**Peace on Earth**

By Ellen Z. Berg, International Relations Committee chair

This month brings Thanksgiving, which is a lovely day for family, friends, food, and reflection on the bounty and blessings we have in our lives.

It has become a tradition for the day after Thanksgiving to usher in the December holidays. Merchants use parades, enchanting windows and sales to turn our attention to the gift-giving, party-planning, money-spending aspects of the holidays. There is plenty of time for all that—but first, the League invites you to extend the reflective mood of Thanksgiving for another two weeks and consider the most profound message of the holiday season: our aspiration for peace on earth.

Where do we stand on the path to peace? What possible way forward is there? Who stands in the way of peace—and who promotes it? What role is there for the League?

This year the League of Women Voters of the United States has placed arms control on its legislative watch list, and the brief selection of readings in this *Voter* includes the first action taken: a letter to the members of the Senate urging the ratification of the new START treaty.

In light of this renewed LWV emphasis on arms control, we have invited Ambassador Thomas Graham, Jr. to speak at our forum on December 9. He will reflect on the broad questions posed above, in a speech entitled “Nuclear Disarmament and the Future.” Those of us who have heard him before can guarantee a memorable evening: Tom Graham is an expert who is informative, candid and engaging.

Ambassador Graham served as general counsel and acting director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency during the Cold War, during which period he became the most experienced negotiator on either the U.S. or Soviet side. President Clinton appointed him to be his ambassador on the nuclear issue. Now retired from government, he remains involved in his field—among other ways as a visiting professor in the University of Washington program which prepares people for careers in arms control. This brings him to Seattle now and then—and hence to us.


**NEW DATE, TIME AND LOCATION FOR THE FORUM! CHECK THE BACK COVER FOR DETAILS**
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President’s Message

Hi!

My name is Jet and some of you may know me. I often come to the office with Allison and hang out. The League office is a great place to be; lots of people come by and I make sure to give them a warm welcome. The volunteers who work in the office love me and play with me although for some reason they seem less fond of my Kong chew toy and don’t seem to want to take it when I offer it to them. Unfortunately they get distracted a lot by these weird boxes that they sit next to and stare at and other ones that they talk into so I have to lie down and take a nap until they’re ready to play again.

Sometimes a whole bunch of people will come into the office and sit around the big table and talk. They must be having a good time because they laugh a lot but I think running and fetching is way more fun. I like to go in and lie under the table — I keep hoping some of the snacks will make it down to me but I think Allison may have told them no. I guess the discussions are really interesting because they often forget about me completely until I stick my head in their lap.

The only time it’s not so much fun is when Allison shuts me in her office. For some reason she really doesn’t want me to play with the man who comes and pokes around in the big machine that spits out paper. Fortunately, that doesn’t happen too often. It’s weird though, everyone seems happy to see him but they’re really grumpy before he arrives.

A lot of you say you have a dog and have offered to introduce me. I love to meet and play with other dogs. I’m working on Allison to see if we can arrange a League day at the dog park so we can all run around and have fun together. It may take a while though, for some reason she’s not that excited about going for walks this time of year.

I hope to see you the next time you come by the office and if I do, could you please remember: there’s a box with dog treats on top of the refrigerator!

P.S. A big thank you to Jet for writing my column this month and I want to wish all of you the very best this holiday season.

Sincerely,

Mission Statement

The League of Women Voters of Seattle, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues and influences public policy through education and advocacy.

The League of Women Voters of Seattle serves the greater Seattle area, including the cities of north King County as well as east King County from Bothell to Bellevue.
## December/January

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>Social Justice Comm. 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board Meeting KCS Luncheon with Barbara Madsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Deadline/ Internatl Rel. Comm. 12:45 p.m./ Teacher Study Comm. 4:00 p.m./ Justice Works! 7:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Borgen Project 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Eastside Holiday Luncheon 11:30 a.m. Forum: Nuclear Disarmament and the Future 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reclaimed Water Committee 2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Civics Ed Committee 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Crisis in Gaza 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Committee 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>January 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DECEMBER

**Social Justice Committee**  
Thursday, December 2  
7:00–8:30 p.m.  
League Office

**Board Meeting**  
Saturday, December 4  
9:00 a.m.  
League Office

**KCS Luncheon with Barbara Madsen**  
Saturday, December 4  
11:15 a.m.  
Highline Community College

**Voter Deadline**  
Monday, December 6

**Justice Works!**  
Monday, December 6  
7:15 p.m.  
909 E. Newton, D9

**International Relations Committee**  
Monday, December 6  
12:45-2:45 p.m.  
League Office

**Teacher Study Committee**  
Monday, December 6  
4:00–6:00 p.m.  
League Office

**Borgen Project**  
Wednesday, December 8  
7:30  
4500 Palatine N.

**Eastside Holiday Luncheon**  
Thursday, December 9  
11:30 a.m.  
580 East Sunset Way, Issaquah

**Forum: Nuclear Disarmament and the Future**  
Thursday, December 9  
7:00 p.m.  
Wykoff Auditorium, Seattle University

### JANUARY

**Forum: Program Planning**  
Thursday, January 6  
7:30 p.m.  
Seattle First Baptist Church

**Board Meeting**  
Saturday, January 8

**Voter Deadline**  
Monday, January 10
Forum Schedule

The League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) presents a public forum each month between August and May, generally on the first Thursday of the month at 7:30 p.m. Most forums are held at the Seattle First Baptist Church, but occasionally they are scheduled in other locations, including at least one on the eastside. The tentative schedule of upcoming forums for 2010-2011 appears below; check your Voter or the LWVS website, seattlelwv.org, each month for up-to-date information. ** PLEASE NOTE: The forum for this month will be held one week later than usual, on December 9 at 7:00 p.m. It will NOT be held at Seattle First Baptist Church, but rather at Seattle University, in Wykoff Auditorium in the Engineering Building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 9</td>
<td>Nuclear Disarmament and the Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6</td>
<td>Program Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3</td>
<td>Reclaimed Water—tentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>Women's Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>Development of a Public School Teacher—tentative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LWV Tattoos for the Holidays!

Get your stocking stuffers, tuck them into your holiday cards, give them as party favors for your unit holiday parties, or adorn yourself with a definite conversation starter during the holidays. We’re asking $1 donation for each tattoo. They are easy to apply with a wet cloth and easy to remove with olive oil. Tattoos are full color but are shown in black and white in the Voter. Call the office at (206) 329.4848 or email Lindsay (Lindsay@seattlelwv.org) to order yours. Shipping free for orders of 10 or more.
November Board Briefs  By Joanna Cullen, Secretary

The Board of the League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) met on Saturday morning, November 13, rather than the usual first Saturday of the month to prevent scheduling conflicts for members who planned to attend the League of Women Voters of Washington Action Workshop in Bellevue on November 6.

Membership
16 new members joined this month. Local units, the new member dinner, the fall gala, household members and the speakers bureau events were all sources that brought in new members. The new $100 Booster Membership has proven popular and will help to offset what seems to be an increased need for low and no fee scholarships.

Speakers Bureau
14 speakers were provided to venues on ballot measures. Effort is now focused on developing a list of potential voter registration opportunities for 2011 and ensuring a LWVS presence at Bumbershoot. The Seattle League, in conjunction with Snohomish County and other local affiliates, is planning a training for Speakers Bureau presenters and moderators. The Board was also asked to identify potential groups that may be good partners for these activities.

Program Planning
Program planning is in good shape through March. The Board discussed possibilities to explore for April. The tentative forum in May on education will also have to be confirmed.

Committee Work
The board appointed a committee to review our procedures for taking positions during elections and to make recommendations for possible improvements. A committee is being formed for the January Program Planning forum, and the board noted that calls for reading committees on upcoming studies will be necessary. A committee was appointed for the midyear fiscal audit. The Board will need to appoint people to write positions and read them if there are items for a February election.

Fundraising
While some figures are still pending, it appears that the League netted about $31,000 on the fall gala. This was a very reasonable amount, but less than had been budgeted. The Board extended their appreciation to Allison and all the other volunteers who stepped up to make this happen. President Allison Feher and the treasurer are working on recommendations for cuts and efficiencies to present to the Board, and the Board is exploring additional sources of funds. An Equipment Committee was appointed to specifically explore efficiencies that may be found in that area. The Board will also be working on our Local Unit feedback for the event. Did people miss the live auction?

The Board approved a request from Julie Anne Kempf to submit a proposal for the League to be one of the presenters at the Guiding Light Network’s workshop on citizenship this summer. Proposals are due November 19 and decisions regarding which proposals have been accepted would be sometime in December. Eric Liu, the speaker for the fall gala, is the founder of the organization with a mission described as lifelong learning and civics engagement, a good match for the League. Julie, Dana Twight, and Victoria Bennett will be leading this effort.
Committees

Social Justice Committee
Date: Thursday, December 2
Time: 7:00 – 8:30 p.m.
Place: League Office

International Relations Committee
Date: Monday, December 6
Time: 12:45 – 2:45 p.m.
Place: League Office

This will be our first post-forum meeting — and so the beginning of a new project. The committee has decided we would like to spend the rest of this League year learning and talking about America’s sense of itself and its role in the world. We will continue to discuss the outline of this project in December, and we will refresh our memory of Fareed Zakaria’s guidelines for American policy — anyone wanting this reading should contact Ellen Berg at ellenzberg@msn.com or (206) 329-4848.

Then in January Vicky Downs will lead a discussion of a book about historical themes in American foreign relations, and in subsequent months we will trace those (and other) themes coursing through issues in contemporary foreign relations. Issues of concern include: What is our policy/role in the Afghanistan-Pakistan-India situation? How are we redefining our role in the global economy? How do we convey/not convey our human rights heritage in foreign affairs? What is the role of the military in U.S. foreign policy? What is the role of development assistance in U.S. foreign relations?

In keeping with the League’s bipartisan spirit of inquiry, we will seek to understand the divergent views which are held by Americans on these issues and the overarching question of America’s role in the world.

Teacher Study Committee
Date: Monday, December 6
Time: 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Place: League Office.
Contact Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis at (206) 329-4848 for more information.

Reclaimed Water Committee
Date: Monday, December 13
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Place: League Office

Civics Education Committee
Date: Wednesday, December 15
Time: 4:30 p.m.
Place: To be determined. Please look for a location update on the League website, seattlelwv.org, or contact chair Dana Twight at (206) 329-4848 or dcttwight@mac.com.

The committee may be working on the March Forum—please come and join us!

Transportation Committee
Date: Tuesday, December 21
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Place: League Office
Speaker: Judy Clibborn, Chair, Washington State Legislature Transportation Committee

Because the League of Women Voters is seen as a very important group of interested voters, people like Ms Clibborn believe that they are communicating to the entire League when they agree to speak to our committee. We are a regional committee and we express a regional interest. Please join us at this December meeting, so near to Christmas, I know. Consider your presence a gift to the proven influence of the League.
Announcements

GREAT DECISIONS 2011

The League of Women Voters of Seattle will sponsor three Great Decisions Discussion Groups beginning in February 2011.

