

To: jnoble@rac.org
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Correction
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abl.084.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Josh,

Earlier when I wrote you about the final version of the letter to presidential candidates, I sent the wrong attachment. Here is the correct one.

Howard

To: "Gary Baldrige" <gbaldrige@cbfnet.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Final version: letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <s9a11f68.059@mail.cbfnet.org>
References:

At 12:23 PM 8/21/00 -0400, you wrote:
>Please do send a text version. Thanks.

Here it is:

August 18, 2000 imilar letter sent to:

The Honorable George W. Bush	Vice President Albert Gore, Jr.
State Capitol	Mr. Ralph Nader
100 E. 11th Street	Mr. Patrick J. Buchanan
Austin, TX 78701	Mr. John Hagelin

Dear Governor Bush:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Honorable George W. Bush

August 18, 2000

Page two

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and

The Honorable George W. Bush

August 18, 2000

Page three.

to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal

initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

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

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

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

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

Respectfully yours,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Green
Professor, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thomas J. Jeavons, General Secretary
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)
Philadelphia, PA
Rabbi Michael Lerner
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine
San Francisco, CA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dr. Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action
Wynnewood, PA
Dr. Glen Stassen, Professor
Fuller Theological Seminary

Pasadena, CA

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA
The Rev. Dr. Daniel W. Weiss, General Secretary
American Baptist Churches USA
Valley Forge, PA

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

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

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

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

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

Organizations are list for purpose of identification.

A reply to this letter may be address to the facilitator of this initiative:

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

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

To: "Gary Baldrige" <gbaldrige@cbfnet.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Final version: letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <s9a11f68.059@mail.cbfnet.org>
References:

At 12:23 PM 8/21/00 -0400, you wrote:
>Please do send a text version. Thanks.

Here it is:

August 18, 2000 imilar letter sent to:

The Honorable George W. Bush	Vice President Albert Gore, Jr.
State Capitol	Mr. Ralph Nader
100 E. 11th Street	Mr. Patrick J. Buchanan
Austin, TX 78701	Mr. John Hagelin

Dear Governor Bush:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Honorable George W. Bush

August 18, 2000

Page two

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and

The Honorable George W. Bush

August 18, 2000

Page three.

to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal

initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

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

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

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

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

Respectfully yours,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Green
Professor, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thomas J. Jeavons, General Secretary
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)
Philadelphia, PA
Rabbi Michael Lerner
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine
San Francisco, CA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dr. Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action
Wynnewood, PA
Dr. Glen Stassen, Professor
Fuller Theological Seminary

Pasadena, CA

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA
The Rev. Dr. Daniel W. Weiss, General Secretary
American Baptist Churches USA
Valley Forge, PA

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

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

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

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

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

Organizations are list for purpose of identification.

A reply to this letter may be address to the facilitator of this initiative:

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

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

To: adam
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Further questions, information
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments: A:\abl.093.doc; A:\abolish.289.doc;
In-Reply-To:
References:

Dear Adam,

Thanks for letting me know of your calling plans. It sounds like you have it under control.

Is Mary McGory included in your call list? She attended the news conference on de-alerting last December and wrote a column on it.

Is there any chance that C-SPAN would be interested? Congress probably won't be very active this week, so they may have some time.

Attached is a draft of my opening remarks, with a couple of gaps. It may help you with your pitch.

Also attached is a substitute final page of the letter to the candidates with two additional signers as an addendum. You can substitute it when you make copies of this letter.

I'm going to Monday Lobby at midday on Tuesday. Is there any need for me to stop by your office afterwards? Otherwise you can reach me by phone before 11:00 and after 2:00.

August 2, 2000

President William Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

You have indicated that you will soon be deciding whether to start deployment of a national missile defense (NMD). We recommend that your decision be negative: do not deploy national missile defense.

As a national association of laity and clergy, we wholeheartedly support the official position of the United Methodist Church, as adopted by the 2000 General Conference, which met in Cleveland in May. As one of ten actions leading to the abolition of nuclear weapons, the General Conference called upon the possessors of nuclear weapons to "halt all efforts to develop and deploy strategic missile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful."

National missile defense seeks a technologically solution for challenges that instead call for skilled diplomacy. That's certainly the case with North Korea where new opportunities are opening. Likewise with Iran and even Iraq if we cease the ill-advised sanctions that are making innocent people suffer.

Moreover, national missile defense is a vast waste of resources that could be better used elsewhere. This scheme is a fulfillment of President Eisenhower's warning about the growing influence of the military-industrial complex. It's the defense contractors who will profit most from development of NMD, not the average American.

Therefore, we say: just say no.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman
Chair

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

August 2, 2000

To: Nancy Small
Pax Christi USA

Fax: 814 452-4784

No. of pages: 4

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Nancy:

The attached letter to presidential candidates asking questions about nuclear disarmament is something I've worked out with Dave Robinson during the past couple of months. Our intent is to get 25 to 30 religious leaders as signers and send it to the candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties on August 18, the day after the last nominating convention (the Democrats). We will ask for their replies by September 5 and hold a news conference on September 7 to release the results.

I have started the process of getting signers. I'm getting five or six United Methodist bishops and reaching out to other denominations and other faiths. David indicated that he could get Bishop Sullivan, Bishop Gumbleton, and several other Catholic bishops affiliated with Pax Christi to sign. However, his absence for a week because of his grandmother's death and then your national assembly curtailed his activities on this letter.

I'm approaching you rather than waiting for Dave to come back because of the tight deadline. Would you be able to help get five or six Catholic bishops? Or I'm willing to write the ones you suggest. (That's what I've done with Episcopal bishops because Mary Miller and Tom Hart have been too busy.) Or I can wait for Dave's return if necessary.

I've reserved space at the National Press Club for Thursday afternoon, September 7 for the news conference. United Methodist Bishop Dale White will participate. I'm hoping that either Bishop Sullivan or Bishop Gumbleton can be there. I realize that it's the week of your staff "retreat", but it seems the right time to have the news conference and get the candidates' answers into the public domain. We're hoping that reporters and grassroots activists will ask follow up questions to the candidates.

If you want to discuss this further with me, please call me at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,

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

August 3, 2000

To: Dr. Robert Parham
Baptist Center for Ethics

Fax: 615 383-0915

No. of pages: 4

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Dr. Parham:

Out of our concern for peace and justice, we believe that the future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Pax Christi USA we have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Would you be willing to be a signer?

The initial signers are United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. For additional signers we are seeking national leaders and prominent clergy from other Christian denominations and other faiths. Among others Dr. Glen Stassen has signed.

Our intent is to mail the letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

With this schedule we would like to have your reply no later than August 14. You can reply by phone or fax at 301 896-0013, by e-mail at mupg@igc.org, or by writing to the above address. If you have any questions, please call me.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Chair

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

August 7, 2000

To: Russell Siler, Mark Brown

Fax: 202 783-7502

No. of pages: 5

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Letter to presidential candidates

Dear Russell and Mark:

I'm writing you as you return from vacation to retransmit a request I sent by e-mail a couple of weeks ago. It's about getting four to six Lutheran signers for the attached letter to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues, which I drafted with assistance of Dave Robinson of Pax Christi USA. Our intent is to mail this letter to the candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

As initial signers we have United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. So far we have ten additional signers, shown on the attached list. We have requests out to more than 30 others: Catholic, United Methodist, AME, AMEZ, CME, and Episcopal bishops; Baptist, Presbyterian, UCC, Unitarian, Jewish, Buddhist, and Muslim leaders. We will be satisfied if we get 25 to 30 signers with interfaith variety and geographic spread.

Although time is short, we would appreciate your helping us obtain several Lutheran leaders. They don't necessarily have to have official positions with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, but some kind of name recognition at least within denominational circles would be helpful. Our deadline is Monday, August 14, but for you with a late start that could be extended to August 16. I will need to know their names, title, organizational identity, city, and state.

You can reply to me by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, by phone or fax at 301 896-0013 or by letter to Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817. If you have any questions, please call me.

Shalom,

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

August 7, 2000

To: Bishop Joel Martinez

Fax: 402 466-7931

No. of pages: 5

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Letter to presidential candidates

Dear Bishop Martinez:

I understand that you may be interested in signing the letter to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues, which I sent previously, but that the letter may have been misplaced.

Here is another copy. If you are willing to sign, you can let me know by phone at 301 896-0013, by fax at the same number, by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, or by letter at the above address.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Shalom,

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

August 7, 2000

To: Irma Garrett

Fax: 713 529-7736

No. of pages: 5

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Letter to presidential candidates

Dear Ms. Garrett:

I am sending you a copy of the letter I sent to Bishop Hearn, requesting him to be a signer of a letter to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues. At General Conference I mentioned to him that I was working on such a letter. This is the fruition.

If Bishop Hearn is willing to sign, you can let me know by phone at 301 896-0013, by fax at the same number, by e-mail at mupj@igc.org, or by letter at the above address.

Please call me if you have any questions.

Shalom,

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

August 8, 2000

To: Bishop Arthur B. Williams

Fax: 216 771-9252

No. of pages: 5

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Letter to presidential candidates

Dear Bishop Williams:

I am sending again an invitation I faxed previously, requesting you to sign a letter to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament. I had an erroneous fax number.

Shalom,

Dear Arthur:

Here is a repeated of the letter I sent you at the Shalom Center.

Out of our concern for peace and justice, we believe that the future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Pax Christi USA we have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Would you be willing to be a signer?

The initial signers are United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan. Bishop White chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops that produced the 1986 report *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. Bishop Sullivan is president of Pax Christi USA. For additional signers we are seeking national leaders and prominent clergy from other Christian denominations and other faiths. We would appreciate your suggestions of other prominent Jewish leaders we should invite to sign.

