

A Proposed Disarmament Working Group

by Howard W. Hallman

Astonishing changes are occurring throughout the world as the Cold War seems to be winding down and democratic forces are emerging in many nations. Accordingly, the 1990s can be perceived as a decade of transition from a prolonged period of east/west tensions and military intervention in the Third World to a new era whose shape is yet to be determined.

As this occurs, it would be useful to have in Washington a working group that unabashedly has a disarmament orientation. Its purpose would be to insist upon global disarmament as a long-range goal (ten years or beyond), to advocate current policies that move toward that goal, and to judge efforts of arms control, arms reduction, and alternative defense arrangements on their effectiveness as intermediate steps toward disarmament.

Basic membership in the Disarmament Working Group would consist of organizational representatives who accept the goal of global disarmament. The Working Group would collaborate on many current issues with "arms controllers" and persons favoring arms reduction but not complete disarmament, but the Group would continuously offer the longer-range perspective. It would see disarmament as requiring not only reduction of military forces and destruction of weapons but also dealing with political, economic, and social issues.

The primary focus should be seeking to influence policies and practices of President Bush and top executives. This recognizes that a substantial part of the task of achieving disarmament requires execution of foreign policies, particularly international negotiations, and command of the military, including unilateral demobilization initiatives. The Executive Branch can be approached in the following ways:

Directly

Written communication

Oral communication

Vigils, demonstrations (spin off by member organizations)

Indirectly

Through influential citizens

Through Congress

Media

Public opinion

Grassroots mobilization (through member organizations)

A secondary focus would be seeking to influence Congress, including budget issues, authorizing

legislation, appropriations, and sense of Congress resolutions. However, this should not duplicate the efforts of other working groups associated with the Monday Lobby, which are oriented primarily toward Congress.

It would be necessary to have a **disciplined agenda** for a Disarmament Working Group. In the beginning the focus should be upon opportunities for **European demilitarization**, closely related to **strategic nuclear arms reduction**. But it should be open to a broader, global agenda over a longer period.

Geographic Regions

Global disarmament is unlikely to be achieved in one fell swoop but rather requires military-political-economic-social solutions in different regions of the world. In outline they are as follows:

Northern Hemisphere (mostly north of 30th parallel)

Rockies to Urals

North America

North Atlantic

Europe

Urals to Rockies

Asia

North Pacific

Middle East

Third World

Latin America

Africa

Asia

Within the Northern Hemisphere the military alignment has an interrelated combination of conventional, tactical nuclear, and strategic nuclear weapons. In summary, deployment is as follows:

	<u>North America</u>	<u>North Atlantic</u>	<u>Europe</u>	<u>Asia</u>	<u>North Pacific</u>
Conventional	US, Canada (standby)	Naval: US, USSR, GB	NATO, WTO	USSR, China, Korea	Naval: US, USSR
Tactical Nuclear	US (ready reserves)	Naval: US, USSR, GB	Land, sea, air: US, USSR, Fr.	Land, air: USSR, China, US (Korea)	Naval: US, USSR

Strategic	US: land,	Submarines:	USSR, GB,	USSR,China	Submarines:
Nuclear	air	US,USSR,GB	France		US, USSR

Currently negotiations are dealing with (a) conventional land forces in Europe (but may soon be bringing in air forces and after a period tactical nuclear forces) and (b) strategic nuclear weapons (land-based, air, and sea) of the United States and the Soviet Union. The Disarmament Working Group should assert pressure to move these negotiations along and to broaden their scope.

Negotiations

The Working Group over the long run should pay attention to other arenas of arms reduction negotiations and underlying political issues. Possible sets of negotiations include:

Subject	Participants	Comments
START	US, USSR	Phase II: add Great Britain, France, China
CFE	NATO/WTO	Add air, tactical nuclear
Test Ban		
Threshold	US, USSR	Quickly complete, implement
Comprehensive	Possessors	Resume negotiations
	PTB signers	UN Amendment Conference
Chemical	Multinational	Push to completion
Nonproliferation	Multinational	1990 Review Conference
Needed:		
Naval	US, USSR, others	Nuclear and conventional
Global arms trade	Multinational	Missiles, other weapons
Regional:		All involve political issues
Asia	USSR/China	
	North and South Korea	
	Southeast Asia	
	India/Pakistan	
Middle East	Arab/Jewish nations	
Africa	Southern Africa	
	Civil wars	
Latin America	Central America	

I don't suggest that the Disarmament Working Group should take on all of these possible sets of negotiations in the near future, but the total scope of what is required for moving toward global disarmament during the 1990s should be kept in view.

In most of the negotiations the Working Group will find numerous allies among arms controllers and advocates of alternative defense measures short of total disarmament. Working with such a broader coalition is very important, but the Working Group should maintain its advocacy of global disarmament.