The Mercer Island group will meet on Thursday afternoons at the home of Susie Anschell, 3426 74th S.E. Call Susie at (206) 329-4848 if you wish to participate.

The Seattle group will meet on alternate Tuesday evenings beginning mid February at the home of Vicky Downs, 909 East Newton. Call Carol Goldenberg at (206) 329-4848 if you wish to participate in this group.

The Issaquah group will meet on alternate Sunday evenings beginning in early February. Call Denise Smith at (206) 329-4848.

The following topics have been selected by the Foreign Policy Association for the 2011 Great Decisions Discussion Series.

> Rebuilding Haiti
> U.S. National Security
> Horn of Africa
> Responding to Financial Crisis
> Germany ascendant
> Sanctions and Nonproliferation
> The Caucasus
> Global Governance

Great Decisions is a discussion program based on a study guide published by the New York based Foreign Policy Association, an independent nonprofit organization dedicated to public education regarding international issues. The illustrated book is written by independent experts. It contains in-depth articles providing maps, historical background, present and future policy options and an opportunity to take part in a national opinion poll on U.S. foreign policy. To obtain the $20.00 Great Decisions 2011 book, call (800) 477-5836 or visit www.greatdecisions.org. The book is being written now and will be mailed in January 2011.

This is a fine opportunity to introduce friends and neighbors to League and to add intellectual stimulation to your winter months.

Watch for more details in next month’s Voter.
EASTSIDE HOLIDAY LUNCHEON

DATE: THURSDAY, DECEMBER 9
TIME: 11:30 A.M.
PLACE: SUSAN COTTERELL’S HOME, 580 EAST SUNSET WAY, ISSAQUAH
EMAIL GRANNYSUE@MSN.COM; PHONE (206) 329-4848

All Eastside League members and prospective members are cordially invited to a luncheon hosted by the Issaquah daytime unit at the home of member Susan Cotterell. Susan has a cat, so please, if you are allergic, take your meds before you come. Her home has a ramp at the back door.

WHAT TO BRING: About $6.00 to reimburse those who are supplying or buying food for our lunch. AND your holiday cheer!

Directions: Head East on I-90 towards Issaquah, exit at exit 18, East Sunset Way/Highlands. Take a right onto East Sunset Way at the traffic light. Go past the small gravel parking lot. Susan’s gray house with a front porch is on the right hand side, before the funeral home on the same side. Park on the wide shoulders of E. Sunset Way. Please email or phone Susan directly if no one has reached you and you plan to attend.

Thank you, everyone. Especially Susan.

-Margaret Austin, Issaquah daytime unit leader.

THE BORGEN PROJECT TO VISIT WITH LEAGUE

DATE: WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 8
TIME: 7:30 P.M.
PLACE: 4500 PALATINE AVE. N.

Leaguers and friends are invited to meet Clint Borgen of The Borgen Project at the Magnolia, Queen Anne, Fremont and Ballard unit meeting hosted by Teddy Geokezas at her home.

Clint, a 32 year old Anacortes native, has become a vocal political advocate for people around the world without a voice. He recently spoke to students of Seattle University, and is speaking at Pepperdine University to students and faculty.

His seven year old project to “downsize poverty” aims to mobilize and train volunteers in all 435 U.S. Congressional districts.

The Borgen Project encourages citizens to use their power as constituents. Come to hear and see how this entrepreneur and his volunteers are making a difference to people in underserved countries.


Parking is challenging. Do carpool when possible. Refreshments will be served.
HEAR SPEAKER FROM JUSTICE WORKS!

DATE:  MONDAY, DECEMBER 6  
TIME:  7:15 P.M.  
PLACE:  HOME OF VICKY DOWNS, 909 E. NEWTON, (206) 329-4848

Justice Works! is a national organization whose goal is to create a safer and a more just community. This is done through providing the previously incarcerated with positive transitions back into society and campaigning for just laws and equal treatment for all people.

Justice Works! has an active Washington Chapter headquartered in Columbia City. The organization maintains ongoing programs to help the families of the incarcerated and to assist in the successful reentry of the newly released into society. One could attend some people-centered activity every week at the Columbia City headquarters. It might be a barbecue, a party for kids, or a welcome home party for someone newly released.

In addition, Justice Works! is actively engaged in the larger issues which affect the incarcerated. Among those are the 3-Strikes law, voting rights, and wrongful incarceration. A major campaign is once more being organized to amend the 3-Strikes legislation.

Washington approved Initiative 593, described as the 3-Strikes measure, in 1993 and was the first state to do so. It was described in the Voters’ Pamphlet as aiming at 3-time violent offenders, the worst of the worst offenders. In reality the list of 3-strike offenses includes crimes involving no violence, no weapons, and no injuries. Robbery 2 and Assault 2, which are common 3-strikes crimes, are regarded as the least serious of criminal offenses and singly carry standard sentences of three months to seven years.

The League opposed the 3-Strikes Initiative when it was proposed. There are many things to consider when a measure of this type is adopted. Is it fair? Forty percent of the 3-strike detainees are black. Are blacks more criminally inclined or is it just easier to nab a purse snatcher than a market manipulator? Most minor crimes are carried out by youth. If not locked up, are they likely to spend their lives in criminal activity? What are the costs to them personally and to society in general, of keeping these young men locked up until they die?

Efforts have been made in the legislature for several years to amend the 3-Strikes legislation basically by eliminating Robbery 2 as a 3-strikes offense. A leader in that effort has been Senator Adam Kline from the 37th district. A new piece of legislation is being prepared for this session which will allow the Parole Board, now called the Indeterminate Sentence Review Board (ISRB), to release 3-strike prisoners who were not jailed for violent offenses after they have served fifteen years.

The Capitol Hill/Montlake Unit and all who wish to join us will review some of these issues at their December meeting with a speaker from Justice Works!. Remember: Monday, December 6, 7:15 pm.
“CRISIS ON CRISIS IN GAZA” — A PRESENTATION BY REVEREND ANNE HALL AND DR. DAVID HALL

DATE: Thursday, December 16
TIME: 7:30 P.M.
PLACE: Home of Jan Orlando, 5026 36th Ave. NE

The North Central Unit of the League of Women Voters of Seattle will host Reverend Anne Hall and Dr. David Hall at their December meeting. Anne and David will describe their trips to Gaza in October, 2009 and May, 2010 with Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility (WPSR). David saw patients, consulted with colleagues and taught seminars. Anne visited women’s empowerment, activity and health centers, and listened to the stories of the women of Gaza, all of whom have been traumatized by Israel’s 2008-2009 attack on Gaza, as well by as the ongoing siege.

Anne is a pastor at University Lutheran Church in Seattle and sings with the Seattle Raging Grannies. David is a Child, Adolescent and Family Psychiatrist in private practice, and serves on the board of WPSR, of which he has twice been president. He is also a former president of National Physicians for Social Responsibility, the U.S. affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, which won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1985. Anne and Dave are both actively involved with the Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action, in resistance to nuclear weapons at the Bangor Trident submarine base on Hood Canal.

Please join us for an eye-opening presentation.

Refreshments will be served.

LWV KING COUNTY SOUTH HOLIDAY LUNCHEON

DATE: Saturday, December 4
TIME: 11:15 Social, lunch and speaker following at noon
PLACE: Highline Community College
COST: $12, includes lunch

The League of Women Voters of King County South invites you to a Holiday Luncheon with Barbara Madsen, Chief Justice of the Washington State Supreme Court. For tickets and information, call 206-243-7161 and leave a message or email us at WALWVKCS@juno.com.

Chief Justice Madsen will discuss the pros and cons of elected vs. appointed judges and the process of the Washington State Supreme Court decision-making as she sees it.
League News

TRANSPORTATION REPORT: THE SEATTLE WATERFRONT

By Janet Winans, Transportation Committee

On October 19, the Transportation Committee heard from Cary Moon of the People’s Waterfront Coalition (PWC). The coalition was formed in 2005 to advocate for a great civic waterfront with a sustainable solution to replace the Alaskan Way Viaduct after the 2001 earthquake. Members of the coalition are design leaders, advocacy groups, and citizens interested in the safety and viability of the Seattle waterfront AND access between Seattle’s downtown and Ballard, Magnolia, Aurora Avenue North and West Seattle.

The coalition advocates the following principles:

1. Recommend that a surface/transit/I5 solution be compared fairly to other options.
2. Emphasize transit, which offers people alternatives to the high cost of car-dependence.
3. Make sure the solution allows the best opportunity for a new civic waterfront.
4. Consider the viaduct not in isolation but as part of a large network. Viaduct users are primarily headed into downtown, and trips are short and local. Can we use existing capacity on streets and transit to provide mobility at a lower cost? Do not jump to the conclusion that a new highway must be built.
5. The right solution should meet multiple goals and support the vision for future Seattle, not perpetuate the status quo.

In 2007, following the No and No results of the public votes on the two Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) highway options, then Seattle City Councilmember Peter Steinbrueck obtained funding to commission an Urban Mobility Plan. This plan fleshed out the PWC proposal and provided the basis for the I-5/surface/transit solution, which was studied in the 2008 stakeholder process cosponsored by the city, county and state. This was a transparent, highly participatory process to study options for viaduct replacement and to recommend a solution to elected leaders. The six guiding principles that any solution must meet were:

1. Improve public safety.
2. Provide efficient movement of people and goods.
3. Maintain or improve downtown Seattle, regional, port and state economies.
4. Enhance Seattle’s waterfront, downtown and adjacent neighborhoods as a place for people.
5. Create solutions that are fiscally responsible.
6. Improve the health of the environment.

At the conclusion of a year of study and comparison, the city, county and WSDOT leaders ultimately recommended two choices, either surface/transit/I-5 or an elevated/transit hybrid. Although the governor had promised to work with these leaders in a transparent public process, at some point she met with a different group of stakeholders—Boeing, the regional and Seattle Chambers of Commerce and the Building Industry Association of Washington (BIAW)—in closed meetings to vet the recommendations. After their meetings the governor announced that a deep bore tunnel was the only option to replace the viaduct. Those stakeholders consider that the SR99 corridor is a “back engine highway,” which must be maintained as such. According to Moon, they consider their tunnel a “win win” solution, creating jobs and ensuring that building new roads will continue to be the best use of any transportation funds. Boeing considers that any other alternative will adversely impact their access to and use of I-5, despite much analysis that proves their beliefs inaccurate.

From Moon’s perspective, the tunnel project is typical of “megaprojects,” which tend to involve
major political gumption and optimism and to underestimate the technical risks. She listed ongoing concerns with the project.

1. There is no contingency alternative on the table (or in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)), that preserves the possibility of a civic waterfront if the tunnel proves too expensive or risky. We can only choose between the bored tunnel and elevated option, which was already rejected by Seattle voters.

2. WSDOT and the governor have set up contracts so only the tunnel itself is guaranteed. The portals, lids over the cut and cover sections and reconnecting city streets that access SR99 may be cut from the budget and left to the city if tunnel costs rise.