Our intent is to mail the letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

With this schedule we would like to have your reply no later than August 14. You can reply by e-mail at mupg@igc.org or by phone or fax at 301 896-0013. If you have any questions, please call me.

With best regards,
Howard

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

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

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

Dear Mr. Vice President:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully yours,

Signers

Attachments:

Excerpts from statements by U.S. religious bodies.

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

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

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

July 21, 2000

August 8, 2000

Mr. Wes Pippert
National Press Building, #1092
Washington, DC 20045

Dear Wes:

Thanks for your willingness to be our sponsor for a room at the National Press Club for the afternoon of Thursday, September 7. We, of course, will pay all expenses.

The purpose of the news conference is to present the replies of presidential candidates to a letter from religious leaders on issues of nuclear disarmament. A copy of this letter, for which we are now getting signatures, is enclosed. It will go to the candidates on August 18.

Would you please call Michelle Licht in the catering department of the National Press Club to confirm your sponsorship. Her number is 202 662-7502.

If you have any questions about this arrangement, please get in touch with me.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman
Chair

August 8, 2000

Ms. Sally Lilienthal
The Ploughshares Fund
Fort Mason Center
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Sally:

I'm aware that you have some donors available who give small grants for 501(c)(4) activities between your regular board meetings. Therefore, I'm wondering if one or more of them would be willing to contribute a total of \$5,000 to help us stage a news conference and follow through media contacts for the release of replies of presidential candidates to a letter from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues.

The letter, which is attached, poses ten questions. While some of them touch on matters now being discussed in the presidential campaign, two of the questions (numbers 1 and 8) address the morality and utility of nuclear weapons, subjects usually avoided. We are seeking 30 to 35 signers from various denominations and faiths with racial/ethnic diversity and geographic spread around the country. For the most part we are not trying for heads of communion, who signed the joint statement by religious and military leaders issued by the Washington National Cathedral, but we will include that statement as an attachment, thereby showing their support for nuclear disarmament.

The letter will go to the presidential candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties on August 18, following the completion of the last nominating convention. We are asking for replies by September 5. We will release the replies on September 7 at a news conference at the National Press Club. The participants will include United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White, who has spearheaded that denomination's work on nuclear abolition, and either Bishop Walter Sullivan or Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, respectively president and past-president of Pax Christi USA. We are also seeking Jewish participation.

We will obtain a media consultant for two purposes: to help publicize and manage the news conference and to make contact with political reporters who are in touch with the presidential candidates so that they can ask follow-up

Ms. Sally Lilienthal
August 8, 2000
Page two.

questions. We are talking with Steven Rabinowitz and Bob Schaeffer about fulfilling this role, but we have yet to make final arrangements with one of them.

We ourselves will put the questions and answers into play with grassroots activists of the 30+ faith-based organizations associated with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Thus, when presidential candidates appear at public forums around the country, our people can ask questions on nuclear disarmament from a faith perspective.

Since I've last corresponded with you, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has formed. It builds on the experience of the CTBT campaign but has a broader agenda and is gaining wider participation. At a planning meeting on May 22 we decided to focus attention on national missile defense (NMD). Because most of the organizations haven't worked on this issue, I obtained and circulated briefing materials from Steve Young of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers. I invited 20/20 representatives to our June 22 meeting, and we decided to jointly develop a postcard alert on NDM. 20/20 had funds for this, and we have network connections. Within three weeks we had 28 sponsors, 20/20 produced the card (copy enclosed), and faith-based organizations began distributing the cards all around the country.

We're still seeking financial support for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, but this hasn't kept us from doing what we can with existing resources. I'm going ahead with the letter to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues with hope and faith that we can raise funds for the media consultant and other expenses. We will be grateful to you if you can assist us.

Please let me know if you need further information.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman
Chair

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

August 10, 2000

To: Steve Rabinowitz

Attn: Adam Segal

Fax: 202 543-7567

No. of pages: 5

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Letter to presidential candidates

Dear Steve:

We are in the process of gaining signers from religious leaders for the attached letter to presidential candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties in issues of nuclear disarmament. We have 20 signers so far and expect 30 to 40 with broad coverage of denominations and geographic areas. We will send the letter to the candidates on Friday, August 18 and ask for replies by Tuesday, September 5. We have reserved space at the National Press Club for Thursday afternoon, September 7 to release the candidates' replies. Our presenters will include United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White and Catholic Bishop Walter Sullivan.

We are seeking your assistance in promoting the news conference, sending the letter and candidates' reply to a wider sector of the news media, and making contact with key reporters and talk show producers so that they can ask the candidates follow-up questions. We ourselves will distribute the letter and the replies to religious grassroots activists around the country so that they can appear at candidates' rallies and forums to ask questions on nuclear disarmament issues.

We realize that there is always uncertainty whether the candidates will respond to our letter and whether anyone in the news media will be interested in the replies, or lack thereof. However, we are introducing two issues that none of the candidates have addressed so far: the morality of possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons (question 1) and the military utility of nuclear weapons (question 8). If they don't want to answer these questions, we want reporters and grassroots activists to press them on these matters.

Would your firm be available to help us? If so, what would be your fee for this service? We don't have a lot of resources, but we can manage a fair price.

Since time is short, we would appreciate a response as soon as possible. If you need further information, please call me. I work out of my home, so you can reach me in the evening and on the weekend.

Shalom,

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

August 14, 2000

To: Dr. Tyrone Pitts

Fax: 202 398-4998

No. of pages: 6

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Letter to presidential candidates

Dear Dr. Pitts:

I realize that you've been out of town the last few weeks for your annual session. Therefore, I want to retransmit a request I made to you on July 22.

Out of our concern for peace and justice, we believe that the future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Pax Christi USA we have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Would you be willing to be a signer?

Those who have signed so far are shown on an attachment. Others are pending, including Catholic bishops, Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Unitarian leaders plus some from denominations already represented.

Our intent is to mail the letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

With this schedule we would like to have your reply no later than Wednesday, August 16. You may respond by phone or fax at 301 896-0013 or by e-mail at mupg@igc.org. If you have any questions, please call me.

With best regards,

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

August 14, 2000

To: Dr. Robert Parham

Fax: 615 383-0915

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Letter to presidential candidates

Dear Dr. Parham:

As you consider whether you will sign the letter to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues, you may be interested in who has signed to date. The list is attached. You will note that several Baptist leaders have already signed. By our deadline on Wednesday, August 16 we expect to have Presbyterian leaders, five or six additional Catholic bishops, and some more from denominations already represented.

Shalom,

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

August 14, 2000

To: Bishop McKinley Young

Fax: 214 333-1960

No. of pages: 6

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Letter to presidential candidates

Dear Bishop Young:

Not knowing that you had moved to Texas, I wrote you recently in Atlanta. Now I want to retransmit a request I made to you earlier.

Out of our concern for peace and justice, we believe that the future of the global nuclear arsenal is an issue that deserves serious consideration in the U.S. presidential campaign. Accordingly, with assistance of Pax Christi USA we have drafted the attached letter on this issue to candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties. Would you be willing to be a signer?

Those who have signed so far are shown on an attachment. Others are pending, including Catholic bishops, Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Unitarian leaders plus some from denominations already represented.

Our intent is to mail the letter to the candidates and their top advisors on Friday, August 18 after the last nominating convention has ended (the Democratic on August 17). We will ask the candidates to reply by Tuesday, September 5 and then hold a news conference on September 7 to release their replies.

With this schedule we would like to have your reply no later than Wednesday, August 16. You may respond by phone or fax at 301 896-0013 or by e-mail at mupg@igc.org. If you have any questions, please call me.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

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

August 14, 2000

To: Susan Easterwood

Fax: 312 787-5872

No. of pages: 7

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Letter to presidential candidates

Dear Ms. Easterwood:

Here is a copy of the letter I wrote to Bishop Persell, plus a copy of the letter to presidential candidates on nuclear disarmament issues, and a list of signers to date.

Our deadline is Wednesday afternoon, August 16. You may reply by phone or fax to 301 896-0013 or by e-mail to muj@igc.org

Thanks for your cooperation.

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

August 14, 2000

To: Sally Lilienthal

Fax: 415 775-4529

No. of pages: 3

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Sally:

I want to follow up by phone my letter inquiry whether you might help fund our news conference to release replies from presidential candidates to the letter from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. But before I do I want to supply you the list of signers to date. By Wednesday I expect a total of 35 to 40 names, including more Catholic bishops, Presbyterian leaders, and more from other denominations listed.

Shalom,

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

August 14, 2000

To: Sally Lilienthal

Fax: 415 775-4529

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Other signers

Dear Sally:

We've now added five Catholic bishops, another Episcopal bishop, and another Jewish leaders to the signers of the letter to presidential candidates, as follows:

Catholic bishops:

Most Rev. Victor H. Balke
Bishop of Crookston, MN

Most Rev. Matthew H. Clark
Bishop of Rochester, NY

Most Rev. Patrick F. Flores
Archbishop of San Antonio, TX

Most Rev. Thomas J. Gumbleton
Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, MI

Most Rev. Raymond A. Lucker
Bishop of New Ulm, MN

Most Rev. Walter F. Sullivan (previously signed)
Bishop of Richmond, VA
President, Pax Christi USA

Others:

The Right Reverend John Palmer Croneberger
Bishop Coadjutor , Episcopal Diocese of Newark (NJ)

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

August 18, 2000

The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500

Attn: Dr. Leon Fuerth

Dear Mr. Vice President:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.
August 18, 2000
Page two

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and

The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.
August 18, 2000
Page three.

to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

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

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

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

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

Respectfully yours,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Green
Professor, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Michael Lerner
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine
San Francisco, CA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA

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

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

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

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

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

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

Organizations are list for purpose of identification.

