

Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 08:12:56 -0500  
From: Lonnie & Fran Turner <76622.637@compuserve.com>  
Subject: U.S. set to withdraw from ABM Treaty  
Sender: Lonnie & Fran Turner <76622.637@compuserve.com>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard:

I hope to be at the meeting. I favor a letter.

Lonnie

From: "Charlotte V. Davenport, csjp" <csjp@igc.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: ABM Treaty -- act today  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 09:52:49 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200  
Importance: Normal

Thank you so much for your efforts to keep us in the battle against Nuclear Arms and the Missile Defense Shield.  
Charlotte Davenport

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 8:56 AM  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: ABM Treaty -- act today

Dear Colleagues:

News reports indicate that President Bush is going to announce U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty very soon rather than in January. Therefore, we need to act immediately to oppose this action. I suggest the following.

1. This morning, Wednesday, December 12, write a letter to President Bush on your letterhead, asking him not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty. You can fax your letter c/o Dr. Condoleezza Rice at 202 456-9190.
2. Immediately send out an e-mail alert to your network around the country. Ask them to call the White House comment line at 202 456-6213 or e-mail President Bush at [president@whitehouse.gov](mailto:president@whitehouse.gov) opposing U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Background. The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union went into effect in 1972. The purpose was to restrict the development of national missile defense systems. The rationale was that if each side is vulnerable to attack, each would refrain from launching a first strike. This was part of the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). Since then the ABM Treaty has been a central part of the arms control structure that has restrained the deployment of nuclear weapons.

U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to the collapse of the arms control structure without putting in place an alternative scheme. This will encourage Russia to maintain multi-warhead strategic missiles rather than eliminating them, as envisioned under the never ratified START II Treaty. Even if the U.S. arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as President Bush has proposed, and even if Russia matches this number, the MAD doctrine will still be in place and large numbers of missiles will be maintained under high alert. Therefore, the premise of

the ABM Treaty remains valid.

President Bush wants to withdraw from the ABM Treaty to proceed with development of national missile defense. As the United Methodist General Conference has indicated, such a system is "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful". For further arguments against missile defense, see the letter to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on the web site of United Methodist General Board of Church and Society at [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).

Thanks for your prompt action.

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](mailto: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.

Reply-To: <ronsider@esa-online.org>  
From: "Ron Sider" <ronsider@esa-online.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: ABM Treaty -- act today  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 09:52:42 -0500  
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-SLUIDL: 9E3114BC-ED6B11D5-B5670090-27B0F6E1

Mr. Hallman, from now on, would you please send your e-mails for Ron Sider to the following address only:

rsider@speakeasy.net

Thanks for changing that in your system.

Naomi Miller  
Assistant to Ron Sider

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 8:56 AM  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: ABM Treaty -- act today

Dear Colleagues:

News reports indicate that President Bush is going to announce U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty very soon rather than in January. Therefore, we need to act immediately to oppose this action. I suggest the following.

1. This morning, Wednesday, December 12, write a letter to President Bush on your letterhead, asking him not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty. You can fax your letter c/o Dr. Condoleezza Rice at 202 456-9190.
2. Immediately send out an e-mail alert to your network around the country. Ask them to call the White House comment line at 202 456-6213 or e-mail President Bush at [president@whitehouse.gov](mailto:president@whitehouse.gov) opposing U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Background. The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union went into effect in 1972. The purpose was to restrict the development of national missile defense systems. The rationale was that if each side is vulnerable to attack, each would refrain from launching a first strike. This was part of the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). Since then the ABM Treaty has been a central part of the arms control structure that has restrained the deployment of nuclear weapons.

U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to the collapse of the arms control structure without putting in place an alternative scheme. This will encourage Russia to maintain multi-warhead strategic missiles rather than eliminating them, as envisioned under the never ratified START II Treaty. Even if the U.S. arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as President Bush has proposed, and even if Russia matches this number, the MAD doctrine will still be in place and large numbers of missiles will be maintained under high alert. Therefore, the premise of the ABM Treaty remains valid.

President Bush wants to withdraw from the ABM Treaty to proceed with development of national missile defense. As the United Methodist General Conference has indicated, such a system is "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful". For further arguments against missile defense, see the letter to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on the web site of United Methodist General Board of Church and Society at [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).

Thanks for your prompt action.

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](mailto:mupj@igc.org)

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

X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express Macintosh Edition - 4.5 (0410)  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 13:09:49 -0400  
Subject: FW: ABM Treaty -- act today  
From: "stuwhis" <stuwhis@enter.net>  
To: Edward Aguilar <qed435@cs.com>, disarmnow <disarmnow@erols.com>,  
Mary Miller <mary.miller@ecunet.org>,  
Bill Sulzman <bsulzman@juno.com>, Howard hallman <mupj@igc.org>,  
"David O. Selzer" <dos403@aol.com>

-----  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: ABM Treaty -- act today  
Date: Wed, Dec 12, 2001, 9:55 AM

Dear Colleagues:(via stuwhis@enter.net)

News reports indicate that President Bush has announced U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Therefore, we need to act immediately to oppose this action. I suggest the following.

1. This morning, Wednesday, December 12, write a letter to President Bush on your letterhead, asking him not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty. You can fax your letter c/o Dr. Condoleezza Rice at 202 456-9190.
2. Immediately send out an e-mail alert to your network around the country. Ask them to call the White House comment line at 202 456-6213 or e-mail President Bush at [president@whitehouse.gov](mailto:president@whitehouse.gov) opposing U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Background. The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union went into effect in 1972. The purpose was to restrict the development of national missile defense systems. The rationale was that if each side is vulnerable to attack, each would refrain from launching a first strike. This was part of the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). Since then the ABM Treaty has been a central part of the arms control structure that has restrained the deployment of nuclear weapons.

U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to the collapse of the arms control structure without putting in place an alternative scheme. This will encourage Russia to maintain multi-warhead strategic missiles rather than eliminating them, as envisioned under the never ratified START II Treaty. Even if the U.S. arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as President Bush has proposed, and even if Russia matches this number, the MAD doctrine will still be in place and large numbers of missiles will be maintained under high alert. Therefore, the premise of the ABM Treaty remains valid.

President Bush wants to withdraw from the ABM Treaty to proceed with development of national missile defense. As the United Methodist General Conference has indicated, such a system is "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful". For further arguments against missile defense, see the letter to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on the web site of United Methodist General Board of Church and Society at [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).

Thanks for your prompt action.

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](mailto: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.

Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 13:49:39 -0500  
From: "Kelly Julian" <kjulian@inareaumc.org>  
Subject: Delivery Confirmation RE: Correction of White House number  
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>  
Auto-Submitted: auto-replied  
X-Mailer: Internet Anywhere Message Server Version: 3.2.4.0 Build: 1100

Kelly is no longer with our office. To correspond with the Bishop's office, please change to ecoleman@inareaumc.org.



Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 09:45:02 +0000  
From: Dick Heacock <akimpact@mosquitonet.com>  
Reply-To: akimpact@mosquitonet.com  
Organization: Alaska IMPACT  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7C-CCK-MCD NSCPCD47 (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: [Fwd: ABM Treaty Withdrawal]

<x-html><!doctype html public "-//w3c//dtd html 4.0 transitional//en">

<html>

&nbsp;

<p>Dick Heacock wrote:

<blockquote TYPE=CITE><font color="#FF0202"><font size=+2>Dear Mr. President:</font></font>

<p><font color="#FF0202"><font size=+2>Please DO NOT withdraw from this treaty!</font></font>

<p><font size=+2>The United States is already perceived as a ROGUE nation for opting out of other essential treaties related to justice, peace & the protection of our environment.</font>

<p><font size=+2>U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to the collapse of the global arms control structure.&nbsp;&nbsp;  Even if the U.S. arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as you have proposed, and even if Russia matches this number, the MAD doctrine will still be in place and large numbers of missiles will be maintained under high alert.&nbsp;&nbsp;  Therefore, the premise of the ABM Treaty remains valid.</font>

<p><font size=+2>Missile Defense plans (initiated soon after World War II, as I remember as a veteran of the South Pacific Campaign) do not warrant the dismissal of a treaty vital to the peace of the world. As the United Methodist General Conference has indicated, such a system is "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful".&nbsp;&nbsp;  For further arguments against missile defense, see the letter to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on the web site of United Methodist General Board of Church and Society at [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).</font>

<p><font size=+2>Sincerely,</font>

<p><font size=+2>Rev. Richard K. Heacock, Jr.</font>

<br><font size=+2>Executive Director, Alaska IMPACT</font>

<br><font size=+2>3012 Riverview Drive</font>

<br><font size=+2>Fairbanks, AK 99709-4735</font>

<br><font size=+2>(World War II Navy Veteran & retired United Methodist Pastor/Home Missionary, Southwest Texas Annual Conference)</font>

<br>&nbsp;

<br>&nbsp;</blockquote>

</html>

</x-html>

From: PVmsmagic@aol.com  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 15:18:54 EST  
Subject: Re: Oppose withdrawal from ABM Treaty  
To: mupj@igc.org  
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 118

PEACE/JUSTICE ALERT #6  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
December 12, 2001

## OPPOSE WITHDRAWAL FROM ABM TREATY

News reports indicate that President Bush is about to announce U.S. withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. This is the treaty that prevents the United States and Russia from developing and deploying a national missile defense. It is fundamental part of the global arms control structure.

Please contact the White House as soon as possible and express your opposition to withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. You can call the White House comment line at 202 456-6213 or e-mail President Bush at [president@whitehouse.gov](mailto:president@whitehouse.gov). For the latter your subject line might be: "Don't withdraw from ABM Treaty." Your message can elaborate on this view.

Background. The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union went into effect in 1972. The purpose was to restrict the development of national missile defense systems. The rationale was that if each side is vulnerable to attack, each would refrain from launching a first strike. This was part of the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). Since then the ABM Treaty has been a central part of the arms control structure that has restrained the deployment of nuclear weapons.