3. Seattle would be the number one victim of all of the potential problems, and would suffer the consequences of any failure in the construction of the tunnel, not just financially. There may not be enough money to adequately protect Pioneer Square, historic buildings and the historic underground.

4. Seattle MUST have a strong voice in all decision making.

5. While forty percent of current viaduct traffic exits to downtown, the tunnel’s main purpose is for bypass trips. The only planned access point to and from the tunnel will be into Pioneer Square, so traffic will either come up into the square or avoid the tunnel and use available or not so available arterials. If the tunnel is tolled, this problem would worsen: forty percent of would-be tunnel users will divert to city streets to avoid the toll. Access to downtown Seattle would not be improved.

6. The $190 million financing promised for additional transit service has been cut. There is NO transit in this project at all.

7. The state’s budget for the SR99 project is $3.1 billion. $2.4 billion is allocated from gas tax money, which is secure, but the remaining funds are not. $400 million is expected to be generated via a bond on future toll revenue, and $300 million is expected from the Port of Seattle. Keep in mind that funding for the SR520 project is still $2 billion short, too. There may not be enough money for both concurrently.

8. There are only 480 direct construction jobs expected to result from the $3 billion project. This is partially because much of the work will be done by a highly automated drilling machine which will cost much of the money.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

The Environmental Impact Statement is yet to be released. When it is, READ IT very critically.

Does it ensure the preservation of historic buildings?

Does it protect Pioneer Square streets from being used as highway ramps?

Are there performance goals that will establish accountability over the time of construction and after completion?

Urge the city to demand that a surface/transit/I-5 alternative be included in the EIS in case the tunnel plan proves unfeasible.

Demand additional transit from Ballard, Magnolia, Aurora N and West Seattle.

Demand that the waterfront street that is to be built in the footprint of the viaduct be four lanes. The alternative of lanes one way north and south using Western Avenue is unacceptable.

Demand the release of Steinbrueck’s Urban Mobility Plan.

Demand street grid improvements to fully utilize all the available surface streets.

Implement traffic demand management with improved signals and increased parking fees.

Earth Justice, a public service legal organization, may provide assistance to organizations reading the EIS to help ensure an integrity review.

Finally, Moon is very pleased with the design team chosen for the Waterfront Park, “20 acres of opportunity.”
A HEARTFELT THANK YOU TO ALL!

BY ALLISON FEHER, LWVS PRESIDENT

So many people participated to help make our 34th Annual Political Party and 90th Anniversary Gala a success. From the planning stages early in the year to the myriad day of event tasks to the final wind-up, hundreds of people contributed their time, their skills and their financial resources to help support this organization. This is a tremendous gift and it is much appreciated.

The night of the event was fabulous and I hope all the guests enjoyed themselves as much as I did. During the cocktail hour people got to mingle and chat while enjoying live music performed by violinist Will Bush and pianist Lou Bush. We were also entertained by a continuous slide show depicting the milestones and fun memories of our local league. Thank you Nancy Eitreim for putting it together. Many candidates and officeholders dropped by to enjoy the Political Party even if they couldn’t stay for dinner. We appreciate their taking time out of their busy schedules to help make our event a fun and successful one. King County Executive Dow Constantine opened the dinner program with some lovely compliments to the League for our 90th Anniversary. Keynote Speaker Eric Liu was inspiring and national board Vice President Judy Davis reminded us that all politics is local—without us there wouldn’t be a national League—so keep up the efforts! Finally, we closed the evening with a raffle.

Thank you very much to these gracious donors:

- Ben Bridge Jeweler
- The Captain Whidbey Inn
- Dimitriou’s Jazz Alley
- Larry and Ron Jones of Jones Glassworks
- Seattle Theater Group Presents
- The Suquamish Tribe

To organize all of that fun and entertainment took a lot of behind the scenes activity. First off, the development committee was formed and set the framework for the event. Members who worked on this include Judy Bevington, Kris Bushley, Jean Carlson, Diana Henderson, Sally Mackle, Ginna Owens, Lily Reid, Dorothy Young Sale, Denise Smith and Laura Weese. As the event date drew closer and the call for all hands on deck went out Brigitte Ashley, Nancy Eitreim, and Paula Polet joined in the weekly meetings and took on the many tasks that needed to be accomplished. In the office Lindsay Cummings and our incredible CIS desk crew— Mary Barton, Amanda Berry, Ruthie Dornfeld, Michele Lucien Erickson, Cynthia Howe, Candis
Litsey, Betty Sullivan, Estelle Wertheimer, and Cyndi Woods—got mailings out, made innumerable reminder and follow-up calls, and performed other tasks as needed. Many of these volunteers also pitched in during those intensive last few days to prep materials, set up the site, handle registration, sell raffle tickets, and generally keep things moving. They were joined in these efforts by Janet Ashley, Juliet Beard, Randy Crittenden, Nancy Eitreim, Jean Godden and The Connections Group, The League of Women Voters of Washington, Kelly Powers, Kathy Sakahara, Ruth Schroeder, Denise Smith, Joan Thomas, Washington Public Campaigns, Laura Weese and the following LWVS units: Ballard, Bellevue, Capitol Hill/Montlake, Horizon House, Mercer Island, North Central, North Seattle, Queen Anne/Magnolia, SouthEnd, View Ridge and West Seattle.

Finally, there were the financial contributions. In addition to the portion of the ticket price that contributes to the League, we received many additional donations and sponsorships. Large or small, all of these come together to help support the work of this organization and say to our hard-working volunteers, “we believe in you and the work that you do.” This is an incredibly powerful message, especially in these times when there are so many pressing needs and calls upon our resources. Thank you so much to the following for your generous support:

Gold sponsors and donations of $1,500 or more
Herb Bridge
William Crittenden
Pamela Mitchell
Betty and Jay Sullivan
Joan Thomas

Silver sponsors and donations of $900 or more
Judy Bevington
Nancy Debaste
Allison Feher

In kind donations for free or reduced cost services were very helpful in designing and printing our save the date postcards, invitations and program. Thank you to Sarah Bullock, the King/Kitsap County chapter of the American Red Cross and Urban Press.

Another essential to a successful event is getting the audience. Thank you to all who brought friends and relations to help us celebrate. In particular, thanks to all our table captains: Judy Bevington, Herb Bridge, Kris Bushley, Jean Carlson, Bill Bolerjack, Phil Erickson, Dorothy Hopper, Julie Ann Kempf, Jan Orlando, Ben Powers, Bonnie Rimawi, Leah Reuben-Werner, Kathy Sakahara, Cathy Liu Scott, Laraine Volkman, Chrystal Wood and volunteers from Powerful Voices. Thank you all!
Donations of $200 or more


Additional donors:

Nancy Allan, Seth Armstrong, Mary Arnold, Brigitte Ashley, Margaret Austin, Virginia Barker, Juliet Beard, Astrid Berg, Elaine Birn, Cheryl Bleaney, Ann Bowden, Ann Brand, Lael Braymer, Shira Brewer, Marcia Brown, Michele Buetow, Katherine Bullitt, Lee Carpenter, Carpenters Union Local No. 131, Heidi Carpine, George Cheung, Patricia Clark, Suzanne Clark, Patricia Cleary, Anne Conn, Lois Constantine, Zita Cook, Jeanette Corkey, Judith Coskey, Frederick Cox, Jennifer Crandall, Beatrice Crane, Joanna Cullen, Elizabeth Darrah, Paneen Davidson, Joanne Davis, Marie DeBell, Margaret Dion, Jean Donohue, Deborah Eddy, Susan Eidenschink, Ruth Eller, Michele Lucien Erickson,
Hilke Faber, Jean Falls, Eleanor Fordyce, Jayne Frietag, Susan Fuchs, Theodora Geokezas, Jean Godden, Julie Goldberg, Carol Goldenberg, Sandra Greenup, Sue Gregory, Joanna Grist, Nancy Grout, Brian Gunn, Lenore Hale, Ellen Hanley, Shirley Harper, Ellen Hazzard, Edie Hilliard, Shelly Hilliard, Cynthia Howe, Kathleen Huckabay, International Federation of Engineers, Luanna Iverson, Margaret Johnson, Kristin Jones, Julie Jordan, Marta Kalve, Diane Kaufman, Janel Kempf, Lucille Kempf, Julia Kissel, Asuman Kiyak, Christine Knutson, Laborers Local 440, Gunbjorg Ladstein, Lois Laughlin, Eleanor Laxdall, Andrea Lee, Jean Leed, Kathleen Leindecker, Anne Lester, Myra Lupton, Sarah Luthens, Janet Lynch, Reed, Connie Reed, Barbara Reid, Lily Reid, Lyn Reynolds, Ruthe Ridder, Bonnie Rimawi, Angela Robinson, Loring Rowell, Charles Roxin and Jaclyn Wall, Nancy Rust, Peggy Saari, Dorothy Young Sale, Betty Sanders, Sharon Tomiko Santos, Sam Scharff, Hazel Schiffer, Wendy Schindler, Mary Jo Schreifels, Ruth Schroeder, Joan Scott, Courtland Shafer, Elsie Simon, Shirley Skeith, Rosealma Smith, Olive Spannaus, Jane Stevens, Marcella Stone, Ellyn Swanson, Gael Tarleton, Hazel Thomas, Peggy Tlapak, Dana Twight, Tjitske Van Der Meulen, Lee Van Divort, Penney Van Vleet, Margaret Vance, Laura Parma Veigel, Cathleen Verde, Laraine Volkman, Elizabeth Walter, Anita Warmflash, Joanne Way, Virginia Wedgewood, Laura Weese, Constance Wentzel, Estelle Wertheimer, Dorothy Willard, Ethel Williams, Margaret Williams, Boots Winterstein, Cyndi Woods, Edith Younge and Jean Zatochill.

Once again, thank you to all for all your support and a very happy holiday season! If you are aware of supporters who have been overlooked, please let us know so we can acknowledge them appropriately.
Voter Service

VOTER REGISTRATION REPORT
By Cyndi Goddard-Woods, Voter Services

The League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) Voter Registration season has come to an end for the year. I can’t tell you how much we appreciate all the volunteers who stepped up to help LWVS register voters all over the greater Seattle area. The season started with the efforts of Lindsay Cummings, our office specialist, to update the training materials last spring and ended with our registering voters at the Rally to Restore Sanity on October 30. We had a presence at Bumbershoot, the Magnolia and Capitol Hill farmers markets and many more places across our catchment area.

At times (more than I care to admit), we put out last-minute requests for help and they were always answered by willing volunteers. Thank you!

I’m extremely proud of this aspect of our Voter Services portfolio. Registering voters furthers our mission (“encouraging active participation of citizens in government”) so powerfully that I can’t wait to get back in the game next year. I hope you’ll consider joining us at a table or training other volunteers to help register voters. Watch for our training announcements in the Seattle Voter next spring.

