning days of the Cold War, particularly through citizen exchanges, and we have a continuing interest in US-Russian relationships. In 1990-91 we opposed U.S. participation in the Gulf War. We support measures to curtail international arms trade and to eliminate land mines throughout the globe. As a linkage of peace and justice concerns, we favor shifts in federal budget priorities to reduce military spending and increase spending to meet urgent human and community needs. We support the United Nations and other international organizations that can peaceably resolve international conflict.

To achieve nuclear abolition we favor a dual track approach that (i) advocates far-reaching global initiatives, such as a Nuclear Abolition Convention, and (ii) simultaneously works for incremental steps, such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties (START I, II, III), zero alert for nuclear weapons, nuclear free zones, and termination of nuclear weapons research and development activities. Earlier this year we helped develop grassroots support for Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), important both in its own right and as a precursor of the CTBT.

#### Work within Methodism

As our name “Methodists United” indicates, we seek participation from the entire Methodist family, including African Methodist Episcopal, African Methodist Episcopal Zion, Christian Methodist Episcopal, Free Methodist, United Methodist, and Wesleyan Churches. Most of our members are United Methodists, but other Methodist denominations are represented on our board of directors and national advisory committee. As an incorporated, nonprofit association, we are not an official part of any Methodist denomination but have a cooperative relationship with denominational agencies.

Recognizing the importance the quadrennial United Methodist General Conference (the denomination’s official governing body), we put on Peace with Justice Breakfasts at the 1988, 1992, and 1996 gatherings and lobbied for resolutions on nuclear abolition and other peace issues. We are in regular contact with bishops and peace and justice leaders in the 66 annual conferences, the denomination’s main geographic unit. To reach out to the entire Methodist family, we have held a Gathering on Peace and Justice that brought together persons from the six Methodist denominations. During the past year we have sought ways to draw AME, AMEZ, and CME leaders into work for nuclear abolition.

## **Modes of Operation**

**Education.** We provide information on national policy issues and pending legislation to people around the country who are active in local churches, Methodist district and conference organizations, and on college campuses. We use a network approach, seeking to reach bishops and conference leaders who have responsibility for reaching out to many more people. We publish *Peace Leaf*, a quarterly bulletin, and occasional *Peace/Justice Alerts*. We also join in joint postal card alerts, such as those that 20/20 Vision initiates.

**Public policy advocacy.** In Washington, D.C. we engage in public policy advocacy directed toward Congress and the federal executive. We do this on our own and also as signers of joint letters to Congress, the president, and other executive officials. We provide timely information on legislative issues to grassroots Methodists and urge them to contact their elected representatives and participate in call-in days.

**Coalitions.** We constantly work through coalitions of like-minded agencies, including the Monday Lobby of peace and disarmament organizations, the Abolition 2000 network, working groups on the CWC (now completed) and the CTBT, and the Citizens Budget Campaign. We are one of the leaders in establishing a Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition as part of the Abolition 2000 network. We constantly try to serve as a bridge between religious organizations and secular peace organizations.

**Religious networks.** In Washington we work closely with various Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish denominational offices and peace fellowships, and we also reach out to key staff persons at denominational headquarters if located elsewhere. From time to time we have circulated sign-on letters to heads of religious communion (see samples in Appendix).

## **Legal Status**

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a nonprofit corporation, established under laws and regulations of the District of Columbia. The corporation has status as a 501(c)(4) organization under the Internal Revenue Code. We have established the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, which the Internal Revenue Service has recognized as a 501(c)(3) organization and a public foundation under section 509(a)(1). IRS letters are attached.

## **B. Description of Project**

### **Challenge**

Strong grassroots mobilization, achieved through cooperative action of CTBT supporters, is essential to achieve Senate ratification. A preliminary analysis of the U.S. Senate identifies 32 undecided senators who come from 24 states, as shown on the map on the next page..

In these key states religious denominations and religious peace/justice associations have important contributions to make in developing grassroots support for CTBT ratification. There is a natural constituency among Mainline Protestant denominations, historic peace churches, the Catholic Church, and important segments of the Jewish community, all of which have long been

on record in favor of halting nuclear weapons testing. There is potential support from other denominations which traditionally haven't worked on disarmament issues, especially African American denominations. There are selective opportunities within other denominations which don't usually take positions on such issues.

