

Saying No to New Nuclear Weapons: Round Two

MASSACHUSETTS CONGRESSMAN ED MARKEY called it “the biggest victory that arms control advocates have had in Congress since 1992.” Yet even as they celebrated Congress’ decision last November to delete all funding from the 2005 federal budget for new nuclear weapons, peace and security advocates knew that their euphoria was likely to be short-lived. And indeed, when President Bush released his budget for fiscal year 2006 last month, he asked Congress to restore funding for research on the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, better known as the nuclear bunker buster.

The bunker buster is just one of the administration’s pet nuclear projects that were de-funded last year, along with research on low-yield nuclear weapons, a new facility for manufacturing plutonium pits—the nuclear triggers for thermonuclear warheads—and preparing the Nevada Test Site for a resumption of nuclear testing. The bunker buster is designed to burrow hundreds of feet into the earth and attack deeply buried facilities that produce and store weapons of mass destruction, suspected to exist in countries such as North Korea and Iran. Reaching its underground target, a powerful nuclear bomb would detonate and, according to proponents, cause minimal damage on the surface. Critics, including the Ploughshares-funded Union of Concerned Scientists, insist that “it is not technically possible to use

“the development of new weapons for ill-defined future requirements is not what the nation needs at this time”

nuclear weapons to destroy deeply buried targets without at the same time causing significant radioactive contamination and collateral damage.”

Since 2002 when the weapon was first proposed, Ploughshares Fund grantees have worked to educate members of Congress and the public about the dangers of expanding the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. defense policy.

As the stakes grew, Ploughshares Fund joined forces with the Steven and Michele Kirsch Foundation in 2002 to launch the Arms Control Advocacy Collaborative (AC²), an initiative designed to strengthen existing advocacy efforts in Washington, DC. AC² retained Terri S. Lodge, former Senior Congressional Advisor at the State Department, to win congressional approval of key arms control agreements and legislation. Along with representatives of ten leading organizations on Capitol Hill, Lodge has worked relentlessly to implement strategies for halting development of new nuclear weapons, as well as opposing funding for missile defense, promoting legislation to solve security issues in Iran and North Korea, and securing vulnerable nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union. In 2003, arms control lobbyists, with AC² in the lead, managed to cut the administration’s request for new nuclear weapons money and to draw a sharp line between research into new weapons, and development, testing or production.

In 2004 AC² worked hard to ensure that *all* funding for new nuclear weapons programs was cut from the federal budget. Lobbyists met with senators and representatives and briefed congressional staffers; national organizations mobilized their memberships to voice opposition in calls and letters



Michael Douglas joins
Ploughshares Fund Board

In accepting the invitation to join Ploughshares Fund’s Board of Directors, actor Michael Douglas said, “The events of this past year in Iran, North Korea, Iraq and elsewhere have strengthened my resolve to take decisive action to reduce the nuclear threat. Having been a Ploughshares Fund contributor for the past five years, I have come to admire the

leading role it plays in catalyzing initiatives to prevent nuclear terrorism, stop the development of new nuclear weapons and prevent armed conflict.”

to their representatives; op-eds and letters appeared in newspapers all over the country. But it was an unlikely ally who delivered the decisive blow to the program in last November’s budget negotiations. Republican Congressman David Hobson of Ohio, chairman of the House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, which oversees the Department of Energy nuclear weapons complex, refused to approve the administration’s request for funds for new nuclear weapons programs without a clearer explanation of the need. In a speech to the Arms Control Association in February, Hobson explained that “the development of new weapons for ill-defined future requirements is not what the nation needs at this time. What is needed, and what is absent to date, is leadership and fresh thinking for the 21st century regarding nuclear security and the future of the U.S. stockpile.” He added in a recent op-ed, “Not only are these initiatives an unwise and unnecessary use of limited resources, they also send the wrong signal to the rest of the world. When we want countries such as Iran and North Korea to abandon nuclear weapons development, it is hypocritical for the United States to embark on new weapons and testing initiatives.”