At first, the thought of standing up in front of a group of people I’d never met to talk about initiatives, propositions and referenda terrified me. Who would ever want to spend thirty minutes or an hour listening to me drone on about these boring topics? Then I participated on the reading committee for our ballot measure summaries and I realized that I knew a lot about these issues—probably more this election than I ever have before. And they were interesting. The issues in this election were so important to so the voters. As a Speakers Bureau volunteer, I had the opportunity to help voters better understand these complex issues and make informed choices. I grew more interested and excited to share what I knew.

This election season we went to 15 different venues across the LWVS territory and presented voters with nonpartisan, clear and fact-based information about the ballot measures for the 2010 election. This was an unusually complex election year, particularly given the state of the economy—just look at how many ballot measures dealt with taxes, budgets and money. And then there were the ballot issues that were in conflict with each other. Through our Speakers Bureau, we serve our League mission to “encourage informed and active participation in government and ... increase understanding of major public policy issues...”

The voters I spoke to were thoughtful and engaged, and asked good questions. We had interesting and, yes, FUN discussions. They were truly grateful for this service and gave us positive feedback in person and thank you notes. I’m looking forward to the next election!

SPEAKERS BUREAU
By Cyndi Goddard-Woods, Voter Services

When I signed up to co-chair the Voter Services position on the Board, my goal was to help the League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) ensure that voters have access to unbiased information about election issues so they could make informed choices when they filled out their ballots. Who knew it would turn out to be FUN?
The speakers at the November Action Forum received rave reviews from those in attendance.

We heard first from Tim Harris, Executive Director of Real Change, who talked about his four top action priorities for Seattle: inequality, the tunnel, police accountability and incarceration.

Mr. Harris believes that in our most recent elections, inequality won. He urged that we continue to press for tax reform, connecting it to everyday matters in a way voters will understand. According to Harris, banks need to be made accountable in the area of foreclosures. He criticized the payday loan industry for feeding on the vulnerability of the poor. On this last issue—what he calls the “Archimedes of the financial industry”—he considers that the legislature may perhaps be persuaded to regulate the payday loan companies because they are not yet as influential as banks.

The tunnel Harris sees as a social justice issue because he believes that, with resources so scarce, we don’t have the money to spend on this “gold-plated” option. “A billion dollars matters.” He considers it also an issue of democracy and government accountability in that he believes this was an option rejected by the voters.

Police accountability is an area where Harris finds it is very hard to make progress. He was particularly critical of the current “banishment” practices of the Seattle Police Department (SPD), whereby—according to Harris—people are issued a citation, not subject to appeal, and ordered to stay away from a certain area for a year. They are then subject to arrest if they violate that order. Harris claimed that the SPD uses such citations to harass folks, most often the visible poor and black youth.

Harris’ final topic, incarceration, is a huge issue even though Real Change and others were successful in lobbying against a new jail. As human services decline, the jail population continues to increase. As a result, prisoners are sent to jail farther away from their home communities; this works even more hardship on their families.

Mr. Harris made clear how seemingly disparate subjects are all interconnected in the area of social justice.

For more information about Real Change and these and other issues see http://www.realchangenum.org.

Doug Howell, the Sierra Club’s Coal Free Washington Campaign Director, spoke next. The League of Women Voters of Washington and the Sierra Club both belong to Washington State’s Environmental Priorities Coalition. The coalition has set, as one of its four priorities, the end of the subsidy for the TransAlta Power Plant in Centralia and the closure of the plant or its conversion to a cleaner source of power.

Mr. Howell said that many people do not know that we have a coal-fired power plant in Centralia, Washington. He reported that the plant is the dirtiest source of power in Washington—#1 in climate pollution, #1 for toxic mercury emissions, #1 for causing haze in Washington national parks. Furthermore, he said, the plant owners “made a killing during the energy crisis and yet they are still subsidized by the state.” The subsidy originated in order to encourage the company to keep mines open in Washington so as to keep the coal miners employed. Even though the Centralia mine has been closed since 2006, there is still in place a $5 million-a-year sales tax exemption for TransAlta, the multi-billion-dollar Canadian corporation that owns the plant.

Howell laid out the various health and
environmental impacts of coal-fired plants and their costs to the state: fine particulates, sulfur dioxide, coal combustion waste, coal mining waste, industrial waste water, and hazardous air pollutants such as hydrochloric acid and mercury. If TransAlta were held to a reasonable (national) standard, he said, it would go out of business.

The Environmental Priorities Coalition will be concentrating on three main avenues in recommended legislation: first, funds to assist TransAlta employees in Centralia to find and train for other employment or to sustain them in the absence of employment; second, provisions to ensure grid stability if TransAlta goes off-line; and third, emissions standards to reduce greenhouse gas and toxic emissions.

Howell left us with one main message to take to the legislature:
“TransAlta has huge public health impacts. It is the number one carbon polluter in the state. And we can transition the plant off coal without costing the state a dime.”

For more information on TransAlta or the Environmental Priorities Coalition, see http://cascade.sierraclub.org and http://environmentalpriorities.org.

Our third speaker, Rebecca Roe, was prevented from attending by a family emergency. We look forward to hearing from her on another occasion.

FOLLOW THE LEAGUE’S PROGRESS IN OLYMPIA
SUBSCRIBE TO THE LEGISLATIVE NEWSLETTER

During the legislative session you will receive information about League support or opposition to bills, pertinent committee hearings, status of bills and Action Alerts. If you are willing to receive the newsletter via email it’s free! If you prefer to have it mailed to you there is a $15 charge. Please specify which version you wish to receive - mail or email. $15 Mail Free via Email

Name_______________________________________________________________
Address_____________________________________________________________
Phone_____________________________________________________________
Email_______________________________________________________________

(Please print your email address clearly!!)

Make your check payable to and return to:
LWVWA, 4730 University Way NE, #720, Seattle, WA 98105
PH: 206-622-8961, outside toll area, 1-800-419-2596, email: lwvwa@lwvwa.org, www.lwvwa.org
GETTING READY FOR THE NEW YEAR

What local issues are making you mad or sad, keeping you busy, or leaving you wondering why League isn’t doing more? Our program planning forum and unit planning meetings are coming up in January. We’ll be making plans for our local Seattle program for the next league year as well as forwarding ideas to the state Board for the League of Women Voters of Washington program. This is a time for you to share your concerns with other Leaguers and convince them to become more involved on issues near and dear to you.

Get ready to persuade folks that a Voter article or a forum or even a study is needed on your topic. Identify people who may be willing to work on your issue. Whether your “hot topic” is schools, the environment, social justice, gun control, transportation, campaign finance reform, housing or something else, this is a time to get your ideas into the hopper. Start now to advocate and plan to come to the January forum ready to lobby for your recommendations.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF WASHINGTON
2011 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Strengthen Democracy
- support public campaign financing for judicial positions
- protect state funding that invests in programs to promote a more secure future for all citizens

Support Education, Early Learning, Families and Children
- support development of a funding system for the K-12 basic education structure
- protect state and federal funding to meet basic needs of families and children
- promote policies and programs that promote the well-being and safety of all children
- improve and support child care program quality and access for low-income families.

Improve Access to Health Care
- guarantee access for all residents in comprehensive, uniform, and affordable health services
- use implementation of the Affordable Care Act to help maintain funding for public health, health coverage for low income populations, and for incentives for primary care doctors to work in under-served areas

Protect Natural Resources and Human Health
- provide clean energy and good health by transitioning power plants away from burning coal
- reduce pollution by controlling phosphorus in lawn fertilizers
- adopt an effective program to clean up and prevent pollutants, including petroleum products, from entering the waters of the state
- reduce and eliminate toxic chemicals in children’s products quickly and effectively

Promote a Balanced Transportation System
- increase affordable and reliable access to public transportation
- decrease the number of single-occupancy vehicles on roads, bridges and ferries
- increase fuel efficiency by promoting development and use of alternative fuel sources across all modes of transportation
Membership Report by Kelly Powers, Membership Chair

Members, thanks for the heavy lifting this fall!

We had our 90th Anniversary Gala fundraiser and our fall membership drive, we put on five forums in four months, and there has been much community engagement during this election season. Meanwhile, several committees are busily preparing for forums and studies and we’re going into TRY production. All of these activities require dedicated volunteers generously donating skills, time and funds. We really appreciate it!

We are delighted to announce that we have 15 new members in October. Thanks to everyone who brought a friend to an event or a forum and to all the unit leaders asking attendees to join if they haven’t already.

A warm thank you to all the members who donated an additional amount with their dues:


We recently began offering a Booster Membership level and members are responding enthusiastically. Many thanks to the following members who renewed at the Booster level: Nancy Baynham, Betsy Darrah, Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Diane Horn, Peggy Johnson, Christopher D. Jones, Gail Katz, Candis Litsey, Rosalie McCreary, Judy Pigott and Gail Winberg.

And big membership smooch to Vicky Downs who renewed at the Contributing Membership level.

Your generosity helps retain active members who are going through rough financial times.

5th Grader at the Day of Jubilation: “I hope to vote every time there is an election.”

We wanted to share with you an inspiring program of study at a public elementary school in Olympia. Third, fourth and fifth graders are studying the history of voting rights as a year-long study. Here’s an excerpt from The Olympian about the program:

“For fifth-grade teachers Amy Koster and Wendy Hughes, the events were a chance to add a dynamic piece to their classroom instruction at Garfield Elementary School in Olympia. The children were learning about history and voting rights, and the kids were excited to learn even more about historical figures they were studying in class – including the film that had a speaker dressed up as a suffragist.

Student Ezra Mead was doing research on famous suffragist Susan B. Anthony, and classmate Ryan Guscott said he was doing a
research paper on suffragist Alice Paul. Paul helped form the National Woman’s Party in 1916 and used harder tactics – including pickets at the White House – to push for the 19th Amendment. Paul’s tactics landed her in jail, where she went on a hunger strike. She later authored the first Equal Rights Amendment, in 1923.

“I thought it was a really good presentation. I heard a lot of things I did not know,” said Livia Le, also a Garfield student.

Looking ahead to her adult years, Le said: “I hope to vote every time there is an election. There was a lot of people who fought for the right to vote. … I should vote.”

To see the complete article:

‘They agreed to share power’ Women’s suffrage 100th year: Crowd gathers at Capitol to celebrate state’s male voters granting women the right to vote,” by Brad Shannon, The Olympian, November 9, 2010.


Diversity Policy

The League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS), in both its values and practices, affirms its beliefs and commitment to diversity and pluralism, which means there shall be no barriers to participation in any activity of the League on the basis of gender, race, creed, age, sexual orientation, national origin or disability.

LWVS recognizes that diverse perspectives are important and necessary for responsible and representative decision-making. LWVS subscribes to the belief that diversity and pluralism are fundamental to the values it upholds and that this inclusiveness enhances the organization’s ability to respond more effectively to changing conditions and needs.

LWVS affirms its commitment to reflecting the diversity of Americans in its membership, board, staff and programs.
BOOK REVIEW by Vicky Downs

Peddling Peril: How the Secret Nuclear Trade Arms America’s Enemies by David Albright

It is universally acknowledged that a country with nuclear weapons is mightier than its non-nuclear neighbors. Iran, Syria, Libya, South Africa and North Korea among others, together with several terrorist groups, have all sought the know-how, the chemicals and the equipment to join the nuclear “club.” In this book, Albright describes how it was that “almost every organization that was determined to get help with nuclear weapons and had contacted [Abdul Qadeer] Khan to do so, eventually received it one way or another!”

