

From: Murraylou2@cs.com

Date: Fri, 6 Apr 2001 17:09:54 EDT

Subject: Re: Nuclear posture review

To: mupj@igc.org

X-Mailer: CompuServe 2000 6.0 for Windows US sub 352

<x-html><HTML><FONT FACE=arial,helvetica><FONT SIZE=2>Why not release an interfaith position paper with alternatives immediately

<BR>after the Bush administration publishes its own?

<BR>

<BR>Murray Polner</FONT></HTML>

</x-html>

Date: Sat, 7 Apr 2001 08:19:23 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Egbert Lawrence <egbertl4pj@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Re: Nuclear posture review comments from Larry Egbert  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Cc: UUAWO@aol.com

Howard,

Thanks for this outline. I would (at this time and before our discussion Tuesday) suggest we make a statement and get our religious leaders to sign. There is a huge tradition here, as you say, but repetition is crucial. Sometimes, we need to repeat, REPEAT, REE-PEE-T!! And, after repeating, say it again.

Besides, most denominations have peasants running around doing the grunt work so the additional labor involved for the leaders is negligible.

See you Tuesday. PEACE! Larry  
--- "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org> wrote:  
> To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament  
>  
> Dear Colleagues:  
>  
> Since our January meeting I have been in  
> conversation with Lisa Wright  
> (National Council of Churches) and Pat Conover  
> (United Church of Christ)  
> about the possibility of a statement by religious  
> leaders on the U.S.  
> nuclear posture. Although they have both been too  
> busy with other  
> responsibilities to devote much time to this matter,  
> they have given me  
> comments on successive drafts of a statement. The  
> latest version is  
> attached. At our April 10 meeting we will discuss  
> what to do with it.  
>  
> The Department of Defense is in the midst of a  
> nuclear posture review with  
> a mandate to report to Congress by December 2001.  
> This is tied in with an  
> overall strategic review that the Bush  
> Administration has underway.  
> Guesses are that results of this review will begin  
> to be released in May or  
> June. Possibly the official nuclear posture review  
> will be completed and  
> released in June or July, well before the  
> congressional deadline.  
>  
> Several civic sector organizations, such as Union of  
> Concerned Scientists,

> Federation of American Scientists, and Center for  
> Defense Information, are  
> developing a statement on the U.S. nuclear posture  
> for release in May or June.  
>  
> If we are going to have any influence on the debate  
> on nuclear posture, we  
> would also need to get something out by the latter  
> part of May or early  
> June. Among the options we might consider are the  
> following.  
>  
> (1) Do nothing with . Among the reasons are (a) we  
> don't have time to do  
> this properly, (b) there are too many statements  
> floating around now for  
> heads of communion to sign (such as on Vieques, the  
> federal budget, and  
> land mines), (c) the views of the religious  
> community on nuclear  
> disarmament are already known.  
>  
> (2) During the remainder of April participants in  
> the Interfaith Committee  
> for Nuclear Disarmament could refine my draft. The  
> revised draft could  
> then be circulated to heads of communion the first  
> two or three weeks in  
> May (after these other statements are out of the  
> way). The statement could  
> be released at a news conference toward the end of  
> May or early June.  
> Participants in the news conference would be  
> interfaith. Among others Bob  
> Edgar would be an important participant because of  
> his position as general  
> secretary of the National Council of Churches and  
> his 20 year involvement  
> with nuclear disarmament issues.  
>  
> (3) We could gather a collection of individual  
> letters from heads of  
> communion, stating the denomination's position on  
> nuclear disarmament and  
> making recommendations on the U.S. nuclear posture.  
> Presumably these  
> letters would be drafted by staff involved in the  
> Interfaith Committee.  
> The letters could be released as a package toward  
> the end of May or early  
> June.  
>  
> We will discuss these alternatives at the April 10  
> meeting. If you can't

> be there and want to offer your views in advance,  
> please reply to all.  
>  
> Shalom,  
> Howard  
>

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/msword  
> name=abolish.344.doc; x-mac-type=42494E41;  
> x-mac-creator=4D535744

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

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

---

Do You Yahoo!?

Get email at your own domain with Yahoo! Mail.

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

Date: Sat, 07 Apr 2001 15:28:55 -0500  
From: lmehall@attglobal.net  
Reply-To: lmehall@attglobal.net  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.04 (Win95; I)  
To: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Cancellation

Dear Howard,

I was anticipating your note after my mom's conversation with Carlee about the death of this relative. I am sorry you are not coming! I did have a great lunch menu planned. Our lake is full, and everything is beautiful out here! You will have to bring Carlee another time. We are off to 4:00 p.m. mass! Take Care! Lynette

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

Dear Lynette,

We regret to inform you that we have cancelled our Illinois trip for Easter weekend. Therefore, we won't be stopping by to see you.

Carlee's Swedish relatives have cancelled their trip. One of their sons drowned a couple of weeks ago, so they decided not to travel.

So we'll have to wait to the Hallman reunion to see you and get caught upon all you and your family are doing.

Howard

From: HolRonFost@aol.com  
Date: Sat, 7 Apr 2001 21:22:42 EDT  
Subject: Re: VIM project  
To: mupj@igc.org  
X-Mailer: AOL 6.0 for Windows US sub 10520

<x-html><HTML><FONT FACE=arial,Helvetica><FONT SIZE=2>Thanks for the follow up -- I'll pass on this information to some churches  
<BR>that had been inquiring about DC mission projects.  
<BR>  
<BR>Ron</FONT></HTML>  
</x-html>

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

Dear Mary,

A query about motel space for the reunion. Our daughter, Joy, has become engaged. She wants to bring her fiancé and his two children from a previous marriage to the reunion to join her and her son, Matthew. I had previously booked three rooms for our family at the Comfort Inn in Black Mountain. I called to request another room but found no vacancy. We'll get something elsewhere. However, do you know of any one who has had a change of plans and might free up a room at the Comfort Inn?

Our reservations are for three nights, Thursday-Saturday. Carlee and I will be there by Thursday, if not earlier. Our daughters probably won't make it until Friday, but I'm going to hold on to the Thursday night reservations for now. Mary Hurrel and Mary Hallman are coming early and might need a room on Thursday. I'll eventually cancel what I don't need, but one of them may be available on Thursday in case a Hallman needs a room that night.

We're looking forward to this gathering and seeing all of you.

Howard

From: MMBuegg@aol.com  
Date: Sat, 7 Apr 2001 23:57:06 EDT  
Subject: Re: A query  
To: mupj@igc.org  
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 128

Howard, I have sent your letter on to Ed who knows more about housing than I do. I think Ed has the Email address of everybody so you might send them an email asking if there is an extra room among the gang. don't give up any rooms however as they will get harder and harder to come by. mmb

Walter and Mary Miller Brueggemann  
4 Downshire Lane  
Decatur, GA 30033-1414

Tel 404/327-9159

From: MMBuegg@aol.com  
Date: Sun, 8 Apr 2001 12:02:45 EDT  
Subject: Re: A query  
To: mupj@igc.org  
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 128

Dear Howard:

I am going to write all the cousins when I get the email addresses from Ed and ask them not to let go of any rooms as requests for more rooms are there and the motel is full. I will also call the Comfort Inn and ask them to give us any rooms that are canceled.

We have gotten word that Edgar is not doing well at all. I can imagine that they had made motel reservations but it does not seem right to ask them about them right now. But in a group message I think it will be OK to say to everyone do not let go of your reservations. What do you think about that?  
mmb

Walter and Mary Miller Brueggemann  
4 Downshire Lane  
Decatur, GA 30033-1414

Tel 404/327-9159

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022

Date: Sun, 08 Apr 2001 21:16:03 -0400

Subject: rooms at Comfort Inn

From: Edward Brueggemann <edbruegge@mediaone.net>

To: Jeanette Hallman <vhall110@southwind.net>,

Edgar Hallman <halledee@aol.com>, Brian Hallman <bhallman@slb.com>,

Gordon Hallman <JoanHallman@hotmail.com>,

Jim Brueggemann <jbbruegg@aol.com>,

John Brueggemann <jbruegge@skidmore.edu>,

Debby Guarino <Guari@mediaone.net>, David Sanborn <bdq@mediaone.net>,

Howard Anderson <howardfran@yahoo.com>, Terri McQueen <maxandlil@yahoo.com>,

Howard Hallman <mupj@igc.org>, Don Knutson <dknutsonr@aol.com>,

Elisha/ Paul Churchill <paulnlish@aol.com>,

Eric / Mitzi Hallman <jems0615@aol.com>, Joy Hallman <jlhallman@aol.com>,

Ellen and Brian Burns <ea.burns@aol.com>,

Lisa and David Briggs <lisahbriggs@msn.com>,

Katrina Hallman <katrinaeh@yahoo.com>,

Jennifer and Jeff Moore <jenhallman\_moore@yahoo.com>,

Jeanette and Ken Spencer <SPENCERSAGE@aol.com>,

Sara Vettraino <mvettraino@aol.com>, Carol Pepper <cpepper@towerhill.org>,

Bruce Hallman <hallman7@juno.com>, Diane Gniadek <pgni@aol.com>,

David Hallman <dhall29106@aol.com>, Suzanne Knutson <sknutsone@aol.com>,

Karen and Greg Walaitis <walaitis@uswest.net>,

John and Corine Knutson <knutson6@juno.com>,

Ben Spencer <spencbe@opp.51.org>

Dear Cousins,

April 8,2001

Already we have heard that the Comfort Inn is full and there is a family who wish they had another room for more family that is coming. So this note is to urge you not to give up a room but send us a note by email or snail mail that you have an extra room available at the Comfort Inn in Black Mountain, NC

Specifically Howard Hallman (mupj@igc.org) is looking for an additional room for his family.

Hope this will be a blessed holy week for each of you.

Mary B.

Walter and Mary Miller Brueggemann

4 Downshire Lane

Decatur, GA 30033-1414

Tel 404/327-9159

March 17, 2001

Bishop S. Clifton Ives  
900 Washington Street, E  
Charleston, WV 25301

Dear Bishop Ives:

I understand that you are a member of a committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that is considering ways to update the prophetic "In Defense of Creation" pastoral letter and foundation document issued in 1986. That's an excellent idea, for conditions have changed but the challenge remains.

Our organization formed in 1987 in response to the bishops' call for prayer and action on this issue. We are actively engaged in education and advocacy on nuclear disarmament. We submitted the resolution entitled "Saying No to Deterrence" (pp. 782-785 in *The Book of Resolution, 2000s*) and shepherded it through General Conference.

As background for your work, I would like to share several items with you. (1) Practical steps for nuclear disarmament from the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This includes a commitment by the nuclear-weapon states to "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals". (2) A "Statement on Nuclear Disarmament, NATO Policy and the Churches" adopted by the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. It picks up on the Final Document as I hope you will consider doing. (3) A "Religious Leaders' Appeal to President Bush to De-Alert Nuclear Weapons". (4) A letter to President Bush from religious leaders on national missile defense. The last two provide a faith perspective on these important issues.

I serve as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, and I relate to civil-sector organizations working for nuclear disarmament. I also work closely with staff of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. Therefore, if you would like further background information to assist your committee, please let me know.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

March 17, 2001

Bishop Ray W. Chamberlain, Jr.  
P.O. Box 32939  
Knoxville, TN 37930

Dear Bishop Chamberlain:

I understand that you are a member of a committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that is considering ways to update the prophetic "In Defense of Creation" pastoral letter and foundation document issued in 1986. That's an excellent idea, for conditions have changed but the challenge remains.