AC²’s Lodge says that Hobson’s leadership on this issue underscores the fact that opposition to building a new generation of nuclear weapons is not a partisan issue, but one that concerns people across the political spectrum. “We are continuing to appeal to legislators on both sides of the aisle who are increasingly concerned about the costs and security implications of these weapons.”

Representative Hobson is expected to provide leadership to oppose the renewed funding request once again, along with prominent Democrats such as Senator Dianne Feinstein and Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher of California, who called it “a waste of money on a weapon commanders in the field have not asked for, is of highly questionable utility, and may trigger a new global nuclear arms race.”

What is Lobbying?

Despite the image of the corporate lobbyist wielding fistfuls of cash in exchange for tax breaks for his client, lobbying is an honorable and essential exercise in the shaping of public policy. As a public foundation, the Ploughshares Fund is one of very few funders allowed to designate a portion of its grants to support lobbying. “Since there are so few sources of funding explicitly designated for lobbying programs, we take very seriously our responsibility to fund the best ones we can identify,” says Financial Director Catharine Kalin, whose job it is to ensure that Ploughshares’ lobbying grants stay within legal limits, currently around 8% of Ploughshares’ annual budget.

Recent Ploughshares Fund Grants To Oppose New Nuclear Weapons

Arms Control Association* (Washington, DC) For media outreach, policy advocacy and the publication of *Arms Control Today*.

British American Security Information Council* (Washington, DC and London, UK) For policy advocacy in the U.S. and Europe on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

California Peace Action (Berkeley, CA) For grassroots lobbying to promote the Campaign for a New American Foreign Policy.

Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation* (Washington, DC) For congressional education and outreach to prevent the development of new nuclear weapons.

Center for Defense Information* (Washington, DC) For public outreach on nuclear weapons.

Federation of American Scientists* (Washington, DC) For a blue-ribbon study on the role and utility of nuclear weapons in U.S. security policy.

Coalition for Peace Action (Princeton, NJ) To lobby elected officials on nuclear weapons issues.

Friends Committee on National Legislation* (Washington, DC) For direct lobbying on nuclear weapons programs and policies.

HEAL Utah (Salt Lake City, UT) For an outreach campaign to Utah’s congressional delegation on the issue of renewed nuclear testing.

Hans Kristensen (Washington, DC) For research and analysis of U.S. nuclear weapons policy and planning.

Natural Resources Defense Council* (Washington, DC) For technical, legal and policy challenges to U.S. nuclear policies.

Peace Action (Silver Spring, MD) To build a broad grassroots constituency opposed to the development and use of nuclear weapons.

Physicians for Social Responsibility* (Washington, DC) For outreach to health professionals on the SMART (Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism) campaign.

Henry L. Stimson Center (Washington, DC) For bipartisan congressional briefings on security issues, including new nuclear weapons.

Taxpayers for Common Sense Action (Washington, DC) To advocate for changes to federal funding for nuclear weapons programs.

20/20 Vision (Washington, DC) To introduce resolutions in city councils opposing pre-emptive war and research on new nuclear weapons.

Union of Concerned Scientists* (Washington, DC and Cambridge, MA) For technical research and analysis of nuclear weapons policies and proposals.

Women’s Action for New Directions* (Washington, DC and Arlington, MA) For the Women Legislators’ Lobby, a bipartisan coalition of women state legislators working to influence national policies on military spending and nuclear weapons.

* Members of the Arms Control Advocacy Collaborative (AC²).

Ploughshares Board Honors Lew and Sheana Butler



In what can only be described as a peaceful transfer of power, on January 30, 2005,

Lewis Butler, founding chairman of the Board of Directors of the Ploughshares Fund, stepped down after twenty-three years in that position and handed the gavel to his successor, Roger Hale.