How did Khan, a Pakistani engineer, commit industrial espionage in the Netherlands? Theoretically he was hired as a metallurgical researcher, but he quickly made his way into many areas of the Physical Dynamic Research Laboratory, which was part of the secretive Ultra-Centrifuge Nederland. In spite of the fact that only Dutch citizens were allowed in most parts of the company, he was often invited in to help translate complicated, and often secret, dossiers from German into Dutch.

Khan soon obtained detailed diagrams of Dutch and German centrifuges, and once boasted “he himself was capable of making a centrifuge.” In less than a decade he made good on his boast. He became the self-described “father” of Pakistan’s nuclear bomb and went on to sell weapons technology and technical help to anyone who could pay his price.

His was an illicit trade, and he proved extraordinarily capable of taking advantage of some countries’ lax laws, evading inspectors, and using a vast network of other traders so as to divide his orders into small and less noticeable portions. He seems to have been willing to sell to anyone, including Al Qaeda. Greed, not ideology, guided his sales.

Eventually agents, including the CIA, found and stopped much of what Khan tried to develop, but few in the illicit nuclear trade actually landed in jail. Khan himself was released from house arrest in 2009.

Albright says that much of the difficulty in catching the nuclear thieves was due to lax export and national secrets laws. He tells us that though laws tend to be better today, there are “three critical steps that must be taken” in order to avoid a nuclear catastrophe. Implementing universal laws and norms against nuclear smuggling is of utmost importance. In addition, “establishing more secure nuclear assets and working toward earlier detection of illicit trade” are also necessary.

In a final chapter, Albright shows how very effective one supplier is in locating illicit trade. The supplier provided materials and technical assistance to rogue groups in the past, but has now found it more profitable to work with governments to help uncover illegal trade.

This book reads like a thriller! It was published in 2010 and is about 250 pages long. I found it full of interesting information that was new to me.

The opinions in this review are personal and do not represent those of the LWV.
Last month, we began a series of articles by the Immigration Committee on common myths and misperceptions about immigration. The following article continues the series.

**MYTH: IMMIGRATION TAKES JOBS FROM AMERICAN WORKERS**

**By Bob Hayman, Immigration Committee**

One of the main arguments against immigration is the claim that immigrants take jobs from Americans. Certainly, there are examples where this is true: foreign athletes such as Ichiro Suzuki, Yao Ming, and Felix Hernandez all occupy major league roster spots that could be filled (although not necessarily as well) by Americans. But these are high-end, highly specialized positions, and no one will argue that a less qualified American should replace Ichiro. The displaced Americans referred to in this claim tend to be average wage earners. To what extent is this claim true for them?

An ad aired in Arizona depicted white-collar workers cleaning out their desks and taking a one-way elevator ride to unemployment, because of immigrants. The recently-formed Reclaim American Jobs Caucus in the U.S. House of Representatives has created an advertisement that says that there are 15 million unemployed Americans, and 8 million undocumented immigrants with jobs, so we could cut unemployment in half simply by booting the undocumented immigrants out of the country. The math is certainly simple, but it carries the assumption that the number of jobs would remain constant if we were to boot out 8 million workers, and that Americans would then flock to fill those jobs. The truth is more complex.

While economics is not an exact science, there is an emerging consensus on how immigration affects the employment rates of Americans. A recent study compared employment rates in states with relatively high numbers of immigrants to rates in states with low immigration levels, and found that immigration was associated with increased overall productivity and income levels. This was because immigrants filled less-desirable low-skill jobs, while increasing the demand for goods and services that in turn created higher paying jobs. This study also found that immigration caused no discernible difference in employment rates for native-born Americans, and concluded that there is no evidence that immigration occurs at the expense of jobs for native-born Americans.

This illustrates a flaw in the reasoning of the Reclaim American Jobs Caucus. It ignores the fact that those 8 million undocumented workers are also 8 million consumers, and their families add even more. Thus, a number of studies have concluded that, while immigration slightly decreases wages for the lowest-skilled workers (e.g., those who didn’t finish high school), its overall impact on job levels and on the economy is positive. One study, which found that immigration expands the economy, calculated that a 29% increase in immigration would add $180 billion to household incomes. A second study concluded that, because immigrants consume goods and services, they create more jobs and have a small but positive impact on overall wages. This finding applies also to undocumented immigrants — studies indicate that undocumented immigrants and native-born workers tend to concentrate on different types of jobs (undocumented immigrants generally work in hospitality and service jobs), so illegal immigration has little effect on employment among native-born Americans.

This means that those white-collar workers in the elevator ad are actually not being replaced by undocumented immigrants. To emphasize that point, the United Farm Workers recently organized a “Come on, take our jobs” campaign, in which they challenged unemployed Americans to apply for the agriculture jobs that many undocumented immigrants fill. There has been little response (only 7 applicants this year), and
a similar challenge in 1998 netted only 3 applicants. This does not surprise economists, whose near consensus is that immigrants, both legal and illegal, contribute to economic growth and create as many jobs as they occupy.

Consequently, if the Reclaim American Jobs Caucus is successful in booting 8 million undocumented immigrants out of the country, they will likely also be booting out 8 million jobs. Net job gain to 15 million unemployed Americans? Zip.

Thus, this myth, while it has intuitive appeal, is not supported by research. In fact, because immigration increases economic growth, deporting working immigrants under current economic conditions is exactly what we should not do.


7. Shierholz, op. cit.


10. Silva, op. cit.
December Program: Arms Control

**LWVUS ARMS CONTROL POSITION**

**ADOP TED 1983, UPDATED 2010**

The League of Women Voters of the United States believes that arms control measures are essential to reduce the risk of war and increase global stability. Toward that end, the U.S. government should give the highest level of importance to arms control efforts that:

- Limit or reduce the quantity of weapons;
- Limit proliferation and prohibit first use of nuclear weapons;
- Prohibit first use and possession of chemical, biological and radiological weapons;
- Prohibit explosive testing of nuclear weapons;
- Reduce tensions in order to prevent situation in which weapons might be used.

While these objectives should receive the highest level of attention, the U.S. government should also negotiate measures that inhibit the development and improvement of weapons, particularly nuclear weapons that increase incentives to attack first in a period of crisis.

As a goal of international negotiations, the League supports the worldwide elimination of nuclear weapons.

The League of Women Voters recognizes that peace in an interdependent world is a product of cooperation among nations and therefore strongly favors multilateral negotiations. Leadership by the United States in advancing arms control measures through negotiations and periodic review is encouraged.

Given the potential for worldwide proliferation of nuclear technology, efforts involving all countries are essential to limit the spread of nuclear weapons and to protect commonly held nuclear weapons-free regions such as the seabed and outer space. Multilateral efforts are appropriate as well to achieve bans on the possession of chemical, biological and radiological weapons; and to achieve limitations on the transfer or trade of all weapons.

The League of Women Voters also supports bilateral arms control efforts which may be especially appropriate in negotiations to limit, safeguard and reduce quantities of weapons. The League believes that unilateral initiatives are not the most appropriate means to achieve arms control.

The League does not support tying progress in arms control to other issues. The League believes that arms control is too important in and of itself and too crucial to all nations to be linked to other foreign and military policy goals.

The League of Women Voters believes that arms control measures should be evaluated in terms of the following factors:

**EQUITY.** The terms should be mutually beneficial, and each nation's security and interests should be adequately protected, as should the security of all nations. Equity does not necessarily require equality in numbers of weapons but may be achieved through a relative balance in capabilities.

**VERIFIABILITY.** Each party should be able to ensure that other parties comply with the terms of the agreement, whether using national technical means (such as satellites, seismic sensors and electronic monitors) or on-site inspection. The League recognizes the role that multilateral and international institutions can play in assisting verification efforts and believes it is extremely...
important to ensure compliance, acknowledging that absolute certainty is unattainable.

Equity and verifiability are critical in efforts to limit and reduce quantities of weapons and to prohibit the possession and spread of nuclear weapons.

CONFIDENCE-BUILDING. Each party should be assured of the political or military intentions of other parties. Fostering confidence is vital in efforts to stem the development and proliferation of weapons and prohibit their first use; and to reduce tensions.

WIDESPREAD AGREEMENT. All appropriate parties should participate in and approve the results of the negotiating process. However, the League recognizes that, in specific cases, progress can be achieved even though some key parties do not participate.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION. The quality of the earth’s environment should be protected from the effects of weapons testing or use. Environmental protection has special significance in negotiations regarding all weapons of mass destruction as well as conventional weapons that have residual effects.

CONTINUITY. Negotiations should build on past agreements and should be directed toward future negotiations whenever feasible. Innovative thinking and new approaches should, however, be encouraged when appropriate.

Further Guidelines

League support of arms control measures includes actions on proposals, negotiations and agreements.

The League supports efforts to achieve quantitative limits or reductions that focus on nuclear warheads, non-nuclear weapons of mass destruction, missiles and other delivery systems, antia ballistic missiles, conventional weapons or troop levels.

The League advocates limits on the spread or proliferation of weapons, nuclear technology and fissile materials. The League opposes the proliferation of weapons, nuclear technology and fissile materials to non-state actors or to commonly held areas such as the seabed or outer space. The League supports establishing effective international monitoring, accounting and control of such transfers.

The League’s pursuit of bans on the possession or use of weapons may apply to existing weapons or those not yet developed.

The League seeks to reduce tensions through better means of communication, exchange of information or prior notification of military tests and maneuvers in order to avoid the risks of miscalculation or accident. Other League-supported measures to reduce tensions and create a climate of trust among nations include scientific and cultural exchanges, conflict resolutions training, and strengthening the United Nations and its supporting agencies. Efforts are encouraged to mediate regional issues and arrive at negotiated settlements to minimize arms build-ups and avoid conflicts. The United States should keep lines of communication open.

The League supports efforts to inhibit the development and improvement of weapons through qualitative limits, including limits on testing of weapons. These constraints may be selective or comprehensive in their application.

Efforts to improve the arms control regime of international laws, oversight bodies and verification modalities are also supported, and U.S. engagement and leadership in this regard is encouraged. The League supports diligence by the United States in meeting the terms of ratified arms control agreements and in reviewing their effectiveness over time.
League of Women Voters of the United States

September 16, 2010

To: Members of the U.S. Senate
From: Elisabeth MacNamara, President
Re: Support START Treaty

The League of Women Voters of the United States commends the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for its bipartisan vote in support of the new START treaty and we urge all Senators to vote for ratification when START comes to the full Senate for a vote.

The LWVUS has a long standing position in support of efforts to reduce the risk of war, including negotiations on arms control measures. In June 2010, delegates to our national convention reiterated the League’s support for this position. We believe that arms control is essential to reduce the risk of war and increase global stability.