Although we don't endorse the MAD doctrine, we recognize that U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to the collapse of the global arms control structure. This will encourage Russia to maintain multi-warhead strategic missiles rather than eliminating them, as envisioned under the never ratified START II Treaty. Even if the U.S. arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as President Bush has proposed, and even if Russia matches this number, the MAD doctrine will still be in place and large numbers of missiles will be maintained under high alert. Therefore, the premise of the ABM Treaty remains valid.

President Bush wants to withdraw from the ABM Treaty to proceed with development of national missile defense. As the United Methodist General Conference has indicated, such a system is "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful". For further arguments against missile defense, see the letter to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on the web site of United Methodist General Board of Church and Society at [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).

Thanks for your prompt action.

Howard W. Hallman

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

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

From: PVmsmagic@aol.com  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 15:31:44 EST  
Subject: Sorry  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 118

<x-html><HTML><FONT FACE=arial,Helvetica><FONT SIZE=3 FAMILY="SERIF" FACE="Bookman Old Style"  
LANG="0">As I was trying to forward our alert to members of Foundry's peace mission I think I inadvertently sent it  
back to you.&nbsp; I have now succeeded in giving it further distribution.<BR>

<BR>

Phil</FONT></HTML>

</x-html>

Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 14:08:22 -0700  
From: Don Whitmore <3RDM@gte.net>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7C-CCK-MCD {C-UDP; EBM-APPLE} (Macintosh; I; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Thanks!

Dear Howard - Thanks for the action alert on the ABM Treaty. Well done!

I forwarded your alert to my e-lists, after correcting the phone number and adding the fax number.

For your info, pasted below is my e-letter to Bush. Take care, Don Whitmore

P.S. Have you visited my new website? [www.abolishnukes.com](http://www.abolishnukes.com)

December 12, 2001

Dear Mr. President:

I urge you to delay your decision to withdraw from the 1972 ABM Treaty -- at least until national missile defense can be proven as a cost-effective asset to national security. I believe such proof can be ascertained within existing treaty constraints.

Premature treaty withdrawal incurs unnecessary risks to our national security. The reasons are several and have been explained at length by our international partners. One serious consequence of premature withdrawal is a potential weakening of the international coalition to combat terrorism. That is a price too dear to pay.

I pray that you will reach your decision prayerfully.

Sincerely,

Donald C. Whitmore

Retired aerospace engineer with professional experience in missile defense systems and expertise in nuclear arms control.

16202 S.E. Lake Moneysmith Rd.  
Auburn, WA 98092

Phone/fax: 253-833-2941

From: "James R. Green" <Jimvert@worldnet.att.net>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Oppose withdrawal from ABM Treaty  
Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2001 16:40:35 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2014.211  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2014.211

Thanks, Howard, for yet another urgent reminder to speak up.

Please note my own address: cergreen@worldnet.att.net  
Please add our incoming PWJ Coordinator, Steve Hodges  
PO Box

657

Sneedville, TN 37869

(H)

423.733.4436

(W)

423.733.4195

stevehodges@naxs.net

Carol E. Green, Holston Conference

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

From: Howard W. Hallman <mupj@igc.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>; Eusook Ahn <eusook@yahoo.com>; Becky Balentine <BBALEVANG@aol.com>; C. Pat Curtin <Choctawsal@aol.com>; Patricia Deal <patmdeal@aol.com>; W. Alan Delamater <REVALD@worldnet.att.net>; Karen Dial <karendial@yahoo.com>; John Dowell <jdowellumm@aol.com>; Daniel Evans <dfevans@bakerd.com>; Juan Feliciano-Valera <juanfeli@coqui.net>; Les O. Fowler <lof@asheboro.com>; JoAnn Yoon Fukumoto <joumc@aol.com>; Philip Granger <pgranger@iquest.net>; Gloria Holt <Gholt@umcna.bsc.edu>; Teri Johnson <firstum@itctel.com>; Cheol Kwak <sadumc@earthlink.net>; David Livinston <DSL2@juno.com>; Helen Byholt Lovelace <whlovelace@aol.com>; Michael Mattox <mmattox@arumc.org>; Joe Willie May <joemay@mississippi-umc.org>; Jessica Moffatt <jmoffatt@olp.net>; J. Harris Moore <JHMOORE@comp.uark.edu>; Pat Moreland <PpMORE@aol.com>; Helenmae Newcomer <helenmae@aol.com>; Mart  
Sent: Wednesday, December 12, 2001 12:49 PM  
Subject: Oppose withdrawal from ABM Treaty

> PEACE/JUSTICE ALERT #6  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
> December 12, 2001  
>  
> OPPOSE WITHDRAWAL FROM ABM TREATY  
>  
> News reports indicate that President Bush is about to announce U.S.  
> withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. This is the

> treaty that prevents the United States and Russia from developing and  
> deploying a national missile defense. It is fundamental part of the  
global  
> arms control structure.  
>  
> Please contact the White House as soon as possible and express your  
> opposition to withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. You can call the White  
> House comment line at 202 456-6213 or e-mail President Bush at  
> president@whitehouse.gov. For the latter your subject line might be:  
> "Don't withdraw from ABM Treaty." Your message can elaborate on this  
view.  
>  
> Background. The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty between the United  
> States and the Soviet Union went into effect in 1972. The purpose was to  
> restrict the development of national missile defense systems. The  
> rationale was that if each side is vulnerable to attack, each would  
refrain  
> from launching a first strike. This was part of the cold war doctrine of  
> mutually assured destruction (MAD). Since then the ABM Treaty has been a  
> central part of the arms control structure that has restrained the  
> deployment of nuclear weapons.  
>  
> Although we don't endorse the MAD doctrine, we recognize that U.S.  
> withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to the collapse of the  
> global arms control structure. This will encourage Russia to maintain  
> multi-warhead strategic missiles rather than eliminating them, as  
> envisioned under the never ratified START II Treaty. Even if the U.S.  
> arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as President Bush has  
> proposed, and even if Russia matches this number, the MAD doctrine will  
> still be in place and large numbers of missiles will be maintained under  
> high alert. Therefore, the premise of the ABM Treaty remains valid.  
>  
> President Bush wants to withdraw from the ABM Treaty to proceed with  
> development of national missile defense. As the United Methodist General  
> Conference has indicated, such a system is "illusory, unnecessary, and  
> wasteful". For further arguments against missile defense, see the letter  
> to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on the web site of United  
> Methodist General Board of Church and Society at [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under  
> advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).  
>  
> Thanks for your prompt action.  
>  
> Howard W. Hallman  
>  
>  
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto: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.





<BR><FONT SIZE=2>president@whitehouse.gov.&nbsp; For the latter your subject line might be:</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>&quot;Don't withdraw from ABM Treaty.&quot;&nbsp; Your message can elaborate on this  
view.</FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Background.&nbsp; The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty between the United</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>States and the Soviet Union went into effect in 1972.&nbsp;&nbsp; The purpose was  
to</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>restrict the development of national missile defense systems.&nbsp; The</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>rationale was that if each side is vulnerable to attack, each would refrain</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>from launching a first strike.&nbsp;&nbsp; This was part of the cold war doctrine of</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>mutually assured destruction (MAD).&nbsp;&nbsp; Since then the ABM Treaty has been  
a</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>central part of the arms control structure that has restrained the</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>deployment of nuclear weapons.</FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Although we don't endorse the MAD doctrine, we recognize that U.S.</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to the collapse of the</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>global arms control structure.&nbsp;&nbsp; This will encourage Russia to maintain</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>multi-warhead strategic missiles rather than eliminating them, as</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>envisioned under the never ratified START II Treaty.&nbsp;&nbsp; Even if the U.S.</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as President Bush has</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>proposed, and even if Russia matches this number, the MAD doctrine will</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>still be in place and large numbers of missiles will be maintained under</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>high alert.&nbsp;&nbsp; Therefore, the premise of the ABM Treaty remains valid.</FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>President Bush wants to withdraw from the ABM Treaty to proceed with</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>development of national missile defense.&nbsp;&nbsp; As the United Methodist  
General</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>Conference has indicated, such a system is &quot;illusory, unnecessary, and</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>wasteful&quot;.&nbsp;&nbsp; For further arguments against missile defense, see the  
letter</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on the web site of United</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>Methodist General Board of Church and Society at [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).</FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Thanks for your prompt action.</FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Howard W. Hallman</FONT>  
</P>  
<BR>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Howard W. Hallman, Chair</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>Methodists United for Peace with Justice</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)</FONT>  
</P>

<P><FONT SIZE=2>Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of</FONT>  
<BR><FONT SIZE=2>laity and clergy.&nbsp; It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination. </FONT>

</P>

</BODY>

</HTML></x-html>

To: CPC General <CPC@CPCUMC.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: Oppose withdrawal from ABM Treaty  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <3CF15F9E27A3D511AA9300E01828EA9E08E27C@www.cpcumc.org>  
References:

At 04:51 PM 12/12/01 -0500, you wrote:

> A friendly reminder. These kinds of messages are considered spam and  
>illegal if they do not include a mechanism for unsubscribing from the  
>listserve.

Dear Friend,

I sent the Peace/Justice Alert to several lists that I maintain, but it isn't a list serve. A number of people have thanked me for the information.

If you don't want to receive such messages, please let me know.

Howard Hallman

From: "Adrienne Fong" To: Subject: Alert - Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 01:04:38 - 0800 X-MSMail-Priority: Normal X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.3110.1 X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.3110.3

This alert is from Howard Hallman who has been working on Anti-Nuclear issues. For further info contact Howard at the e-mail address below. (open screen for better viewing) Adrienne

December 12, 2001

## **OPPOSE WITHDRAWAL FROM ABM TREATY**

**Call President Bush Today!**

**Tel. (202) 456-1414**

**E-mail: [president@whitehouse.gov](mailto:president@whitehouse.gov)**

President Bush is about to announce U.S. withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. This is the treaty that prevents the United States and Russia from developing and deploying a national missile defense. It is fundamental part of the global arms control structure.