A reply to this letter may be address to the facilitator of this initiative:

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

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

August 18, 2000

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

Attn: Dr. Condoleezza Rice

Dear Governor Bush:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Honorable George W. Bush
August 18, 2000
Page two

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and

The Honorable George W. Bush
August 18, 2000
Page three.

to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

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

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

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

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

Respectfully yours,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Green
Professor, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Michael Lerner
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine
San Francisco, CA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA

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

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

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

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

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

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

Organizations are listed for purpose of identification.

A reply to this letter may be addressed to the facilitator of this initiative:

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

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

August 18, 2000

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

Dear Mr. Nader:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Ralph Nader
August 18, 2000
Page two

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and

Mr. Ralph Nader
August 18, 2000
Page three.

to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

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

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

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

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

Respectfully yours,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Green
Professor, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Michael Lerner
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine
San Francisco, CA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA

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

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

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

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

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

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

Organizations are listed for purpose of identification.

A reply to this letter may be addressed to the facilitator of this initiative:

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

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

August 18, 2000

Mr. Patrick J. Buchanan
Buchanan Reform, Inc.
18233 Old Court House Road
Vienna, VA 22182

Dear Mr. Buchanan:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Patrick J. Buchanan
August 18, 2000
Page two

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and

Mr. Patrick J. Buchanan
August 18, 2000
Page three.

to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

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

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

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

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

Respectfully yours,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Green
Professor, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Michael Lerner
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine
San Francisco, CA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA

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

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

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

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

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

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

Organizations are listed for purpose of identification.

A reply to this letter may be addressed to the facilitator of this initiative:

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

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

August 18, 2000

Similar letter sent to:

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

Vice President Albert Gore, Jr.
Mr. Ralph Nader
Mr. Patrick J. Buchanan
Mr. John Hagelin

Dear Governor Bush:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Honorable George W. Bush
August 18, 2000
Page two

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and

The Honorable George W. Bush
August 18, 2000
Page three.

to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

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

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

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

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

Respectfully yours,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Green
Professor, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Michael Lerner
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine
San Francisco, CA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA

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

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

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

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

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

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

Organizations are listed for purpose of identification.

A reply to this letter may be addressed to the facilitator of this initiative:

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

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

August 23, 2000

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

Dear Mr. Fuerth:

I am hand-delivering a second copy of a letter to Vice President Gore, to your attention, from 46 religious leaders who are asking a series of questions on nuclear disarmament issues. We are requesting a response by Tuesday, September 5. We have scheduled a news conference for Thursday, September 7 to release the responses of the presidential candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties.

We mailed this letter to you on Friday afternoon, August 18 from a post office in Bethesda, Maryland. It was sent priority mail with conformation of delivery requested. The U.S. Postal Service reports that an attempted delivery was made at 6:22 a.m. on August 21 (why so earlier, I don't understand) and a notice was left. Apparently no further attempt was made. I apologize for the delay.

We look forward to Vice President Gore's reply.

Sincerely yours,

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

August 28, 2000

To: Ms. Heidi Marquez
Bush-Cheney 2000

Fax: 512 344-3799

No. of pages: 6

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Letter to Governor Bush on nuclear disarmament

Dear Ms. Marquez:

Here is a copy of the letter to Governor Bush from 46 religious leaders, asking a series of questions on nuclear disarmament issues. We have sent a similar letter to the presidential candidates of the Democratic, Reform, and Green parties. We request a reply by Tuesday, September 5. A news conference is scheduled at the National Press Club for September 7 to release the replies from the presidential candidates. Therefore, we hope to hear from Governor Bush on a timely basis.

We mailed our letter to Governor Bush on August 18 via express mail. We have confirmation that it was received at the Governor's Office on August 21. On August 24 the correspondence unit there told me it was referred to the Campaign Office for response.

The letter contained the following attachments. If you want them again, please let me know, and I'll send them express mail.

Policy statements on nuclear disarmament by religious denominations
Joint statement of religious and military leaders on nuclear disarmament, issued by the
Washington National Cathedral
What Military Leaders Say about Utility of Nuclear Weapons.

Thanks for your cooperation.

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

August 29, 2000

To: Rabbi David Saperstein

Fax: 202 667-9070

No. of pages: 7

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Rabbi Saperstein:

Recently you joined 43 other religious leaders in signing a letter to the presidential candidates of the Democratic, Republican, Reform, and Green parties, asking them a series of questions about their position on nuclear disarmament issues. A copy is attached. We have asked for their replies by September 5 and have scheduled a news conference at the National Press Club for September 7 to release their responses.

Would you be willing to join Catholic Bishop Thomas Gumbleton and United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White as presenters at this news conference? It will start at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7, but we are asking the presenters to arrive at 1:30 for final briefing.

Attached is an outline of the format of the news conference. We would like you to offer a brief opening statement that offers a Jewish perspective on nuclear disarmament. Bishop Gumbleton and Bishop White will do likewise for their faiths. Then we want the three of you to take turns presenting the candidates response to our questions. After that will come questions from the press.

If you have questions about my request, please call me at 301 806-0013

With best regards,

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

August 31, 2000

To: Bishop Thomas Gumbleton

Fax: 313 897-2980

No. of pages: 7

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Bishop Gumbleton,

I deeply appreciate your rearranging your schedule so that you can participate in the news conference in Washington, D.C. to present replies from presidential candidates to the letter from religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. It will take place at 2:00 p.m., Thursday, September 7 at the National Press Club, 549 14th Street, NW. We are asking participants to meet there at 1:30 p.m. to review our approach. You will be joined as a presenter by United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White. We are also inviting Rabbi David Saperstein, director of Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, to join us.

Our media consultant is trying to set up interviews with TV and print media outlets before and after the press conference. Would you be available? If so, what times and days will you be free during your Washington visit?

For purposes of outreach to these news sources, please provide me biographic information about yourself, a page or so. You can e-mail it to me at mupj@igc.org or fax it to 301 896-0013. The latter is also my phone number if you want to call me.

Shalom,

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

August 31, 2000

To: Adam Eiding

Fax: 202 232-8340

No. of pages: 8

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Adam:

Here is biographical information on Bishop C. Dale White, Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, and myself (long and short version).

Bishop White arrives Wednesday evening and will be available for interviews on Thursday morning, September 7. Bishop Gumbleton is arriving that morning and leaving that evening. He has another interview to handle in the morning and will not be available to us. In his work with Methodists United for Peace with Justice he has helped develop linkages between faith-based organizations working on this issue and arms control and disarmament organizations in the civic sector.

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA

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

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

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

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

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

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

Addendum: Late Signers

Rabbi Mordechai Liebling
Jewish Reconstructionist Federation
and the Shefa Fund

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

Organizations are list for purpose of identification.

A reply to this letter may be address to the facilitator of this initiative:

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

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

General Lee Butler
JFK LIBRARY, BOSTON
NOVEMBER 22, 1998

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen, and thank you, Pierce, for your comments. I must confess, however, that I find myself left with decidedly mixed emotions. I've never before been introduced by a man my wife is in love with. On that score, my dear 007, I might remind you that in my last position while on active duty I might arguably have borne the titleŠ001.

I should say in the same breath that you have extraordinary taste in female admirers. You could not have a more loyal and devoted fan than Dorene Sue Nunley Butler, this talented, blond, Catholic dancer from California who chose me over a life of fame and fortune on the stage. Her reward for that fateful decision was to hang curtains in 28 different homes in our 33 years of life together in the Air Force. Our mutual prize was two extraordinary children and three enchanting grandchildren who collectively are the light of our lives.

Dorene and I are delighted to be back in Boston in the company of old friends and many new ones. Our first granddaughter, Madison Anne, was born here while son Brett was earning an MBA at Harvard Business School. I had the privilege of taking somewhat shorter courses at the business school and the Kennedy School, and value greatly the memories and the friendships from those endeavors.

It is equally a privilege to be your speaker this afternoon in this magnificent setting. I am indebted to the Lawyers Alliance for World Security for this recognition, and inspired by their intelligent, responsible efforts to reduce nuclear dangers. Those of us who have been in the arena, especially Ambassador Tom Graham, do not take the role of critic lightly. We are keenly aware of the constraints, the obstacles and the frustrations that confront the policymaker.

At the same time, we are equally seized by a sense of profound dismay, of opportunity lost, of danger prolonged, that the creative dimension of leadership has been displaced by the cautious underreach of the bureaucracy. In this 35th anniversary year of the signing of the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, who cannot yearn for the vision, the eloquence and above all the sense of personal accountability of a John F. Kennedy? He understood intuitively what legions of experts discounted, or ignored: that the prospect of nuclear war was intolerable.

That is precisely the understanding that compelled me from the blessed anonymity of retired life into the role of public critic of the nuclear weapon states and what I judge to be their irresponsible and potentially disastrous perpetuation of the most acute risks of the Cold War era.

This is not a role that I sought, relish or ever imagined. I became an instant icon of the abolition movement, about which I knew very little, in many respects admire, but with some elements of which I have sharp disagreements. I am besieged with invitations to speak, to appear, to write books and to otherwise take on a broader role I did not want and with which I am very conflicted. I frequently remind the more ardent critics of U.S. foreign and security policy who come to me for support that I was the co-author with Colin Powell of a post-Cold War military strategy premised on robust conventional forces and an unswerving U.S. commitment to global leadership.