Members of the board, past and present, along with family and friends, gathered to pay tribute to Lew that evening, and to acknowledge the steadfast support provided by his wife Sheana. Naila Bolus said earlier that “one of Sally Lilienthal’s earliest acts of genius in founding the Ploughshares Fund was asking Lew Butler to serve as chair of the Board of Directors. It’s impossible to imagine how we could have navigated our way in a world that has changed so dramatically in the intervening twenty-three years, and how we could have forged such an important role for Ploughshares in addressing those changes if we had not had Lew’s calm wisdom to guide us.” Sally Lilienthal was one of many speakers who testified to Lew’s integrity (former Congressman Pete McCloskey later recalled Lew’s act of conscience in resigning from his post in the Nixon Administration to protest the bombing of North Vietnam) and the impact that Lew has had on Ploughshares Fund as an organization. Sally highlighted some of the groundbreaking projects he championed over the years, including an emergency grant to install seismic monitors at the Soviet nuclear test site to prove that a test ban could be verified, and the campaign to ban landmines.

In honor of that spirit, Roger Hale informed the guest of honor of the establishment of the *Lew Butler Fund for Innovation*, a special fund within Ploughshares’ endowment to provide a permanent source of support for the smartest people with the best ideas for building a safer, more peaceful world for future generations. The fund was launched with an initial gift of \$250,000 from friends, family, staff and board members. “All of us who have served with Lew on the board, and everyone who gives to Ploughshares knowing that their money is being spent carefully, thoughtfully and with an eye toward results, have Lew to thank for leading this organization for so many years,” said board member Alastair Mactaggart.

To make a gift to the *Lew Butler Fund for Innovation*, or for more information on establishing a special fund in someone’s honor, please contact Deborah Bain at the Ploughshares Fund.



U.S. Army soldiers in Iraq.

The Power to Declare War

With no end in sight to the war in Iraq, and hints in the air of future military action in Iran, Syria and North Korea, the question of when and how American military force should be used is more pressing than ever. Specifically, who has the authority to declare war? According to the United States Constitution, “Congress shall have the power to declare war.” Yet Presidents from Harry Truman to George W. Bush have bypassed congressional declarations of war and committed thousands of U.S. troops to battle around the globe. In 1973, in the aftermath of Vietnam, Congress enacted the War Powers Resolution in an attempt to clarify situations in which the President could use the military more freely, and to impose limitations and explicit requirements on the executive branch. But this issue, one of the most fundamental in a democratic society, still remains unresolved. Our recent engagements with Afghanistan and Iraq have raised questions and disputes over the proper divisions of war powers to new levels.

In response, the Constitution Project at Georgetown University has convened a bipartisan panel of constitutional, legislative and national security experts to examine how the United States has historically chosen to use force abroad and the constitutional role of each branch of government in the exercise of war powers, and to make recommendations for how the decision to go to war should be made in the future. Chaired by two former congressmen, Republican Mickey Edwards and Democrat David Skaggs, the panel also includes Morton Halperin, former State Department Director of Policy Planning; R. James Woolsey, former CIA Director; former Senator James Sasser (R-TN); and George Joulwan, former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe.

Their recommendations are clear and unequivocal: Congress must resume its constitutional duty to reach a deliberate and transparent collective judgment about each use of force abroad after a full public debate. Congress should authorize the use of force only by declaration of war or a specific statute or appropriation. Congress must not only conduct continuing oversight of the use of force, but also collect the information necessary to decide on supplemental appropriations. The report considers the changing nature of threats to national security, concluding that “while new threats may change the kind of force that is authorized and the identity of the enemy, they require no change in how we decide to use force. The system of checks and balances is no less necessary today for the constitutional exercise of war powers than it was in 1789.”

The War Powers report will be distributed to members of Congress and its findings presented in workshops for relevant congressional staff. It will be available shortly at www.constitutionproject.org/wp and on the Ploughshares Fund website www.ploughshares.org.