**Background.** The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union went into effect in 1972. The purpose was to restrict the development of national missile defense systems. The rationale was that if each side is vulnerable to attack, each would refrain from launching a first strike. This was part of the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). Since then the **ABM Treaty has been a central part of the arms control structure that has restrained the deployment of nuclear weapons.**

Although we don't endorse the MAD doctrine, we recognize that U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to the collapse of the global arms control structure. This will encourage Russia to maintain multi-warhead strategic missiles rather than eliminating them, as envisioned under the never ratified START II Treaty. Even if the U.S. arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as President Bush has proposed, and even if Russia matches this number, the MAD doctrine will still be in place and large numbers of missiles will be maintained under high alert. Therefore, the premise of the ABM Treaty remains valid.

President Bush wants to withdraw from the ABM Treaty to proceed with development of national missile defense. **The United Methodist General Conference** has indicated, such a system is "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful". For further arguments against missile defense, see the letter to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on the web site of United Methodist General Board of Church and Society at [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).

Thanks for your prompt action

Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
e-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto: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.

Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 07:53:00 -0800 (PST)  
From: Carol Windrum <cawindrum@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: deep appreciation for your efforts  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Dear Howard,

Thank you so much for your consistent, tireless work on this matter. These are horrific times and they seem to just be getting worse.

Over the past year, our "Voices to the Capitol" folks (over 200 from across the state) have been contacting our leaders urging them to support the AMB treaty. The December/January issue that is about to go out will again encourage people to contact Bush. I am using your material.

I just can't believe how arragant Bush is! He really doesn't care about global cooperation on anything. And then he wonders why so many countries hate us!

Again, thanks for all your efforts! Carol  
--- "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:

> PEACE/JUSTICE ALERT #6  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
> December 12, 2001  
>  
> OPPOSE WITHDRAWAL FROM ABM TREATY  
>  
> News reports indicate that President Bush is about  
> to announce U.S.  
> withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM)  
> Treaty. This is the  
> treaty that prevents the United States and Russia  
> from developing and  
> deploying a national missile defense. It is  
> fundamental part of the global  
> arms control structure.  
>  
> Please contact the White House as soon as possible  
> and express your  
> opposition to withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. You  
> can call the White  
> House comment line at 202 456-6213 or e-mail  
> President Bush at  
> president@whitehouse.gov. For the latter your  
> subject line might be:  
> "Don't withdraw from ABM Treaty." Your message can  
> elaborate on this view.  
>  
> Background. The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty  
> between the United  
> States and the Soviet Union went into effect in  
> 1972. The purpose was to  
> restrict the development of national missile defense

> systems. The  
> rationale was that if each side is vulnerable to  
> attack, each would refrain  
> from launching a first strike. This was part of  
> the cold war doctrine of  
> mutually assured destruction (MAD). Since then the  
> ABM Treaty has been a  
> central part of the arms control structure that has  
> restrained the  
> deployment of nuclear weapons.  
>  
> Although we don't endorse the MAD doctrine, we  
> recognize that U.S.  
> withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to  
> the collapse of the  
> global arms control structure. This will encourage  
> Russia to maintain  
> multi-warhead strategic missiles rather than  
> eliminating them, as  
> envisioned under the never ratified START II Treaty.  
> Even if the U.S.  
> arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as  
> President Bush has  
> proposed, and even if Russia matches this number,  
> the MAD doctrine will  
> still be in place and large numbers of missiles will  
> be maintained under  
> high alert. Therefore, the premise of the ABM  
> Treaty remains valid.  
>  
> President Bush wants to withdraw from the ABM Treaty  
> to proceed with  
> development of national missile defense. As the  
> United Methodist General  
> Conference has indicated, such a system is  
> "illusory, unnecessary, and  
> wasteful". For further arguments against missile  
> defense, see the letter  
> to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on  
> the web site of United  
> Methodist General Board of Church and Society at  
> [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under  
> advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).  
>  
> Thanks for your prompt action.  
>  
> Howard W. Hallman  
>  
>  
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto: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!?

Check out Yahoo! Shopping and Yahoo! Auctions for all of your unique holiday gifts! Buy at <http://shopping.yahoo.com> or bid at <http://auctions.yahoo.com>

X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5.5  
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 13:04:53 -0500  
From: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
To: <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: U.S. set to withdraw from ABM Treaty

Howard,

Do you think statements from individual churches on the pullout from the ABM are needed? Or, could there be a sign-on for heads of communion? I know Cliff would be willing to sign on.

Let me know asap.

Thanks,  
Catherine

>>> "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> 12/11/01 04:42PM >>>  
Dear Colleagues:

This message is something we should discuss on Thursday morning at the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Should we immediate send in a sign-on letter objecting to U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty? If you can't come to the meeting, let me know your views.

Shalom,  
Howard

###

>From: John Isaacs <jdi@clw.org>  
>Subject: U.S. set to withdraw from ABM Treaty  
>  
>The U.S. is about to withdraw from the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty,  
>according to reports on CNN and in the Reuters story below. The CNN report  
>suggests that Secretary Powell informed the Russians last weekend of our  
>imminent announcement.  
>  
>Thus the ideologues within the Bush Administration -- the same group that  
>last week helped scuttle the Geneva, Switzerland conference to review and  
>strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention -- win another battle to  
>destroy arms control and permit the United States to act unilaterally  
>abroad against the views of the rest of the world.  
>  
>=====

>  
>"U.S. Nearing ABM Treaty Withdrawal"  
>Reuters - Tuesday December 11 3:17 PM ET



>  
>WASHINGTON (Reuters) The Bush administration is expected to announce  
>plans  
>soon to officially withdraw from the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty,

>Republican congressional sources said on Tuesday.

>  
>Administration officials have told U.S. Senate staff members that the  
>administration expects to give formal notice in January of a required  
>six-month withdrawal period from the treaty, the congressional sources  
>told  
>Reuters.

>  
>``That's what our people have been hearing" that the administration  
>plans  
>to formally withdraw from the treaty, one Republican source said.

>  
>During a speech earlier on Tuesday, President Bush (news web sites)  
>reiterated that the United States ``must move beyond the Anti-Ballistic  
>Missile Treaty" so that it can vigorously develop a missile defense  
>system. But he stopped short of announcing a formal intent to withdraw.

>  
>The Russian news agency ItarTass reported separately on Tuesday that the

>Bush administration will soon officially announce it is leaving the  
>treaty.

>  
>  
>John Isaacs  
>Council for a Livable World  
>110 Maryland Avenue, NE - Room 409  
>Washington, D.C. 20002  
>(202) 543-4100 x.131  
>[www.clw.org](http://www.clw.org)

>  
>

To: "Catherine Gordon" <cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: U.S. set to withdraw from ABM Treaty  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <sc18a783.024@gerizim.ctr.lan>  
References:

At 01:04 PM 12/13/01 -0500, you wrote:

>Howard,

>

>Do you think statements from individual churches on the pullout from the  
>ABM are needed? Or, could there be a sign-on for heads of communion? I  
>know Cliff would be willing to sign on.

Catherine,

I would encourage individual denominations to speak -- as soon as possible. Sign-on letters take two or three weeks and take a lot of efforts. Anyway individual letters on denominational letterheads probably have greater impact.

Thanks for doing this,  
Howard

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>  
To: 'Interested Persons' <No\_One@fcnl.org>  
Subject: Some good news on nuclear weapons  
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 13:41:37 -0500  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

To: Interested Persons

## MINI-NUKES

The Bush administration may have decided not to pursue development of a new nuclear weapon, or "mini-nuke". This is good news.

Last year, Sens. John Warner (R-VA) and Wayne Allard (R-CO) attempted to include language in the annual defense authorization bill to develop a "mini-nuke" that would be used against hardened or deeply buried targets. The language was watered down by the Democrats on the Senate Armed Services Committee, and later by the Democrats from the House Armed Services Committee in the conference committee on the bill. The main result of the Warner-Allard provision was the requirement for a study by the Pentagon to Congress on mini-nukes.

Also last year, Sen. Pete Domenici (R-NM) included \$15 million for development of the new warhead in the Senate versions of the energy and water appropriations bill. House representatives to the conference committee deleted the funds.

The study required by the Warner-Allard provision was delivered to the House and Senate Armed Services Committee at the end of November in a classified report done by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The study concludes that a new nuclear warhead is not needed.

Recently a group of religious leaders met with Franklin Miller, who is in charge of arms control policy for the National Security Council. He stated that there is "no military requirement" for a mini-nuke.

Sen. Carl Levin, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Democrats on the House Armed Services Committee, and all the members of the House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee deserve credit for opposing this program. The Bush administration should be commended for making the right decision.

However, this issue may not be resolved. There are reports that a late-November draft of the Defense Department's Nuclear Posture Review calls for developing a "mini-nuke". That report is being written by the staff of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and may be delivered to Congress on December 28. There appears to be a sharp split within the Bush administration, with the military not wanting to develop a new nuclear warhead and the civilian political appointees pushing for such a warhead.

## REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON NUCLEAR REDUCTIONS

Several years ago, Sen. Bob Smith (R-NH) succeeded in adding a provision to the statute books that bars the President from reducing the nuclear arsenal below START I numbers. After several years of effort, the restrictions (known as the "Smith provision" or Section 1302) were repealed by the House-Senate conference committee on the defense authorization bill. That bill is slated for final House approval today (Thursday, December 13) and in the Senate today or tomorrow.

Rep. Tom Allen (D-ME) was the champion in the House on this issue. Senate chairman Levin again provided the political heft to ensure its repeal.

Without repeal of the Smith provision, the nuclear weapons reductions announced by President Bush at the recent Crawford summit could not go into effect.

#### DE-ALERTING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The conference committee on the defense authorization bill, S. 1438, included a requirement that the Pentagon study "the possibility of deactivating or dealerting nuclear warheads or delivery systems immediately, or immediately after a decision to retire any specific warhead, class of warheads, or delivery system." The final study provision had been included in the Senate version of the defense bill by Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI). Reps. Ed Markey (D-MA) and Ellen Tauscher (D-CA) were the strong House advocates for the issue.