No, this is not about notoriety, which is highly intrusive, nor personal income, which I do not need. I have no unfulfilled professional aspirations. My military career was supremely satisfying, my business career was instructive and rewarding and Dorene and I treasure our privacy.

Why then, you may very well ask, do I persist, however reluctantly, in this very public role of critic and in a more private role as advisor to policymakers who seek my views? Most simply put, because with every passing day I am increasingly convinced and concerned that the world has yet to grasp the elemental truths and the acute penalties which inform my condemnation of nuclear weapons.

I have labored as diligently as time and other responsibilities permit over the past two years to detail these truths and penalties, and more importantly, to understand the powerful forces that lead societies to tolerate, accept, embrace and even to celebrate nuclear weapons.

My efforts have been instructed and encouraged by the responses of both proponents and opponents of my public commentary. Ultimately, however, the several judgments that now follow are the product of deep and often painful reflection on nearly four decades of experience as a nuclear strategist, policymaker, planner and commander.

First, that from the earliest days of the nuclear era the risks, costs and consequences have never been properly understood nor calculated by the theorists, the planners and the poised practitioners of nuclear war.

Second, that nuclear weapons are not weapons at all. They are insanely destructive agents of physical and genetic terror, whose effects transcend time and space, poisoning the earth and deforming its inhabitants for generation upon generation.

Third, that the stakes of nuclear war engage not just the survival of the antagonists but the fate of mankind.

Fourth, that the prospect of shearing away entire societies has no military nor political justification.

Fifth, that the fateful decision of governments to acquire nuclear weapons ushers in a vast enterprise whose scope and complexity will inevitably move beyond the power of any individual or central authority to manage or to control.

Sixth, that despite the ringing rhetoric of deterrence, the mammoth organizations, with their gargantuan appetites, that make up the enterprise of nuclear weapons capability, are powerfully disposed toward greater numbers, enhanced destructiveness, more dangerous postures and first use in a crisis or conflict.

Seventh, that in the nuclear age, the increasingly convoluted prescriptions of deterrence became a formula for unmitigated disaster. Because the consequences of failure were intolerable, the quest for advantage was relentless, igniting cycle after cycle of trepidation, worst case assumptions and a reckless proliferation of nuclear devices and delivery systems.

Eighth, that nuclear weapons prey upon our deepest fears and pander to our darkest instincts. They thrive in the emotional climate born of utter alienation and isolation. They are the natural accomplice of visceral enmity. The unbounded wantonness of their effects is a perfect companion to the urge to destroy completely.

And, finally, that after decades of accommodating to their hideous presence, we have come to accept them as commonplace, inured to their consequences and perpetuating virtually unchanged the frightful policies, practices and postures of the Cold War. I find this incomprehensible and morally intolerable.

The penalties imposed on the nuclear weapon states have been severe. They have been especially so in our own society, corroding our sense of humanity, numbing our capacity for moral outrage and undermining the essential mechanisms of the democratic process. As President Kennedy remarked to Dean Rusk after his first formal briefing on the consequences of a general nuclear war, "and we call ourselves the human race."

Over the long, dark nightmare of the Cold War, the forces of fear, ignorance, greed, power, arrogance and secrecy invaded, weakened and subverted the most basic elements of democratic dialogue, debate and decision-making. From its earliest days, the piercing light of dispassionate scrutiny was shuttered in the name of security, doubts dismissed in the name of an acute and unrelenting threat, objections

overruled by the solemn innovation of vital national interests.

I have seen the price of such folly at close hand, been party to it, railed against it, and struggle still to understand its origins. But, I do understand the consequences and they are chilling. Vitaly important decisions were routinely taken without adequate understanding; assertions too often prevailed over analysis; requirements took on organizational biases; technological opportunity and corporate profits drove force levels and capability; and political opportunism intruded on calculations of military necessity. Authority and accountability were severed, policy dissociated from planning, and theory invalidated by practice. The narrow concerns of a multitude of powerful interests intruded on the rightful role of key policymakers, constraining their latitude for decision. Many were purposefully denied access to critical information essential to the proper exercise of their office.

These are harsh lessons. They go directly to the proposition, that for me lies at the heart of the matter and underwrites Article VI of the Nonproliferation Treaty: that the dictates of state sovereignty and supreme national interest cannot impose arbitrary limits on the establishment of global norms and sanctions promoting decent, civilized behavior—and prohibiting reckless, destructive behavior that threatens our planetary welfare.

Given this perspective, I want to make clear that for me the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons as legitimate instruments of national power is not an endpoint, it is a waypoint. It is an essential precondition to a state of moral grace that, having rejected the wholesale slaughter of human beings as an acceptable resort, is moving instead toward global endorsement of the rule of law. I would argue that goal will remain beyond our moral reach so long as we continue to cloak nuclear weapons as agents of stability, as if their possession somehow conveyed wisdom and forbearance, immunity from the rages of implacable hostility and clarity in the grip of crisis. We cannot at once hold sacred the gift of life and sacrosanct the capacity to destroy it utterly. Otherwise we fall victim to Stalin's horrific homely that we live in an age where the death of a single individual is a tragedy and the death of millions is a statistic.

It matters enormously that we finally regard nuclear weapons for what they are: the antithesis of hope and aspiration, destroyers of civilizations, purveyors of global ruination.

But how then, do we break free from the present dismal circumstances that we have invited by clinging so tenaciously to the fears and beliefs, the cautions and calculus, the policy and postures of a bygone era?

How is it we tolerate the spectacle of an arms control agreement held hostage to sovereign gridlock, its core numerical ceiling of 3500

operational weapons grossly excessive to the security needs of either party and indeed already well beyond the reach of a Russian strategic nuclear force in growing distress?

How is it we accept the reality of thousands of nuclear warheads still poised on high states of alert, ready for launch on a moment's notice? What can possibly justify this foolish, risky, costly and irrelevant posture? What could possibly send a more threatening, confusing and counter-productive message to a Russia sliding into chaos, fearful and suspicious of western intentions, yet desperately needing our resources and our good will?

How is it that NATO, having made what is in my strategic view the highly regrettable decision to expand toward Russia's collapsed western flank, insists upon retaining a nuclear weapons policy and posture that is wholly out of touch with its new security circumstances. Is it any wonder that Russia has abandoned its "no first use" policy, perversely earning the criticism of a NATO that refuses steadfastly to itself adopt such a policy despite it's now overwhelming conventional advantage?

But most importantly, what explains the intellectual and political paralysis in the nuclear weapon states that not only chills new thinking on these issues but actively penalizes it? The looming historical judgment of this community of political elites is that it proved unworthy of its era, incapable of seizing the moment so desperately sought, of exploiting the extraordinary opportunity for which we risked so much for so long.

This is a stunning turn of events. It suggests a major dislocation between the attitudes, habits and modalities conditioned by Cold War security concerns and the challenges, needs and opportunities of the global village that is emerging in its wake. Clearly, that is the case with respect to the incremental, numbers driven and exquisitely detailed approach to nuclear arms control enshrined in the SALT and START negotiations. What matters far more now are the policies, postures and practices that incentivize proliferation, perpetuate enmity, prolong risk and divert precious resources. Separation of warheads from delivery systems, cessation of testing and fissile material production, inventory transparency and accounting, no first use declarations, nuclear free zones and most importantly, a genuine commitment to elimination over the longer term are far more useful than arbitrary, incremental reductions over absurdly prolonged intervals.

New thinking on these and a host of other issues of planetary significance is of utmost urgency. If such thinking will not or worse cannot come from governments, then it must instead come from the rich resources of intellectual capital present in every society, and so abundantly in our own. Whether in the great universities, among which Harvard and M.I.T. rank with such eminence; the laboratories endowed with such brilliance; the NGOs that continue to flourish and to attract remarkable talent; the foundations,

councils, centers and institutes who sponsor and nourish individual genius, our nation has an infinite capacity to marshal its intellectual, economic and moral power.

Our present circumstances are not dire, but they are urgent. In the end it may matter little whether we poison our planet spontaneously, in a spasm of nuclear conflict; or incrementally, by rendering its climate incapable of supporting human life. In either case, the larger issue is that of free will, whether we shall choose to be crass and self-indulgent or noble and altruistic; savage and destructive, or civilized and decent; grasping and deceitful or generous and ethical. For myself, I choose to be optimistic despite my present dismay. I have only to contemplate the innate and profound goodness of my wife, the transporting innocence of our grandchildren and the radiant integrity of their parents to know the prospects and the promise of humanity. My challenge is simply to be worthy of their potential and deserving of their trust.

Thank you and may God help us all as we labor to create a more hopeful future and a more decent world.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Green
Professor, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Michael Lerner
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine
San Francisco, CA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA

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

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

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

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

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

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

**Budget for News Conference
on Letter to Presidential Candidates
from Religious Leaders**

Media consultant	\$3,000
National Press Club room and equipment rental	600
Printing for press handouts	400
Travel and hotel for religious leader participants	<u>1,000</u>
	\$5,000

August 8, 2000

Prepared by
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Contact:
Howard W. Hallman
Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

Policy Statements on Nuclear Disarmament

GENERAL BOARD, AMERICAN BAPTIST CHURCHES

Policy Statement on Peace (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.