The table on the next page provides information on denominational strength in the 24 key states.

The Catholic Church, as the largest denomination in the United States, ranks first in 17 states. Southern Baptists are most numerous in the five southern states. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS), popularly known as Mormons, is top rank in two states. The United Methodist Church ranks second or third in 19 states. Black Baptists rank from second to fourth in ten states. If the three Black Methodist denominations were pooled together, they would be among the top five denominations in several states. With smaller numbers the American Baptist Church, Episcopal Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Presbyterian Church, and United Church of Christ don't show up in the top ranks in many states, but they are all strong supporters of the CTBT and a potent influence. Likewise Brethren, Friends, and Mennonites, though less numerous, are influential on peace issues in quite a few states. Jewish influence tends to be more concentrated.

## Denominational Rank in Key States for CTBT Ratification

State	Denominational Rank (4% or more of church membership)
Alaska	Catholic, Southern Baptist, LDS, ELCA,
Washington	Catholic, LDS, ELCA, United Methodist, Assembly of God, Presbyterian
Idaho	LDS, Catholic, United Methodist
Utah	LDS, Catholic
Arizona	Catholic, LDS, Southern Baptist, Jewish, United Methodist
Wyoming	Catholic, LDS, Southern Baptist, United Methodist, Missouri Synod (Lutheran), Episcopal, ELCA, Presbyterian
Colorado	Catholic, United Methodist, Southern Baptist, LDS, ELCA
New Mexico	Catholic, Southern Baptist, United Methodist, LDS,
Nebraska	Catholic, United Methodist, ELCA, Missouri Synod (Lutheran), Presbyterian
Kansas	Catholic, United Methodist, Black Baptist, American Baptist, Presbyterian, Missouri Synod (Lutheran), Church of Christ (Disciples)
Iowa	Catholic, United Methodist, ELCA, Missouri Synod (Lutheran), Presbyterian
Missouri	Catholic, Southern Baptist, United Methodist, Black Baptist, Missouri Synod (Lutheran)
Indiana	Catholic, United Methodist, Church of Christ, Black Baptist, American Baptist, Eastern Orthodox, Missouri Synod (Lutheran)
Michigan	Catholic, Black Baptist, United Methodist, Missouri Synod (Lutheran)
Ohio	Catholic, United Methodist, Black Baptist, ELCA
Kentucky	Southern Baptist, Catholic, United Methodist, Churches of Christ, Black Baptist
Tennessee	Southern Baptist, United Methodist, Black Baptist, Churches of Christ, Catholic
Mississippi	Southern Baptist, Black Baptist, United Methodist, Catholic
South Carolina	Southern Baptist, Black Baptist, United Methodist, Presbyterian
Virginia	Southern Baptist, United Methodist, Catholic, Black Baptist, Presbyterian
Delaware	Catholic, United Methodist, Black Baptist, Presbyterian, Episcopal
Pennsylvania	Catholic, United Methodist, ELCA, Presbyterian, Jewish, UCC
New York	Catholic, Jewish, Black Baptist, United Methodist
New Hampshire	Catholic, UCC, United Methodist, American Baptist

ELCA = Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

LDS = Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon)

UCC = United Church of Christ

## **Project Activities**

In this project we will work in several ways to develop grassroots support for CTBT ratification, achieved in association with other organizations participating in Washington-based coalitions.

**Among United Methodists.** The greatest amount of our time and expenditures in this project will be directed toward mobilizing United Methodists in key states. This is a receptive constituency because the United Methodist Church has long supported a comprehensive test ban. Moreover, in a majority of the key states the United Methodist Church has the greatest membership among Mainline Protestants and is therefore an important force to mobilize.

As an unofficial organization within Methodism, we maintain an active working relationship with the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, the official advocacy body for peace and justice issues, and with the United Methodist Council of Bishops, the spiritual leaders of the denomination. There are 50 resident bishops, each presiding over one or two annual conferences, a total of 66. Each conference has a board of church and society (though called by different names) with committees working on specific issues, and most of them have peace with justice coordinators. These boards, committees, and coordinators reach out to local churches, clergy, and laity with educational and advocacy activities.