In short, some good news on nuclear weapons.

David Culp, Legislative Representative  
Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)  
245 Second Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20002-5795  
Tel: (202) 547-6000, ext. 146  
Toll free: (800) 630-1330, ext. 146  
Fax: (202) 547-6019  
E-mail: david@fcnl.org  
Web site: www.fcnl.org

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

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

(1) Now that President Bush has publicly announced the decision to withdraw from the ABM Treaty, messages from denominations and grassroots activists are still needed. They can refer to the actual announcement, not just the possibility as my previous message indicate.

Let's let President Bush hear from lots of us.

(2) If you haven't received it direction, here is a message from David Culp that may be of interest to you.

>From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>  
>To: 'Interested Persons' <No\_One@fcnl.org>  
>Subject: Some good news on nuclear weapons  
>Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 13:41:37 -0500  
>X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)  
>  
>To: Interested Persons  
>  
>  
>MINI-NUKES  
>  
>The Bush administration may have decided not to pursue development of a new  
>nuclear weapon, or "mini-nuke". This is good news.  
>  
>Last year, Sens. John Warner (R-VA) and Wayne Allard (R-CO) attempted to  
>include language in the annual defense authorization bill to develop a  
>"mini-nuke" that would be used against hardened or deeply buried targets.  
>The language was watered down by the Democrats on the Senate Armed Services  
>Committee, and later by the Democrats from the House Armed Services  
>Committee in the conference committee on the bill. The main result of the  
>Warner-Allard provision was the requirement for a study by the Pentagon to  
>Congress on mini-nukes.  
>  
>Also last year, Sen. Pete Domenici (R-NM) included \$15 million for  
>development of the new warhead in the Senate versions of the energy and  
>water appropriations bill. House representatives to the conference  
>committee deleted the funds.  
>  
>The study required by the Warner-Allard provision was delivered to the House  
>and Senate Armed Services Committee at the end of November in a classified  
>report done by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The study concludes that a new  
>nuclear warhead is not needed.  
>

>Recently a group of religious leaders met with Franklin Miller, who is in  
>charge of arms control policy for the National Security Council. He stated  
>that there is "no military requirement" for a mini-nuke.

>  
>Sen. Carl Levin, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the  
>Democrats on the House Armed Services Committee, and all the members of the  
>House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee deserve credit for  
>opposing this program. The Bush administration should be commended for  
>making the right decision.

>  
>However, this issue may not be resolved. There are reports that a  
>late-November draft of the Defense Department's Nuclear Posture Review calls  
>for developing a "mini-nuke". That report is being written by the staff of  
>the Office of the Secretary of Defense and may be delivered to Congress on  
>December 28. There appears to be a sharp split within the Bush  
>administration, with the military not wanting to develop a new nuclear  
>warhead and the civilian political appointees pushing for such a warhead.

#### >REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON NUCLEAR REDUCTIONS

>  
>Several years ago, Sen. Bob Smith (R-NH) succeeded in adding a provision to  
>the statute books that bars the President from reducing the nuclear arsenal  
>below START I numbers. After several years of effort, the restrictions  
>(known as the "Smith provision" or Section 1302) were repealed by the  
>House-Senate conference committee on the defense authorization bill. That  
>bill is slated for final House approval today (Thursday, December 13) and in  
>the Senate today or tomorrow.

>  
>Rep. Tom Allen (D-ME) was the champion in the House on this issue. Senate  
>chairman Levin again provided the political heft to ensure its repeal.

>  
>Without repeal of the Smith provision, the nuclear weapons reductions  
>announced by President Bush at the recent Crawford summit could not go  
>into effect.

#### >DE-ALERTING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

>  
>The conference committee on the defense authorization bill, S. 1438,  
>included a requirement that the Pentagon study "the possibility of  
>deactivating or dealerting nuclear warheads or delivery systems immediately,  
>or immediately after a decision to retire any specific warhead, class of  
>warheads, or delivery system." The final study provision had been included  
>in the Senate version of the defense bill by Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI). Reps.  
>Ed Markey (D-MA) and Ellen Tauscher (D-CA) were the strong House advocates  
>for the issue.

>  
>  
>In short, some good news on nuclear weapons.

>  
>  
>David Culp, Legislative Representative  
>Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)

>245 Second Street, N.E.  
>Washington, D.C. 20002-5795  
>Tel: (202) 547-6000, ext. 146  
>Toll free: (800) 630-1330, ext. 146  
>Fax: (202) 547-6019  
>E-mail: david@fcnl.org  
>Web site: www.fcnl.org  
>

From: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
To: "mupj@igc.org" <mupj@igc.org>, "david@fcnl.org" <david@fcnl.org>  
Subject: Any action around announcement about ABM Treaty withdrawal?  
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 14:12:31 -0500  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Dear Howard and David,

Are you aware of, or organizing, responses to President Bush's decision to withdraw from the ABM Treaty? We would like to make this information available for NR/DI participants and post it on our Web site. In particular, the Reverend Barbara Fuller, co-coordinator for the Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice (Ann Arbor, MI) has asked me to pass along information about responses that are in the works.

Thanks,

Wendy Starman  
Manager  
NR/DI



To: STARMAN WENDY <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Any action around announcement about ABM Treaty withdrawal?  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <DC1977460103D311B0DE0060943F439FADCE7A@wesley-exch1.wesleysem.edu>  
References:

Wendy,

Here is an alert I sent out.

Howard

###

PEACE/JUSTICE ALERT #6a  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
December 13, 2001

#### OPPOSE WITHDRAWAL FROM ABM TREATY

President Bush has announced that the United States will withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. This is the treaty that prevents the United States and Russia from developing and deploying a national missile defense. It is fundamental part of the global arms control structure.

Please contact the White House as soon as possible and express your opposition to withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. Ask President Bush to reconsider. The White House address is 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20500; phone: 202 456-1414; fax: 202 456-2461; e-mail: [president@whitehouse.gov](mailto:president@whitehouse.gov). For the latter your subject line might be: "Don't withdraw from ABM Treaty." Your message can elaborate on this view.

Background. The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union went into effect in 1972. The purpose was to restrict the development of national missile defense systems. The rationale was that if each side is vulnerable to attack, each would refrain from launching a first strike. This was part of the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). Since then the ABM Treaty has been a central part of the arms control structure that has restrained the deployment of nuclear weapons.

Although we don't endorse the MAD doctrine, we recognize that U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to the collapse of the global arms control structure. This will encourage Russia to maintain multi-warhead strategic missiles rather than eliminating them, as envisioned under the never ratified START II Treaty. Even if the U.S. arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as President Bush has proposed, and even if Russia matches this number, the MAD doctrine will still be in place and large numbers of missiles will be maintained under high alert. Therefore, the premise of the ABM Treaty remains valid.

President Bush wants to withdraw from the ABM Treaty to proceed with development of national missile defense. As the United Methodist General Conference has indicated, such a system is "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful". For further arguments against missile defense, see the letter to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on the web site of United Methodist General Board of Church and Society at [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).

Thanks for your prompt action.

Howard W. Hallman

From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>  
To: 'STARMAN WENDY' <wstarman@wesleysem.edu>  
Cc: "Howard W. Hallman " <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: Any action around announcement about ABM Treaty withdrawal?  
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 14:21:32 -0500  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

We sent out an alert yesterday. It is on our web site at  
<[http://www.fcnl.org/act\\_lam\\_current/actnow\\_lam\\_index.htm#pres](http://www.fcnl.org/act_lam_current/actnow_lam_index.htm#pres)>.

David

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

From: STARMAN WENDY [mailto:wstarman@wesleysem.edu]  
Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2001 2:13 pm  
To: 'mupj@igc.org'; 'david@fcnl.org'  
Subject: Any action around announcement about ABM Treaty withdrawal?

Dear Howard and David,

Are you aware of, or organizing, responses to President Bush's decision to withdraw from the ABM Treaty? We would like to make this information available for NR/DI participants and post it on our Web site. In particular, the Reverend Barbara Fuller, co-coordinator for the Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice (Ann Arbor, MI) has asked me to pass along information about responses that are in the works.

Thanks,

Wendy Starman  
Manager  
NR/DI

From: "Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers" <coalition@clw.org>  
To: "Stacie Robinson" <srobinson@clw.org>  
Subject: Nuclear Dangers Update - Special Update on ABM Withdrawal  
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 14:57:29 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.00.2919.6600  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

```
<x-html><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META content="text/html; charset=iso-8859-1" http-equiv=Content-Type>
<META content="MSHTML 5.00.2919.6307" name=GENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY>
<DIV><FONT size=2>To: Coalition Members and Friends</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>Re: US Withdrawal from the ABM Treaty</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>During a statement in the Rose Garden, President George W.
Bush announced&nbsp;<today he has formally notified Russia of his intention to
withdraw from the Anti Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>This announcement will have very serious repercussions in
Russia, China, amongst our allies, and in the Congress.&nbsp;<This email update
will give you some of the latest information on how this news is being received
around the world and here in the United States.&nbsp;<BR></FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>--CRND</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>NOTE: The attached articles are for educational purposes only.
For previous editions of the Coalition's "Nuclear Dangers Update," see <FONT><A
href="http://www.clw.org/coalition/nmdnews.htm"><FONT
size=2>http://www.clw.org/coalition/nmdnews.htm</FONT></A><FONT
size=2>.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2><STRONG>IN THIS UPDATE</STRONG></FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>1.White House Statement</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>2. Congressional Reactions</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>3. International Reactions</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>4. Community Response</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>5. News Articles</FONT></DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT size=2>****Please open attachment to view full articles as well as
recent publications, events, and transcripts. Or view online at<BR></FONT><A
href="http://www.clw.org/coalition/news121301.htm"><FONT
size=2>http://www.clw.org/coalition/news121301.htm</FONT></A></DIV></BODY></HTML>
</x-html>
```

Attachment Converted: "C:\Program Files\Internet\download\update121301.htm"

Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 12:33:17 -0800 (PST)  
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Reply from Larry re: Two items  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>

Howard,

Thanks. Meg Riley has already sent a letter for the UU denomination. I have edited same and sent it for comments in the Baltimore PSR chapter. We will keep it going.