We support the START Treaty’s goals of achieving a near-term reduction of nuclear weapons with mutually agreed verification procedures.

We believe that the START Treaty, which was signed by President Obama and Russian President Medvedev on April 8, 2010, will make America more secure. This is the first arms control agreement between the United States and Russia in nearly a decade. The START Treaty includes new verification requirements, reduces deployed strategic warheads to 1,550, which is thirty percent below the existing ceiling, and limits both nations to no more than 700 delivery vehicles.

The League also believes that this treaty is essential to maintaining a stable strategic relationship between the United States and Russia. The treaty calls for regular inspections and timely exchanges of information regarding nuclear arsenals. The START Treaty would not only reduce the number of deployed nuclear weapons in both the United States and Russia but could influence other nations to follow suit.

Just as the Foreign Relations Committee vote was bipartisan, so too is the widespread support for the treaty. The many national security advisors who endorse ratification of the treaty include Secretaries of State and Defense for former Presidents Reagan, George Herbert Walker Bush, Bill Clinton and George W. Bush. The START Treaty also has the support of Secretary of State Clinton, Secretary of Defense Gates and Admiral Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has taken the first step. The League of Women Voters urges you to follow suit and vote yes on ratification of the START Treaty.
BACKGROUND PAPERS

In 2009, the League of Women Voters of the United States (LWVUS) appointed a national Arms Control Task Force to evaluate the relevance of the 1983 Position on Arms Control. As part of its work, it posted a set of Background Papers on the LWVUS website. Shortened versions of these papers follow. Each editor has condensed the material presented, sometimes preserving the author’s language exactly and sometimes paraphrasing. All notes and references have been deleted. To find the original papers on the LWVUS website, lwv.org, click on “Additional issues we are watching” under the Take Action heading, and select Arms Control. You will see Background Papers on the right side of the page. The full address is:

http://www.lwv.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Arms_Control2&Template=/TaggedPage/TaggedPageDisplay.cfm&TPLID=144&ContentID=14806

ARMS CONTROL: GEOPOLITICAL FACTORS PERTINENT TO THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS (LWV) POSITION

BY ELLEN Z. BERG; EDITED BY BETSY GREENE

The Present: A Time of Peril, a Time of Promise

Four geopolitical developments since the League of Women Voters’ (LWVUS) Position on Arms Control went into effect are particularly germane to this review.

1. The End of the Cold War and the Challenge of Existing Weapons: When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, both sides were left with nuclear weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The Soviet weapons systems and production sites were scattered around their former territory, in several newly independent states. During this time of political upheaval and economic duress, the possibility that weapons and related materials would be stolen and sold to other states or terrorists was widely assumed.

Recognizing this peril, the United States created the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program – informally called the Nunn-Lugar program – in 1991. This program has provided funds and expertise to help the former Soviet Union safeguard and dismantle its stockpiles of WMD, reemploy scientists and facilities in non-military research, and convert Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus to nuclear weapons free states. Targets were set for 2012 in a number of categories. A few have been met, but most are 70-93 percent complete.

Since 1991, the United States and the former Soviet Union have been reducing their nuclear stockpiles, under treaty arrangements. [Discussed in the paper on treaties.]

2. A New International Balance of Power and the Challenge of Proliferation to Additional States: During the Cold War there was a bipolar balance of power, and an East-West tension dominated geopolitics. Between 1945 and 1965, many former colonies gained independence. Many of these countries came to assert an independent, countervailing power – especially in the United Nations. With the end of the Cold War, the United States emerged as the single remaining superpower, but that position will probably be short-lived. Development and globalization have transformed the economies of many nations, which are now emerging as part of a new multipolar balance of power.
Since it entered into force in 1970, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has held proliferation in check. The central bargain in the NPT is that the non-nuclear weapons states (a) will not acquire nuclear weapons and (b) will submit to international verification of their compliance to this pledge. In exchange, the nuclear weapons states (a) will give the non-nuclear weapons states access to peaceful nuclear technologies and (b) will pursue disarmament agreements leading eventually to the elimination of their nuclear weapons. Non-compliance is occurring on both sides of the bargain, and this is predictably weakening the non-proliferation regime.

The nuclear weapons states have not lived up to the disarmament part of the bargain or to bans on nuclear weapons tests and on the production of fissile materials. This is one reason some non-nuclear weapons states are breaking their pledge not to acquire nuclear weapons. Another reason is that prestige has marked the nuclear weapons states, and some non-weapons states seek prestige in the new multipolar world by becoming nuclear powers.

Despite the signs of peril, one sign of promise occurred at the September 24th session of the UN Security Council for heads of state, chaired by President Obama, which “unanimously cosponsored and adopted a resolution committing to work toward a world without nuclear weapons and endorsing a broad framework of actions to reduce global nuclear dangers.”

The writers believe that probable proliferation to states and non-state actors threatens us with “a nuclear era that will be more precarious, psychologically disorienting, and economically even more costly than was Cold War deterrence.” They want to reinvigorate the vision of a world without nuclear weapons.

During the Cold War, instead of disarmament, deterrence was adopted as a means of achieving security. With deterrence, states arm themselves as heavily as possible, so fear of retaliation restrains their adversaries from attacking them. These statesmen do not think this strategy will work in the current context of a multipolar balance of power among states, and there is no indication that deterrence will work with non-state actors. While these statesmen have put disarmament on the public agenda, a debate about whether this is a realistic path to security is just getting underway.

4. Some Peace, Some War and the Challenge of Controlling Conventional Arms: On the positive side of the ledger, World War III has not occurred, nuclear bombs have not been used again, and Western Europe has experienced peace and comity after centuries of strife. On the negative side of the ledger, there have been many wars, hot spots have persisted for decades with occasional flare-ups, martial law and/or rule by warlords has become customary in some places, the numbers of refugees and internally displaced persons has steadily risen, a military-industrial complex has become an important element in many economies, international sales of conventional armaments flourish (with the United States leading in sales),
and illicit sales of conventional arms and WMD (or related materials) to terrorist states and non-state actors has been uncovered.

This geopolitical pattern, including some peace and some war, but no cases of resorting to nuclear weapons, is much clearer now than when the 1983 LWVUS Position on Arms Control was written.

Since 1983, international commissions, experts and bipartisan leaders have advocated for the elimination of nuclear weapons. In 1986, the General Secretary of the USSR, Mikhail Gorbachev, proposed a nuclear free world. At a summit meeting with President Reagan, the leaders agreed on elimination over a ten year period, but the agreement floundered when Reagan introduced a Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]. Both leaders, however, rejected deterrence as a suitable policy. In 1996, the World Court issued an Advisory Opinion urging “good faith” negotiations on nuclear disarmament with international control. By 2005, a former Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, urged ending the cold war policy, castigating it as immoral and illegal with high risk of an accidental launching of a nuclear attack.

Following is a list of major efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons:

- January 1946: A UN General Assembly resolution established a Commission to deal with problems caused by the discovery of atomic energy.

- March 1946: An Acheson-Lilienthal Report stated that the application of atomic energy to weapons of war gave mankind a means of destruction previously unknown; that no adequate military defense exists and no single nation could have a monopoly of it. It suggested: (a) international ownership and control of fissile materials, and research and development of atomic explosives, (b) an international agency to develop beneficial possibilities of nuclear energy for medical treatment and production of electricity, and construct, own, and operate useful

---

**THE ELIMINATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS: HISTORY AND DISARMAMENT**

**By Ann Hallan Lakhdhir; Edited by Anita Warmflash**

The paper starts with a statement of the League’s position since 1983: “As a long-term goal, the League supports the worldwide elimination of nuclear weapons.” The United States and the Soviet Union were expanding their arsenals of nuclear weapons and the League’s position seemed a remote possibility. Now, disarmament seems necessary as threats of proliferation, with the possibility of nuclear material falling into the hands of terrorists, increases.

Even before the world community saw the consequences of nuclear bombing at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the physicist Neils Bohr warned President Roosevelt that such a weapon would “completely change future conditions of warfare,” and would be “a perpetual menace to human security” without universal agreement to control nuclear production.

During the cold war between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., some viewed nuclear weapons an asset to intimidate the Soviet Union and discourage any designs to dominate Europe or use chemical or biological weapons if active conflict developed. In time, the U.S. (and the U.S.S.R.) came to see nuclear power as serving the goal of mutual deterrence.

The doctrine of mutual deterrence is increasingly doubted. The arguments against it are that it places the U.S. in a morally ambiguous position in claiming a right to possessing nuclear weapons while denying the right to nations such as Iran. In addition, weaker nations (e.g. Pakistan) claim their right to nuclear weapons in order to protect themselves against stronger nations (e.g. India). However, the doctrine is viewed as irrelevant in an age of terrorists, as it may be impossible to determine their location or to target only terrorists without killing many others.
types of atomic reactors and separation plants, and (c) granting an international agency authority to inspect nuclear reactors globally. This did not happen (The IAEA only has oversight of power plants, and not of fissile material.)

-August 1996: The Canberra Commission established by Australia issued a report suggesting a phased series of verified reductions to reassure nations that elimination was made securely. Transparency and verification were to be considered.

-November 1997: A model Nuclear Weapons Convention was offered as a framework for a treaty like those for Biological and Chemical Weapons.


-June 2006: The Foreign Minister of Sweden urged creation of a Commission on weapons of mass destruction and planning for security without nuclear weapons.

In addition, the present Secretary-General of the UN, Ban Ki-moon, expressed concern about the doctrine of deterrence and the possibility of contagion. The Science Advisor to the Obama Administration authored an article in April 1998 entitled, “Getting to Zero: Is Pursuing a Nuclear-Weapon Free World Too Difficult? Too Dangerous? Too Distracting?,” arguing for creating conditions that would make prohibition “desirable and feasible.” Ambassador Thomas Graham, U.S. Chief Negotiator for a number of twentieth century arms control agreements, offered a blueprint for the elimination of nuclear weapons in a speech sponsored by the League of Women Voters of Seattle in November 2007. In April 2009, in Prague, President Obama spoke of the US commitment to a world without nuclear weapons, promised to negotiate a new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with Russia, to pursue ratification by Congress of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and to seek a treaty to end production of fissile material.

Many in high political and military positions in the U.S. are still convinced that the U.S. requires nuclear weapons for its security and doubt the feasibility of constructing a regime to achieve the elimination of such weapons and ensure continued elimination. These issues are currently being discussed with many countries, including how to ensure security after elimination of such weapons, address the imbalances of conventional weapons among states and reassure those feeling threatened by nations with superior arsenals.
Relevant Treaty Summaries

The two treaties summarized below are at the center of the coming arms control debates and are central to U.S. strategic planning. [Other treaties are also discussed in the full paper, including the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the SALT talks, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, the SORT treaty, the Fissile Materials Cutoff Treaty, and the Treaty on Chemical and Biological Weapons.] A review and understanding of these two treaties will help to inform the discussions on U.S. national security.

Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I)

The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) was signed and ratified in 1991. The START Treaty placed limits on offensive weapons and specified limits to weapons and delivery systems and established conditions for verification procedures. The treaty also established significant accounting provisions, including on-site inspections and an accounting for all weapons, and it allowed for new methods of verification. One implication of the expiration of this treaty in 2009 is that there are now no operational verification provisions between Russia and the United States.

The START negotiations were complicated by President Reagan’s introduction of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) in 1983. The resulting delays and restarts led to an immense nuclear weapons build up; about 32,000 U.S. and 45,000 U.S.S.R. strategic and tactical warheads formed the baseline for the START Treaty. Then, shortly after the signing, the Soviet Union dissolved and several newly independent countries were in possession of nuclear weapons and materials. By 1994 all the countries involved became signatories and ratified the treaty, and by 2001 all former U.S.S.R. weapons had been removed from Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine and transferred to Russia. The drawdown of weapons proceeded in both the U.S. and Russia – amounting to reductions of 30-40%.

The START treaty required limits on the number of strategic weapons (6000 long-range warheads for each side) and on the number of strategic delivery systems such as bombers and land-based and submarine-based missiles (1600 total for each side). Today, the U.S. has 3,696 and Russia has 4,237 deployed strategic warheads. Including tactical weapons, the totals are estimated at 10,000 and 15,000 respectively. Both sides reduced the numbers of strategic delivery systems, (including the destruction of 365 B-52s by the United States).

In July 2009 Presidents Obama and Medvedev signed a memo of understanding in preparation for negotiating a new treaty in which both sides would stipulate reducing the number of deployed warheads to 1500 – 1675 and the number of delivery systems to 500 – 1100. A new treaty has been negotiated and is now before the Senate for ratification.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)

The objective of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is to ban nuclear testing everywhere on the planet, including atmospheric, underwater, and underground testing, in order to curb development of weapons (new or improved) and to prevent harm to humans and the environment. After many failed attempts, the CTBT was negotiated between 1994 and 1996 in Geneva, however the treaty has not gone into force. There are forty-four states which must sign and ratify the CTBT before it can go into effect. China, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (D.P.R.K.), Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Pakistan, and the U.S. have not completed this requirement.

Between 1945 and 1996, the U.S., U.S.S.R., France, U.K. and China conducted over 2,000 nuclear tests. The major nuclear powers have all participated in a moratorium since that time. Even
though the U.S. has not ratified the Treaty, the last U.S. atmospheric test in Nevada was in 1962 and the last underground test was in 1992. The U.S. has continued so-called “subcritical testing” short of explosions as part of the protocol to validate the reliability of the aging nuclear arsenal.

India and Pakistan were not signatories to the NPT and they conducted underground tests in 1998. The D.P.R.K. was a signatory to the NPT but withdrew earlier in this decade and conducted tests in 2006 and 2009. All of these tests were detected by methods deployed for the CTBT Organization, which was created in 1996 to develop and deploy verification technology, even though the treaty is not in force. Supported by proportional contributions from states, the CTBT Organization has developed a verification regime consisting of 337 facilities located globally that constantly monitor for nuclear explosions. Over 70% of these facilities are operational and the collected data is forwarded to the International Data Center in Vienna via a system of satellites and ground communication links. Reports are issued within hours of detection.

The U.S. has signed the CTBT but has not ratified it. The Senate rejected ratification in 1999, and the Obama Administration has indicated that it plans to submit it to the Senate later this year when the expiring START treaty is extended or modified.

The Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States established in 2008 completed its report in 2009 without being able to arrive at a consensus position on the CTBT, largely due to the differing geopolitical outlooks of the members. However, they did recommend a comprehensive net assessment of benefits, costs, and risks that will inform the Senate deliberations. This commission report will serve to frame the early stages of the debates about whether national security will be well served by limitations in the proposed treaties.

Proponents for ratification argue that:

1. Ratification would place the U.S in a leadership position to persuade or push other countries like D.P.R.K., India and Pakistan to sign;

2. Nuclear proliferation and new weapon development would be limited because without testing, design and weapons fabrication could not be verified;

3. Ratification would not compromise security because the U.S. “Stockpile Stewardship Program” maintains the current nuclear capability without physical detonations through subcritical testing and maintenance of technical personnel and facilities.

Opponents argue that:

1. The reliability of nuclear weapons is in doubt if not tested;

2. U.S. security is threatened because “others” are modernizing their weapons;

3. Despite the verification protocols, nations can avoid detection of nuclear testing through extraordinary means such as sensory isolation of underground test tunnels.
National Missile Defense systems are built to protect a country against incoming missiles, intercepting them at any point on the trajectory no matter where they come from: land, sea or air.

During WWII the U.S. military realized the need for missile defense systems, and study and research began soon thereafter. The military has had to deal with varying challenges: from the U.S.S.R.’s Sputnik in 1957 to rogue nations such as North Korea and non-sovereign, often terrorist groups today.

In 1999 President Clinton signed the National Missile Defense Act, which made it “the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as is technologically possible an effective National Missile Defense system capable of defending the territory of the United States against limited ballistic missile attack[s].” That is the current U.S. policy.

In the late 20th century, the goal of the U.S. National Missile Defense has been to prevent an attack on this country. After first withdrawing from the ABM treaty which prohibited it, President G.W. Bush’s administration built long-range defense capabilities in Alaska, California and Hawaii.

In addition the G.W. Bush administration proposed a Ground-Based Midcourse Defense in Eastern Europe to defend against an Iranian threat, and requested the use of facilities elsewhere in Europe for deploying operational ballistic missile defense systems. The Congressional Budget Office considered these proposals controversial, and offered other options including interceptors on U.S. Navy ships, and two kinds of interceptors to be on mobile launchers on U.S. bases in Germany and Turkey.

The Obama Administration canceled the controversial plans for the missile defense system in Eastern Europe, as the agreement had not been signed by the European countries involved and was outspokenly opposed by Russia. However, without bases in Eastern Europe, the administration still intends to “field more of our most capable theater missile defense systems.”

Limited testing of missile defense systems has taken place from time to time. Not all have been successful. For example, since 2002 a number of Ground-Based Midcourse defense intercept flight tests have taken place with mixed results. As a result, in June 2009 Congress put certain restrictions on approved funding. Also, the Secretary of Defense was directed to pursue testing, procurement and deployment of an alternative integrated missile defense system to protect Europe from all types of ballistic missiles.

In May 2009, a joint US-Russian research organization report concluded that Iran would likely not be able to acquire both nuclear weapons and delivery systems with the next five years, and the [Eastern European] system proposed by the Bush Administration would be ineffective against Iranian missiles outfitted with decoys and other countermeasures.

Questions remain as to the effectiveness of any missile defense system. In addition some, including Dr. Hans Blix, point out that missile defense systems are “not entirely defensive in orientation … as radars, surveillance systems, and even interceptors can also be used for offensive military purposes.”

The cost is high: in recent years, Congress appropriated about $9-10 billion for all missile defense activities.

In conclusion, the U.S. missile defense systems are a work in progress. Though they may provide a level of security, there are a number of qualifications. Among them are: test results are mixed, a decision to launch must be made in minutes and must be ready 24/7, terrorists and political enemies are not a stable commodity and
therefore missile systems don’t offer security from an area not identified, building defense systems may influence negotiations on various treaties meant to limit the threat of weapons of mass destruction, and finally the cost of missile defense systems should be weighed against other needs.

STATE AND NON-STATE ACTORS
BY DONALD TURNER; EDITED BY ELLEN BERG

Nuclear weapons expansion pertains to (1) to the expansion of their exiting arsenals by nuclear weapons states, (2) to the new development of nuclear weapons by states which do not have such weapons, and (3) to the acquisition of nuclear weapons by non-state actors. Nuclear weapons development began during WWII, and in the early years was sponsored and funded by individual governments working to develop their own arsenals. By the time the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) opened for signing in 1968, five states had nuclear arsenals. In order of acquisition they are: United States, Soviet Union (now Russia), United Kingdom, France and China. These are identified as “nuclear weapons states” by the NPT. There has been limited proliferation since then, to India, Pakistan, probably Israel, and, most recently, North Korea. It is thought that proliferation to Iran is in the offing.

State Proliferation Progression
This proliferation has occurred despite international efforts to prevent it, including the prohibition in the NPT and the monitoring of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The weakness of these safeguards is that they rely considerably on individual governments candidly reporting that they have created or acquired fissile material which they are using to build weapons. Israel is widely believed to possess nuclear weapons despite its government’s refusal to confirm or deny such possession. As one of just a few nations that has not signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, it is not subject to the inspections non-nuclear weapons states routinely undergo.

When countries source the fuel indigenously and enrich it in government facilities, the proliferation process remains clandestine and may go unreported. Alternatively, when countries secure fissile material, other components, of know-how on the black market, the proliferation can also be hidden from sight until the bomb testing phase. Testing is more discernible, or is even announced, but by then proliferation has occurred.

Dual Use Technology
In state driven nuclear weapons proliferation, most of the spread appears concentrated around dual use materials that can be utilized for nuclear reactors to produce electricity or for weapons. The enriched uranium used in most reactors is not concentrated enough to build a bomb. However, many of the plants and technology used to enrich uranium for power generation can be used to make the highly enriched uranium needed to build a bomb. Nuclear reactors also have the ability to produce plutonium fissile material and while the plutonium resulting from normal reactor fueling cycles is less than ideal for weapons use, a usable weapon can be produced from it.

Technology Proliferation
While in-house development of nuclear weapons programs is an option available to state actors, there have also been incidents where technology has spread through black market developments. One such incident that led to the spread of much information and material is related to Abdul Qadeer Khan (A.Q. Khan), convicted of disseminating nuclear weapons technology as early as 1989 to Iran and Libya and of ties to North Korea. On January 25, 2004 Pakistani investigators reported that Khan and Mohammed Farooq, a high-ranking manager at KRL, had provided unauthorized technical assistance to Iran’s nuclear weapons program in the late 1980s and early 1990s, allegedly in exchange for tens of millions of dollars. General Mirza Aslam Beg, a Chief of Army Staff at the time, was also said by Kahn to have authorized the technology transfers to Iran.
Non-State Progression

While much is known about the ability of states to produce clandestine programs to create nuclear arsenals, there is very little known about the ability of non-state actors and groups to continue proliferation of these materials. Many non-state actors attempting to acquire nuclear materials are difficult to locate or dismantle since they may operate as multiple groups with few ties to any central organization. Moreover, there is not much literature on organizations attempting to acquire nuclear weapons.

Security Risks

There have been many publicly acknowledged attempts by individuals and groups to plan nuclear attacks or to steal nuclear weapons materials. In June 2002 U.S. citizen Jose Padilla was arrested for allegedly planning a radiological attack on the city of Chicago; however, he was never charged with such conduct. He was instead convicted of charges that he conspired to “murder, kidnap and maim” people overseas. In November 2006, MI-5 warned that Islamic terrorists, specifically al-Qaida, were planning on using nuclear weapons against cities in the United Kingdom by obtaining the bombs via clandestine means. In some cases, the idea of proliferation is so pervasive that it nearly becomes part of the culture as in post Soviet Russia where some plots to sell materials have been foiled.