Our organization formed in 1987 in response to the bishops' call for prayer and action on this issue. We are actively engaged in education and advocacy on nuclear disarmament. We submitted the resolution entitled "Saying No to Deterrence" (pp. 782-785 in *The Book of Resolution, 2000s*) and shepherded it through General Conference.

As background for your work, I would like to share several items with you. (1) Practical steps for nuclear disarmament from the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This includes a commitment by the nuclear-weapon states to "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals". (2) A "Statement on Nuclear Disarmament, NATO Policy and the Churches" adopted by the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. It picks up on the Final Document as I hope you will consider doing. (3) A "Religious Leaders' Appeal to President Bush to De-Alert Nuclear Weapons". (4) A letter to President Bush from religious leaders on national missile defense. The last two provide a faith perspective on these important issues.

I serve as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, and I relate to civil-sector organizations working for nuclear disarmament. I also work closely with staff of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. Therefore, if you would like further background information to assist your committee, please let me know.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

March 17, 2001

Bishop Beverly Shamana  
P.O. Box 980250  
West Sacramento, CA 95798

Dear Bishop Shamana:

I understand that you are a member of a committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that is considering ways to update the prophetic "In Defense of Creation" pastoral letter and foundation document issued in 1986. That's an excellent idea, for conditions have changed but the challenge remains.

Our organization formed in 1987 in response to the bishops' call for prayer and action on this issue. We are actively engaged in education and advocacy on nuclear disarmament. We submitted the resolution entitled "Saying No to Deterrence" (pp. 782-785 in *The Book of Resolution, 2000s*) and shepherded it through General Conference.

As background for your work, I would like to share several items with you. (1) Practical steps for nuclear disarmament from the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This includes a commitment by the nuclear-weapon states to "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals". (2) A "Statement on Nuclear Disarmament, NATO Policy and the Churches" adopted by the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. It picks up on the Final Document as I hope you will consider doing. (3) A "Religious Leaders' Appeal to President Bush to De-Alert Nuclear Weapons". (4) A letter to President Bush from religious leaders on national missile defense. The last two provide a faith perspective on these important issues.

I serve as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, and I relate to civil-sector organizations working for nuclear disarmament. I also work closely with staff of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. Therefore, if you would like further background information to assist your committee, please let me know.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

March 17, 2001

Bishop William B. Oden  
P.O. Box 600127  
Dallas, TX 75360

Dear Bishop Oden:

You may recall that we met last June at the Washington National Cathedral when the joint statement of religious and military leaders was released. I understand that now you have appointed a committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops to update the prophetic "In Defense of Creation" pastoral letter and foundation document issued in 1986. That's an excellent idea, for conditions have changed but the challenge remains.

Our organization formed in 1987 in response to the bishops' call for prayer and action on this issue. We are actively engaged in education and advocacy on nuclear disarmament. We submitted the resolution entitled "Saying No to Deterrence" (pp. 782-785 in *The Book of Resolution, 2000s*) and shepherded it through General Conference. We work closely with staff of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, with other denominations, and with civil-sector organizations. I serve as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Because I am immersed in nuclear disarmament activities, I have taken the liberty of sending to Bishops Ives, Chamberlain, and Shamana some background material that I would also like to share with you. (1) Practical steps for nuclear disarmament from the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This includes a commitment by the nuclear-weapon states to "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals". (2) A "Statement on Nuclear Disarmament, NATO Policy and the Churches" adopted by the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. It picks up on the Final Document as I hope you will consider doing. (3) A "Religious Leaders' Appeal to President Bush to De-Alert Nuclear Weapons". (4) A letter to President Bush from religious leaders on national missile defense. The last two provide a faith perspective on these important issues.

Bishop William B. Oden  
March 17, 2001  
Page two.

If I can be of further assistance to you and the committee, please let me know.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

March 17, 2001

Robin Ringler  
United Methodist General Board  
of Church and Society  
100 Maryland Avenue, NE  
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Robin:

I was glad to hear about the committee of bishops seeking to update "In Defense of Creation".

In case it might help their work I have taken the liberty of sending to Bishops Ives, Chamberlain, and Shamana and also to Bishop Oden the enclosed background material. (1) Practical steps for nuclear disarmament from the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This includes a commitment by the nuclear-weapon states to "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals". (2) A "Statement on Nuclear Disarmament, NATO Policy and the Churches" adopted by the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. It picks up on the Final Document.

I also sent them (3) A "Religious Leaders' Appeal to President Bush to De-Alert Nuclear Weapons". (4) A letter to President Bush from religious leaders on national missile defense. These you have.

If you know of any other background information they need and I can supply, please let me know.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

March 19, 2001

Mr. Charles B. Curtis, President  
Nuclear Threat Initiative  
1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Mr. Curtis:

In light of the apparent intent of the Bush Administration to cut back on the Nunn-Lugar program rather than expand it (see enclosed clipping), I'm wondering if you might consider moving up the time when you would consider grants to public policy education and advocacy organizations? I'm thinking specifically of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, and the numerous faith-based organizations that are part of our coalition.

Ken Myers of Senator Lugar's staff met with us at our March meeting to be brief us on the Nunn-Lugar Program. After his briefing we decided that we would work with our grassroots networks in Virginia, Kansas, and Arizona and encourage them to be in touch with Senator Warner, Senator Roberts, and Representative Stump in support of full funding for the Nunn-Lugar Program. That's as much as we can squeeze in within the limits of present resources.

With further resources we could do much more to build support within the faith community around the nation for nuclear threat reduction initiatives, including the Nunn-Lugar Program and related de-alerting and arms reduction measures.

Any time you are ready to consider grant requests for such activities, I and my colleagues would welcome an opportunity to talk with you and your staff.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

April 25, 2001

The Honorable George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Attn: Dr. Condoleezza Rice

Dear Mr. President:

We understand that the strategic review which your administration now has underway is encompassing a review of the U.S. nuclear posture. We note that Congress, in mandating a nuclear posture review, specified that consideration should be given to "the relationship among United States nuclear deterrence policy, targeting, and arms control objectives." We believe, therefore, that the final product should contain a multi-year plan for nuclear disarmament on equal terms with specification of deterrence policy and targeting.

The law of the land in the form of Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) commits the United States and other nuclear-weapon states "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." President Lyndon Johnson and then President Richard Nixon signed this treaty, and the U.S. Senate ratified it in March 1969 by a bipartisan vote of 83 to 15. Affirmative votes were registered by Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen and by two future Senate Republican leaders, Senator Howard Baker and Senator Robert Dole.

The United States and other nuclear-weapon states recommitted themselves to Article VI when the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was extended indefinitely in 1995. The United States concurred with the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, which contains a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

### **Voices of Religion**

Numerous faith-based organizations and religious leaders join in the call for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated:

The Honorable George W. Bush  
April 25, 2001  
Page two.

We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violation of international law.

Speaking for the Holy See at the United Nations in 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino, the Holy See's Permanent Observer at the UN, stated:

Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority.

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

Many denominations in the United States have official policies calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For instance, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1993 indicated that "today, the moral task is to proceed with deep cuts and ultimately to abolish these nuclear weapons entirely." They further stated, "The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal."

The United Methodist General Conference, the denomination's official governing body, in May 2000 stated the moral case against nuclear weapons.

We reaffirm the finding that nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. When used as instruments of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt and spiritually bankrupt.

Therefore, we reaffirm the goal of total abolition of all nuclear weapons throughout Earth and space.

In June 2000 an interfaith group of 21 religious leaders joined 18 retired admirals and generals in a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral in which they said:

The Honorable George W. Bush  
April 25, 2001  
Page three.

We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family.

They further stated:

It is...time for a great national and international discussion and examination of the true and full implications of reliance on nuclear weapons, to be followed by action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

### **Practical Steps**

Thus, the voices of religion and the nations of the world as expressed in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty agree on the long-range goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The question is: how do we achieve that goal in a practicable manner? The 2000 NPT Review Conference provided an answer by specifying in its Final Document a series of "practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI." These steps include:

- ❖ Early entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).
- ❖ A moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions pending entry into force of that treaty.
- ❖ Negotiation of a multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material.
- ❖ Early entry into force and full implementation of START II and the conclusion of START III as soon as possible while preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability.
- ❖ Further efforts by the nuclear-weapon states to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally.
- ❖ Further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons.
- ❖ Concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems.
- ❖ A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons will ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination.

The Honorable George W. Bush  
April 25, 2001  
Page four.

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

Many of these practical steps were also recommended by the 2000 United Methodist General Conference in the attached resolution, "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence".

### **Nuclear Posture Review**

In the current nuclear posture review the United States now has an opportunity to translate its treaty commitment for the elimination of nuclear weapons into specific policies and a schedule of concrete steps. Although we share the view of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, who in 1986 said "No" to nuclear deterrence, we recognize that official U.S. policy is unlikely to immediately and totally reverse its 50-year commitment to nuclear deterrence. However, we ask that U.S. nuclear policy reaffirm the treaty commitment to nuclear disarmament and specify "a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies". This diminishing role should include a no-first-use policy by the United States as a transitional measure on the way to total elimination.

With these basic commitments established the U.S. nuclear policy should outline a program of practical steps that will be carried out in the next four years and for another four year period beyond that. These should encompass (1) de-alerting the entire nuclear arsenal by removing weapons from hair-trigger alert, (2) deep cuts in the strategic arsenal through treaty negotiation and unilateral initiatives, (3) expanding the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (Nunn-Lugar) to help Russia dismantle its nuclear weapons and achieve secure storage of fissile material, (4) vigorous international control of fissile material and ballistic missile technology, (5) use of diplomacy and financial incentives to curtail development of nuclear weapons and long-range missiles by small nations, (6) maintenance of the nuclear testing moratorium and ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and (7) preservation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty because of its restraining influence on strategic missile deployment.

We believe that this agenda is a far superior way to achieve security of the United States from nuclear attack than national missile defense, which your administration is so vigorously pursuing. We agreed with the United Methodist General Conference which has issued a call to "halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful."

### **Public Participation**

Finally we recommend that there be full public participation in the nuclear posture review, including public hearings by the Department of Defense and by appropriate committees of Congress. We ask that a draft nuclear posture statement be published for widespread public discussion with provision for ample feedback before it is finally adopted.

The Honorable George W. Bush  
April 25, 2001  
Page five.

With the United States leading the way the world can move away from outmoded, 20<sup>th</sup> century reliance on nuclear weapons and can free the 21<sup>st</sup> century from the curse of human existence threatened by these terrible instruments of mass destruction. This would constitute true moral progress for humankind. Mr. President, please use the opportunity of the nuclear posture review to provide global leadership for this worthy, achievable goal.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

cc:  
Vice President Richard Cheney  
Secretary of Defense Don Rumsfeld  
Secretary of State Colin Powell

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE  
1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036

April 25, 2001

The Honorable George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Attn: Dr. Condoleezza Rice

Dear Mr. President:

We understand that the strategic review which your administration now has underway is encompassing a review of the U.S. nuclear posture. We note that Congress, in mandating a nuclear posture review, specified that consideration should be given to "the relationship among United States nuclear deterrence policy, targeting, and arms control objectives." We believe, therefore, that the final product should contain a multi-year plan for nuclear disarmament on equal terms with specification of deterrence policy and targeting.