PEACE! Larry

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

> To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

>

> (1) Now that President Bush has publicly announced

> the decision to withdraw

> from the ABM Treaty, messages from denominations and

> grassroots activists

> are still needed. They can refer to the actual

> announcement, not just the

> possibility as my previous message indicate.

>

> Let's let President Bush hear from lots of us.

>

> (2) If you haven't received it direction, here is a

> message from David Culp

> that

> may be of interest to you.

>

> >From: David Culp <david@fcnl.org>

> >To: 'Interested Persons' <No\_One@fcnl.org>

> >Subject: Some good news on nuclear weapons

> >Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 13:41:37 -0500

> >X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

> >

> >To: Interested Persons

> >

> >

> >MINI-NUKES

> >

> >The Bush administration may have decided not to

> pursue development of a new

> >nuclear weapon, or "mini-nuke". This is good news.

> >

> >Last year, Sens. John Warner (R-VA) and Wayne

> Allard (R-CO) attempted to

> >include language in the annual defense

> authorization bill to develop a

> >"mini-nuke" that would be used against hardened or

> >deeply buried targets.

> >The language was watered down by the Democrats on

> the Senate Armed Services

> >Committee, and later by the Democrats from the

> House Armed Services  
> >Committee in the conference committee on the bill.  
> The main result of the  
> >Warner-Allard provision was the requirement for a  
> study by the Pentagon to  
> >Congress on mini-nukes.  
> >  
> >Also last year, Sen. Pete Domenici (R-NM) included  
> \$15 million for  
> >development of the new warhead in the Senate  
> versions of the energy and  
> >water appropriations bill. House representatives  
> to the conference  
> >committee deleted the funds.  
> >  
> >The study required by the Warner-Allard provision  
> was delivered to the House  
> >and Senate Armed Services Committee at the end of  
> November in a classified  
> >report done by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The  
> study concludes that a new  
> >nuclear warhead is not needed.  
> >  
> >Recently a group of religious leaders met with  
> Franklin Miller, who is in  
> >charge of arms control policy for the National  
> Security Council. He stated  
> >that there is "no military requirement" for a  
> mini-nuke.  
> >  
> >Sen. Carl Levin, chairman of the Senate Armed  
> Services Committee, the  
> >Democrats on the House Armed Services Committee,  
> and all the members of the  
> >House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee  
> deserve credit for  
> >opposing this program. The Bush administration  
> should be commended for  
> >making the right decision.  
> >  
> >However, this issue may not be resolved. There are  
> reports that a  
> >late-November draft of the Defense Department's  
> Nuclear Posture Review calls  
> >for developing a "mini-nuke". That report is being  
> written by the staff of  
> >the Office of the Secretary of Defense and may be  
> delivered to Congress on  
> >December 28. There appears to be a sharp split  
> within the Bush  
> >administration, with the military not wanting to  
> develop a new nuclear  
> >warhead and the civilian political appointees  
> pushing for such a warhead.

> >  
> >  
> >REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON NUCLEAR REDUCTIONS

> >  
> >Several years ago, Sen. Bob Smith (R-NH) succeeded  
> in adding a provision to  
> the statute books that bars the President from  
> reducing the nuclear arsenal  
> below START I numbers. After several years of  
> effort, the restrictions  
> (known as the "Smith provision" or Section 1302)  
> were repealed by the  
> House-Senate conference committee on the defense  
> authorization bill. That  
> bill is slated for final House approval today  
> (Thursday, December 13) and in  
> the Senate today or tomorrow.

> >  
> >Rep. Tom Allen (D-ME) was the champion in the House  
> on this issue. Senate  
> chairman Levin again provided the political heft to  
> ensure its repeal.

> >  
> >Without repeal of the Smith provision, the nuclear  
> weapons reductions  
> announced by President Bush at the recent Crawford  
> summit could not have  
> gone into effect.

> >  
> >  
> >DE-ALERTING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

> >  
> >The conference committee on the defense  
> authorization bill, S. 1438,  
> included a requirement that the Pentagon study "the  
> possibility of  
> deactivating or dealerting nuclear warheads or  
> delivery systems immediately,  
> or immediately after a decision to retire any  
> specific warhead, class of  
> warheads, or delivery system." The final study  
> provision had been included  
> in the Senate version of the defense bill by Sen.  
> Jack Reed (D-RI). Reps.  
> Ed Markey (D-MA) and Ellen Tauscher (D-CA) were the  
> strong House advocates  
> for the issue.

> >  
> >  
> >In short, some good news on nuclear weapons.

> >  
> >  
> >David Culp, Legislative Representative  
> Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)

> >245 Second Street, N.E.  
> >Washington, D.C. 20002-5795  
> >Tel: (202) 547-6000, ext. 146  
> >Toll free: (800) 630-1330, ext. 146  
> >Fax: (202) 547-6019  
> >E-mail: david@fcnl.org  
> >Web site: www.fcnl.org  
> >  
> 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!?

Check out Yahoo! Shopping and Yahoo! Auctions for all of  
your unique holiday gifts! Buy at <http://shopping.yahoo.com>  
or bid at <http://auctions.yahoo.com>



Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 17:10:53 -0700 (MST)  
From: Frances Dahlberg <Frances.Dahlberg@Colorado.EDU>  
To: mupj@igc.org

Dear Carlee and Howard,

Thanks for the Xmas letter. It is always nice to hear from you and I certainly don't mind the printed letter.

I wrote to say that I totally agree with Howard. This seems to be not a common thought around here as most people seem to like our War against terrorism. I think it is a terrible idea and not likely to be effective either.

Just returned from California for Ken's funeral which was awesome - over 300 in attendance. The small talks by various friends whom Krissie asked were most interesting as they covered many aspects of his life and I only knew him in a family context. Such a sadness when two people who get along so well and are so happy should have their life together cut off so soon. Krissie is only 58. She has vast numbers of friends and also enjoys her work so is in a better position than many to deal with this but still.

I have been teaching an anthro course on american culture this semester - final is this Saturday - and am scheduled for anthropology of gender next semester. I expect gender to be pretty interesting as last time I went through this material, it was anthro of women not gender.

I remember reading Cricket magazine and am impressed that Carlee is published there.

Keep in touch. Frances

From: Marsusab@aol.com  
Date: Thu, 13 Dec 2001 23:36:03 EST  
Subject: MD/DC Area Ecumenical Prayer Services: December 22 and January 22  
To: Marsusab@aol.com  
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 138

Ecumenical Prayer Vigil  
for Peace in the Middle East

Events reported in the news and conveyed in messages from friends and colleagues in the Middle East show that the need for our prayers has not ended. Please continue to include prayers for peace in all your worship services, taking to God our concern and hope that peace and justice for the children of God will prevail throughout creation.

For more information about the prayer vigil visit: [www.loga.org](http://www.loga.org)

\*\*\*\*\*

BALTIMORE:

Saturday, December 22, 2001, 7:30 pm  
Church of the Advent  
1301 South Charles Street  
Baltimore, Maryland

Tuesday, January 22, 2001, 7:30 pm  
Church of the Immaculate Heart of Mary  
(Corner of Lock Raven Boulevard and Putty Hill Avenue)  
Parkville, Maryland (Exit 29 off the Beltway)

Contact Person: Charles Cloughen  
Frcharles@home.com  
410-821-5489

\*\*\*\*\*

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON, DC

No Ecumenical Prayer Service is scheduled in the DC area that I am aware of for December 22. Please include special petitions for peace in your personal devotions on that day or in your prayers when family and friends are gathered. Suggested prayer petitions are provided below.

The January 22 prayer service for peace in the Middle East in the Metropolitan Washington, DC, area will be an interfaith service. It will be on Tuesday, January 22, 2002, at 7:30 p.m. It will be held at the Bethesda Friends Meeting, Edgemoor Lane and Beverly Road (on the Lower School Campus of the Sidwell Friends School, very close to the Bethesda Metro and Public Library), Bethesda, Maryland.

\*\*\*\*\*

God of mercy, even as we long to understand that which is often beyond our comprehension, we lay before you the hearts, minds and bodies of all those suffering from conflict in Palestine and Israel. Shower upon all holy people of the Holy Land the spirit of justice and reconciliation.

God of justice, bless those who work for peace through justice. Strengthen their resolve in the face of seemingly endless violence and terror. Guide the leaders of the peoples of the Middle East to know your will and to support a just peace for all of your children.

God of peace and hope, encourage those who seek to establish a fair and just peace in the Middle East. Bless their efforts as they work to end conflict. Lead those who engage in violence to put down their weapons and to live in peace with one another.

Blessed Jesus, lifting up the holy land for all humankind, breathe love into our prayers with a desire for nothing other than peace: peace in our hearts, peace for all creation, and especially peace in the land that is called holy.

God of hope, we lift up the city of Jerusalem, distracted and divided, yet still filled with promise as all the cities of the world. Jesus, ride again into our cities, temples, Upper Rooms and Gethsemanes, that we may be given sight to recognize you.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mark B. Brown  
<[A HREF="http://www.loga.org/"](http://www.loga.org/)>Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs</A>  
Division for Church in Society  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America  
Washington, DC

To: HALLEDEE@aol.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Our condolence  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Ernestene and All,

We were saddened to hear from Mary about Edgar's death. Though not unexpected, we nevertheless feel sorrow for his passing. Our thoughts and prayers will be with you in the days ahead during the burial service in Hudson and the memorial service at your church.

I'm so glad I had the opportunity to have several conversations with Ed at the family reunion in North Carolina. We recalled different aspects of our growing up and going to college. I particular remember his story about Grandma Hallman telling him that Beauty died (or however it was she said the dog's name), and Ed dug the grave, only to learned that Beauty was only asleep. These memories will remain.

I know that all of you will miss his gentle soul and loving kindness.

Cordially yours,  
Howard

P.S. Although this new technology called the Internet seems less personal than a hand-written letter, it's a good tool for quick communication.