So if they’re not wining and dining Senators and Congressmen, what does a nonprofit lobbyist actually do? We asked Capitol Hill veteran John Isaacs, president of the Council for a Livable World, who has spent the past 33 years lobbying Congress on a range of arms control issues, from the MX missile to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. “One of the most important things we do as lobbyists is to play the Paul Revere role, that is, to go to congressional offices and warn that the British are coming.” Lobbying organizations have to prove that they are providers of reliable information and sound legislative strategies. Isaacs and his fellow lobbyists appeal to members to step up as leaders and then work with them to generate support from other members, determining who is undecided and who is persuadable, and devising strategies for each.



In a 2002 interview, Representative Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) said, “Congress needs to be educated on the nuclear threat, and Ploughshares is the only organization that supports lobbying on these issues.” Shortly thereafter, the Steven and Michele Kirsch Foundation joined with the Ploughshares Fund to support lobbying through the Arms Control Advocacy Collaborative, or AC².

Lobbying is not confined to the halls of Congress or even Washington, DC. Ploughshares’ emergency grant last year to HEAL Utah enabled the small Salt Lake City organization to put pressure on Republican Senator Bob Bennett, whose vote would be decisive in legislation to begin preparations for renewed nuclear testing, a key component of the Bush Administration’s efforts to re-establish the primacy of nuclear weapons in U.S. defense policy. Following a barrage of radio ads, op-eds and public meetings, Bennett introduced legislation opposing the resumption of nuclear testing. The strategy paid off.

Ploughshares Fund Grants on the NPT

While most Ploughshares-funded projects address nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, the following grants focus specifically on the upcoming Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference (see right).

Acronym Institute (London, UK) To provide analyses and policy proposals in advance of and during the NPT Review Conference, and to publish *Disarmament Diplomacy*, considered to be an indispensable resource for multilateral arms control negotiations.

Arms Control Association (Washington, DC) To launch the “Campaign for the NPT” in partnership with the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, including a website (NPT2005.org) for use by governments, the media and non-governmental organizations.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (Washington, DC) To promote *Universal Compliance: A Strategy for Nuclear Security*, a blueprint for pragmatic and effective policy alternatives for strengthening the non-proliferation regime.

Center for Non-Proliferation Studies Monterey Institute for International Studies (Monterey, CA) Two grants, the first to analyze proposals for addressing nuclear fuel cycle issues within the NPT; the second to convene an international diplomatic workshop prior to the NPT Review Conference in order to provide an open forum for discussion of key issues by delegates.

Global Security Institute (San Francisco, CA) For an international meeting at the Carter Center in Atlanta for diplomats from non-nuclear weapon states to discuss strategies for the NPT Review Conference.

James Goodby (Washington, DC) For analysis of the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. defense policy, aimed at emphasizing the need for progress on disarmament at the upcoming NPT Review Conference.

National Bureau of Asian Research (Seattle, WA) For a conference titled “Nuclear Asia” to address the future of non-proliferation and the NPT in one of the most challenging regions of the world.

Verification Research Training and Information Centre (London, UK) For research and analysis of effective approaches to verification of arms control and disarmament agreements, including the NPT.

SAVING THE NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY: A Conversation with Jean du Preez

The deal struck in 1970 between countries with nuclear weapons and those without was designed to prevent their spread and ultimately eliminate them altogether. Under the landmark Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), non-nuclear weapon states retained the right to develop peaceful uses of nuclear energy in exchange for agreeing not to pursue or acquire nuclear weapons of their own. The five nuclear weapon states—the U.S., Russia, China, France and Great Britain—promised cooperation in the development of peaceful nuclear technology, and to work toward the elimination of their nuclear arsenals. By some measures, the deal has worked remarkably well. Only three additional countries—Israel, India and Pakistan—have gone nuclear in the intervening thirty-five years, despite predictions that there would be twenty or more nuclear-armed nations by the end of the 20th century. But today, as the parties prepare to meet to review progress toward the goals of the treaty, the NPT is in serious danger. Two more countries, Iran and North Korea, may have crossed the nuclear threshold, and in the post-September 11th environment, questions are being raised about the ability of the NPT, and of the international community in general, to halt further proliferation. In preparation for the 2005 Review Conference, which will convene at UN Headquarters in New York City in May, Ploughshares Fund has made a series of grants to the Center for Nonproliferation Studies (CNS) at the Monterey Institute of International Studies for an innovative program to bring delegates together in advance of the conference to elucidate some of the fundamental differences between them, to explore common ground and facilitate agreements on ways to address the most difficult challenges facing the NPT. The program is directed by former NPT diplomat Jean du Preez of South Africa (a country that voluntarily gave up its nuclear weapons program in 1991.) After the conclusion of the final meeting in Annecy, France on March 19th, du Preez spoke with Ploughshares Fund's Deborah Bain.