The law of the land in the form of Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) commits the United States and other nuclear-weapon states "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." President Lyndon Johnson and then President Richard Nixon signed this treaty, and the U.S. Senate ratified it in March 1969 by a bipartisan vote of 83 to 15. Affirmative votes were registered by Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen and by two future Senate Republican leaders, Senator Howard Baker and Senator Robert Dole.

The United States and other nuclear-weapon states recommitted themselves to Article VI when the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was extended indefinitely in 1995. The United States concurred with the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, which contains a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

### **Voices of Religion**

Numerous faith-based organizations and religious leaders join in the call for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated:

The Honorable George W. Bush  
April 25, 2001  
Page two.

We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violation of international law.

Speaking for the Holy See at the United Nations in 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino, the Holy See's Permanent Observer at the UN, stated:

Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority.

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

Many denominations in the United States have official policies calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For instance, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1993 indicated that "today, the moral task is to proceed with deep cuts and ultimately to abolish these nuclear weapons entirely." They further stated, "The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal."

The United Methodist General Conference, the denomination's official governing body, in May 2000 stated the moral case against nuclear weapons.

We reaffirm the finding that nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. When used as instruments of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt and spiritually bankrupt.

Therefore, we reaffirm the goal of total abolition of all nuclear weapons throughout Earth and space.

In June 2000 an interfaith group of 21 religious leaders joined 18 retired admirals and generals in a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral in which they said:

The Honorable George W. Bush  
April 25, 2001  
Page three.

We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family.

They further stated:

It is...time for a great national and international discussion and examination of the true and full implications of reliance on nuclear weapons, to be followed by action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

### **Practical Steps**

Thus, the voices of religion and the nations of the world as expressed in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty agree on the long-range goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The question is: how do we achieve that goal in a practicable manner? The 2000 NPT Review Conference provided an answer by specifying in its Final Document a series of "practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI." These steps include:

- ❖ Early entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).
- ❖ A moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions pending entry into force of that treaty.
- ❖ Negotiation of a multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material.
- ❖ Early entry into force and full implementation of START II and the conclusion of START III as soon as possible while preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability.
- ❖ Further efforts by the nuclear-weapon states to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally.
- ❖ Further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons.
- ❖ Concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems.
- ❖ A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons will ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination.

The Honorable George W. Bush  
April 25, 2001  
Page four.

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

Many of these practical steps were also recommended by the 2000 United Methodist General Conference in the attached resolution, "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence".

### **Nuclear Posture Review**

In the current nuclear posture review the United States now has an opportunity to translate its treaty commitment for the elimination of nuclear weapons into specific policies and a schedule of concrete steps. Although we share the view of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, who in 1986 said "No" to nuclear deterrence, we recognize that official U.S. policy is unlikely to immediately and totally reverse its 50-year commitment to nuclear deterrence. However, we ask that U.S. nuclear policy reaffirm the treaty commitment to nuclear disarmament and specify "a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies". This diminishing role should include a no-first-use policy by the United States as a transitional measure on the way to total elimination.

With these basic commitments established the U.S. nuclear policy should outline a program of practical steps that will be carried out in the next four years and for another four year period beyond that. These should encompass (1) de-alerting the entire nuclear arsenal by removing weapons from hair-trigger alert, (2) deep cuts in the strategic arsenal through treaty negotiation and unilateral initiatives, (3) expanding the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (Nunn-Lugar) to help Russia dismantle its nuclear weapons and achieve secure storage of fissile material, (4) vigorous international control of fissile material and ballistic missile technology, (5) use of diplomacy and financial incentives to curtail development of nuclear weapons and long-range missiles by small nations, (6) maintenance of the nuclear testing moratorium and ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and (7) preservation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty because of its restraining influence on strategic missile deployment.

We believe that this agenda is a far superior way to achieve security of the United States from nuclear attack than national missile defense, which your administration is so vigorously pursuing. We agreed with the United Methodist General Conference which has issued a call to "halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful."

### **Public Participation**

Finally we recommend that there be full public participation in the nuclear posture review, including public hearings by the Department of Defense and by appropriate committees of Congress. We ask that a draft nuclear posture statement be published for widespread public discussion with provision for ample feedback before it is finally adopted.

The Honorable George W. Bush  
April 25, 2001  
Page five.

With the United States leading the way the world can move away from outmoded, 20<sup>th</sup> century reliance on nuclear weapons and can free the 21<sup>st</sup> century from the curse of human existence threatened by these terrible instruments of mass destruction. This would constitute true moral progress for humankind. Mr. President, please use the opportunity of the nuclear posture review to provide global leadership for this worthy, achievable goal.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

cc:  
Vice President Richard Cheney  
Secretary of Defense Don Rumsfeld  
Secretary of State Colin Powell

Tom Zamora Collina  
Union of Concerned Scientists  
1707 H Street, NW, Suite 600  
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Tom;

I want to share with you a letter I sent to President Bush regarding nuclear posture review.

I discussed with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, whether to develop a sign-on letter from religious leaders to the president on this topic. However, they decided the issue was too complex to deal with in this manner. Instead we are encouraging various denominational offices and religious peace fellowships to prepare to respond to President Bush when he releases his nuclear posture.

I'll keep you informed.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

raychamberlain@holston.org  
wvareaumc@aol.com  
bishop\_dallas@mail.smu.edu  
bishop@calnevumc.org

May 8, 2001

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

Dear Mr. Greene:

To support the continuing leadership role we are fulfilling in mobilizing the faith community on nuclear disarmament issues, we request a grant of \$20,000 from the Rockefeller Family.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, brings together 35 faith-based organizations. As the enclosed list indicates, some are denominational offices, some are peace fellowships and other unofficial organizations. Through their extensive grassroots networks they have the capacity to reach churches and synagogues in every congressional district in the United States and to mobilize peace activists in public advocacy.

This network is opposing deployment of national missile defense. As the enclosed letter to President Bush indicates, we feel that missile defense doesn't deal with the real and present danger to the United States, the Russian nuclear arsenal, and may indeed impede efforts to reduce that threat through arms reduction agreements and efforts like the Nunn-Lugar program. There are other more effective ways to deal with the dangers of nuclear proliferation. And the enormous cost of national missile defense will inevitably take money away from social and economic justice programs. Therefore, many of our participating organizations are mobilizing grassroots opposition to national missile defense.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is also actively promoting the de-alerting of the nuclear arsenal. Among other things we are developing grassroots support for this approach in about 20 states where one or more "moderate" U.S. senators might provide leadership on this issue. They are many of the same senators we focused on two years ago in seeking Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The enclosed letter from Indiana religious leaders to Senators Lugar and Bayh illustrates our approach. This letter is being circulated to others in the Indiana faith community, urging them to contact their senators. Similar letters to senators are in circulation in a

Mr. Wade Greene  
May 8, 2001  
Page two.

number of other states. If de-alerting becomes a legislative issue, we will increase grassroots activity.

We are awaiting the completion of President Bush's strategic review to find out the administration's official approach to the U.S. nuclear posture. Meanwhile, my own organization has written the enclosed letter to the president, proposing that nuclear disarmament objectives and practical steps toward that end should be incorporated into the nuclear posture. This would be in keeping with the U.S. NPT obligations. Other participants in the Interfaith Committee are preparing to respond to the Bush policy, when announced, by comparing it with denominational policy on nuclear disarmament. Since there is certain to be discrepancy, we will then mount educational and advocacy efforts to oppose what we disapprove of and support what we favor (such as de-alerting and strategic arms reduction).

With many other issues competing for attention of denominational staff, my leadership role in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament keeps nuclear disarmament on their active agenda. As a catalyst, I promote cooperative activity and timely action as issues come before Congress and the Bush administration. In this manner substantial resources from the faith community are mobilized in grassroots advocacy for practical steps leading toward nuclear disarmament.

If you desire further information, please let me know.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

**Request to Rockefeller Family**

**Budget**

Personnel	
Howard Hallman: half-time for 6 months @ \$3,000	\$18,000
Operating expenses	<u>    2,000</u>
Total	\$20,000

May 8, 2001

An Open Letter to

The Honorable George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We understand that the strategic review which your administration now has underway is encompassing a review of the U.S. nuclear posture. We note that Congress, in mandating a nuclear posture review, specified that consideration should be given to "the relationship among United States nuclear deterrence policy, targeting, and arms control objectives." We believe, therefore, that the final product should contain a multi-year plan for nuclear disarmament on equal terms with specification of deterrence policy and targeting.

The law of the land in the form of Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) commits the United States and other nuclear-weapon states "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." President Lyndon Johnson and then President Richard Nixon signed this treaty, and the U.S. Senate ratified it in March 1969 by a bipartisan vote of 83 to 15. Affirmative votes were registered by Senate Minority Leader Everett Dirksen and by two future Senate Republican leaders, Senator Howard Baker and Senator Robert Dole.

The United States and other nuclear-weapon states recommitted themselves to Article VI when the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was extended indefinitely in 1995. The United States concurred with the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, which contains a commitment to "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

### **Voices of Religion**

Numerous faith-based organizations and religious leaders join in the call for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated:

We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violation of international law.

Speaking for the Holy See at the United Nations in 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino, the Holy See's Permanent Observer at the UN, stated:

Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-

Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority.

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

Many denominations in the United States have official policies calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. For instance, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1993 indicated that "today, the moral task is to proceed with deep cuts and ultimately to abolish these nuclear weapons entirely." They further stated, "The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal."

The United Methodist General Conference, the denomination's official governing body, in May 2000 stated the moral case against nuclear weapons.

We reaffirm the finding that nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. When used as instruments of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt and spiritually bankrupt.

Therefore, we reaffirm the goal of total abolition of all nuclear weapons throughout Earth and space.

In June 2000 an interfaith group of 21 religious leaders joined 18 retired admirals and generals in a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral in which they said:

We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family.

They further stated:

It is...time for a great national and international discussion and examination of the true and full implications of reliance on nuclear weapons, to be followed by action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

## **Practical Steps**

Thus, the voices of religion and the nations of the world as expressed in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty agree on the long-range goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The question is: how do we achieve that goal in a practicable manner? The 2000 NPT Review

Conference provided an answer by specifying in its Final Document a series of "practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI." These steps include:

- ❖ Early entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).
- ❖ A moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions pending entry into force of that treaty.
- ❖ Negotiation of a multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material.
- ❖ Early entry into force and full implementation of START II and the conclusion of START III as soon as possible while preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability.
- ❖ Further efforts by the nuclear-weapon states to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally.
- ❖ Further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons.
- ❖ Concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems.
- ❖ A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons will ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination.
- ❖ The engagement as soon as appropriate of all the nuclear-weapon states in the process leading to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

Many of these practical steps were also recommended by the 2000 United Methodist General Conference in the attached resolution, "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence".

### **Nuclear Posture Review**

In the current nuclear posture review the United States now has an opportunity to translate its treaty commitment for the elimination of nuclear weapons into specific policies and a schedule of concrete steps. Although we share the view of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, who in 1986 said "No" to nuclear deterrence, we recognize that official U.S. policy is unlikely to immediately and totally reverse its 50-year commitment to nuclear deterrence. However, we ask that U.S. nuclear policy reaffirm the treaty commitment to nuclear disarmament and specify "a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies". This diminishing role should include a no-first-use policy by the United States as a transitional measure on the way to total elimination.