In the former USSR there have also been a number of security risks associated with the ability of private groups to obtain nuclear materials. Of particular concern are the break-away Soviet states that still contain large, sometimes undocumented quantities of nuclear materials. In August 2002 the United States launched a program to track and secure enriched uranium from 24 Soviet-style reactors in 16 countries, in order to reduce the risk of the materials falling into the hands of terrorists or “rogue states.”

Most shockingly, there have also been reports of armed civilians attempting to break into nuclear power plants in foreign countries, particularly the well publicized case at the Pelindaba nuclear facility near the Hartbeespoort Dam in South Africa.

These security risks provide high value targets for non-state actors looking to acquire these technologies. As part of a comprehensive plan for eradicating proliferation of nuclear weapons, special attention needs to be focused on these risks, since non-state actors are more likely to utilize nuclear weapons once they have acquired them because they have a unique advantage – that of not being easily identifiable or facing nuclear retaliation.
In the 20th century, virtually all wars and armed conflicts, whether internal or inter-state, have been fought with conventional weapons and have employed delivery systems that are increasingly technologically advanced. Nuclear weapons have been used in war only twice, although the U.S. military continues to use depleted uranium to harden conventional projectiles in conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Since the First World War, chemical weapons have seldom been used, with the notable exception of the fire bombings of WW II and the Iran-Iraq War of the 1980s. The proliferation of conventional weapons continues unabated with the United States as the leading exporter. The victims of wars in the 20th century are predominantly, and increasingly, civilians. (80% or more for casualties: killed or injured). Combat in insurgencies and internal rebellions is frequently in urban areas.

**Conventional Arms Control Treaties**

Control of conventional weapons is approached through conventions or agreements between governments, addressing various types of weapons or regulating the flow of weapons and their licensing. In response to the gases used in WW I, there resulted in 1925 the Geneva Protocol on poisonous gases prohibiting the use of such gases and biological warfare. The U.S. signed the protocol on condition that such weapons not be used against it. Since the 1925 Geneva Protocol, no noteworthy arms control treaties prohibiting conventional weaponry, inclusive of chemical and biological weapons, were agreed upon until 1972. Conventional arms control agreements are noted below with the status of U.S. involvement.

- **United Nations Registry on Conventional Weapons** - U.S. Signatory. The Register attempts to make transparent the shipment and holding of conventional weapons. Like Russia and China, the U.S. is either unwilling or unable to supply the register with reporting on transfers of small arms and light weapons.

- **Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction (BTWC), 1972.** Signed and ratified by the U.S.

- **Convention on Prohibition or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be Deemed Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW Convention), 1981.** The U.S. signed and ratified the Convention with only the first two of five related protocols prohibiting (a) the use of weapons that injure by undetectable fragments and (b) the use of mines, booby traps and other devices, respectively, but refrained from agreeing to the use of incendiary weapons and blinding laser weapons and from recognizing the need for measures to minimize the risks of explosive remnants of war.

- **Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), 1990, signed and ratified by the U.S and other NATO allies along with Russia.** Russia has suspended its participation since late 2007. This treaty attempts to control the expansion of weaponry and forces in order to defuse tensions between the U.S.-NATO and Russia (previously the Warsaw Pact).

- **Convention on the Prohibition of Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction (CWC), 1993 signed and ratified by the U.S. but not ratified by Israel and Myanmar, among others.**

- **Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives, and Other Related Materials, 1997.** This convention attempts to deter insurgencies and armed opposition and to thwart organized crime from influencing legitimate governments. The U.S. signed but did not ratify.
- Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines (APM) and on their destruction, 1997. The U.S. along with China, Russia and others refrained from signing.

- Inter-American Convention on Transparency in Conventional Weapons Acquisitions, 1999. The U.S. signed but has not yet ratified this treaty.

- Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM), 2008. The U.S. along with China, Russia and others have not signed. Cluster munitions have explosive effects from small bomblets or other type weapons cast over a wide area and are anti-personnel in nature.

The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), established in 1991, includes 56 member countries from North America (Canada and the U.S.) and Western Europe, Central Asia, the Caucasus, and Southeastern Europe. It is the largest regional security organization, which focused on the control and destruction of surplus weapons after the end of the Cold War to prevent illegal transfer, among others.

**Conventional Arms Transfers**

The UN Register of Conventional Arms Database 1992-2006 has a wealth of information about arms transactions between states, but widespread involvement by major arms exporters in providing data is deficient. The UN is presently working on an internationally binding treaty for its member countries to control the import, export and transfer of conventional arms.

In 1998, the European Union established a legally binding Code of Conduct on arms exports. This dealt with not only the transfer of military equipment and technology to non-member countries, but also applied to intra-member transfer, and established common criteria in its application and required members to assess the risk of re-export in case of recipient non-member countries.
Unit Meetings

DECEMBER UNIT INFORMATION

The month of December is traditionally “unit choice” month at the League of Women Voters of Seattle. Therefore, we have not provided discussion questions for the forum topic, nuclear disarmament, but units that choose to explore the subject on their own will find plenty of stimulating material at the forum and in the readings in this Voter. The University House and King County North units plan to hold a discussion.

As indicated in the schedule below, many of the units have planned special events for their meetings. See pages 9-11 for more details on some of the plans.

The Kirkland/Redmond unit will not meet in December.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, December 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTHBEND</strong> — Marian Wolfe/Susan Jones</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Lila Bulen, 3716 Cascadia Ave. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hedgwolfe@aol.com">hedgwolfe@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:susan@monckjones.com">susan@monckjones.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITOL HILL/MONTALAKE</strong> — Jan O’Connor/Zita Cook</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>7:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Vicky Downs, 909 E. Newton #D9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:oconnor.js@gmail.com">oconnor.js@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Special Program</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuesday, December 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BELLEVUE</strong> — Bonnie Rimawi</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Bellevue Public Library, Rm. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:bonnierim@aol.com">bonnierim@aol.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday, December 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIEW RIDGE</strong> — Gail Winberg</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>12:45 p.m.</td>
<td>Gail Winberg, 6004 NE 60th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:winbergeng@q.com">winbergeng@q.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Speaker</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUEEN ANNE/MAGNOLIA/BALLARD EVE.</strong> — Karen Adair</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Teddy Geokesas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:adairk@seanet.com">adairk@seanet.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>4500 Palatine Ave. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Speaker</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH END AFTERNOON</strong> — Helen St. John</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Virginia Nielsen, Cristwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:hbstjohn@gmail.com">hbstjohn@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retirement Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N. 190th St. &amp; Fremont Ave.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bldg. B, (206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Luncheon</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, December 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISSAQUAH DAY</strong> — Margaret Austin</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>11:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Susan Cotterell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:Margaret.Austin@comcast.net">Margaret.Austin@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td></td>
<td>580 E. Sunset Way, Issaquah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Luncheon</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MERCER ISLAND</strong></td>
<td>Lucy Copass/Cynthia Howe</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lucyco@speakeasy.org">lucyco@speakeasy.org</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:howe.john@comcast.net">howe.john@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSITY HOUSE</strong></td>
<td>Charles and Nancy Perkins</td>
<td><a href="mailto:perkwz@msn.com">perkwz@msn.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHORELINE</strong></td>
<td>Juliet Beard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:juliet@windermere.com">juliet@windermere.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAYVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Peg Williams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pwilliams@brc-res.com">pwilliams@brc-res.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST HILL</strong></td>
<td>Jeannette Kahlenberg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kahlenb@gmail.com">kahlenb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST SEATTLE</strong></td>
<td>Ethel Williams/Hazel Schiffer</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Hazelms@drizzle.com">Hazelms@drizzle.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N. KING COUNTY</strong></td>
<td>Marjorie Hawkes/Raelene Gold</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mshawkesis@gmail.com">mshawkesis@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:raelene@seanet.com">raelene@seanet.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH CENTRAL</strong></td>
<td>Jan Orlando</td>
<td><a href="mailto:orlanre@aol.com">orlanre@aol.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALLARD/MAGNOLIA</strong></td>
<td>Kerry Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUEEN ANNE DAY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAYVIEW</strong></td>
<td>Peg Williams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pwilliams@brc-res.com">pwilliams@brc-res.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONDAY, DECEMBER 13</strong></td>
<td>Jeannette Kahlenberg</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kahlenb@gmail.com">kahlenb@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUESDAY, DECEMBER 14</strong></td>
<td>Ethel Williams/Hazel Schiffer</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 15</strong></td>
<td>Marjorie Hawkes/Raelene Gold</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mshawkesis@gmail.com">mshawkesis@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THURSDAY, DECEMBER 16</strong></td>
<td>Jan Orlando</td>
<td><a href="mailto:orlanre@aol.com">orlanre@aol.com</a></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SATURDAY, DECEMBER 18</strong></td>
<td>Kerry Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td>(206) 329-4848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Board & Committee Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Executive Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td><strong>President</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td><strong>1st V.P. Action</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td><strong>2nd V.P. Membership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td><strong>3rd V.P. Public Relations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td><strong>4th V.P. Voter Editor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td><strong>Treasurer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td><strong>Secretary</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td><strong>Voter Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td><strong>Outreach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td><strong>Unit Coordinator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td><strong>Voter Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td><strong>Communications</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td><strong>Voter Service</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Education Fund Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td><strong>Co-President/Treasurer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td><strong>Co-President</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td><strong>Secretary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td><strong>Director</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Off-Board Positions

**CIS Coordinator**
- Cynthia Howe | (206) 329-4848 | howe.john@comcast.net |

### Committees

**Civics Education**
- Dana Twilight | (206) 329-4848 | dctwight@mac.com |

**Economics & Taxation**
- Nora Leech | (206) 329-4848 | nleech2002@yahoo.com |

**Education**
- Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis | (206) 329-4848 | terrylucy2u@comcast.net |

**Social Justice Committee**
- Kathleen Randall | (206) 329-4848 | kathleenr8@gmail.com |

**Immigration**
- Barbara Reid | (206) 329-4848 | barbereid@yahoo.com |
- Barbara Yasui | (206) 329-4848 | daruma52@msn.com |

**International Relations**
- Ellen Berg | (206) 329-4848 | ellenzberg@msn.com |

**Land Use**
- Karen Kane | (206) 329-4848 | kanek@iopener.net |

**Reclaimed Water Study Committee**
- Denise Smith | (206) 329-4848 | issaquahsmith@msn.com |

**Transportation**
- Janet Winans | (206) 329-4848 | janetwinans@earthlink.net |
LWV SEATTLE: DECEMBER FORUM

Nuclear Disarmament and the Future

Wykoff Auditorium, Engineering Bldg.
Seattle University
Seattle

Thursday, December 9
7:00 p.m.

Speaker:

Ambassador Thomas Graham, Jr.,
University of Washington faculty, author, and former general counsel
and acting director of the U.S.
Arms Control and Disarmament
Agency

Additional information about the location
is available through a link on our website
or you can call the school for directions at
206-296-6000.

All forums are open to the public.