EPISCOPAL CHURCH General Convention 1997

Abolition of Nuclear Weapons

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA

Fourth Churchwide Assembly, 1995

For Peace in God's World

Give high priority to arms control and reduction. We particularly urge a sharp reduction in the number of weapons of mass destruction. We call for arms control agreements that are substantial, equitable, verifiable, and progressive. We support mutual confidence-building measures to improve mutually assured security. In particular, we give priority to:

agreements among the leading nuclear powers to reduce their nuclear stockpiles and to decrease the possibility of nuclear confrontation or accident;

the successful negotiation of a renewed Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the strengthening of mechanisms to monitor and enforce nuclear treaties, and efforts that move toward the elimination of nuclear weapons

UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ASSOCIATION

The Unitarian Universalist Association affirms its belief in total universal disarmament under controls and urges, as an initial step, that the United States Government proceed with sincere, conscientious and continuing negotiations for a treaty to effectively ban the development and testing of nuclear weapons. (1961)

The only hope for human survival is the religious method of taking risk instead of threatening harm.... The Unitarian Universalist Association calls upon the United States to lead the world toward safety by its own unconditional nuclear disarmament and calls upon the rest of the nations to follow that lead. (1977)

The Unitarian Universalist Association in General Assembly urges the United States to enter into a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty with the USSR and all other countries of the world." (1985)

A peaceful world requires the abolition of nuclear weapons and a new approach to international relations based on common security for all countries rather than dangerous attempts at military superiority. (1989)

□□□ UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST

Pronouncement on Reversing the Arms Race

The Twelfth General Synod (1979) 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.

Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement & Signatories

Statement

We, military professionals and religious leaders, have been brought together by a common conviction.

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.

Historically, military and religious leaders have not always been in agreement on these issues, but now a consensus is emerging. National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide.

In the 1970s and 1980s, religious leaders of many faiths addressed the morality of nuclear weapon policies, expressed their concerns about the destruction of human life and the environment, and called for steps toward nuclear disarmament. It was difficult to envision a world free of the nuclear menace, however, in that dark time of belligerent confrontation and mistrust between two superpowers and their respective allies.

A decade later, generals and admirals from many nations addressed this still-urgent matter of nuclear weapons from a military perspective. They urged a fundamental shift away from reliance upon these weapons in light of the world's changed circumstances in the wake of the Cold War's end. They advocated that nuclear weapons be taken off hair-trigger alert poised to launch at a moment's notice, that swift and deep reductions in nuclear arsenals be made, and that these steps be taken within the framework of an unequivocal commitment to the achievement of their universal, verifiable, enforceable outlawing and prohibition.

These warnings are yet to be heeded, these proposals are yet to be embraced.

This is the situation today despite two truths: first, that the most commonly postulated threats to our national security are not susceptible to nuclear deterrence; second, that our nation's efforts to provide effective leadership in opposing the growing threat of nuclear proliferation will be credible only if our policies and those of the other nuclear powers demonstrate a commitment to the universal outlawing of these weapons.

We also believe that reliance on a nuclear deterrent in the long run calls into question our stewardship of God's creation. In the short run, effective

diplomacy may well require reciprocal and phased reduction of nuclear weapons over some period of years. While we have a variety of perspectives on the language and ethics of nuclear deterrence, none of us would support any role for nuclear weapons except possibly to deter the use of nuclear weapons by others.

And so it is that we now come together to bear witness anew: it is past 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 say that a peace based on terror, a peace based upon threats of inflicting annihilation and genocide upon whole populations, is a peace that is corrupting, a peace that is unworthy of civilization.

We say that it defies all logic to believe that nuclear weapons can exist forever and never be used.

The opportunity is at hand to do away with this danger, to do away with our capacity for self-destruction.

When the atom was split, Albert Einstein warned that if the bomb was developed further, and ever used all out, the human race could be exterminated. Every individual is endangered. This nuclear predicament is untenable in the face of a faith in the divine and unacceptable in terms of sound military doctrine.

We know that the responsibility for banning nuclear weapons does not lie solely with the government of the United States and its citizens. It is a responsibility shared by all sovereign states and sovereign individuals everywhere.

But as the creator of these weapons and the preeminent military power in the world, the United States and its people bear a special obligation, and have a unique opportunity to lead the way.

We call upon our own country to do so.

We call upon our political and military leaders, our faith communities, and all concerned citizens to mobilize in support of this noble cause.

Signatories: Military Professionals and Religious Leaders

The following religious leaders have endorsed the statement as of June 2000:

The Reverend Dr. H. George Anderson, Presiding Bishop, The
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

The Reverend Dr. John A. Buehrens, President, Unitarian
Universalist Association of Congregations

Archbishop Demetrios, Primate of the Greek Orthodox Church
in America

The Reverend Bob Edgar, General Secretary, National Council
of the Churches of Christ in the USA

The Reverend Wesley Granberg-Michaelson, General
Secretary, Reformed Church in America

The Most Reverend Frank T. Griswold, III, Presiding Bishop,
The Episcopal Church

The Reverend R. Burke Johnson, President, Moravian Church
in America, Northern Province

Shaykh Muhammad Hisham Kabbani, Chairman, Islamic
Supreme Council of America

The Reverend Clifton Kirkpatrick, Stated Clerk of the General
Assembly, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Rabbi Charles A. Kroloff, President, Central Conference of
American Rabbis

Rabbi Vernon Kurtz, President, The Rabbinical Assembly

Bishop William B. Oden, President, Council of Bishops, The
United Methodist Church

The Reverend Judy Mills Reimer, Executive Director, Church of
the Brethren, General Board

Rabbi David Saperstein, Director and Counsel, Religious Action
Center of Reform Judaism

The Reverend Dr. Robert E. Sawyer, President, Moravian
Church in America, Southern Province

Monsignor Dennis M. Schnurr, General Secretary, U.S.
Catholic Conference

Dr. Muzammil H. Siddiqi, President, The Islamic Society of
North America

Metropolitan Theodosius, Primate, Orthodox Church in

America

The Reverend John H. Thomas, President, United Church of Christ

The Reverend Jim Wallis, Editor-in-Chief, Sojourners

The Reverend Dr. Daniel E. Weiss, General Secretary, American Baptist Churches USA

The following military professionals have endorsed the statement as of June 2000:

Lt. General Julius Becton, USA (Ret.)

Brigadier General Homer Boushey, USAF (Ret.)

Brigadier General Dallas Brown, Jr., USA (Ret.)

Major General William F. Burns, USA (Ret.)

Rear Admiral Eugene J. Carroll, Jr., USN (Ret.)

Lt. Gen. John H. Cushman, USA (Ret.)

Lt. General Robert G. Gard, USA (Ret.)

Admiral Noel Gayler, USN (Ret.)

General Charles A. Horner, USAF (Ret.)

Rear Admiral Robert G. James, USN (Ret.)

Chaplain (Major General) Kermit D. Johnson, USA (Ret.)

Major General Jack Kidd, USAF (Ret.)

General Robert C. Kingston, USA (Ret.)

Rear Admiral Eugene LaRocque, USN (Ret.)

Admiral Stephen T. Quigley, USN (Ret.)

Vice Admiral John J. Shanahan, USN (Ret.)

Admiral Stansfield Turner, USN (Ret.)

Vice Admiral James B. Wilson, USN (Ret.)

The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence
An Evaluation by Pax Christi Bishops in the United States
Issued on the 15th Anniversary of
Challenge of Peace, God's Promise and Our Response

May 1998

Dear Sisters and Brothers,

We, the undersigned Catholic bishops of the United States and members of Pax Christi USA, write to you on a matter of grave moral concern: the continued possession, development and plans for the use of nuclear weapons by our country. For the past fifteen years, and particularly in the context of the Cold War, we, the Catholic bishops of the United States, have reluctantly acknowledged the possibility that nuclear weapons could have some moral legitimacy, but only if the goal was nuclear disarmament. It is our present, prayerful judgment that this legitimacy is now lacking.

In 1983 the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, in our Pastoral Letter *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, grappled with the unique moral challenge posed by nuclear weapons. Fifteen years ago we stated that, because of the massive and indiscriminate destruction that nuclear weapons would inflict, their use would not be morally justified.¹ We spoke in harmony with the conscience of the world in that judgment. We reaffirm that judgment now. Nuclear weapons must never be used, no matter what the provocation, no matter what the military objective.

Deterrence

Fifteen years ago we concurred with Pope John Paul II in acknowledging that, given the context of that time, possession of these weapons as a deterrent against the use of nuclear weapons by others could be morally acceptable, but acceptable only as an interim measure and only if deterrence were combined with clear steps toward progressive disarmament.

Ours was a *strictly conditioned* moral acceptance of nuclear deterrence. It depended on three criteria:

- a) a reliance on deterrent strategies must be an interim policy only. As we stated then, "We cannot consider it adequate as a long-term basis for peace;"²
- b) the purpose of maintaining nuclear weapons in the interim was only "to prevent the use of nuclear weapons by others;"³ and
- c) a reliance on deterrence must be used "not as an end in itself but as a step on the way toward a progressive disarmament."⁴

In our 10th Anniversary Statement, *The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace*, we further specified that "progressive disarmament" must mean a commitment to the elimination of nuclear weapons, not simply as an ideal, but as a concrete policy goal.⁵

A New Moment

In 1998 the global context is significantly different from what it was a few years ago. Throughout the Cold War the nuclear arsenal was developed and maintained as the ultimate defense in an ideological conflict that pitted what were considered two historical forces against each other -- capitalism in the West and communism in the East. The magnitude of that conflict was defined by the mutual exclusivity of each other's ideology. Nuclear weapons and the policy of Mutually Assured Destruction were accepted as the inescapable context of that particular struggle. Today the Soviet Union no longer exists. The United States is now aiding its democratic successor, the Russian Federation, in dismantling the very nuclear weapons that a short time ago were poised to destroy us. Yet, the Cold War weapons amassed throughout that struggle have survived the struggle itself and are today in search of new justifications and new missions to fulfill.