Given the events of the past few years—the acquisition of nuclear weapons by India and Pakistan; the withdrawal from the treaty by North Korea; evidence of cheating by Iran; and the lack of progress by the nuclear weapon states toward nuclear disarmament—many have predicted the demise of the non-proliferation regime.

What is your prognosis?

The NPT states parties will need to confront the most difficult challenges the NPT has faced in its thirty-five year history. In addition to the problems you just mentioned, the states parties seem to have run out of options for dealing with the only three states that have not joined the treaty—India, Israel, and Pakistan—now armed with nuclear weapons. They have yet to collectively respond to North Korea's unprecedented withdrawal from the treaty in January 2003, resulting in what appears to be a tacit acceptance of yet another nuclear-armed state outside the treaty. The majority of states parties continue to be deeply concerned that despite the core objective of the treaty—to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and promote the ultimate elimination of these weapons—more than 30,000 nuclear weapons continue to exist in the arsenals of the five NPT nuclear weapon states and the three de facto nuclear-capable states. Failure by the states parties to address these tough issues and to reaffirm their respective commitments under the treaty risks making the NPT irrelevant.

What can the U.S. do to ensure a successful outcome?

While actions by the U.S. at both the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences were key to the consensus that emerged, the policies of the current administration may very well have the opposite effect. In fact, the very reason why many delegations and analysts predict a failed conference can be directly linked to U.S. policies and positions. Many non-nuclear weapon states are concerned about the emphasis by the U.S. on further restricting the "inalienable right" to nuclear energy as provided for in Article IV. The U.S. argues that this right is being abused as cover to develop nuclear weapons, however, the overwhelming majority of non-nuclear weapon states have demonstrated their commitment to, and compliance with, their obligations. Driven by concerns that North Korea and Iran are pursuing nuclear technologies and material for weapons purposes, the U.S. will be seeking support for proposals, such as those made President

Bush last February, to limit civilian fuel cycle capabilities to those states that have already acquired this ability. At the same time, the U.S. will likely seek to strengthen the treaty's capacity to deal with non-compliant states, most likely arguing for a guilty verdict on Iran, despite the fact that the IAEA has not yet produced conclusive evidence to this effect.



What impact will the nomination of John Bolton to be Ambassador to the United Nations have on the process?

Bolton is likely to head the U.S. delegation to the Review Conference. Many states are likely to differ sharply with him, potentially resulting in no agreement on any issues. These states will maintain that the U.S. itself has rolled back, or in some cases simply ignored many of its own disarmament obligations under Article VI. States such as Iran may argue that if the U.S. is allowed to cherry-pick which commitments it considers applicable or not, then why should they be denied the same privilege? The U.S. has argued that many of the thirteen steps agreed to in 2000, such as the entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and a treaty banning the production of fissile material, are no longer applicable.

A significant step that could steer the 2005 meeting towards a successful conclusion would be for the U.S. to reaffirm its previously held position in support of negotiations on an internationally verifiable Fissile Materials Control Treaty (FMCT). This could potentially lead to a compromise on the need to control or restrict civilian fuel cycles. Its current opposition to a verifiable FMCT does not provide much confidence that progress is possible. If the U.S. continues to argue that these objectives no longer meet its national security interests, so too could many non-nuclear weapon states argue that these goals are key to preserving international security leading to nuclear disarmament. The reversal of previous agreements made by the U.S. could prove to be deal breakers.