Over the last ten years we have developed strong working relationship with this network of bishops, conference boards and officials. Most recently we brought this into play in developing grassroots support for Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. This summer we are contacting bishops in the CTBT key states and asking them to designate a contact person in each conference they preside over. We will then use these persons as our main contacts for building grassroots support, knowing that they will reach out to a much wider network. We will provide educational material and action alerts (include material produce by Washington-based coalitions), encourage United Methodists to make direct contact with their senators, and promote their participation in state coalitions. At crucial moments we will ask particular bishops to get in touch with their senators. In carrying out these activities we will work closely with the United Methodist General Board of Church so that are our mutual efforts for CTBT grassroots mobilization will be complementary.

**Working with other religious organizations.** The religious community working on peace and justice issues is organized in two ways: as official denominational offices and as unofficial peace fellowships and peace/justice associations. We work closely with both.

To bring into focus religious commitment to CTBT ratification, in June we drafted and circulated a sign-on letter to President Clinton, urging him to promptly send the treaty to the Senate and pledging to build support for treaty ratification (see Appendix). The signers of this letter included representatives of American Friends Service Committee, Church of the Brethren, Church Women United, Episcopal Church, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Evangelical Lutheran Church in American, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Maryknoll Justice and Peace Office, Mennonite Central Committee, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Presbyterian Church (USA), Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism (affiliated with Union of American Hebrew Congregations), Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations, United Church of Christ, and United Methodist General Board of Church and Society.

In addition to the signers of the June letter, we expect involvement in the CTBT ratification campaign by the U.S. Catholic Conference, American Baptist Churches, Fellowship of Reconciliation, Pax Christi USA, Presbyterian Peace Fellowship, and other denominational peace fellowships. We will reach out to others, as explained below.

The Catholic Church in the United States is a long time supporter of a comprehensive test ban. The U.S. Catholic Conference, which rarely signs group letters, has written directly to President Clinton to register its support for the CTBT. It is committed to mobilizing grassroots support by bishops and diocesan social action offices in key states, particular those in which it ranks first in membership. Because U.S. Catholic Conference staff have a broad range of assignments, they lack time to participate in numerous coalition meetings, but they will fully cooperate with the CTBT ratification campaign. We maintain a close working relationship with this staff, and from time to time we share information with them from coalition meetings.

Our intent is to maintain a close contact with all of these religious organizations during the CTBT campaign. We are already playing a catalytic role in linking the religious community with secular peace and disarmament agencies working for CTBT ratification, especially for grassroots mobilization. This is described more fully below.

**Reaching out to other religious denominations.** In this project we will reach out to persons from denominations not traditionally involved in peace and disarmament activities and seek their involvement in the CTBT ratification campaign. We will be do this with an awareness of where these denominations have strength in key states.

We will encourage involvement of three Black Methodist and three Black Baptist denominations, for they have sizable membership in a number of key states. Traditionally these denominations have focused on human rights and social justice issues and have been less involved in disarmament and other peace issues. However, the comprehensive test ban can be conceived as a human rights issue because testing over the years has had adverse affects on indigenous people in the western United States and the South Pacific. Moreover, within the near future nuclear free zone treaties for Africa and the South Pacific will be coming up for ratification, and Black churches have strong ties with Africa and empathy for the peoples of the South Pacific. So there is latent support for nuclear disarmament measures. This was shown through participation by representatives of several of these denominations at the Citizens Signing Ceremony in New York on September 24, 1996 (see Appendix).

Southern Baptists are most numerous in five of the key states. The denomination tends to avoid involvement in disarmament issues, and when it does, it often takes a conservative position. However, there are some individual Southern Baptist leaders who are potential supporters of the CTBT. Some are affiliated with the Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, based in Atlanta. During the CWC ratification campaign, we explored possibilities for Southern Baptist support, and we will build upon contacts made then to find Southern Baptist supporters for CTBT ratification.