From: PatGRomeo@aol.com  
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 09:50:34 EST  
Subject: ABMTreaty  
To: mupj@igc.org  
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 138

Dear Mr. Hallman,

We received your email in reference to the ABM Treaty and would like an address in which to send our letters of protest. Please advise as soon as possible so we can get the letters in the mail.

Thank you!

To: PatGRomeo@aol.com  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: ABMTreaty  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <b0.1ed63062.294b6bba@aol.com>  
References:

At 09:50 AM 12/14/01 EST, you wrote:

>Dear Mr. Hallman,  
> We received your email in reference to the ABM Treaty and would like an  
>address in which to send our letters of protest. Please advise as soon as  
>possible so we can get the letters in the mail.  
>Thank you!

### OPPOSE WITHDRAWAL FROM ABM TREATY

President Bush has announced that the United States will withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. This is the treaty that prevents the United States and Russia from developing and deploying a national missile defense. It is fundamental part of the global arms control structure.

Please contact the White House as soon as possible and express your opposition to withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. Ask President Bush to reconsider. The White House address is 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20500; phone: 202 456-1414; fax: 202 456-2461; e-mail: president@whitehouse.gov. For the latter your subject line might be: "Don't withdraw from ABM Treaty." Your message can elaborate on this view.

Thanks for your efforts,  
Howard Hallman

To: mupj@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to continue  
Cc:  
Bcc: icnd  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Dear Colleagues:

Eight of us participated in the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on December 13 to consider the future of the committee. We previously had heard from several others via e-mail. The consensus that has emerged is as follows.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament provides a useful role as an action-oriented focus in the faith community on nuclear disarmament issues, a concern of many religious organizations. It serves as a source of information and as a means to call upon one another and work together on this issue. At the moment there is no need for regularly scheduled monthly meetings. Rather we can communicate through e-mail and meet on call as necessary. In this mode we can circulate sign-on letters, share suggestions for action alerts, and plan and carry out joint activities.

I was asked to remain as chair, which among other roles serves as catalyst. I consented. I suggested that persons from different organizations should step up and take the lead on particular activities related to our interests. This occurred at this meeting as Kathy Guthrie agreed that FCNL would take the lead in grassroots work in several states where Republican senators will be urged to challenge U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. She will be communicating with you about this. Janet Horman of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society agreed to take the lead in organizing a news conference opposing withdrawal from the ABM Treaty if President Bush has a formal ceremony of withdrawal in January. However, this may be moot because it appears that the U.S. ambassador in Moscow has already presented a formal notice of withdrawal.

For e-mail communication it was agreed to convert my list of 40 or so contacts into a list serve. I will control who enters, limiting participation primarily to national faith-based organizations working for nuclear disarmament. Members of the list will have direct access to sending messages. This will give all participants an opportunity to communicate with others directly without going through me. The one reservation was a concern that some list-serves generate large volumes of chit-chat and become burdensome to read. We will keep a watch for this and try to control excesses. I will follow through on setting up the list serve.

If you have any comments on this plan, please let me know.

Shalom,  
Howard

X-Sender: jcoode@pop.maryknoll.org  
X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Version 5.1  
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 12:00:56 -0500  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
From: Judy Coode <jcoode@maryknoll.org>  
Subject: Re: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to continue  
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 14 Dec 2001 17:02:36.0109 (UTC) FILETIME=[210C3FD0:01C184C1]

Dear Howard:

Thanks for the update. We appreciate hearing what's going on, though we have been sorely absent from conversation. The list-serve idea sounds good.

Thanks for all your efforts.

Peace,  
Judy Coode  
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns



From: UUAWO@aol.com  
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 12:30:56 EST  
Subject: Re: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to continue  
To: mupj@igc.org  
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 125

Howard --

I am so happy to read this email of yours. I'm so glad the committee will continue. The stuff that Bush has been pulling lately is so overwhelming I almost cried at CLW's list of awful things.

I couldn't help in the transition -- such issues are not a priority for our program staff and I am merely an ofc administrator. But as long as I am here, I will get nuclear disarmament issues into our cyber-alerts, and I will be sure that we sign on to letters. (Because I had volunteer Ellen in the ofc Wednesday, I was able to get a letter written to Bush re the ABM Treaty withdrawal.) And I'm grateful that Larry is committed to this work & able to be a part of the committee for us. UUs have SO many resolutions on these issues...but I'm told we can't work on every resolution that's been passed since 1961.

Thank you for all your work, Howard.

Theresa Kashin

Administrator, Unitarian Universalist Assn. Washington Office

Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 12:37:28 -0500  
From: Ron Sider <rsider@speakeasy.net>  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to continue

Sounds good.  
Ron Sider

"Howard W. Hallman" wrote:

> Dear Colleagues:  
>  
> Eight of us participated in the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for  
> Nuclear Disarmament on December 13 to consider the future of the committee.  
> We previously had heard from several others via e-mail. The consensus  
> that has emerged is as follows.  
>  
> The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament provides a useful role as  
> an action-oriented focus in the faith community on nuclear disarmament  
> issues, a concern of many religious organizations. It serves as a source  
> of information and as a means to call upon one another and work together on  
> this issue. At the moment there is no need for regularly scheduled monthly  
> meetings. Rather we can communicate through e-mail and meet on call as  
> necessary. In this mode we can circulate sign-on letters, share  
> suggestions for action alerts, and plan and carry out joint activities.  
>  
> I was asked to remain as chair, which among other roles serves as catalyst.  
> I consented. I suggested that persons from different organizations should  
> step up and take the lead on particular activities related to our  
> interests. This occurred at this meeting as Kathy Guthrie agreed that  
> FCNL would take the lead in grassroots work in several states where  
> Republican senators will be urged to challenge U.S. withdrawal from the ABM  
> Treaty. She will be communicating with you about this. Janet Horman of  
> the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society agreed to take the  
> lead in organizing a news conference opposing withdrawal from the ABM  
> Treaty if President Bush has a formal ceremony of withdrawal in January.  
> However, this may be moot because it appears that the U.S. ambassador in  
> Moscow has already presented a formal notice of withdrawal.  
>  
> For e-mail communication it was agreed to convert my list of 40 or so  
> contacts into a list serve. I will control who enters, limiting  
> participation primarily to national faith-based organizations working for  
> nuclear disarmament. Members of the list will have direct access to  
> sending messages. This will give all participants an opportunity to  
> communicate with others directly without going through me. The one  
> reservation was a concern that some list-serves generate large volumes of  
> chit-chat and become burdensome to read. We will keep a watch for this  
> and try to control excesses. I will follow through on setting up the list  
> serve.  
>  
> If you have any comments on this plan, please let me know.

>  
> Shalom,  
> Howard  
>  
> Howard W. Hallman, Chair  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
> 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036  
> Phone/fax: 301 896-0013; e-mail: mupj@igc.org  
>  
> Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a membership association of  
> laity and clergy. It has no affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

From: "Charlotte V. Davenport, csjp" <csjp@igc.org>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to continue  
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 13:14:45 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

Thank you for your efforts. The plan sounds very workable and I think the list serve idea will create a wider opportunity to become aware of specifically focused actions that persons in our network can become involved in doing.

Charlotte Davenport, csjp

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2001 11:49 AM  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to continue

Dear Colleagues:

Eight of us participated in the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on December 13 to consider the future of the committee.

We previously had heard from several others via e-mail. The consensus that has emerged is as follows.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament provides a useful role as an action-oriented focus in the faith community on nuclear disarmament issues, a concern of many religious organizations. It serves as a source of information and as a means to call upon one another and work together on this issue. At the moment there is no need for regularly scheduled monthly meetings. Rather we can communicate through e-mail and meet on call as necessary. In this mode we can circulate sign-on letters, share suggestions for action alerts, and plan and carry out joint activities.

I was asked to remain as chair, which among other roles serves as catalyst. I consented. I suggested that persons from different organizations should step up and take the lead on particular activities related to our interests. This occurred at this meeting as Kathy Guthrie agreed that FCNL would take the lead in grassroots work in several states where Republican senators will be urged to challenge U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. She will be communicating with you about this. Janet Horman of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society agreed to take the lead in organizing a news conference opposing withdrawal from the ABM Treaty if President Bush has a formal ceremony of withdrawal in January. However, this may be moot because it appears that the U.S. ambassador in Moscow has already presented a formal notice of withdrawal.

For e-mail communication it was agreed to convert my list of 40 or so contacts into a list serve. I will control who enters, limiting

participation primarily to national faith-based organizations working for nuclear disarmament. Members of the list will have direct access to sending messages. This will give all participants an opportunity to communicate with others directly without going through me. The one reservation was a concern that some list-serves generate large volumes of chit-chat and become burdensome to read. We will keep a watch for this and try to control excesses. I will follow through on setting up the list serve.

If you have any comments on this plan, please let me know.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

Reply-To: <lisaw@nccusa.org>  
From: "Lisa Wright" <nccwsdc@bellatlantic.net>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to continue  
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 16:12:11 -0500  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
Importance: Normal  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

Howard - thanks for all this, and my regrets for not attending! I had 15 meetings on my schedule this week (got to 12, but that was too much)!

Merry Christmas!

Lisa

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2001 11:49 AM  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to continue

Dear Colleagues:

Eight of us participated in the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on December 13 to consider the future of the committee.

We previously had heard from several others via e-mail. The consensus that has emerged is as follows.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament provides a useful role as an action-oriented focus in the faith community on nuclear disarmament issues, a concern of many religious organizations. It serves as a source of information and as a means to call upon one another and work together on this issue. At the moment there is no need for regularly scheduled monthly meetings. Rather we can communicate through e-mail and meet on call as necessary. In this mode we can circulate sign-on letters, share suggestions for action alerts, and plan and carry out joint activities.

I was asked to remain as chair, which among other roles serves as catalyst.