But, with the end of the Cold War came new hope. World opinion has coalesced around the concrete effort to outlaw nuclear weapons, as it has with biological and chemical weapons and most recently with anti-personnel landmines. As examples of this opinion we note the dramatic public statement of December 1996 in which 61 retired Generals and Admirals, many of whom held the highest level positions in the nuclear establishment of this country, said that these weapons are unnecessary, destabilizing and must be outlawed.⁶ We also note the historic International Court of Justice opinion of July 1996 that, "The threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable to armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of humanitarian law." The Court went on to say, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."⁷

Additionally, the Holy See has become more explicit in its condemnation of nuclear weapons and has urged their abolition. We recognize this new moment and are in accord with the Holy See, which has stated, "If biological weapons, chemical weapons and now landmines can be done away with, so too can nuclear weapons. No weapon so threatens the longed-for peace of the 21st century as the nuclear [weapon]. Let not the immensity of this task dissuade us from the efforts needed to free humanity from such a scourge."⁸

Unfortunately the monumental political changes that have occurred in the wake of the Cold War have not been accompanied by similar far reaching changes in the military planning for development and deployment of nuclear weapons. It is absolutely clear to us that the present US policy does not include a decisive commitment to progressive nuclear disarmament. Rather, nuclear weapons policy has been expanded in the post-Cold War period to include new missions well beyond their previous role as a deterrent to nuclear attack. The United States today maintains a commitment to use nuclear weapons first, including pre-emptive nuclear attacks on nations that do not possess nuclear weapons. "Flexible targeting strategies" are aimed at Third World nations, and a new commitment exists to use nuclear weapons either preemptively or in response to chemical and biological weapons or other threats to US national interests.⁹ This expanded role of the US nuclear deterrent is unacceptable.

A New Arms Race

In order to maintain the necessary credibility required by a continued reliance on nuclear deterrence, the United States is today embarking on an expansion of its nuclear weapons complex. The Department of Energy, in conjunction with the Department of Defense, has developed the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program, a vast and multi-faceted effort at modernizing the nuclear weapons complex to provide for the continued research, development and testing of nuclear weapons well into the next century. The program will eventually lead to creating computer-simulated nuclear weapons tests that will allow the United States to continue to test nuclear weapons in the event that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, (which will ban full-scale underground nuclear testing) enters into force.¹⁰ The cost of this Stockpile Stewardship program is currently estimated at \$60 billion over the next dozen years. Such an investment in a program to upgrade the ability to design, develop, test and maintain nuclear weapons signals quite clearly that the United States, (as well as the other nuclear weapons states that are similarly developing these new testing and design capabilities) shows no intention of moving forward with "progressive disarmament" and certainly no commitment to eliminating these weapons entirely.¹¹

Instead of progressive nuclear disarmament, we are witnessing the institutionalization of nuclear deterrence. The recent Presidential Decision Directive on nuclear weapons policy, partially made known to the public in December 1997, makes this point clear. The Directive indicates that the United States will continue to rely on nuclear weapons as the cornerstone of the nation's strategic defense, that the role of these weapons has been increased to include deterring Third World non-nuclear weapons states and deterring chemical and biological weapons, as well as other undefined vital US interests abroad.¹² Does not this policy, coupled with the huge investments under the Stockpile Stewardship Program, represent a renewed commitment to nuclear deterrence that will affect generations to come? The Department of Energy's own timetable for the Stockpile Stewardship Program indicates that the United States will continue to develop, test and rely upon a nuclear deterrent through the year 2065.¹³ This is clearly not the interim policy to which we grudgingly gave our moral approval in 1983. Rather, it is the manifestation of the very reliance on nuclear deterrence "as a long-term basis for peace" that we rejected in *The Challenge of Peace*. Does not this policy, implemented with very little public discussion or debate, move our nation far away from the goal of elimination at the very time when the aspirations of the world community are gaining momentum toward this very elimination?

Clearly the present course of US policy threatens to ignite a new arms race both among the existing nuclear weapons states as they collaborate and compete in the development of computer-simulated design and testing programs and among those non-nuclear armed nations that perceive the institutionalization of nuclear deterrence as a threat to their societies. The vast majority of the world's nations have forsworn the development of nuclear weapons under the Nonproliferation Treaty. In exchange, the nuclear weapons states agreed to eliminate their nuclear arsenals. As the nuclear weapons states embark

on their current modernization programs, they send a clear message to the rest of the Treaty's signatories that not only do they not intend to uphold the agreement, they believe that nuclear weapons are indispensable to their national security. We must confess our fear that it may not be long before other nations who feel threatened renounce their pledge not to develop nuclear weapons and embark along the very path that the nuclear states have shown by their example and decrees they judge to be in the interest of a nation's security.

New Nuclear Missions

The shift in US strategic planning—from that of deterring the use of nuclear weapons by other nuclear weapons states to globally targeting all nations that may develop any weapons of mass destruction is a relatively new development.¹⁴ This development raises serious concerns. Such an expansion of the role of nuclear weapons runs in stark contradiction to our own stated assessments of the morality of nuclear deterrence and the role of nuclear weapons as well as commitments that the United States has made under the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. In *Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace* we addressed the growing concerns that nuclear weapons might be used against other than nuclear threats: "The United States should commit itself never to use nuclear weapons first, should unequivocally reject proposals to use nuclear weapons to deter non-nuclear threats, and should reinforce the fragile barrier against the use of these weapons."¹⁵ Nuclear deterrence policy, as developed over the past decade, stands in clear contradiction to these goals.

Inherent Dangers

The policy of nuclear deterrence has always included the intention to use the weapons if deterrence should fail. Since the end of the Cold War this deterrent has been expanded to include any number of potential aggressors, proliferators and so-called "rogue nations." The inherent instability in a world unconstrained by the great-power standoff present throughout the Cold War leads us to conclude that the danger of deterrence failing has been increased. That danger can become manifest if but one so-called "rogue state" calls the deterrent bluff. In such a case the requirements of deterrence policy would be the actual use of nuclear weapons. This must not be allowed. Because of the horrendous results if these weapons should be used, and what we see as a greater likelihood of their use, we now feel it is imperative to raise a clear, unambiguous voice in opposition to the continued reliance on nuclear deterrence.

Moral Conclusions

Sadly, it is clear to us that our strict conditions for the moral acceptance of nuclear deterrence are not being met. Specifically,

a) the policy of nuclear deterrence is being institutionalized. It is no longer considered an interim policy but rather has become the very "long-term basis for peace" that we rejected in 1983.

b) the role of nuclear deterrence has been expanded in the post Cold War era well beyond the narrow role of deterring the use of nuclear weapons by others. The role to be played now by nuclear weapons includes a whole range of

contingencies on a global scale including countering biological and chemical weapons and the protection of vital national interests abroad.

c) although the United States and the republics that made up the former Soviet Union have in recent years eliminated some of their huge, superfluous stockpiles of nuclear weapons, our country, at least, has no intention, or policy position of eliminating these weapons entirely. Rather, the US intends to retain its nuclear deterrent into the indefinite future.

Gospel Call of Love

As bishops of the Church in the United States, it is incumbent on us to speak directly to the policies and actions of our nation. We speak now out of love not only for those who would suffer and die as victims of nuclear violence, but also for those who would bear the terrible responsibility of unleashing these horrendous weapons. We speak out of love for those suffering because of the medical effects in communities where these weapons are produced and are being tested. We speak out of love for those deprived of the barest necessities because of the huge amount of available resources committed to the continued development and ongoing maintenance of nuclear weapons. We recall the words of another Vatican message to the United Nations, that these weapons, "by their cost alone, kill the poor by causing them to starve."¹⁶ We speak out of love for both victims and the executioners, believing that "the whole law is fulfilled in one statement, namely, 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself'" (Gal. 5-14).

It is out of this love that we raise up our voices with those around the world in calling for an end to the reliance on nuclear deterrence and instead call upon the United States and the other nuclear weapons states to enter into a process leading to the complete elimination of these morally offensive weapons. Indeed, in taking this position we are answering the call of Pope John Paul II, whose Permanent Representative to the United Nations stated in October 1997:

"The work that this committee (1st Committee of the United Nations) has done in calling for negotiations leading to a nuclear weapons convention must be increased. Those nuclear weapons states resisting such negotiations must be challenged, for in clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence they are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world. The gravest consequences for humankind lie ahead if the world is to be ruled by the militarism represented by nuclear weapons rather than the humanitarian law espoused by the International Court of Justice.

"Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Nonproliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition.

"This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multi-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."¹⁷

We recognize the opposition that our message will meet. We are painfully aware that many of our policymakers sincerely believe that possessing nuclear weapons is vital for

our national security. We are convinced though, that it is not. Instead, they make the world a more dangerous place. They provide a rationale for other nations to build a nuclear arsenal, thereby increasing the possibility that they will be used by someone.

Not only are they not vital for national security, but we believe they actually contribute to national insecurity. No nation can be truly secure until the community of nations is secure. We are mindful of Pope John Paul II's warning that "violence of whatever form cannot decide conflicts between individuals or between nations, because violence generates more violence."¹⁸

On this, the 15th anniversary of *The Challenge of Peace* the time has come for concrete action for nuclear disarmament. On the eve of the Third Millennium may our world rid itself of these terrible weapons of mass destruction and the constant threat they pose. We cannot delay any longer. Nuclear deterrence as a national policy must be condemned as morally abhorrent because it is the excuse and justification for the continued possession and further development of these horrendous weapons. We urge all to join in taking up the challenge to begin the effort to eliminate nuclear weapons now, rather than relying on them indefinitely.

May the grace and peace of the risen Jesus Christ be with us all.