Likewise there are opportunities to develop support among other Evangelical Christians, and Orthodox Christians. During the CWC ratification campaign, we explored whether it was possible to gain endorsement from a unit of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormons) and discovered that the denomination as such would not take a position pro or con.

We will find out whether this will also be true for the CTBT. Because Mormons live in a region affected adversely by U.S. nuclear weapons testing, it seems likely that individual Mormons can be identified who will support treaty ratification.

**Working with a broader coalitions.** As an organization, Methodists United for Peace with Justice participates in the Monday Lobby, the Abolition 2000 network and other broad-based coalitions working on nuclear disarmament and related peace issues. We were part of the Poison Gas Working Group that spearheaded citizen action for ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Now as the CTBT ratification campaign is getting underway, we have taken initiatives to assure that the religious community is fully integrated into this effort along with organizations from the peace and disarmament community. Thus, after consultation with a number of organizations, we arranged for a meeting on June 26 to begin discussing grassroots strategies for developing support for the CTBT. In addition to representatives from religious organizations, participants included persons from Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers, Disarmament Clearinghouse, Peace Action, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Plutonium Challenge, 20/20 Vision, Union of Concerned Scientists, and Women's Action for New Direction. Other organizations expressing an interest in cooperative grassroots action include Americans for Democratic Action, Greenpeace, Military Production Network, Women Strike for Peace, and World Federalist Association.

Persons at the meeting agreed to work together on a number of matters, including joint activities in key states, joint alerts to grassroots constituents, common informational material, grassroots media activities, bringing people to Washington for lobby days, and phone banks. An e-mail list/serve will be established for organizations cooperating in grassroots mobilization so that we can share information with one another. Several individuals and organizations agreed to take leadership for some specific tasks.

The group agreed to meet bimonthly at first and then monthly until the CTBT is ratified in order to review grassroots strategy and facilitate working together. Howard Hallman, chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, who chaired the June meeting, agreed to serve as moderator of the next meeting. This is a cooperative endeavor that will function through sets of horizontal relationships dealing with particular activities, open to all who wish to participate.

Most of the secular organizations and several of the religious organizations working on grassroots strategy are part of the CTBT Working Group, set up by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. The Working Group concentrates its attention on dealings with the Clinton Administration and Congress, but it keeps track of grassroots activities developed by participating organizations. In addition, a Plutonium Challenge Working Group (soon to be renamed) of the Monday Lobby meets weekly to consider issues related to nuclear disarmament. It intends to spend one-half of each one-hour meeting on CTBT matters, including grassroots activities. We participate in both working groups and will help forge bonds with religious organizations working for CTBT ratification which are not regular participants in these working group.

## **C. Key Personnel**

The work of Methodists United for Peace with Justice on this project will be carried out by its chair, Howard W. Hallman. He will be compensated for project activities but will continue to serve as an unpaid volunteer for performing his duties as chair of the Board of Directors.

### **Professional Career**

In his professional career Howard Hallman has been a community organizer, administrator, technical assistance provider, trainer, researcher, and writer on matters of housing, community development, citizen participation, neighborhood self-help, and metropolitan governance.

He is a graduate of the University of Kansas in Lawrence, where he earned B.A. and M.A. degrees and worked for the Bureau of Government Research.

Hallman worked in Philadelphia from 1952 to 1958, first for the Philadelphia Housing Association, an advocacy organization, and then as a consultant to citizen organizations. His focus was on housing and urban renewal policy, suburban planning, and metropolitan development.

From 1959 to 1965 he worked in New Haven, Connecticut, for three years as director of the city's neighborhood improvement program and for another three years as deputy director of Community Progress, Inc., a private nonprofit corporation set up to run community action and anti-poverty programs. Toward the end of this period he was on loan part time to the War on Poverty Task Force in Washington, D.C.

Hallman moved to Washington in 1965 and served as a consultant to city governments and community action agencies around the country, helping them set up employment training and community action programs. In 1967 he directed a study of the Poverty Program for a U.S. Senate subcommittee.