With these basic commitments established the U.S. nuclear policy should outline a program of practical steps that will be carried out in the next four years and for another four year period beyond that. These should encompass (1) de-alerting the entire nuclear arsenal by removing

weapons from hair-trigger alert, (2) deep cuts in the strategic arsenal through treaty negotiation and unilateral initiatives, (3) expanding the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (Nunn-Lugar) to help Russia dismantle its nuclear weapons and achieve secure storage of fissile material, (4) vigorous international control of fissile material and ballistic missile technology, (5) use of diplomacy and financial incentives to curtail development of nuclear weapons and long-range missiles by small nations, (6) maintenance of the nuclear testing moratorium and ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and (7) preservation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty because of its restraining influence on strategic missile deployment.

We believe that this agenda is a far superior way to achieve security of the United States from nuclear attack than national missile defense, which your administration is so vigorously pursuing. We agreed with the United Methodist General Conference which has issued a call to "halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful."

### **Public Participation**

Finally we recommend that there be full public participation in the nuclear posture review, including public hearings by the Department of Defense and by appropriate committees of Congress. We ask that a draft nuclear posture statement be published for widespread public discussion with provision for ample feedback before it is finally adopted.

With the United States leading the way the world can move away from outmoded, 20<sup>th</sup> century reliance on nuclear weapons and can free the 21<sup>st</sup> century from the curse of human existence threatened by these terrible instruments of mass destruction. This would constitute true moral progress for humankind. Mr. President, please use the opportunity of the nuclear posture review to provide global leadership for this worthy, achievable goal.

With best regards,

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

July 18, 2001

Sally Lilienthal, President  
Ploughshares Fund  
Fort Mason Center  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Sally:

I am sending copies of letters from the Internal Revenue Services that classify Methodists United for Peace with Justice as a 501(c)(4) corporation and the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund as a 501(c)(3) entity. These letters go with the grant proposal which I e-mailed you on July 14.

The grant request is in support of the catalytic leadership I provide the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Although the focus of the Interfaith Committee is upon influencing public policy, the nature of my work falls within the scope of 501(c)(3) eligibility. Direct lobbying in Washington and grassroots lobbying is handled by participating faith-based organizations through their own resources. However, we are also willing to accept a 501(c)(4) grant.

We hope that you will give favorable consideration to our proposal.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

August 31, 2001

Sally Lilienthal, President  
Ploughshares Fund  
Fort Mason Center  
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Sally:

As a supplement to my proposal to the Ploughshares Fund for a grant to support the leadership I provide the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, I am sending you letters from four participating organizations that register their support for the role I play.

When vacation season ends after Labor Day, I may have some more such letters to send you. Or you may be hearing directly from some of the participating organizations.

On the action front we are gearing up for Senate consideration of the defense authorization bill in September with the possibility of cuts in missile defense funding and restrictions on activities that violate the ABM treaty. The Senate Armed Services Committee will complete its markup on Friday, September 10. We have scheduled a briefing for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Monday, September 10 so that we can reach out to our networks in key states to have grassroots people get in touch with their senators before voting starts on September 19.

That's the kind of focused efforts that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament can undertake. I hope that you will look favorably upon our request to further this work.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

August 31, 2001

Ms. Katherine Magraw  
Secure World Program  
W. Alton Jones Foundation  
232 East High Street  
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Dear Ms. Magraw:

As a supplement to our proposal to the W. Alton Jones Foundation for a grant to support the leadership I provide the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, I am sending you letters from four participating organizations that register their support for the role I play.

When vacation season ends after Labor Day, I may have some more such letters to send you. Or you may be hearing directly from some of the participating organizations.

On the action front we are gearing up for Senate consideration of the defense authorization bill in September with the possibility of cuts in missile defense funding and restrictions on activities that violate the ABM treaty. The Senate Armed Services Committee will complete its markup on Friday, September 10. We have scheduled a briefing for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Monday, September 10 so that we can reach out to our networks in key states to have grassroots people get in touch with their senators before voting starts on September 19.

That's the kind of focused efforts that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament can undertake. I hope that you will look favorably upon our request to further this work.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

## **The U.S. Nuclear Posture for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**

### **A Statement by Religious Leaders**

Under a mandate from the U.S. Congress, the Secretary of Defense is conducting "a comprehensive review of the nuclear posture of the United States for the next 5 to 10 years." It will be the first such review in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We the undersigned religious leaders would like to introduce our perspective into the nuclear posture review.

#### **Voices of Religion**

Since nuclear weapons emerged in 1945 as an instrument of military and foreign policy, people of religion have questioned their morality. This has led a variety of religious bodies to call for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

From a global perspective the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated:

We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violation of international law.

In January 2001 the Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches reiterated "its deep and long-standing concern at the continued risk of Creation posed by the existence of nuclear weapons."

Speaking for the Holy See at the United Nations in 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino, the Holy See's Permanent Observer at the UN, stated:

Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority.

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

[Add statement of world Jewish and Muslim leaders if possible.]

In the United States the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. has stated:  
[to be added]

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1993 indicated that "today, the moral task is to proceed with deep cuts and ultimately to abolish these nuclear weapons entirely." They further stated, "The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal."

The General Board of the American Baptist Churches stated in 1985: "We call on all nations to abolish their nuclear weapons and to dispose of such weapons in a manner that is not harmful to either the physical or political environment."

In a resolution on "Abolition of Nuclear Weapons" the 1997 General Convention of the Episcopal Church supported "the goal of total nuclear disarmament."

The 1995 Churchwide Assembly of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in American endorsed "efforts that move toward the elimination of nuclear weapons."

The 2000 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A. reaffirmed "its long-standing call to end the arms race" and laid out a series of steps for nuclear disarmament.

The Unitarian Universalist Association noted in 1989: "A peaceful world requires the abolition of nuclear weapons."

The 1979 General Synod of the United Church of Christ "calls upon our government and all governments of the world to work together to reduce the danger of nuclear holocaust by limiting and eliminating such forms of warfare."

In 1986 the United Methodist Council of Bishops stated unequivocally that "we say a clear and unconditional *No* to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing." The 2000 General Conference of the United Methodist Church reaffirmed "the goal of the total abolition of all nuclear weapons throughout Earth and space."

[Add a Jewish statement.]

In June 2000 18 representatives from these and other denominations joined 18 retired generals in a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral in which they said:

"We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family."

They further stated:

It is...time for a great national and international discussion and examination of the true and full implications of reliance on nuclear weapons, to be followed by action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

We the signers of this present statement share this perspective. We affirm that nuclear weapons are morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. We agree that time has arrived for the American people to engage in widespread public discussion on nuclear weapons and to make a commitment to a practical plan for their elimination.

## **Treaty Obligation**

Voices of religion are not alone in calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Numerous civil-sector leaders and many governments have advocated nuclear abolition.

The world's nations gave this goal concrete expression in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which went to effect in 1970. In Article VI the United States and other nuclear-weapon states agreed "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." President Lyndon Johnson and then President Richard Nixon signed this treaty, and the U.S. Senate ratified the treaty in March 1969 by a bipartisan vote of 83 to 15.

The nuclear-weapon states recommitted themselves to Article VI when the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was extended indefinitely in 1995. They concurred with the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, which contains a promise to "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

## **Practical Steps**

Thus, the voices of religion and the nations of the world as expressed in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty agree on the long-range goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The question is: how do we achieve that goal in a practicable manner? The 2000 NPT Review Conference provided the answer by specifying in its Final Document a series of "practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI." These steps include:

- ❖ Early entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).
- ❖ A moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions pending entry into force of that treaty.
- ❖ Negotiation of a multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material.
- ❖ Early entry into force and full implementation of START II and the conclusion of START III as soon as possible while preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability.
- ❖ Further efforts by the nuclear-weapon states to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally.
- ❖ Further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons.

- ❖ Concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems.
- ❖ A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons will ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination.
- ❖ The engagement as soon as appropriate of all the nuclear-weapon states in the process leading to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

## **Nuclear Posture Review**

The United States now has an opportunity to translate its treaty commitment for the elimination of nuclear weapons into specific policies and a schedule of concrete steps. This can and should be accomplished in the current Nuclear Posture Review, which by Congressional mandate is supposed to consider "the relationship among United States nuclear deterrence policy, targeting, and arms control objectives."

Therefore, we make the following recommendations:

- 1) That an action plan leading toward worldwide nuclear disarmament should be incorporated into the U.S. nuclear posture.
- 2) That the practical steps formulated in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference be incorporated into the U.S. nuclear posture.
- 3) That the concept of a diminishing role for nuclear weapons should serve as a guiding principle for the United States for the years ahead.
- 4) That the United States work with other nations to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons with adequate safeguards as soon as practicable.

We further recommend that there be full public participation in the nuclear posture review, including public hearings by the Department of Defense and by appropriate committees of Congress. We ask that a draft nuclear posture statement be published for widespread public discussion with provision for ample feedback before it is finally adopted.

With the United States leading the way the world can move away from outmoded, 20<sup>th</sup> century reliance on nuclear weapons and can free the 21<sup>st</sup> century from the curse of human existence threatened by these terrible instruments of mass destruction. This would constitute true moral progress for humankind.

Signers

Draft of March 10, 2001  
Written by Howard W. Hallman

## A Resolution of Appreciation

The Honorable Richard Lugar, U.S. Senator from Indiana, is a long-time supporter of efforts to contain, reduce, and eventually eliminate weapons of mass destruction.

In 1991 Senator Lugar was an initiator of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (known as Nunn-Lugar) to assist Russia in dismantlement of nuclear weapons and delivery systems.

In 1994 he provided Senate leadership for ratification of the second Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START II).

In 1997 he served as Senate leader for ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Senator Lugar continues to provide leadership for continuation and expansion of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program and other measures aimed at eliminating nuclear weapons.

Therefore, the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society expresses its deep appreciation to Senator Richard Lugar, a distinguished United Methodist, for his creative leadership in the quest to rid the world of weapons of mass destruction.

## **Nuclear Disarmament: What Then Shall We Do?** **by Howard W. Hallman**

"We say a clear and unconditional *No* to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position than cannot receive the church's blessing." *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*, 1986.

With these prophetic words, based upon a strong biblical and theological foundation, the United Methodist Council of Bishops made clear where they stood on a central moral issue of our times. They then registered their commitment to "the eventual goal of a mutual and verifiable dismantling of all nuclear armaments."

The 1988 United Methodist General Conference affirmed the conclusions of *In Defense of Creation*. Each succeeding General Conference has supported the goal of nuclear abolition. The 2000 General Conference testified:

We affirm the finding that nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. When used as instruments of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt and spiritually bankrupt.

Therefore, we affirm the goal of total abolition of all nuclear weapons throughout Earth and space.

The United Methodist Church is not alone in calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. The World Council of Churches, the Holy See, the Dalai Lama, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, all the Mainline Protestant denominations in the United States, historic peace churches, numerous Evangelicals, and many Jewish leaders support this goal. So do a host of retired admirals and generals and prominent persons who have held national security positions in the U.S. government.