Anthony S. Apuron, OFM, Cap.
Archbishop of Agana, Guam

Patrick R. Cooney
Bishop of Gaylord, MI

Victor Balke
Bishop of Crookston, MN

Thomas V. Daily
Bishop of Brooklyn, NY

William D. Borders
Archbishop of Baltimore, MD (ret.)

James J. Daly
Auxiliary Bishop of Rockville Centre, NY
(ret.)

John Michael Botean
Bishop of St. George in Canton

Nicholas D'Antonio, OFM
Bishop of New Orleans, LA (ret.)

Joseph M. Breitenbeck
Bishop of Grand Rapids, MI (ret.)

Joseph P. Delaney
Bishop of Fort Worth, TX

Kevin M. Brit
Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, MI

Norbert L. Dorsey, C.P
Bishop of Orlando, FL

Charles A. Buswell
Bishop of Pueblo, CO (ret.)

Joseph A. Ferrario
Bishop of Honolulu, HI (ret.)

Matthew H. Clark
Bishop of Rochester, NY

John J. Fitzpatrick
Bishop of Brownsville, TX (ret.)

Thomas J. Connolly
Bishop of Baker, OR

Patrick F. Flores
Archbishop of San Antonio, TX

Joseph A. Fiorenza
Bishop of Galveston-Houston, TX

Raphael M. Fliss
Bishop of Superior, WI

Marion F. Forst
Bishop of Dodge City, KS (ret.)

Benedict C. Franzetta
Auxiliary Bishop of Youngstown, OH (ret.)

James H. Garland
Bishop of Marquette, MI

John R. Gaydos
Bishop of Jefferson City, MO

Raymond E. Goedert
Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago, IL

John R. Gorman
Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago, IL

F. Joseph Gossman
Bishop of Raleigh, NC

Thomas J. Grady
Bishop of Orlando, FL (Ret.)

Charles V. Grahmann
Bishop of Dallas, TX

Thomas J. Gumbleton
Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, MI

Richard C. Hanifen
Bishop of Colorado Springs, CO

Bernard J. Harrington
Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, MI

Edward D. Head
Bishop of Buffalo, NY (ret.)

William L. Higi
Bishop of Lafayette, IN

James R. Hoffman
Bishop of Toledo, OH

Joseph L. Howze
Bishop of Biloxi, MS

Howard J. Hubbard
Bishop of Albany, NY

William A. Hughes
Bishop of Covington, KY (ret.)

Raymond G. Hunthausen
Archbishop of Seattle, WA (ret.)

Joseph L. Imesch
Bishop of Joliet, IL

Michael J. Kaniecki, S.J.
Bishop of Fairbanks, AK

John T. Kelly
Diocese of New York (Episcopal)

Raymond A. Lucker
Bishop of New Ulm, MN

Dominic A. Marconi
Auxiliary Bishop of Newark, NJ

Joseph F. Maguire
Bishop of Springfield, MA (ret.)

Leroy T. Matthiesen
Bishop of Amarillo, TX (ret.)

Edward A. McCarthy
Archbishop of Miami, FL (ret.)

John E. McCarthy
Bishop of Austin, TX

John R. McGann
Bishop of Rockville Centre, NY

Lawrence J. McNamara
Bishop of Grand Island, NE

John J. McRaith

Bishop of Owensboro, KY

Dale J. Melczek
Bishop of Gary, IN

Donald W. Montrose
Bishop of Stockton, CA

Robert M. Moskal
Bishop of St. Josaphat in Parma, OH

Michael J. Murphy
Bishop of Erie, PA (ret.)

P. Francis Murphy
Auxiliary Bishop of Baltimore, MD

William C. Newman
Auxiliary Bishop of Baltimore, MD

George H. Niederauer
Bishop of Salt Lake City, UT

James D. Niedergeses
Bishop of Nashville, TN (ret.)

Anthony J. O'Connell
Bishop of Knoxville, TN

Edward J. O'Donnell
Bishop of Lafayette, LA

Albert H. Ottenweller
Bishop of Steubenville, OH (ret.)

Donald E. Pelotte, S.S.S.
Bishop of Gallup, NM

A. Edward Pevec
Auxiliary Bishop of Cleveland, OH

Michael D. Pfeifer, O.M.I.
Bishop of San Angelo, TX

Kenneth J. Povish
Bishop of Lansing, MI (ret.)

Francis A. Quinn
Bishop of Sacramento, CA (ret.)

Ricardo Ramirez, CSB
Bishop of Las Cruces, NM

John R. Roach
Archbishop of St. Paul /Minneapolis, MN
(ret.)

Frank J. Rodimer
Bishop of Paterson, NJ

Peter A. Rosazza
Auxiliary Bishop of Hartford, CT

Joseph M. Sartoris
Auxiliary Bishop of Los Angeles, CA

Walter J. Schoenherr
Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, MI (ret.)

Roger L. Schwietz, OMI
Bishop of Duluth, MN

Daniel E. Sheehan
Archbishop of Omaha, NE (ret.)

Richard J. Sklba
Auxiliary Bishop of Milwaukee, WI

John J. Snyder
Bishop of St. Augustine, FL

George H. Speltz
Bishop of St. Cloud, MN (ret.)

Kenneth D. Steiner
Auxiliary Bishop of Portland, OR

James S. Sullivan
Bishop of Fargo, ND

Joseph M. Sullivan
Auxiliary Bishop of Brooklyn, NY

Walter F. Sullivan
Bishop of Richmond, VA

Arthur N. Tafoya
Bishop of Pueblo, CO

Elliot G. Thomas
Bishop of St. Thomas, VI

David B. Thompson
Bishop of Charleston, SC

Kenneth E. Untener
Bishop of Saginaw, MI

Rene A. Valero
Auxiliary Bishop of Brooklyn, NY

Daniel Walsh
Bishop of Las Vegas, NV

Loras J. Watters
Bishop of Winona, MN (ret.)

Emil A. Wcela
Auxiliary Bishop of Rockville Centre, NY

Rembert Weakland, OSB
Archbishop of Milwaukee, WI

Gabino Zavala
Auxiliary Bishop of Los Angeles, CA

Footnotes

¹ *The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response*, NCCB, 1983, No. 150.

² *Ibid.*, *Challenge of Peace*, No. 186

³ *Ibid.*, *Challenge of Peace*, No. 185 & 188 (1)

⁴ John Paul II, "Message to the United Nations Special Session On Disarmament, 1982," #8

⁵ *The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace*, NCCB, 1993, p. 13.

⁶ New York Times, December 6, 1996, *Statement on Nuclear Weapons by 61 International Generals and Admirals*.

⁷ Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the (Il)legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, July 8, 1996.

⁸ Archbishop Renato Martino, United Nations Permanent Observer of the Holy See, Statement to the United Nations' 1st Committee, Oct. 15, 1997.

⁹ British American Security Information Council, *Nuclear Futures: Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and US Nuclear Strategy*, March 1, 1998. p.10

¹⁰ President William J. Clinton, Letter of Transmittal of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to the United States Senate, Sept. 22, 1997.

¹¹ Western States Legal Foundation, *A Faustian Bargain: Why "Stockpile Stewardship" is Incompatible with the Process of Nuclear Disarmament*, March 1998.

¹² Reported in the Washington Post, December 7, 1997, p. 1.

¹³ Information shared by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory(LLNL) Senior NIF Scientist, William J. Hogan with Pax Christi USA Delegation to LLNL, October 7, 1997.

¹⁴ British American Security Information Council, *Nuclear Futures: Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and US Nuclear Strategy*, March 1, 1998. p.9.

¹⁵ *The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace*, NCCB, 1993, p. 13.

¹⁶ Giovanni Cheli, Permanent Representative for the Holy See Observer Mission to the United Nations, United Nations 1st Special Session on Disarmament, 1976.

¹⁷ Archbishop Renato Martino, United Nations Permanent Observer of the Holy See, Statement to the United Nations' 1st Committee, Oct. 15, 1997.

¹⁸ Pope John Paul II, Address to Pax Christi International, May 29, 1995.

About Pax Christi USA

Pax Christi USA strives to create a world that reflects the Peace of Christ by exploring, articulating, and witnessing to the call of Christian nonviolence. This work begins in personal life and extends to communities of reflection and action to transform structures of society. Pax Christi USA rejects war, preparations for war, and every form of violence and domination. It advocates primacy of conscience, economic and social justice and respect for creation.

Pax Christi USA commits itself to peace education and, with the help of its bishop members, promotes the gospel imperative of peacemaking as a priority in the Catholic Church in the United States. Through the efforts of all its members and in cooperation with other groups, Pax Christi USA works toward a more peaceful, just, and sustainable world.

Pax Christi USA is a section of Pax Christi International, the Catholic peace movement.

The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence: An Evaluation by Pax Christi USA Bishops in the United States is a publication of Pax Christi USA. A writing committee was established under the leadership of Pax Christi USA Bishop President Walter F. Sullivan, Bishop of Richmond, Va., and Pax Christi USA National Council member Bishop Thomas J. Gumbleton, Auxiliary Bishop of Detroit, Mich. The text was circulated for endorsement among Pax Christi USA bishop members. The names and dioceses of all bishops endorsing the statement as of September 1, 1998 are included at the end of the text.