What can non-governmental organizations—such as your own—do to strengthen the non-proliferation regime?

While the NPT states parties are the only decision-making players in the review process, the role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) has become increasingly important. Whereas official NPT delegations often represent inflexible positions, NGOs represent a larger scope of views, mostly in support of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. While so-called activist NGOs have an important role to play, so do analytical organizations and academic institutions such as CNS. In addition to representing the moral conscience of the people, we also endeavour to assist government representatives to take informed and responsible decisions on how to implement their obligations under the treaty and on how to further enhance the treaty's effectiveness in the face of increasing challenges. CNS, the only organization in the world dedicated exclusively to graduate education, executive training and research in the field of non-proliferation and disarmament, prides itself as being one of the leading non-governmental institutions involved in the NPT review process. Funding provided by the Ploughshares Fund has enabled the Center to facilitate dialogue among NPT states parties through informal diplomatic workshops. The most recent workshop, entitled "The 2005 Review Conference: Finding Common Ground" held on the 20th and 19th of March brought together no less than 60 key participants in the 2005 Review Conference, and was aimed at narrowing down some of the fundamental differences between them, and, in the words of Ambassador Sergio Duarte, president-elect of the Review Conference, "to informally test waters and develop options for some of the most pressing challenges facing the treaty today."

To read the complete interview, go to: www.ploughshares.org/publications.php?id=86

The Ploughshares Fund seeks to prevent the spread and use of nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of war, and to prevent conflicts that could lead to the use of weapons of mass destruction. Pooling funds contributed by approximately 2,000 individuals nationwide, Ploughshares makes grants to the organizations and individuals that show the greatest potential for influencing policy. Since it was founded in 1981, Ploughshares has made grants totaling over forty million dollars.



PLOUGHSHARES FUND

Fort Mason Center
San Francisco, CA 94123
415-775-2244 tel
415-775-4529 fax
ploughshares@ploughshares.org
www.ploughshares.org

Board of Directors

J. Brian Atwood
James B. Blume
Michael Douglas
Mary Lloyd Estrin
Angela Foster
Roger L. Hale, *Vice Chair*
David Holloway
Thomas C. Layton, *Secretary*
Sally Lilienthal, *President*
Alastair Mactaggart
Lynda Palevsky
Robert A. Rubinstein
Cynthia Ryan
Robert Sims
Patricia F. Sullivan, *Treasurer*
Brooks Walker III
Edith B. Wilkie
Philip W. Yun
Lewis H. Butler, *Chairman Emeritus*

Advisors

Lloyd Axworthy
George Bunn
General George Lee Butler
Owen Chamberlain
Adrian W. DeWind
Jayantha Dhanapala
Gloria Duffy
Susan Eisenhower
Leslie H. Gelb
Hal Harvey
The Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh
George F. Kennan
Steve Kirsch
Lawrence J. Korb
Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky
Admiral L. Ramdas
William Matson Roth
Margaret R. Spanel
Richard H. Ullman
Frank von Hippel

Staff

Naila Bolus, *Executive Director*
Coretta Anderson,
Development Associate
Deborah Bain, *Development and Communications Director*
Lorely Bunoan, *Office Manager*
Paul Carroll, *Program Officer*
Deepti Choubey, *Director, Peace and Security Initiative*
Catharine Kalin, *Finance Director*

Editor: Deborah Bain

Recycled Paper/Soy-based inks

PLOUGHSHARES NOTES

Ploughshares Fund Receives \$2.2 Million Ford Foundation Grant

Ploughshares Fund's efforts to strengthen the peace and security community got a major boost with news that the Ford Foundation had awarded a three-year grant of \$2.25 million. In addition to strengthening Ploughshares Fund's grantmaking to organizations addressing U.S. policy on nuclear weapons and international security, the Ford grant will also help support the Peace and Security Initiative, a nationwide collaboration of advocacy organizations, think tanks, grassroots groups and foundations, dedicated to increasing the community's impact and assuring its sustainability.