There is even an international treaty that calls for the elimination of nuclear weapons. It is the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which went to effect in 1970. In Article VI the United States and other nuclear-weapon states agreed "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament."

In May 2000 while the United Methodist General Conference was assembled in Cleveland, an NPT Review Conference met at the United Nations in New York. In the Final Document of this gathering the nuclear-weapon states committed themselves to "an unequivocal

undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." So the stage is set for ridding the world of these horrible instruments of mass destruction.

## **The Global Arsenal**

Yet, nuclear weapons persist. The United States and Russia each possess more than 12,000, possibly as many as 19,000 apiece (the precise total is secret). Of these, the U.S. deploys 7,300 strategic warheads on missiles and bombers that can strike from afar. Russia deploys approximately 6,000 strategic warheads. In addition, France has 482 nuclear weapons, China 410, and the United Kingdom 200. Israel possesses 100 or more. India and Pakistan have tested nuclear weapons and may have built some. Between them the United States and Russia have enough nuclear weapons to destroy one another many times over.

Hopeless? No. There is a broad consensus on methods to reduce and eventually eliminate all nuclear weapons on Earth. These methods were spelled out in a set of practical steps outlined in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. They are also specified in a set of actions recommended by the 2000 United Methodist General Conference.

It is time for the U.S. government to take seriously its international commitment. Now is an opportune time, for the Department of Defense and other governmental agencies are currently reviewing the nuclear posture of the United States. Congressional legislation mandating this review requires consideration of "the relationship among United States nuclear deterrence policy, targeting, and arms control objectives." Accordingly, the path toward nuclear disarmament can and should be incorporated into the U.S. nuclear posture.

Let's look at the possible steps along this path.

### **De-alerting**

The General Conference asks the nuclear-weapon states to "immediately take all nuclear weapons off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and by other means." As it is, the United States and Russia each maintain on hair-trigger alert approximately 2,000 nuclear warheads with the total destructive power of 100,000 Hiroshima bombs, ready to launch on a moment's notice. Misjudgment in time of crisis, miscalculation of false radar signals, computer error, or action by a rogue commander could lead to nuclear war.

In an election campaign speech in May 2000 George W. Bush stated, "The United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status." Speaking of Russia, he noted, "for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch." President Bush has ordered the Department of Defense to study options for de-alerting, but at this writing he hasn't announced any specific actions.

We should insist that President Bush work with Russia take action to remove *all* nuclear weapons from hair-trigger alert.

## **Strategic Arms Reduction**

The General Conference called for "a program to systematically dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles as soon as possible". This should be accomplished "with adequate safeguards and verification". It should be "carried out under multilateral treaties and through reciprocal national initiatives".

The treaty route has led to a pair of Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties (START) between the United States and Russia. START I cut the respective strategic arsenals -- the long-range missiles and bombers -- to 8,500 U.S. warheads and 6,500 Russian warheads. START II, not yet in effect, would further reduce the arsenal to 3,000 to 3,500 warheads on each side. In Helsinki in 1997 President Clinton and President Yeltsin set the goal of 2,000 to 2,500 for a START III agreement, but negotiations have never commenced. Russian President Putin has proposed an even lower target of 1,000 to 1,500 warheads.

Reciprocal national initiative was the approach used by President Bush the elder in 1991 when he ordered a stand-down of strategic bombers and removal of alert status of land- and submarine-based missiles scheduled for elimination under START I. Soviet President Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. In the next several both nations withdrew large numbers of tactical nuclear warheads deployed with their arms and navies and put them in central storage depots.

During the 2000 presidential campaign President Bush the younger cited this experience and indicated that "the United States should be prepared to lead by example because it is in our best interest and the best interest of the world." He stated, "It should be possible to reduce the number of American nuclear weapons significantly further than what has already been agreed to under START II without compromising our security in any way." He said that it need not "require years and years of detailed arms control negotiation."

Like de-alerting, we are waiting to see how a President Bush will follow through on his campaign statement. We should hold him to it and should press for deep reductions in strategic nuclear weapons in the immediate future.

## **Nuclear Weapons Convention**

Strategic arms reduction can be a significant step toward nuclear abolition. To achieve the ultimate goal, the United Methodist General Conference calls upon the nuclear-weapon states to "enter into a multilateral process to develop, adopt, and carry out a nuclear weapons convention that outlaws and abolishes all nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control."

A group of non-governmental organizations has drafted a nuclear weapons convention, which has been deposited with the United Nations as an official document for study. However, the nuclear-weapon states have not entered into negotiations for this purpose.

One forum for such negotiations could be the Conference on Disarmament, a multilateral body that meets periodically in Geneva. The 2000 NPT Review Conference recommended that the Conference on Disarmament establish a subsidiary body with a mandate to deal with nuclear

disarmament. This is something we can support as a means of getting started on the longer-range goal of a nuclear weapons convention even as we are working for intermediate steps.

## **Nuclear Testing**

For more than 40 years the religious organizations have called for the end of nuclear weapons testing and for adoption of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The 2000 General Conference reaffirmed its support for the CTBT and called upon the nuclear-weapon states to "cease all research, development, testing, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons and refrain from modernizing the existing arsenal."

The five officially defined nuclear-weapon states -- United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, and China -- have ceased full-fledged nuclear testing. However, the United States and Russia continue subcritical tests of nuclear devices that don't result in a full nuclear explosion. Moreover, the United States operates a \$5 billion Stockpile Stewardship Program that goes beyond its stated purpose of maintaining safety and reliability and encompasses research that could lead to new nuclear weapons. And in South Asia in 1999 India and Pakistan conducted nuclear weapons test.

In 1996 the nations of the world agreed to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. So far 71 nations have ratified the treaty, including the United Kingdom, France, and Russia. But the United States, China, India, Pakistan, and North Korea haven't ratified. The treaty cannot go into effect until they do.

The CTBT came before the U.S. Senator for ratification in October 1999 and was defeated 51 to 48 in a highly partisan vote. During the presidential campaign George W. Bush indicated that if elected he would maintain the testing moratorium but that he doesn't favor ratification of the CTBT.

The CTBT is still needed as an important nuclear non-proliferation measure because of the restraints it places on non-nuclear states as well as current possessors of nuclear weapons. It creates a process for worldwide monitoring of suspected test explosions and provides for on-site verification. As long as the United States refuses to ratify the treaty, it cannot effectively press India and Pakistan to cease nuclear weapons testing. Therefore, we need to work relentlessly for U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

## **National Missile Defense**

Since the advent of nuclear warheads mounted on missiles, nations have dreamed of developing a defense against these weapons. Since the 1950s the United States has spent more than \$100 billion on this kind of research and development, \$69 billion since President Reagan launched the Strategic Defense Initiative (known popularly as Star Wars) in 1983. Yet no effective strategic missile defense system has been devised.

Around 1970 U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons theorists developed the idea that the prevailing doctrine of nuclear deterrence, known as mutually assured destruction (MAD), would be more effective if neither nation deployed missile defense. The idea was that their mutual

vulnerability would restrain them from using nuclear weapons. This approach was enshrined in the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972.

Nevertheless, the United States has continued development of a National Missile Defense (NMD). The Clinton Administration renewed this effort. President George W. Bush and his top appointees have advocated an even more vigorous program. It would be designed primarily to defend against attack by a handful of small nations (such as North Korea, Iran, and Iraq) that might develop nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. This has a certain popular appeal, but deeper analysis reveals serious flaws.

First, the real danger of nuclear attack on the United States comes from Russian missiles that might be launched accidentally or might get into the hands of terrorist organizations. The way to deal with this danger is through such measures as de-alerting, strategic arms reduction through treaties and reciprocal initiatives, and control of fissile material (see below). But if the United States withdraws from the ABM Treaty in order to deploy a National Missile Defense, Russia is likely to withdraw from START II and keep in service multi-warhead missiles that are scheduled for elimination.

Second, there are many other ways to deal with the potential threats from small nations, including diplomacy, control of fissile material and ballistic missile technology, and financial assistance to nations cooperating with non-proliferation. Furthermore, a small nation or a terrorist organization desiring to attack the United States with weapons of mass destruction is more likely to use other means of delivery, such as smuggling them in, boats in U.S. harbors and offshore using cruise missiles. None of these methods could be stopped by missile defense.

Third, the budgetary costs are enormous, estimated to exceed \$100 billion for the multi-layered approach of the Bush Administration. With a large tax cut in the offing and other defense increases, spending a huge amount on missile defense would preclude achieving the objective of "leave no child behind" and other social justice objectives. Moreover, the technological feasibility of National Missile Defense has yet to be proven, and numerous scientists and engineers believe that it is unachievable.

With this reasoning in the background the United Methodist General Conference has issued a call to "halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful."

### **Fissile Material Control**

Even if all nuclear weapons were eliminated, the world would still have a huge stockpile of fissile material that could be reconstituted into nuclear weapons. For that reason the General Conference calls for development and implementation of "a system for control of all fissile material with international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards."

The 2000 NPT Review Conference spoke of "the necessity of negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices."

Since 1991 the United States has been providing assistance to Russia to safeguard and dismantle its own nuclear weapons and those returned to Russia from the newly independent states of Belarus, Ukraine, and Kazakstan. Known as the Nunn-Lugar Program (after the two senators who sponsored the legislation) or the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, this effort has helped Russia dismantle more than 4,000 nuclear weapons and achieve a much safer storage system than would otherwise have been possible. Recently a study commission recommended that this program should be expanded.

## No Use

In 1986 the United Methodist bishops indicated, "While we oppose any use of nuclear weapons, we support, as a transitional measure, a no-first-use policy by the United States and urge its reinforcement in an agreement with other nuclear-weapon states."

Fourteen years later the 2000 General Conference went further and called upon all possessors of nuclear weapons to "renounce unconditionally the use of nuclear weapons for deterrence and war-fighting purposes" and to "pledge never to use nuclear weapons against any adversary under any circumstance."

The Final Document of the NPT Review Conference is more cautious and advocates "a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons will ever be used."

The official U.S. policy takes the opposite position. It relies upon nuclear deterrence and the willingness to use nuclear weapons as the bedrock of national security. Presidents of both political parties have refused to heed the call for a policy of no-first-use of nuclear weapons.

It is time for change. The United States should incorporate nuclear disarmament objectives into its official nuclear posture. This should encompass the following:

- 1) reaffirmation of the treaty commitment to join other nuclear weapon states in seeking the total elimination of nuclear weapons;
- 2) commitment to a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies;
- 3) a policy of no-first-use as a transitional measure until nuclear disarmament can be achieved;
- 4) a promise to take all nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert; and
- 5) adoption of other practical steps to achieve nuclear disarmament.

We should insist to our leaders that this be achieved. After all, it is in defense of God's creation.

###

Add a box:

Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy, has an e-mail alert system on nuclear disarmament issues. To receive alerts and information, write to [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org).



**Draft**  
**The U.S. Nuclear Posture for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**  
**A Statement by Religious Leaders**

Under a mandate from the U.S. Congress, the Secretary of Defense is conducting "a comprehensive review of the nuclear posture of the United States for the next 5 to 10 years." It will be the first such review in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We the undersigned religious leaders would like to introduce our perspective into the nuclear posture review.

**Voices of Religion**

Since nuclear weapons emerged in 1945 as an instrument of military and foreign policy, people of religion have questioned their morality. This has led a variety of religious bodies to call for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

From a global perspective the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated:

We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemned as violation of international law.