I consented. I suggested that persons from different organizations should step up and take the lead on particular activities related to our interests. This occurred at this meeting as Kathy Guthrie agreed that FCNL would take the lead in grassroots work in several states where Republican senators will be urged to challenge U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. She will be communicating with you about this. Janet Horman of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society agreed to take the lead in organizing a news conference opposing withdrawal from the ABM Treaty if President Bush has a formal ceremony of withdrawal in January. However, this may be moot because it appears that the U.S. ambassador in Moscow has already presented a formal notice of withdrawal.

For e-mail communication it was agreed to convert my list of 40 or so contacts into a list serve. I will control who enters, limiting participation primarily to national faith-based organizations working for nuclear disarmament. Members of the list will have direct access to sending messages. This will give all participants an opportunity to communicate with others directly without going through me. The one reservation was a concern that some list-serves generate large volumes of chit-chat and become burdensome to read. We will keep a watch for this and try to control excesses. I will follow through on setting up the list serve.

If you have any comments on this plan, please let me know.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

From: PVmsmagic@aol.com  
Date: Fri, 14 Dec 2001 07:32:10 EST  
Subject: Bethesda UMC Contribution  
To: mupj@igc.apc.org  
X-Mailer: AOL 7.0 for Windows US sub 118

<x-html><HTML><FONT FACE=arial,helvetica><FONT SIZE=3 FAMILY="SERIF" FACE="Bookman Old Style"  
LANG="0">Howard,<BR>  
The generous check from Bethesda UMC arrived yesterday and I'll deposit it to our Education Fund later today.&nbsp;That will bring the balance in that account to \$620.10.<BR>  
Phil</FONT></HTML>  
</x-html>



From: Jaydee Hanson <JHanson@UMC-GBCS.ORG>  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: RE: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to continue  
Date: Sun, 16 Dec 2001 16:25:20 -0500  
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Howard, Thanks for your continued work on nuclear disarmament. Please have a merry Christmas. I look forward to working with you in the New Year.  
Jaydee

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

From: Howard W. Hallman [mailto:mupj@igc.org]  
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2001 11:49 AM  
To: mupj@igc.org  
Subject: Interfaith Committee on Nuclear Disarmament to continue

Dear Colleagues:

Eight of us participated in the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on December 13 to consider the future of the committee. We previously had heard from several others via e-mail. The consensus that has emerged is as follows.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament provides a useful role as an action-oriented focus in the faith community on nuclear disarmament issues, a concern of many religious organizations. It serves as a source of information and as a means to call upon one another and work together on this issue. At the moment there is no need for regularly scheduled monthly meetings. Rather we can communicate through e-mail and meet on call as necessary. In this mode we can circulate sign-on letters, share suggestions for action alerts, and plan and carry out joint activities.

I was asked to remain as chair, which among other roles serves as catalyst. I consented. I suggested that persons from different organizations should step up and take the lead on particular activities related to our interests. This occurred at this meeting as Kathy Guthrie agreed that FCNL would take the lead in grassroots work in several states where Republican senators will be urged to challenge U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. She will be communicating with you about this. Janet Horman of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society agreed to take the lead in organizing a news conference opposing withdrawal from the ABM Treaty if President Bush has a formal ceremony of withdrawal in January. However, this may be moot because it appears that the U.S. ambassador in Moscow has already presented a formal notice of withdrawal.

For e-mail communication it was agreed to convert my list of 40 or so contacts into a list serve. I will control who enters, limiting participation primarily to national faith-based organizations working for nuclear disarmament. Members of the list will have direct access to sending messages. This will give all participants an opportunity to communicate with others directly without going through me. The one reservation was a concern that some list-serves generate large volumes of

chit-chat and become burdensome to read. We will keep a watch for this and try to control excesses. I will follow through on setting up the list serve.

If you have any comments on this plan, please let me know.

Shalom,  
Howard

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

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

Date: Mon, 17 Dec 2001 09:39:15 -0500 (EST) To: nuclearcalendar@lists.his.com Subject: Nuclear Calendar From: "FCNL Nuclear Calendar" X-Mailer: Html Mime Mail Class Sender: owner-nuclearcalendar@fcnl.org Reply-To: nuclearcalendar@fcnl.org  
FCNLblock



## Friends Committee on National Legislation



### Nuclear Calendar



**Note:** The next *Nuclear Calendar* will be published Monday, January 7. Best wishes for the coming year.



**Week of Dec. 17** Senate Armed Services Committee, vote on the nomination of Everet Beckner to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration (estimate)



**Week of Dec. 17** Senate floor vote on the nominations of Beverly Cook to be Assistant Secretary for Environment, Safety and Health and Margaret Chu to be Director of the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, both of the Energy Department (estimate)



**Dec. 18** Special election to replace the late Rep. Floyd Spence (S.C.-2)

**Dec. 18-19** [NATO defense ministers meeting](#), Brussels, Belgium

**Dec. 19** 9:30-11 am, Brookings/Harvard Forum, "[The Anthrax Scare and Bioterrorism: Is the coverage informative or needlessly frightening?](#)", Brookings Institution. RSVP [on-line](#), or to [communications@brookings.edu](mailto:communications@brookings.edu) or (202) 797-6105.

**Dec. 20** House and Senate floor action on the defense and supplemental appropriations bill conference report, [H.R. 3338](#). Broadcast on [C-SPAN](#) and [C-SPAN 2](#). (tentative)

**Dec. 20** Congress adjourns (tentative)

**Dec. 28** Defense Department submits the Nuclear Posture Review to Congress ([Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1041](#)) (was due Dec. 1)

**Dec. or Jan.** Energy Department issues the final Environmental Impact Statement on [Yucca Mountain, Nev.](#) as the storage site for high-level nuclear waste

### 2002

**Jan. 4** Defense Department's [Ballistic Missile Defense Organization \(BMDO\)](#) announces a major reorganization (tentative)

**Jan. 4-6** Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee and Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf meet during a South Asian summit, Kathmandu, Nepal (tentative)

**Jan. 8** Special election to replace the retired Rep. Steve Largent (Okla.-1)

- Jan. 8** Greenpeace "[Star Wars 17](#)" trial begins, Los Angeles
- Jan. 21** [Martin Luther King, Jr.](#) Day (federal holiday)
- Jan. 21** [Conference on Disarmament](#), first session begins, Geneva
- Jan. 23** Noon, Congress reconvenes
- Jan. 23** 9 pm, President Bush delivers the State of Union address

The *Nuclear Calendar* is published every Monday when Congress is in session. To subscribe [click here](#), or send an e-mail to [majordomo@fcnl.org](mailto:majordomo@fcnl.org) with "subscribe NuclearCalendar" (without the quotation marks) in the message body. To unsubscribe [click here](#), or send an e-mail to [majordomo@fcnl.org](mailto:majordomo@fcnl.org) with "unsubscribe NuclearCalendar" (without the quotation marks) in the message body.

Published by the [Friends Committee on National Legislation](#) (FCNL) and the [FCNL Education Fund](#). Address: 245 Second Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002-5795. Phone: (202) 547-6000. Fax: (202) 547-6019. E-mail: [fcnl@fcnl.org](mailto:fcnl@fcnl.org). Web site: <http://www.fcnl.org>.

Editor is [David Culp](#). Publication is made possible by contributions from the Ploughshares Fund, W. Alton Jones Foundation Fund of the Rockefeller Family Fund, Town Creek Foundation, and the contributors and supporters of the [Friends Committee on National Legislation](#) and the [FCNL Education Fund](#).

We encourage readers to copy and distribute the *Nuclear Calendar*. When doing so, please include the following credit: "Reprinted from the *Nuclear Calendar*, published by the Friends Committee on National Legislation and the FCNL Education Fund."

Peace/Justice E-Alert #1  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
April 23, 2001

We are launching a Peace/Justice E-Alert to provide up-to-date information on legislation pending before the U.S. Congress and policy decisions of the Executive Branch. We will focus particularly on issues of nuclear disarmament but will deal with other matters from time to time.

#### DE-ALERTING

Numerous experts favor de-alerting the nuclear arsenal by taking long-range, strategic weapons off hair-trigger alert. The United Methodist General Conference has registered its support (see Book of Resolution, 2000, p. 784). President George W. Bush spoke favorably on this idea during the 2000 presidential election campaign. Presently the Bush Administration has a strategic review underway that includes examination of de-alerting options. In January more than 60 religious leaders wrote to President Bush in favor of de-alerting (see [www.fcni.org](http://www.fcni.org)). You can add your voice of support by writing to him (White House, Washington, D.C. 20500, Attn. Dr. Condoleezza Rice.) So far, de-alerting hasn't come into focus as a legislative issue, but we'll let you know when it does. Further information is available from [www.backfromthebrink.org](http://www.backfromthebrink.org).

#### NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

In the same campaign speech President Bush advocated a vigorous national missile defense program. Since his inauguration he and his top appointees have pushed for layered missile defense with deployment on land and sea and in the air. The strategic review will certainly endorse this approach.

Although the idea of defending the U.S. homeland from missile attack has considerable appeal, the United Methodist General Conference has indicated that efforts to deploy national missile defense "are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful" (p. 784). This concern was elaborated in a recent letter from representatives of 25 religious organizations to President Bush, pointing out that the greatest present danger to the United States comes from Russian missiles, that de-alerting, arms reduction, and fissile material control provide the best means for dealing with this threat. This letter also indicated that there are better non-proliferation tools to respond to potential threats from small nations, including diplomacy, international monitoring of nuclear test explosions, fissile material control, and missile technology control (see [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org)).

Within the next two or three months there is likely to be a resolution or amendment introduced in Congress to slow down the rush to deployment of national missile defense. We'll let you know when this happens. In the meantime you can write to President Bush, expressing your opposition.

The next Peace/Justice E-Alert will deal with the Nunn-Lugar Program, which provides financial assistance for dismantlement of Russian nuclear weapons.

Peace/Justice Alert #2  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
May 7, 2001

## SPEAK OUT ON NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

Last week President George W. Bush made a major speech advocating multi-layered national missile defense. Although his views were already known, his administration is now launching a major campaign to build public support.

On this subject the United General Conference in a resolution on "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence" has called upon all possessors of nuclear weapons to "halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful." Please add your opposition to national missile defense by writing to President Bush at the White House, Washington, D.C. 20500. Share your views with your U.S. senators and representative.