Letter to presidential candidates
August 18, 2000

E-mail addresses of signers

gbaldrige@cbfnet.org,
bruceb@fgcquaker.org,
J. Daryl Byler@mail.mcc.org,
cwayne@aol.com,
green@brandeis.edu,
susannah.heschel@dasher.dartmouth.edu,
khurty@churchwomen.org,
thomj@pym.org,
Ashreynu@aol.com,
bishop@umcneb.org,
dpanoff@ccarnet.org,
Dreeves@afsc.org,
uuawo@aol.com,
uccwdc@erols.com,
copel@ucc.org,
Awaskow@aol.com.
Rlevy@.huc.edu,
jnoble@rac.org,
lwyolton@prodigy.net
dradcliff_gb@brethren.org
MLiebling@aol.com

Letter to presidential candidates
Addresses if signers

Bishop Kenneth L. Carder
520 Commerce Street, Suite 201
Nashville, TN 37203-3714

Bishop Ernest S. Lyght
252 Bryant Avenue
White Plains, NY 10605

Bishop Melvin G. Talbert
P.O. Box 980250
West Sacramento, CA 95798

The Right Reverend Frederick H. Borsch
Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles
P.O. Box 512164
Los Angeles, CA 90051

The Right Reverend John P. Croneberger
Episcopal Diocese of Newark
24 Rect0r Street
Newark, NJ 07102

The Right Reverend Ronald H. Haines
Episcopal Diocese of Washington
Church House, Mt. St. Alban
Washington, DC 20016

The Right Reverend Sanford Z. K. Hampton
Episcopal Diocese of Olympia
P.O. Box 12126
Seattle, WA 98102

The Right Reverend William D. Persell
Episcopal Diocese of Chicago
65 E. Huron Street
Chicago, IL 60611

The Right Reverend Arthur B. Williams, Jr.
Episcopal Diocese of Ohio
2230 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44115

The Rev. Dr. James Dunn
Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs
200 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Dr. James Forbes, Senior Minister
Riverside Church
490 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10027-5788

Dr. Glen Stassen
Fuller Theological Seminary
135 North Oakland Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91182-1790

Dr. Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action
10 E. Lancaster Avenue
Wynnewood, PA 19096

The Rev. Dr. Daniel W. Weiss
General Secretary
American Baptist Churches USA
P.O. Box 851
Valley Forge, PA 19482

Governor George W. Bush's Views on Nuclear Disarmament Issues

On August 18, 2000 forty-six religious leaders wrote to Governor George W. Bush and other presidential candidates, asking a series of questions on nuclear disarmament issue. We indicated that we wanted to release the candidates' replies at a news conference scheduled for Thursday, September 7, 2000. In response Governor Bush's campaign staff provided us copies of (1) a speech on "New Leadership on National Security", given in Washington, D.C. on May 23, 2000, and (2) answers to a previous questionnaire from the Arms Control Association. This material provides answers to five of our ten questions, a partial answer to one, leaving four unanswered questions where Governor Bush's views are unknown.

The questions and Governor Bush's answers, derived from these sources, are as follows:

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

Governor Bush: Views unknown.

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

Governor Bush: Views unknown.

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

Governor Bush: Views unknown.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

government to accept the new vision I have outlined, and act on it. But the United States should be prepared to lead by example, because it is in our best interest and the best interest of the world."

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

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

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

Governor Bush: No comment.

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

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

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

This analysis was prepared by Methodists United for Peace with Justice. The text of Governor Bush's May 23 speech is on the web site of the Bush campaign: www.georgebush.com.

September 5, 2000

News Conference to Report Replies of Presidential Candidates
to Questions from Religious Leaders on Nuclear Disarmament Issues
Thursday, September 7, 2000
National Press Club, Washington, D.C.

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

I would like to welcome you to this news conference. I am Howard Hallman, chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy. I also serve as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

The purpose of this news conference is to present replies from presidential candidates to questions asked by 48 religious leaders on nuclear disarmament issues. These religious leaders represent a cross-section of faith groups, denominations, and geographic areas of the United States. They have addressed ten questions to the candidates out of a belief that the American people should be fully informed on the candidates' views of this important matter. Our approach is wholly nonpartisan. We have no intent to endorse any of the candidates. Rather we will share the candidates' answers with our grassroots networks so that individuals may make their own decisions on who to vote for.

Some of the questions deal with specific tactics of nuclear arms control and disarmament, such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, de-alerting weapons now on hair-trigger alert, deep cuts in strategic weapons through arms control treaties and reciprocal national initiatives. Already candidates have addressed these issues to some extent. But three of our questions deal with deeper issues that the candidates haven't so far discussed.

The first is the morality of the possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons. There is a lot of talk about moral values in the election campaign. We believe that nuclear weapons constitute a moral issue, not merely a matter of military strategy, and should be discussed as such.

Second, the United States and other nuclear weapons states have a legal obligation under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to eliminate their nuclear arsenals. This treaty was signed by the United States in 1968, submitted to the Senate by President Johnson, endorsed by President Nixon, and ratified by the Senate in March 1969 by a bipartisan vote of 85 to 13. It is the law of the land. We want to know what each presidential candidate, if elected, would do during the next four years to fulfill this U.S. commitment to nuclear disarmament. We encourage them to debate what the best approach would be.

Third, we note that many admirals and generals have questioned the military utility of nuclear weapons. Because the president has the responsibility for authorizing the use of nuclear weapons, we have asked the candidates to tell us what categories of targets they consider it legitimate to strike with nuclear weapons.

Nuclear disarmament is not a new issue with the faith community. It has been a matter of concern since the beginning of the nuclear weapons era. Therefore, before proceeding with our presentation of answers from the candidates, I would like to call upon two distinguished religious leaders to briefly offer faith-based perspectives on nuclear weapons.

The Treaty was opened for signature on July 1, 1968, and signed on that date by the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and 59 other countries. On July 9, President Johnson transmitted it to the Senate, but prospects for early U.S. ratification dimmed after the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August. The Senate adjourned without voting on the Treaty. In February, 1969, President Nixon requested Senate approval of the Treaty, and in March the Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification. The Treaty entered into force with the deposit of U.S. ratification on March 5, 1970.

TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Signed at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968

Ratification advised by U.S. Senate March 13, 1969

Ratified by U.S. President November 24, 1969

U.S. ratification deposited at Washington, London, and Moscow March 5,
1970

Proclaimed by U.S. President March 5, 1970

Entered into force March 5, 1970

Article VI

Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

From Council for Livable World web page

Questions to Gore and Bradley, November 1999

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

11. I believe that nuclear deterrence has merit and incremental increases in our nuclear arsenal measurably increase our military power.

strongly agree
agree
disagree
strongly disagree

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

2. I believe the U.S. should work toward total abolition of nuclear weapons by 2010. I support immediate negotiations with Russia and other nuclear powers to reduce nuclear stockpiles.

strongly agree
agree
disagree
strongly disagree

Gore: The Administration is working towards arms control agreements with the Russians that would mandate further reductions in nuclear weapons.

13. I support Admiral Stansfield Turner's proposal that the U.S. now take the initiative to create a reciprocal reduction in nuclear alert status by separating warheads from delivery systems and moving the components hundreds of miles away to a storage sites monitored by verification teams.

strongly agree
agree
disagree
strongly disagree

Gore: Right now, U.S. nuclear warheads are not targeted against Russian targets, and the Russians are similarly "de-targeted." I have concerns about Admiral Turner's ideas because of the way in

which they might work out in a period of crisis if either side tried to reunite warheads with their delivery systems. This issue is one that requires further detailed study.

NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

14. I favor helping to pay the costs of another country (such as Russia or North Korea) to dismantle its nuclear weapons program.

- strongly agree
- agree
- disagree
- strongly disagree

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

COMPREHENSIVE TEST BAN TREATY

15. Please check one of the following:

- I support ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- I oppose ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty but oppose resumption of nuclear testing.
- I oppose ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and favor a resumption of nuclear testing.

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

Gore's web site

First Task: Defining a Military Strategy for the Future. Al Gore understands clearly the classic security agenda of "war and peace," as well as the new security agenda our military faces in the 21st century.

America must maintain its nuclear strength, with adequate offensive forces to ensure deterrence.

To: "Gary Baldrige" <gbaldrige@cbfnet.org>
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>
Subject: Re: Final version: letter to presidential candidates
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:
In-Reply-To: <s9a11f68.059@mail.cbfnet.org>
References:

At 12:23 PM 8/21/00 -0400, you wrote:
>Please do send a text version. Thanks.

Here it is:

August 18, 2000 imilar letter sent to:

The Honorable George W. Bush	Vice President Albert Gore, Jr.
State Capitol	Mr. Ralph Nader
100 E. 11th Street	Mr. Patrick J. Buchanan
Austin, TX 78701	Mr. John Hagelin

Dear Governor Bush:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Honorable George W. Bush

August 18, 2000

Page two

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(7) Complementary to nuclear arms reduction through treaties is the undertaking of reciprocal initiatives through executive action. This was the approach used by President Bush in 1991 when he took unilateral action to deactivate a large number of U.S. strategic weapons and

The Honorable George W. Bush

August 18, 2000

Page three.

to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons stationed outside the United States. A few weeks later Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev reciprocated with similar actions. Would you as president use similar reciprocal

initiatives to achieve such objectives as de-alerting and significant reductions in the nuclear arsenal? If so, please provide specifics.

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

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

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

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

Respectfully yours,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Green
Professor, Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thomas J. Jeavons, General Secretary
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)
Philadelphia, PA
Rabbi Michael Lerner
Editor, TIKKUN Magazine
San Francisco, CA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dr. Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action
Wynnewood, PA
Dr. Glen Stassen, Professor
Fuller Theological Seminary

Pasadena, CA

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

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

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

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

Rabbi Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Philadelphia, PA
The Rev. Dr. Daniel W. Weiss, General Secretary
American Baptist Churches USA
Valley Forge, PA

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist Church
Newport, RI

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

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

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

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

Organizations are list for purpose of identification.

A reply to this letter may be address to the facilitator of this initiative:

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

Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org