In January 2001 the Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches reiterated "its deep and long-standing concern at the continued risk of Creation posed by the existence of nuclear weapons."

Speaking for the Holy See at the United Nations in 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino, the Holy See's Permanent Observer at the UN, stated:

Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by a universal authority.

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

[Add statement of world Jewish and Muslim leaders if possible.]

In the United States the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. has stated:  
[to be added]

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1993 indicated that "today, the moral task is to proceed with deep cuts and ultimately to abolish these nuclear weapons entirely." They further stated, "The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal."

The call for elimination of nuclear weapons has also come from a variety of Protestant denominations, historic peace churches, Unitarians, and Jewish bodies. [separate Jewish and Muslim statements could be inserted]

In June 2000 an interfaith group of 21 religious leaders joined 18 retired admirals and generals in a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral in which they said:

"We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family."

They further stated:

It is...time for a great national and international discussion and examination of the true and full implications of reliance on nuclear weapons, to be followed by action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."

We the signers of this present statement share this perspective. We affirm that nuclear weapons are morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. We agree that time has arrived for the American people to engage in widespread public discussion on nuclear weapons and to make a commitment to a practical plan for their elimination.

## **Treaty Obligation**

Voices of religion are not alone in calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Numerous civil-sector leaders and many governments have advocated nuclear abolition.

The world's nations gave this goal concrete expression in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which went to effect in 1970. In Article VI the United States and other nuclear-weapon states agreed "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." President Lyndon Johnson and then President Richard Nixon signed this treaty, and the U.S. Senate ratified the treaty in March 1969 by a bipartisan vote of 83 to 15.

The nuclear-weapon states recommitted themselves to Article VI when the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was extended indefinitely in 1995. They concurred with the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, which contains a promise to "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."

## **Practical Steps**

Thus, the voices of religion and the nations of the world as expressed in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty agree on the long-range goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The question is: how do we achieve that goal in a practicable manner? The 2000 NPT Review Conference provided the answer by specifying in its Final Document a series of "practical steps for systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI." These steps include:

- ❖ Early entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).
- ❖ A moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions pending entry into force of that treaty.
- ❖ Negotiation of a multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material.
- ❖ Early entry into force and full implementation of START II and the conclusion of START III as soon as possible while preserving and strengthening the ABM Treaty as a cornerstone of strategic stability.
- ❖ Further efforts by the nuclear-weapon states to reduce their nuclear arsenals unilaterally.
- ❖ Further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons.
- ❖ Concrete agreed measures to further reduce the operational status of nuclear weapons systems.
- ❖ A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies to minimize the risk that these weapons will ever be used and to facilitate the process of their total elimination.
- ❖ The engagement as soon as appropriate of all the nuclear-weapon states in the process leading to the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

## **Nuclear Posture Review**

The United States now has an opportunity to translate its treaty commitment for the elimination of nuclear weapons into specific policies and a schedule of concrete steps. This can and should be accomplished in the current Nuclear Posture Review, which by Congressional mandate is supposed to consider "the relationship among United States nuclear deterrence policy, targeting, and arms control objectives."

Therefore, we make the following recommendations:

- 1) That an action plan leading toward worldwide nuclear disarmament should be a central component of the U.S. nuclear posture.

- 2) That the practical steps formulated in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference be incorporated into the U.S. nuclear posture.
- 3) That the concept of a diminishing role for nuclear weapons should serve as a guiding principle for the United States for the years ahead.
- 4) That the United States work with other nations to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons with adequate safeguards as soon as practicable.

We further recommend that there be full public participation in the nuclear posture review, including public hearings by the Department of Defense and by appropriate committees of Congress. We ask that a draft nuclear posture statement be published for widespread public discussion with provision for ample feedback before it is finally adopted.

With the United States leading the way the world can move away from outmoded, 20<sup>th</sup> century reliance on nuclear weapons and can free the 21<sup>st</sup> century from the curse of human existence threatened by these terrible instruments of mass destruction. This would constitute true moral progress for humankind.

Signers

Draft of April 6, 2001  
Written by Howard W. Hallman

## **A Proposal for Financial Support for Interfaith Activities on Nuclear Threat Reduction and Disarmament**

This proposal requests that consideration be given to directing substantial funds to the faith community in the United States so that religious denominations and religious associations can make important contributions to the Nuclear Threat Initiative being established by Senator Sam Nunn and Mr. Ted Turner. This would build upon (a) the long-standing goal of religious organizations to eliminate nuclear weapons and (b) the current involvement of a coalition of religious organizations to achieve concrete steps leading to this goal. This represents both the prophetic and the pragmatic approaches of the faith community.

Since the beginning of the nuclear age religious bodies and religious leaders have expressed their concern about nuclear weapons. Faith-based groups have consistently pressed for the end of nuclear weapon testing, reduction of strategic and tactical nuclear weapons, and the eventual elimination of nuclear arsenals. A collection of policy statements on nuclear weapons is presented in Attachment 1.

At the same time a wide variety of denominational units and unofficial religious organizations have engaged in public policy advocacy in behalf of specific measures that contribute to nuclear threat reduction and nuclear disarmament. In doing so they tap into grassroots networks that reach virtually every county in the United States and every congressional district.

### **Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament**

Currently the work of the faith community on this issue comes to focus in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. This group is a loose-knit coalition of representatives of denominational offices and unofficial religious associations who work together in educational and public advocacy activities on specific steps that lead toward nuclear disarmament. Howard W. Hallman, chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, serves as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

The following 35 organizations are now involved in activities initiated by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament (the number is growing from month to month). Where they fit in the total perspective of religious organizations in the United States is shown in Attachment 2.

#### **Denominational Units**

American Baptists Churches, USA  
Church of the Brethren  
Church World Service  
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship  
Episcopal Church  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America  
Mennonite Central Committee  
National Council of Churches

Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.  
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism  
Unitarian Universalist Association  
United Church of Christ  
United Methodist Church  
U.S. Catholic Conference

**Unofficial Associations**

Alliance of Baptists  
American Friends Service Committee  
Baptist Peace Fellowship  
Buddhist Peace Fellowship  
Church Women United  
Conference of Major Superiors of Men  
Disciples Peace Fellowship  
Episcopal Peace Fellowship  
Evangelicals for Social Action  
Fellowship of Reconciliation  
Friends Committee on National Legislation  
Jewish Peace Fellowship  
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
Muslim Peace Fellowship  
Pax Christi USA  
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship  
Sisters of Saint Joseph of Peace  
Sisters of Mercy of the Americas  
Sojourners Peace Ministry  
World Peacemakers

In addition, in recent years representatives of another 22 denominations have signed statements and letters on nuclear disarmament issues although they are not engaged in regular public advocacy activities on this matter (see Attachment 2). We will seek to involve them and others more fully in nuclear threat reduction and disarmament issues if we are able to expand our resources. More on this latter.

**Previous Activities**

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament builds upon the experience of two previous campaigns. The first was support for ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) in the spring of 1997. About a dozen faith-based organization were involved in efforts along with a number of civil-sector organizations, coordinated by the Poison Gas Task Force

The second campaign was for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) by the U.S. Senate. Starting in June 1997, 22 faith-based organizations participated in the Interfaith Group for the CTBT. We were strictly nonpartisan, but we recognized that the big challenge was to develop Republican support for the treaty. Therefore, we carried out an

extensive grassroots campaign directed toward 35 Republican senators in 30 states. Our activities in support of the CTBT are described in Attachment 3. Although the CTBT was defeated in October 1999 in a highly partisan vote, the faith community had an impact. For instance, during the two days of Senate debate 62 senators signed a letter initiated by Senators Warner and Moynihan asking for postponement of the decision. Of the 20 signers who nevertheless voted against the treaty, 19 were from states where the Interfaith Group for the CTBT had an active grassroots campaign. We don't claim full credit for their signature, but persons on Capitol Hill told us that many senators were nervous about voting against the CTBT because of grassroots pressure for ratification and they sought postponement as a way out.

Following the defeat of the CTBT we began exploring what we should do next. This led to the establishment of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament in May 2000.

### **Initial Activities**

At a planning meeting in May 2000 we decided that we would concentrate on issues on the current political agenda and on practical steps that lead toward nuclear disarmament. We decided to give immediate attention to halting deployment of a U.S. national missile defense (NMD) and eventually to terminating the program. Beyond that we committed ourselves to developing public support for arms control treaties as they come before the U.S. Senate, including CTBT, START II protocol, a future START III agreement, and other treaties of this nature. We also agreed to work on other nuclear disarmament issues as they arise, such as de-alerting, the Nunn-Lugar program, halting new weapon development, non-proliferation measures, negotiation of a nuclear weapons convention, and instituting an international regime of fissile material control.

We moved into action in June and July. The Friends Committee for National Legislation took the initiative to get a sign-on letter from religious leaders to President Clinton opposing deployment of national missile defense. In collaboration with 20/20 Vision, 28 faith-based organizations distributed more than 40,000 postcards to get our constituents around the country to write the president in opposition to NMD. Some organizations also used electronic means to transmit the message to grassroots networks. Thus, we became another source of pressure on President Clinton.

In November we decided to prepare for the next presidential administration and the next Congress by making contact with key Republican senators who can help build a strong bipartisan majority for reducing nuclear threats and achieving nuclear arms reduction. In particular, we agreed to focus on possibilities for de-alerting and U.S.-Russian strategic arms reduction through START III or reciprocal executive initiatives. We are now in the process of organizing interfaith groups in nine states to meet with ten key senators, and we are also talking with their staffs in Washington. After this is underway we will add another ten senators to our list and may eventually reach 30 or more. Later we will turn our attention to the House of Representatives, especially the Armed Services Security Committee. We are also seeking to contact key officials in the Bush Administration.

At the same time we are working with Back from the Brink Campaign to develop grassroots support for de-alerting. In early January, 11 faith groups joined with 11 civil-sector organizations in co-sponsoring a 20/20 postcard asking their members to writing incoming

President Bush in support of de-alerting. A variety of faith organizations are publicizing call-in days to the White House on de-alerting scheduled for February 5 and 6.

During 2001 we will deal with other issues as they arise, such as national missile defense, nuclear posture review, development of mini-nukes, and the Nunn-Lugar program. On the latter we have invited Senator Lugar's staff to meet with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at one of our monthly meetings. In this case we may go somewhat beyond the nuclear field and support U.S. funding of the proposed Russian chemical weapons destruction facility in Shchuchye.

### **Faith-based Networks**

Although the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is based in Washington, much of our work occurs through outreach to faith-based grassroots networks located all around the United States.

Denominations differ in structure and the extent of centralization or decentralization, but most of them have a national headquarters for their officers and support staff. A few of the national units are located in Washington, D.C., but most are based elsewhere around the country. Of the latter, some of the larger ones maintain an office for public policy advocacy in Washington, D.C. So do historic peace churches. These form the base for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, but we seek to include denominations that lack Washington offices

Most denominations have regional units known variously as diocese, synod, conference, presbytery, convention, and district with a presiding officer known as bishop, conference minister, president, and other titles. These dioceses and conferences often have staff and working committees, including one on social action. The staff and committees of dioceses and conferences are in touch with local churches, their pastors and members. These intermediate units are an important part of our outreach network.