Imma Saliz de Baranda/Nonviolent Peaceforce
Nonviolent Peaceforce team member helps with tsunami relief efforts in Sri Lanka.

Ploughshares Fund Grantees Aid Survivors

Among the areas hardest hit by the recent earthquake and tsunami are regions embroiled in conflict and civil war, where Ploughshares Fund grantees have been working to prevent violence and promote post-conflict reconstruction. Within hours of the disaster, the Nonviolent Peaceforce team in Sri Lanka was working with grassroots partners

around the country to provide relief assistance. Experts from Refugees International (RI) traveled immediately to Aceh, Indonesia to monitor the Indonesian government's relief operations. In both Sri Lanka and Aceh, RI's goal is to strengthen local capacity and press for a rapid transition from relief to reconstruction.

Anonymous Angel Renews Match Offer

For the fifth year in a row, contributors who make new gifts of \$5,000 or more to the Ploughshares Fund will have their gifts matched, dollar for dollar, by an anonymous angel. Eligible along with new donors are existing supporters who currently give at lower levels and who decide to raise their support to \$5,000 or more, and individuals whose support may have lapsed. "I hope that my offer challenges people to stop and consider how much they are willing and capable of giving to build a safer, more secure world, and to give at that level now," wrote our generous benefactor when she made her initial matching offer in 1999. Since its inception, the program has generated over two million dollars in total gifts.

Atwood, Ryan and Sims Join Ploughshares Fund Board

Not all of the new members of Ploughshares Fund's board are world renowned actors (see page 1), but all are stars in their own fields. J. Brian Atwood is the former Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development, where he oversaw one



Lonely Runoan
New Board Chair Roger Hale with Sally Lillienthal and Lew Butler. (See story on page 2)

of the world's largest international development organizations. He is currently the Dean of the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota. As a principal of the Boston-based Schooner Foundation, Cynthia Ryan is a leader in the human rights and peace and security funding communities. Attorney Robert E. Sims specializes in white collar and international criminal matters at the Latham and Watkins law firm in San Francisco. Future issues of Ploughshares Fund's newsletter will feature conversations and opportunities to become better acquainted with our new board members.

Ploughshares Council Briefed on Proliferation Crises

Bay Area members of the Ploughshares Council gathered for lunch in San Francisco on Friday, November 12th to hear grantee David Albright, in conversation with Ploughshares Fund Program Officer Paul Carroll, discussing "What's New for the Axis Of Evil? Iraq, Iran and North Korea After Election 2004." The first non-governmental inspector of the Iraqi nuclear weapons program, Albright is president of the Institute for Science and International Security in

Washington, DC. Five days after North Korea announced to the world that it possessed nuclear weapons, Ploughshares Council members were invited to participate in a conference call briefing with board member Philip Yun, a former State Department advisor on North Korea, and grantee Leon V. Sigal, author of *Disarming Strangers: Nuclear Diplomacy with North Korea*. The Ploughshares Council comprises individuals who provide leadership and sustained support to the Ploughshares Fund through their annual contributions of \$1,000 or more.

Ploughshares Family Values

"Your support of Ploughshares Fund is an investment in the future of our families," wrote Executive Director Naila Bolus in the introduction to our most recent Annual Report. Looking toward the future of her own family, Naila gave birth to identical twin daughters, Josette Bolus Glass and Willa Frances Glass, on February 2, 2005. The girls, their parents and their big sister Gabrielle are all doing extremely well.

PLOUGHSHARES FUND

Fort Mason Center
San Francisco, CA 94123

FIRST CLASS
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
SAN FRANCISCO, CA
PERMIT NO. 925

"When we want countries such as Iran and North Korea to abandon nuclear weapons development, it is hypocritical for the United States to embark on new weapons and testing initiatives."

— Rep. David Hobson, R-OH