In 1969 Hallman organized the Center for Governmental Studies, later renamed Civic Action Institute. For the next seven years the Center conducted studies of municipal decentralization, citizen participation, and employment and training programs and conducted workshops for local officials and citizen leaders. In 1971 Hallman presented a paper on citizen participation at an international conference in Zagreb, Yugoslavia in 1971, and he was elected a fellow of the National Academy of Public Administration in 1973. In 1976 he was the principal founder of Neighborhoods, USA, a national association of neighborhood leaders and local officials. Hallman served as a full-time consultant to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development on citizen participation policies in 1977. From 1978 to 1983 the Civic Action Institute under his leadership provided training and technical assistance to local officials and citizen leaders on citizen participation and neighborhood action.

In 1984 Hallman switched his primary attention to public advocacy on peace and justice issues. In 1987 he was an organizer of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, an advocacy organization, served as executive director for a while and is now chair of the board of directors. He also performed occasional consulting on matters of citizen participation and neighborhood

organizing through the Civic Action Institute. In 1992 he hosted a Polish delegation to the United States in a study of citizen participation practices. In 1994 he spent a week in Turkey speaking to local officials and citizen organization leaders on democratic participation. In May 1996 he presented a paper on citizen participation at an international conference in Tokyo. He has conducted studies in Sweden, Canada, Puerto Rico, and Israel.

Hallman is author of more than 250 articles, pamphlets, and reports and nine books, including *The Organization and Operation of Neighborhood Councils*, *Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis*, and *Neighborhoods: Their Place in Urban Life*.

## **Peace Activities**

Hallman has long experience working for world peace. While in college he became a Christian pacifist. He requested selective service classification as a conscientious objector and performed alternative civilian service during the Korean War. Subsequently he engaged in a variety of peace activities as a volunteer, mostly through the Fellowship of Reconciliation and local churches..

In 1984 Hallman decided to focus his attention on the need for nuclear disarmament. In the process of becoming better informed, Hallman got acquainted with various national peace organizations and fed in ideas. He became active in the Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign of Montgomery County, Maryland, where he lives, and as a volunteer served as coordinator for three years. He was a delegate to two national Freeze conventions and the first convention of the merged SANE/FREEZE (now known as Peace Action). In the late 1980s he chaired a county-wide Interfaith Forum for Peace in Justice, which conducted a public forums and all-day conferences, including several with Russian participants.

In 1986 Hallman drafted, circulated, revised, and got signatures from a wide range of people for "A Citizens' Declaration on Worldwide Nuclear Disarmament: Starting Now, Finishing Before the Year 2000". He staged a public signing ceremony in September 1986.

In 1987 Hallman helped establish Methodists United for Peace with Justice, which organized in response to the United Methodist bishops call for greater prayer and action for peace, set forth in their pastoral letter and foundation document, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. Since then he has filled several offices: issues chair, treasurer, executive director, and now chair of the board of directors. At his initiative Methodists United was able to get peace and justice resolutions adopted by the 1988, 1992, and 1996 United Methodist General Conferences, including one on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option" in 1992 and an updated resolution on "Nuclear Abolition" in 1996.

In November 1989 through Methodists United for Peace with Justice Hallman got religious leaders from a number of denominations to sign a letter to President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, calling for general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion.

In May 1991 Hallman had an insight that nuclear disarmament could come in two stages: first, deactivate the nuclear arsenal by bringing strategic submarines into port and removing their missiles, taking warheads off ICBMs, and removing nuclear weapons from strategic bombers; second, dismantlement of these weapons through balanced stages. This ideas was incorporated

into a policy statement of Methodists United for Peace with Justice in October 1991 and sent to political leaders in the United States, Soviet Union, and Russian Federation and to arms control advocates in the United States. With a few changes this statement became the "Zero Option" resolution adopted by the 1992 United Methodist General Conference. In February 1992 Hallman got representatives more than 30 national peace and arms control organizations in the United States to recommend the deactivation approach to President Bush and President Boris Yeltsin.

For a number of years Hallman has been active in the Monday Lobby of peace and arms control organizations as the representative of Methodists United for Peace with Justice. In 1990 he organized a monthly series of five forums on different issues of nuclear disarmament for Monday Lobby participants and Congressional staff. In November 1995 he convened a special seminar on zero global alert, an approach now favored by a number of arms control experts and in the same vein as the deactivation proposal of Methodists United.