National offices often communicate with their regional units and have them pass the messages and material on to local churches. National offices also have lists of key contacts on various issues, increasingly on the internet, and they communicate with them directly. Thus, we are able to tap into these established means of communication and reach grassroots activists throughout the country on issues of nuclear disarmament.

Within each denomination are unofficial associations that bring together persons with common interests, such as Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, Pax Christi, Presbyterian Peace Fellowship, Jewish Peace Fellowship, and associations drawn from Catholic religious orders. There are also organizations cutting across denominational lines, such as Evangelicals for Social Action, Fellowship of Reconciliation, and Sojourners. All of them have individual members located around the country who are strongly committed to working on peace and justice issues. Some of them have state and local chapters. There are also interfaith associations in many states with a concern for peace and justice issues. All of them will be valuable participants in outreach activities of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, as they were in the CTBT campaign. In total the denominational and association networks can reach hundreds of thousands of peace activists.

## **Strategies and Tactics**

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament uses a variety of tactics for achieving its goals. We combine education and public advocacy activities. Foundation support goes for activities permitted for 501(c)(3) organizations under the Internal Revenue Code. Activities considered direct lobbying and legislative alerts to grassroots networks are paid by denominational offices from their own funds. We are careful to make that distinction.

In outline the activities we undertake include the following.

### Grassroots mobilization

- Use of grassroots networks of denominations and religious associations
- State and local interfaith organizing
- Information dissemination (study guides, fact sheets, bulletin inserts)
- Action alerts (via U.S. mail, e-mail, fax)
  - By participating organizations
  - Jointly
- Letters, phone calls, e-mail to public officials
- Home state meetings with members of Congress
- Petitions
- National call-in days
- Regional training workshops
- Conference calls
- Worship and celebration

### Public policy advocacy in Washington

- Sign-on letters
- Lobby days
- Meetings with members of Congress and their staff
- Meetings with Executive Branch officials
- News conferences
- Newspaper ads
- Rallies
- Ceremonies

## **Collaboration with Civil-sector Organizations**

As noted, we work closely with civil-sector organizations. We have an informal corps of advisers who attend our monthly meetings, including staff from 20/20 Vision, Bank from the Brink Campaign, and others involved in grassroots activities. In January we had a briefing session on de-alerting and strategic arms reduction led by Dr. Bruce Blair, president, Center for Defense Information, and Daryl Kimball, executive director, Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers.

Members of the faith community participate in various working groups organized by the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. Coming out a recent meeting of the Deep Cuts/NMD Working Group, we will be involved in an effort to reach European and Canadian contacts to encourage opposition to national missile defense. We will also work with several civil-sector

organizations to develop a report showing the total nuclear threat to United States (Russian and Chinese missiles, unsecured fissile material, possible future possession of nuclear weapons by a few new nations and terrorist groups, delivery by a variety of means) and the most appropriate responses to these threats (of which national missile defense seems a low priority of doubtful technological feasibility and questionable cost effectiveness). We are also in touch with a group of organizations reviewing the U.S. nuclear posture, a topic we are considering.

## **International Contacts**

We maintain contact with the international faith community. For the 1998 meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee in Geneva, Howard Hallman worked with Pax Christi USA to develop a statement transmitted to the delegates by Dr. Konrad Reiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president, Pax Christi International. Hallman also drafted an NGO statement on "A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons" that was read to the delegates by U.S. Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton.

In October 2000 Hallman attended a consultation of church representatives from Europe, Canada, and the United States in Brussels to consider ways to encourage NATO to lessen its dependence on nuclear weapons. He is in touch with efforts (a) by the World Council of Churches to have its Central Committee issue a fresh statement on nuclear disarmament toward the end of January and (b) by Pax Christi International to issue a similar statement in April, signed by leading Catholic bishops from different continents from around the globe. He also maintains contact with representatives of the Holy See in Rome and at the United Nations.

## **Request for Support**

Given the experience of the faith community and our extensive grassroots network, we believe that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament would be a natural partner for the new Nuclear Threat Initiative. Therefore, we ask you to consider allotting \$1 million a year for five years to obtain full participation of the faith community. This would enable us to convert what is now a shoestring operation, squeezed out of fairly meager resources, into a much fuller endeavor. This amount would be spent as follows.

**Core support.** The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament functions as a loose-knit coalition of faith-based organizations. This works better than attempting to form a separate corporation with a formal board of directors and staff. That's because denominational offices can be involved without going through elaborate approval mechanisms they would need if they were to have formal affiliation with a legal entity. Furthermore, the relaxed nature of the Interfaith Committee enables participating organizations to choose which precise issues they want to work on and how they will approach these issues within their networks. This eliminates the need to seek unanimity on every issue and every activity.

First, given this situation, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament needs catalytic leadership to keep it together and to move it along. This is provided by its chair, Howard Hallman, who has been chosen by consensus. His role is similar to that described in the report on CTBT activities.

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

Some of the requested funds will therefore go to the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, a 501(c)(3) entity, in support of Hallman's half-time service as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Information about his qualifications is provided below.

Second, there is need for a field coordinator to facilitate interfaith cooperation at the state and local levels. Participating organizations reach out to their own grassroots networks to get them to act on issues of nuclear threat reduction and disarmament. State and local groups can be more effective if they join with other faith groups in their state and congressional district in making contact with their senators and representatives. For this to come about there needs to be persons in states and districts responsible for pulling groups together. This might be somebody from any of the participating denominations, encouraged by denominational headquarters. Achieving this requires a field coordinator working with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament to orchestrate state and local cooperation.

Third, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament needs a common web site to serve as a central source of faith-based information on nuclear threat reduction and disarmament and to provide linkages with web sites of denominations, civil-sector organizations, and governmental agencies.

Fourth, occasionally the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will want to publish reports developed collectively by its participating organizations. By and large distribution will be handled by these organizations themselves.

**Outreach.** Core support will account for less than one-fourth of the requested grant of \$1 million. The remainder will be spent to broaden the base of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and to enable participating organizations to increase their outreach capacity. This will be achieved through a series of grants to entities dealing with particular segments and to particular denominational offices.

The highest priority will be given to bringing in segments of the faith community that are not now fully involved in disarmament activities. These gaps are shown in Attachment 2. Although leaders of African American denominations, Methodist and Baptist, sometimes sign statements and letters to public officials on nuclear disarmament, their networks are not involved. We believe that a way to break through would be to give a grant to a black church consortium to hire a staff person who would work on nuclear disarmament issues and seek involvement of their grassroots networks. A similar grant should be given to an entity representative of the Evangelical community. This possibility also needs to be explored for the Orthodox Christian, Jewish, and Muslim faith communities.

The second priority is to bolster the staff of major Protestant and Catholic denominations working for nuclear disarmament. As it is, denominational staff cover an amazing number of issues and don't always make meetings of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament because they are attending meetings on other subjects, such as Latin America, Africa, Middle East, debt relief, the world AIDS crisis, human rights, and others matters. It would be desirable, therefore, to provide a series of small grants so that they can add staff, such as an intern, who will work full time on nuclear disarmament and participate fully in grassroots outreach.

These organizational grants combined with the facilitating work of the chair and field coordinator will leverage substantial resources from participating denominations and religious associations.

### **Annual Budget**

#### **I. Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament**

##### **A. Leadership**

Chair -- ½ time	\$ 36,000
Fringe benefits (15%)	<u>5,400</u>
	41,400
Non-personal	<u>18,600</u>
	60,000

##### **B. Outreach**

Field coordinator -- full time	\$ 50,000
Fringe benefits (15%)	<u>7,500</u>
	57,500
Non-personal	<u>32,500</u>
	90,000

##### **C. Communications**

Program assistant	\$ 30,000
Fringe benefits (15%)	<u>4,500</u>
	34,500
Non-personal (including web site contractual)	<u>25,500</u>
	60,000

##### **D. Joint Publications**

\$ 25,000

=====

\$ 235,000

#### **II. Mobilizing grants to denominational units and other entities**

\$ 765,000

Total requested per year

=====

\$1,000,000

## United Methodist Church Opposes Bush's Missile Defense

U.S. Newswire

13 Jun 13:14

### **United Methodist Church Opposes Bush's Missile Defense**

To: National Desk

Contact: Bishop Dale White, 401-856-0966 (work) or 401-847-3419

(home) or Jaydee Hanson, 202-488-5650

Both of the United Methodist Church

WASHINGTON, June 13 /U.S. Newswire/ -- The General Board of Church and Society of the United Methodist Church is working to defeat the nuclear missile defense system. President Bush is a member of the United Methodist Church. The church's 67 bishops have unanimously approved a strongly worded statement urging the defeat of President Bush's proposed strategic missile defense system.

The Bishops' statement follows the passage of a resolution by The General Conference of the United Methodist Church calling for an end to the development of the missile defense system. Citing the threat to world security and peace presented by the proposed system, the Church's General Board of Church and Society (GBCS) plans to deploy staff, gather volunteers, create a web site, lobby members of Congress and establish a vigorous program to reach the Church's 12 million members worldwide. Since one of those members is President George W. Bush, the actions of the Bishops, the General Conference, the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society are especially significant. All other national religious bodies will be invited by The General Board of Church and Society to join their efforts to defeat the missile defense system.

The concerns about "Star Wars II" as articulated by GBCS, go far beyond the complaints of the system's unworkability and astronomical costs. Because of the great vulnerability of the weapons being considered (including lasers and interceptors in space, in the air, and at sea), they would be useless to an innocent nation waiting to be attacked.

Potentially useful to an aggressor with the element of surprise on its side, the weapon's primary uses are all offensive, including destroying opposing satellites, seizing military control of space, and attacking targets on the surface of the earth from space without warning.

The United Methodist Bishops in their resolution call upon all people of goodwill to join actively in the struggle to achieve peace with justice. Appealing to President Bush and Congress to refrain from the development of a national missile defense system, the Bishops state, "We must join together to see that the untold billions of dollars proposed for a meaningless search for security through a national missile defense system are not once again taken from the mouths of children and the poor."

---

Only the General Conference speaks for the entire denomination.  
The General Board of Church and Society is the international public  
policy and social action agency of The United Methodist Church.

KEYWORDS:

DEFENSE POLICY, GOVERNMENT, POLICY, RELIGION

-0-

/U.S. Newswire 202-347-2770/

06/13 13:14

Copyright 2001, U.S. Newswire

## Open Letter to President George W. Bush and Preside Vladimir Putiin

Dear Soulmates:

You seemed to hit it off very well at your recent meeting in Slovonia. That's good for both nations and for the world.

The press reports that you spent a lot of time talking about missile defense and its relationship to the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and other arms control treaties. However, you apparently never reached the point of confessing what you both know in your heart-of-hearts: that the nuclear weapons of the United States and Russia are useless except to deter the other side's nuclear weapons.

Numerous military leaders, including General Colin Powell when he was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have testified that nuclear weapons have no utility in military combat. They are simply too powerful and too destructive for military objectives, which can be achieved more readily by other means. Deterrence is all that remains.

The United States maintains its strategic nuclear arsenal to deter Russia from attacking with its nuclear arsenal. Conversely Russia maintains its strategic nuclear arsenal to deter the United States from attacking with its nuclear arsenal. If one side had no nuclear weapons, the other side would have no need for its nuclear weapons. That's that plain and simple truth. The corollary is that the wisest course would be to simultaneously and expeditiously eliminate both nations' nuclear arsenals.