Reasons for opposing national missile defense were stated in a recent letter from representatives of 27 denominational offices and national faith-based organizations, as follows:

Dear Mr. President:

We the undersigned representatives of faith-based organizations share with you the desire to keep God's people, including those in the U.S. homeland, safe from nuclear attack. However, we are deeply concerned about the haste to make a commitment to deploy unproven technology for national missile defense.

First, the real and present danger for nuclear attack on the United States comes from the several thousand Russian missiles now on hair trigger alert and thousands of Russian nuclear weapons in reserve with inadequate security. The best remedies are mutual de-alerting, strategic arms reduction, and stable control of fissile material. These opportunities could be jeopardized if the United States withdraws from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty to erect a national missile defense. Russia might then withdraw from other arms control treaties and retain multi-warhead missiles now scheduled for elimination under START II. Also, China might increase its nuclear arsenal. This would pose far greater danger to U.S. homeland security than the remote threat of a few missiles a small nation might develop years from now.

Second, heavy emphasis on unproven anti-missile technology to counter a speculative future threat from a few small nations neglects other elements of a comprehensive non-proliferation strategy. More promising methods include international monitoring of nuclear test explosions, rigorous fissile material control, stringent missile technology control, diplomacy, financial assistance to nations cooperating in nuclear non-proliferation, and countering social, economic, and political instability that provides the breeding ground for terrorist groups

Third, we are seriously concerned about budgetary implications. Since 1983 the United States has spent \$69 billion on national missile defense, enriching major defense contractors but producing no effective system. President Clinton's plan, which you have criticized as inadequate, would cost \$60 billion. Indications are that the layered approach you favor could

cost more than \$100 billion. A budgetary commitment of this magnitude along with the tax cut you are promoting would preclude achieving the goal of "Leave No Child Behind" and dealing with other urgent domestic needs.

For these reasons we urge you to pull back from the dangerous rush to a premature decision on national missile defense and withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Signed by representatives of 27 faith-based organizations.

Peace/Justice E-Alert #2  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
April 30, 2001

## NUCLEAR THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM

Since 1991 the United States has been providing financial assistance to Russia and other former Soviet republics to strengthen the security of nuclear weapon and fissile material. This is sometimes called the Nunn-Lugar Program after former Senator Sam Nunn(D-GA) and Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN), who sponsored the initial nuclear threat reduction program. Senator Pete Domenici (R-NM) has also played a leading role in efforts related to security of fissile material.

This initiative is a series of programs assist Russian in (1) dismantlement of strategic nuclear weapons, (2) protection of nuclear warheads and weapon usable nuclear materials, (3) disposal of excess plutonium and highly-enriched uranium, (4) downsizing of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapon complexes, and (5) enhancement of boarder security and export controls. There is also a component that promotes alternative employment opportunities for nuclear weapons scientists. These activities are all consistent with policy recommendations of the United Methodist General Conference in its resolution on "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence".

## Bush Budget

The budget that President Bush sent to Congress not only eliminates program expansion projected in last year's budget but also decreases funding for some components below the current level.



To: mupj@igc.org, umgbcs  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Oppose withdrawal from ABM Treaty  
Cc:  
Bcc: mupjbd, umbishops, umconf, umcs, umgbcs, umpj  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

PEACE/JUSTICE ALERT #6  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
December 12, 2001

## OPPOSE WITHDRAWAL FROM ABM TREATY

News reports indicate that President Bush is about to announce U.S. withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. This is the treaty that prevents the United States and Russia from developing and deploying a national missile defense. It is fundamental part of the global arms control structure.

Please contact the White House as soon as possible and express your opposition to withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. You can call the White House comment line at 202 456-6213 or e-mail President Bush at [president@whitehouse.gov](mailto:president@whitehouse.gov). For the latter your subject line might be: "Don't withdraw from ABM Treaty." Your message can elaborate on this view.

Background. The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union went into effect in 1972. The purpose was to restrict the development of national missile defense systems. The rationale was that if each side is vulnerable to attack, each would refrain from launching a first strike. This was part of the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). Since then the ABM Treaty has been a central part of the arms control structure that has restrained the deployment of nuclear weapons.

Although we don't endorse the MAD doctrine, we recognize that U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to the collapse of the global arms control structure. This will encourage Russia to maintain multi-warhead strategic missiles rather than eliminating them, as envisioned under the never ratified START II Treaty. Even if the U.S. arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as President Bush has proposed, and even if Russia matches this number, the MAD doctrine will still be in place and large numbers of missiles will be maintained under high alert. Therefore, the premise of the ABM Treaty remains valid.

President Bush wants to withdraw from the ABM Treaty to proceed with development of national missile defense. As the United Methodist General Conference has indicated, such a system is "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful". For further arguments against missile defense, see the letter to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on the web site of United Methodist General Board of Church and Society at [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).

Thanks for your prompt action.

Howard W. Hallman

PEACE/JUSTICE ALERT #6a  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
December 13, 2001

#### OPPOSE WITHDRAWAL FROM ABM TREATY

President Bush has announced that the United States will withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. This is the treaty that prevents the United States and Russia from developing and deploying a national missile defense. It is fundamental part of the global arms control structure.

Please contact the White House as soon as possible and express your opposition to withdrawal from the ABM Treaty. Ask President Bush to reconsider. The White House address is 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20500; phone: 202 456-1414; fax: 202 456-2461; e-mail: [president@whitehouse.gov](mailto:president@whitehouse.gov). For the latter your subject line might be: "Don't withdraw from ABM Treaty." Your message can elaborate on this view.

Background. The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union went into effect in 1972. The purpose was to restrict the development of national missile defense systems. The rationale was that if each side is vulnerable to attack, each would refrain from launching a first strike. This was part of the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). Since then the ABM Treaty has been a central part of the arms control structure that has restrained the deployment of nuclear weapons.

Although we don't endorse the MAD doctrine, we recognize that U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty will contribute to the collapse of the global arms control structure. This will encourage Russia to maintain multi-warhead strategic missiles rather than eliminating them, as envisioned under the never ratified START II Treaty. Even if the U.S. arsenal is reduced to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads, as President Bush has proposed, and even if Russia matches this number, the MAD doctrine will still be in place and large numbers of missiles will be maintained under high alert. Therefore, the premise of the ABM Treaty remains valid.

President Bush wants to withdraw from the ABM Treaty to proceed with development of national missile defense. As the United Methodist General Conference has indicated, such a system is "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful". For further arguments against missile defense, see the letter to President Bush from religious leaders, posted on the web site of United Methodist General Board of Church and Society at [www.umc-gbcs.org](http://www.umc-gbcs.org) (under advocacy -- advocacy letters -- March 13, 2001).

Thanks for your prompt action.

Howard W. Hallman

To: mupj@igc.org  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Oppose increased funding for nuclear weapons  
Cc:  
Bcc: mupjbd, umbishops, umconf, umcs, umgbcs, umpj  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To:  
References:

Peace/Justice Alert #5  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
September 28, 2001

## OPPOSE INCREASED FUNDING FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS

We dispatched the last Peace/Justice Alert on national missile defense near the moment when the first airliner struck the World Trade Center. That tragic event completely changed the atmosphere in Washington. Whereas there had been an opportunity to reduce funding for missile defense, it vanished in the name of national unity. Instead the \$1.3 billion cut by the Senate Armed Services Committee was restored, though with the option for the president to use some of the funds for anti-terrorism. Even though the terrorist attack sadly prove the point that opponents of vast funding for missile defense had made about where the real dangers lay, proponents are arguing for increases in funding. So the debate goes on. In the future we will have to again assert our opposition.

In the meantime an effort is underway to increase funding for nuclear weapons research and development. This is described in the following action alert from David Culp of the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL). We urge you to respond.

## NO MORE FUNDS FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAMS

A few senators are proposing to add more than \$300 million to the nuclear weapons budget. A floor vote in the Senate could occur next week (week of Oct. 1).

Sens. Domenici (NM), Reid (NV) and Bingaman (NM) have filed an amendment, Senate Amendment 1671, to increase the nuclear weapons budget of the Energy Department by \$339 million. They could offer the amendment as a floor amendment to the defense authorization, as soon as Monday, October 1.

## ACTION

Please call the Washington offices of your two Senators. Ask them to oppose Senate Amendment 1671 by Sen. Domenici, which would increase the nuclear weapons budget in the defense authorization bill.

The U.S. should not be spending more money on nuclear weapons development and testing. This is the wrong message to send to the world following the tragedy of September 11. Instead, the Senate should increase funding for non-proliferation programs--such as the "Nunn-Lugar" threat reduction initiative-- to safely and securely dismantle and dispose of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons in the U.S., Russia, and elsewhere, and fund initiatives to de-alert nuclear weapons within the next year.

To find your Senators' Washington telephone numbers, either call the Capitol Switchboard at 202-224-3121 or use the Legislative Action Center on FCNL's web site. Just click on the link below, select your state and click on <Go>, then select your member and click on <Go>. Here is the link: <http://capwiz.com/fcnl/dbq/officials/>

## BACKGROUND

The Bush administration requested \$5.30 billion for the nuclear weapons activities budget at the Energy Department for fiscal year 2002, which begins October 1. The budget funds the work of the Los Alamos (NM), Sandia (NM), and Lawrence Livermore (CA) nuclear weapons labs. It also funds a half dozen nuclear weapons production sites scattered across the country and the Nevada Test Site. These facilities are used to maintain the U.S. nuclear arsenal. None of these funds are for non-proliferation programs.

Earlier this year, the Senate Armed Services Committee recommended spending \$5.45 billion for the nuclear weapons account, higher than the Bush administration's request. Sens. Domenici, Reid and Bingaman are now seeking to boost that by \$339 million.

Some Senators have been suggesting that the U.S. should develop new nuclear weapons, especially a "mini-nuke." While this amendment does not specifically authorize development of a new nuclear weapon, it is a significant increase for the nuclear weapons budget.