In the summer of 1995 Hallman began exploring ways to mobilize the religious community in the United States to work together in a renewed push for nuclear abolition. He circulated among U.S. religious leaders a Citizen's Pledge to work for nuclear abolition, which the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation initiated in 1995. In the fall and winter of 1995-96 Hallman participated in organizing meetings of the Abolition 2000 network. He lined up representatives from the religious community to participate in a Citizens Signing Ceremony on September 24, 1996, commemorating the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and pledging to work for nuclear abolition. Building upon these initiative efforts, Hallman has worked with others to establish a Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition as a component of the broader nuclear abolition movement. He has agreed to manage a list/serve e-mail network for the Religious Working Group.

Through his position as chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice Hallman became heavily involved in the grassroots campaign to achieve U.S. Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. Grassroots work for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty builds upon the base of the CWC campaign.

## **D. Board of Directors**

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is governed by a Board of Directors elected by the membership. To draw in the younger generation we now have two high school students, a college student, and a seminary student on the Board. Current members are:

Chair: Howard W. Hallman, Bethesda, MD  
Vice Chair: Rev. Bruce K. Edwards, Jefferson City, MO  
Secretary: Morie K. Adams-Griffin, Missoula, MT  
Treasurer: Phillip H. Miller, Annandale, VA

Rev. Joy E. Arthur, Midland, MI  
Kathleen Brown, Kirkwood, MO  
Sarah Cadle, Washington, DC  
Sherman Harris, Potomac, MD  
Charlotte Hipkins, Sevierville, TN  
Rev. James Hipkins, Sevierville, TN  
Jayne Mardock, Tacoma Park, MD  
Rev. John M. Mecartney, Detroit, MI  
Jonathan Randolph, Hattiesburg, MS  
Rev. Schuyler Rhodes, New York, NY  
Ben Trammel, Houston, TX  
Donald C. Whitmore, Auburn, WA

## **E. Information on Accomplishments**

To illustrate our accomplishments in mobilizing the religious community, the Appendix contains lists of pledge signers we obtained and letters that we initiated to President Clinton from top religious leaders in support the nuclear abolition. They include:

Religious leaders who signed the Citizen's Pledge for Nuclear Abolition developed by the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation  
Representatives of religious organizations who at our invitation participated in the Citizens Signing Ceremony in New York on September 24, 1996 (the day heads of states signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty)  
Letters we collected from heads of religious communions to President Clinton, urging him to make nuclear abolition a major focus of his second term, including a letter from the National Council of Churches, co-signed by 16 heads of communion

Beyond our contacts with heads of communion, we have an active relationship with Washington offices of the various denominations.

## **F. Status of Current Grant**

Not applicable

## **G. References**

Robin Ringler, Peace with Justice Coordinator  
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society  
100 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002  
phone: 202 488-5647

Robert Tiller, Director of Security Programs  
Physicians for Social Responsibility  
1101 14<sup>th</sup> Street,, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005  
phone: 202 898-0150

David Culp, Legislative Director  
Plutonium Challenge  
1200 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20005  
phone: 202 289-2388

### III. Financial Information

#### A. Budgets

##### Project Budget

Personnel	
Hallman 60 days@\$200	\$12,000
Fringe benefits (15%)	<u>1,800</u>
	13,800
Communications	2,400
Printing	1,200
Office expenses	600
Travel	<u>2,000</u>
	6,200
TOTAL	\$20,000

##### Organization's Basic Budget

Communications	\$1,800
Printing	2,000
Office expenses	600
Travel	1,600
Special events	<u>2,000</u>
TOTAL	\$8,000

##### Nuclear Abolition Project

Personnel	\$8,000
Communications	1,250
Printing	375
Office expenses	125
Travel	<u>250</u>
TOTAL	\$10,000

#### B. IRS Letters (in Appendix).

#### C. Sources of Funds

Our basic budget is funded by contributions from members, United Methodist annual conferences, and fees for special events. The Nuclear Abolition Project is funded by a grant from the Samuel Rubin Foundation. We have a three-year grant request pending with the W. Alton Jones Foundation, which will consider it at its November 1997 board meeting.