This bold idea was actually considered in 198\_ by President Reagan and President Gorbachev when the met in Reyk.... The stumbling block then was Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI but popularly known as Star Wars), which aimed at making the United States invulnerable to missile attack. Gorbachev wouldn't agree to total nuclear disarmament unless Reagan dropped SDI. Reagan was too committed to SDI to terminate it.

It turns out that both had too much faith in American technological prowess. During the Reagan and first Bush administrations the United States spent \$ billion without producing a single workable strategic defense system. Gorbachev need not have worried. Reagan could have put aside his fantasy for the more significant objective of a world free from the curse of nuclear weapons.

President Bush, President Putin, please don't make the same mistake. Don't allow missile defense to prevent you from searching your souls and resolving to achieve what is both feasible and desirable: the mutual elimination of the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals. With the U.S. arsenal eliminated, Russia would have no fear that the U.S. would hide behind a missile shield to make a pre-emptive attack. Furthermore, mutual elimination of nuclear weapons could occur many years before the U.S. could develop a missile shield (which may never occur anyway because of technological infallibility).

Although a distinguish panel of scientists recently issued recommendations for nuclear arms reduction claimed this would take at least two decades to achieve, the timetable could be much faster. For starters it would be possible to stand down, that is, to remove from active deployment

both arsenals in their entirety within a year or two. The natural starting place would be the strategic weapons scheduled for elimination under the second Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START II). Other weapons would follow in a mutual schedule that would place neither side at a disadvantage at any moment. This could be achieved with mutual verification.

Weapons taken out of active deployment would then be dismantled on a schedule that also prevents either side from gaining an advantage. Two precedents would be drawn upon: (1) the Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF) Reduction Treaty, signed by Reagan and Gorbachev in 1987, which has recently completed the task of dismantling an entire system of nuclear weapons with mutual inspection; and (2) the Nunn-Lugar-Domenici programs of nuclear threat reduction whereby the United States provides financial and technical assistance to Russia for the dismantlement of nuclear weapons and for the safe storage of nuclear material.

645 words

## How To Apply For a Grant

The Ploughshares Fund supports organizations and individuals working to stop the spread of weapons and build regional security. The Ploughshares Fund can make grants for direct lobbying programs. There are no geographical limitations on grants. The Ploughshares Fund does not fund the production of films, videotapes or books. It also does not fund the research and writing of academic dissertations.

If you are uncertain whether your project fits into Ploughshares' areas of interest, you are encouraged to write a brief letter describing your project. We will let you know if a full proposal is appropriate.

### When to Apply

The Ploughshares Fund Board of Directors meets four times a year. Proposals must be received two months in advance in order to be eligible for consideration at a board meeting. The Ploughshares Fund may also consider requests for emergency funding on a discretionary basis. For more information, please contact our office at 415-775-2244. We accept and encourage proposals submitted by email. Please do not send multiple copies.

### 2000-2001 Proposal Deadlines:

December 1  
February 15  
April 16  
July 16

To ensure the smooth processing of your application, please include the following information:

### Summary Page

Organization name, address telephone number and website  
Name, address and email address (if available) of contact person  
Contact person, address and telephone number of fiscal sponsor, if applicable  
Project title  
Amount requested  
Total project and organization budgets  
Summary description of organization and project

### Full Proposal

Proposals should be clear and concise and contain the following information:

## Description of organization

Full description of project: (No more than ten pages.)

What are the objectives of the project?

What are the methods by which the project will be accomplished?

What audience(s) do you intend to reach?

How will you evaluate the success of the project?

Information and/or documentation of current or past accomplishments.  
(It is unnecessary to include large amounts of material; just a few examples will suffice.)

List of Board of Directors

List of key staff and their qualifications

If you are applying to renew a current grant from the Ploughshares Fund, you must include a report (no longer than three pages) on the current status of the grant. This report is NOT a substitute for the final report required in the original grant agreement.

Names and telephone numbers of three references

## Financial Information

Complete budgets for the project and the organization.

IRS letter of determination indicating the tax status of the organization.

Fiscal sponsor's IRS letter of determination and a letter from the fiscal sponsor agreeing to act in that role (if applicable).

Other sources of funding and potential funding. List of current funders.  
To what other organizations have you applied or will you apply for support?

## Email

[ploughshares@ploughshares.org](mailto:ploughshares@ploughshares.org)

## Mail/phone/fax

Ploughshares Fund  
Fort Mason Center  
Bldg. B, Suite 330  
San Francisco, CA 94123

tel: (415) 775-2244

fax: (415) 775-4529

# **Get Rid of the Nukes**

**An Open Letter to President George W. Bush and President Vladimir Putin**

**from Howard W. Hallman**

Dear Soulmates:

You have gotten along well at your first two meetings as you explore a new strategic relationship between the United States and Russia. That's encouraging. What's less encouraging is that your discussion has the wrong focus. You're talking mostly about missile defense when you should be considering the common interest in eliminating all nuclear weapons. To the extent that you're discussing nuclear weapons, you're stuck on Cold War doctrine that continues to rely upon a sizable nuclear arsenal committed to the doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD).

The truth is nuclear weapons have no legitimate place in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They have no utility in combat. They are not needed as an instrument of deterrence. As numerous religious bodies have declared, their use and threatened use is immoral.

Experience of the past fifty years has shown that nuclear weapons have no military utility in combat situations. American presidents came to this realization in the Korean War, the Vietnam War, and the Gulf War. Soviet and Russia leaders came to a similar conclusion in Afghanistan, in dealing with rebellious republics, such as Chechnya, and in border skirmishes. Numerous generals and admirals who have studied other possible battle situations in today's world have come to a similar conclusion. Furthermore, the nation that used nuclear weapons for the first time since 1945 would pay an enormous political cost in world opinion.

In a quiet moment think about this. Consider the hundreds of thousands of innocent victims who would die and be maimed and the environmental destruction that would occur if nuclear weapons were used. As you do, you will almost certainly conclude in your heart-of-hearts that you will never authorize the use of nuclear weapons.

So why keep them? What remains is the Cold War doctrine of using nuclear weapons to deter other nuclear weapons. Simple logic and application of common sense tells us that if the United States, Russia, and all other possessors would get rid of their nuclear arsenals, there would be nothing to deter. This leads inextricably to the conclusion that the wisest course would be the total elimination of all nuclear weapons.

So, President Bush and President Putin, the starting point for a truly modern, 21<sup>st</sup> century strategic framework would be a mutual declaration, "We do not need nuclear weapons any more. Therefore, we will work together for their total elimination." Together you can then get heads of other nuclear-weapon states to join you in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear arsenals."

Once you start with this premise the steps fall easily into place. They include:

- Take all missiles off hair-trigger alert and carry out other measures to stand down the nuclear arsenal.
- Fully implement START II and make further cuts in the strategic arsenals by treaty, executive agreement, or unilateral initiatives.
- Continue the moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions and ratify and implement the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).
- Negotiate a multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material and carry out vigorous measures to safeguard existing fissile material.
- Institute strict international controls on missile technology.
- Carry out these steps with complete openness and adequate verification.
- Negotiate and implement a Nuclear Weapons Convention that outlaws nuclear weapons with effective international inspection and verification.

Where does missile defense fit into this scheme of things? First, missile defense against current possessors of nuclear weapons becomes moot as existing arsenals are eliminated. Second, missile defense against future adversaries will not be needed if vigorous nuclear non-proliferation measures are carried out, including strict international control over fissile material and missile technology. Prevention of alien states and terrorists groups from acquiring fissile material for their "suitcase" bombs, delivered surreptitiously, will do far more to promote security from nuclear attack than the unproven, vastly costly, and probably technologically infeasible missile defense schemes.

Therefore, Mr. Presidents, cast out outdated Cold War thinking and lead us in a truly 21<sup>st</sup> century approach to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

To President George W. Bush and President Vladimir Putin

Dear Mr. Presidents:

As religious leaders from many parts of the globe, we appeal with you to carry out a new quality of leadership to protect humankind from nuclear destruction. We write as the terrorist attacks on Washington and New York and previous terrorist attacks in Moscow signal a new era in the quest for global security. Undeterred by the world's largest nuclear arsenals, they plant bombs, hijack and crash commercial airlines. If they could, they would acquire and explode nuclear weapons. There may be some alien states that would do likewise.

There is a twofold solution for which your leadership is essential. First, all existing nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles must be totally secure from misuse and every gram of fissile material must be absolutely secure from falling into the wrong hands. Second, all peoples on Earth must be secure from nuclear attack by any of the current possessors of nuclear weapons and by party that might acquire them. This can be best achieved by the total elimination of all nuclear weapons and stringent control over all fissile material.

This is definitely within the national interest of the United States and Russia because nuclear weapons have no legitimate place in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They have not deterred numerous regional wars during the past fifty years, and clearly they do not deter terrorists. They have no utility in combat as your predecessors discovered in wars in Korea, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and other locales. Furthermore, as numerous religious bodies have declared, the use and threatened use of nuclear weapons is immoral.

In a quiet moment think about this. Consider the hundreds of thousands of innocent victims who would die and be maimed and the environmental destruction that would occur if nuclear weapons were used. As you do, you will almost certainly conclude in your heart-of-hearts that you will never authorize the use of nuclear weapons.

So why keep them? What remains is the Cold War doctrine of using nuclear weapons to deter other nuclear weapons through the doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). Simple logic and application of common sense tells us that if the United States, Russia, and all other possessors would get rid of their nuclear arsenals, there would be nothing to deter. This leads inextricably to the conclusion that the wisest course would be the total elimination of all nuclear weapons. This would provide mutual security from nuclear attack by another nuclear-weapon state. When combined with strict control of fissile material, it would prevent terrorist groups from acquiring and using nuclear weapons.

President Bush and President Putin, the starting point for a truly modern, 21<sup>st</sup> century strategic framework would be a mutual declaration, "We do not need nuclear weapons any more. Therefore, we will work together for their total elimination." Together you can then get heads of other nuclear-weapon states to join you in "an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear arsenals."

Once you start with this premise the steps fall easily into place. They include:

- Take all missiles off hair-trigger alert and carry out other measures to stand down the nuclear arsenal. This would eliminate the danger of launch by accident or by a rebel group.
- Fully implement START II and make further cuts in the strategic arsenals by treaty, executive agreement, or unilateral initiatives. Bring other nuclear-weapon states into this process.
- Continue the moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions and ratify and implement the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).
- Negotiate a multilateral treaty banning the production of fissile material and carry out vigorous measures to safeguard existing fissile material.
- Institute strict international controls on missile technology.
- Carry out these steps with complete openness and adequate verification.
- Negotiate and implement a Nuclear Weapons Convention that outlaws nuclear weapons with effective international inspection and verification.

Where does missile defense fit into this scheme of things? First, missile defense against current possessors of nuclear weapons becomes moot as existing arsenals are eliminated. Second, missile defense against future adversaries will not be needed if vigorous nuclear non-proliferation measures are carried out, including strict international control over fissile material and missile technology. Prevention of alien states and terrorists groups from acquiring fissile material for "suitcase" bombs will do far more to promote security from nuclear attack than the unproven, vastly costly, and probably technologically infeasible missile defense schemes.

Therefore, Mr. Presidents, we implore you to cast aside outdated Cold War thinking and lead us in a truly 21<sup>st</sup> century approach to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

With best regards,

Religious leaders from around the world.