## Appendix

Letters from Internal Revenue Service establishing Methodists United for Peace with Justice as a 501(c)(4) organization and the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund as a (501)(c)(3) entity and a public foundation under section 509(a)(1).

A letter from representatives of religious organizations to President Clinton in support of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and pledging to develop public support for Senate ratification.

List of religious leaders we got to sign the Citizen's Pledge for Nuclear Abolition, developed by the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

Representatives from religious organizations who at our invitation participate in the Citizens Signing Ceremony in New York on September 24, 1996.

A listing of letters we collected from heads of religious communions to President Clinton in December 1996 and January 1997, urging him to make nuclear abolition a major focus of his second term.

June 13, 1998

Mrs. Nancy Ignatius  
3650 Fordham Road  
Washington, DC 20016

Dear Mrs. Ignatius:

As I indicated in our telephone conversation, I am involved in mobilizing the religious community to work for nuclear abolition. As a co-convenor of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, which is part of the Abolition 2000 network, I am working on a global scale. In the United States much of my current work is in developing grassroots support within the religious community for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

I would like to share with you several statements and proposals that relate to this activity, as follows:

- My ideas for mobilizing the religious community globally.
- A set of documents related to the NPT Preparatory Committee, where our Religious Working Group enlisted the cooperation of the World Council of Churches and Pax Christi International.
- A statement by the Holy See at the UN First Committee last October.
- A statement recently released by Catholic bishops associated with Pax Christi USA.

The last two reveal that both the Holy See and the Pax Christi bishops are more outspoken against nuclear deterrence and more favorable to total nuclear abolition than the present policy of the National Council of Catholic Bishops (USA).

I would like to keep in touch with you to assure that what I am doing is complementary to your efforts.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

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

September 11, 1998

To: Wanda Moore  
Congress for National Black Churches

Fax: 202 371-0908

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Ms Moore:

Here is a copy of the invitation for Ms. Robinson to the breakfast with Senator Jeffords on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It will take place from 8:30 to 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, September 16 at the Mott House, 122 Maryland Avenue, NE. In addition to Senator Jeffords, Steve Andreasen of the White House national security staff will attend as a resource person.

If Ms Robinson can attend, please let me know at 202 896-0013.

Shalom,

September 11, 1998

Rev. Chris Hopgood  
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)  
8901 Connecticut Avenue  
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Dear Rev. Hopgood:

Here is information on the Breakfast with Senator Jeffords on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It will take place from 8:30 to 10:00 a.m., Wednesday, September 16 at the Mott House, 122 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, DC. Serving as a resource person will be Steve Andreasen of the White House national security staff.

I look forward to seeing you on Wednesday.

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**

September 24, 1998

To: Sally Lilienthal, President  
Ploughshares Fund

Fax: 415 775-4529

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Grant Request

Dear Sally:

I was surprised to receive your letter that I missed a June 10 deadline for proposals for your September board meeting. My notes on a telephone conversation with you on June 5, 1998 indicate that you told me there was an August 1 deadline for this board meeting. Please see attachment. (The reference to "travel \$" refers to my request for assistance on travel to the NPT PrepCom meeting.) On this basis I mailed a proposal on July 23. Naila Bolus acknowledged it on July 29 with an indication that the Board meets Sept. 28, 1998. (See attached copy.) There was no indication that I had missed a submission deadline.

Although submitting a proposal is no assurance of a grant, I have gone ahead in a good faith effort based upon the belief that our successful work within the religious community on the CTBT would merit support to broaden our efforts. On this basis I am in the process of organizing a meeting of the interfaith group that has worked on the CTBT for the third week in October to consider becoming an "interfaith working group for nuclear disarmament". We would continue working for CTBT ratification, add de-alerting to our agenda for November and December, consider dealing with stockpile stewardship next year, and work on other aspects of nuclear disarmament. I am also in the process of lobbying the organizers of the October 9 and 10 meetings in Chicago (which you are helping fund) to include the role of the religious community in their strategy discussions. This has been omitted from the announced agenda and the lineup of speakers. Although I won't drop out immediately if I don't get a grant from you at this time, it will clearly diminish my capacity to achieve continuity with present activities and develop religious involvement much fuller.

I realize that I am reaching you just before your board meeting when you probably have already made a tentative alignment of grants compared to funds available. Even so, would you consider giving us a four month grant of \$18,000, which is approximately one-third of our request for an annual budget? Then you can consider a longer-term grant in January. Because I made a good faith effort to meet the deadline I understood you to say on June 6, I urge you to consider this last minute request.

Shalom,

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

March 4, 1999

To: Jenny Smith

Fax: 202 546-5142

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Jenny:

Here is a print list of participants in the Interfaith Group for the CTBT.

**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: Tom Hart

Fax: 202 547-4457

No. of pages: 5

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: CTBT

Dear Tom:

Here is the letter from religious leaders and the first page of signers. I'm also sending two versions of our swing list. The newer one with addresses and phone numbers adds Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson, who is an Episcopalian. She's a long shot but worth a try. There are a lot of Methodists and Catholics in Texas, and the Southern Baptist State Convention is progressive.

**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: Bishop Woodie W. White

Fax: 317 924-4859

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: CTBT

Dear Bishop White:

Last Friday the U.S. Senate decided to vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on October 12. This sudden vote, after two years of stalling, is an attempt by Senator Lott, the majority leader, and Senator Jesse Helms, chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, to scuttle the treaty. They believe that CTBT supporters won't be able to develop sufficient support in such a short time. We intend to prove them wrong.

On Saturday I mailed to you and other United Methodist leaders in key states the attached memo, suggesting specific action. I'm faxing you this copy to reach you sooner with the hope that you would be willing to make a personal call to Senator Lugar in behalf of the CTBT. He is an important leader in the Senate on this issue. It would be great if he would announce his support for the CTBT this week. His phone number in Washington is 202 224-4814.

I hope also that people in the two Indiana United Methodist conferences can make calls to Senator Lugar in Washington or to one of his offices in Indiana. The latter are listed in an attachment. Please encourage conference staff and leaders to mobilize such support.

If you are able to reach Senator Lugar, I would appreciate learning the outcome of the call.

Thanks for your cooperation.

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 4, 1999

To: Bishop Charles Jordan

Fax: 515 283-8672

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: CTBT

Dear Bishop Jordan:

Last Friday the U.S. Senate decided to vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) on October 12. This sudden vote, after two years of stalling, is an attempt by Senator Lott, the majority leader, and Senator Jesse Helms, chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, to scuttle the treaty. They believe that CTBT supporters won't be able to develop sufficient support in such a short time. We intend to prove them wrong.

On Saturday I mailed to you and other United Methodist leaders in key states the attached memo, suggesting specific action. I'm faxing you this copy to reach you sooner because I know that you are headed for Washington this week for the meeting of the General Board of Church and Society.

When you are in Washington, do you think that it would be possible for you to squeeze in some time to call upon Senator Grassley and ask him to vote for the CTBT? He is on the list of undecided senators. Or if you wouldn't have time to see him directly, would you please call him either from Iowa or when you are in Washington?

I hope also that people in the Iowa United Methodist conferences can make calls to Senator Grassley at Washington office (202 224-3744) or to one of his offices in Iowa. The latter are listed in an attachment. Please encourage conference staff and leaders to mobilize such support.

If you are able to reach Senator Grassley, I would appreciate learning the outcome of your conversation.

Thanks for your cooperation.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman



**[Back to Application Procedures](#)**

**PROPOSAL OUTLINE FORM**

**(Please place on top of proposal submission)**

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

ORGANIZATION: \_\_\_\_\_

CONTACT PERSON: \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_ FAX: \_\_\_\_\_

EMAIL: \_\_\_\_\_

SHORT PROJECT TITLE: \_\_\_\_\_

PROPOSAL SUMMARY (less than 1000 characters including spaces, see [test box](#)):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

AMOUNT REQUESTED: \_\_\_\_\_

PROJECT BUDGET PER YEAR: \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET: \_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL ORGANIZATION BUDGET: \_\_\_\_\_

**PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES AND AMOUNTS:**

1. RECEIVED/COMMITTED: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. APPLIED FOR: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_