Unilateral Initiatives

A special contribution of the Working Group would be to propose possible unilateral initiatives which the United States could undertake: both on its own and in response to those advanced by Soviet

President Gorbachev. One can devise a disarmament scenario which has a series of reciprocal measures of force withdrawal and demobilization, moving faster than the negotiations route.

June 1, 1989

BEYOND CONTAINMENT, BEYOND DETERRENCE

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

During the course of his European trip to attend the NATO summit meeting in Brussels, President George Bush articulated the view that U.S. policy is moving toward an approach described as "beyond containment." The Soviet Union, he observed, is in a state of radical change, both internally and in its approach to Eastern Europe. In an interview, he explained:

And as this change asserts itself, and as they genuinely change, our doctrine need no longer be containing a militarily aggressive Soviet Union. It means a united Europe. It means a Europe without as many artificial boundaries. It means much more freedom and democracy, not only in the Soviet Union, but in Europe. As those things happen, the role of NATO shifts, our own role shifts, from the main emphasis on deterrence to an emphasis on the economic side of things.

To be fair to the president's complete views, he said that this would occur down the line. "But before one reaches that stage," he insisted, "we have just got to be careful and we have got to keep our defenses up."

Bush's looking beyond containment is a refreshing change in the perspective of U.S. policy. It is an appropriate accompaniment to refreshing changes occurring in the Soviet Union. It challenges us to consider the implications of going "beyond containment." Bush hinted at one tremendous implication: shifting NATO's role from a main emphasis upon deterrence to an economic emphasis. But he did not develop this idea further.

Yet, if you think about it a little, you realize that "beyond containment" inevitably implies moving "beyond nuclear deterrence". That's because the two policies are inextricably linked. If one removes all the phantasy scenarios, the sole purpose of the U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal is to deter Soviet expansion into Western Europe. Once we have firm assurances that the Soviets will not and cannot invade Western Europe -- assurances guaranteed through withdrawal and demobilization of Soviet offensive forces, then we can disband the strategic nuclear arsenal because it will no longer have a mission.

To better understand this linkage between containment and nuclear deterrence, we need to review the history of the last 50 years.

U.S. Containment as Response to Soviet Expansionism

The U.S. containment policy started as a reaction to Soviet expansionism in Europe, initiated and led by Joseph Stalin. U.S. containment started in the years immediately following World War II, but Soviet expansionism had commenced at the beginning of that great war. This occurred through the German-Soviet nonaggression pact of August 1939, which guaranteed Soviet security in exchange for neutrality in case Germany went to war. A secret protocol gave the Soviet Union a share of Polish territory if the Germans invaded Poland.

With this agreement in hand, Adolph Hitler sent the Nazi army into Poland on September 1, 1939. Soon thereafter the Red army invaded from east. The Nazi blitzkrieg moved so fast that German soldiers got to the partition line before the Soviets and moved beyond so that the Soviet Union got less territorial spoils than it had bargained for.

However, the Soviets now had a free hand to go after other territory. In October 1939 the Soviet Union pressured Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into accepting the basing of Soviet military forces on their soil. On November 20 the Red Army invaded Finland, an action that caused the League of Nations to expel the Soviet Union from its membership. In March 1940 vanquished Finland ceded to the Soviet Union the Karelian isthmus (north of Leningrad), including the city of Vyborg, and also the port of Hanko. In June of that year Soviet military forces occupied Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. In August 1940 the Soviet Union formally annexed these three Baltic states and converted them to Soviet republics.

Public opinion in the United States was appalled by Soviet invasion of Finland, and the U.S. government refused to recognize Soviet annexation of the Baltic states (a policy still in force). But the United States was much more concerned about Nazi conquest of France and the low countries and the possible invasion of England. In March 1941 Congress approved the Lend-Lease program to supply nations fighting against Germany and its Axis associates, Italy and Japan. When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, the United States entered World II and became allied with Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and other Axis foes.

In Europe Italy surrendered in . The Soviets turned back the Germans from their deepest penetration in and began pushing the Nazi army back to its homeland. U.S., British, Canadian, and other Allied forces landed in Normandy in June 1944. When the Big Three leaders -- Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin met in Yalta in February 1945 to work out postwar understandings, the Red Army was already covering much of Eastern Europe. They formulated the occupation zones for Germany but did not reach agreement on German reparation. They agreed to reestablish Poland as an independent nation, worked out a plan for a new Polish government, but could not agree upon the western boundary of Poland. Regarding the nations being liberated from Axis rule, the three Allied governments in the Yalta declaration promised to assist the people "to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and

pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people."

This was a promise the Soviets broke repeatedly. As the Red Army drove back the Nazis, the Soviet Union regained control of the Baltic States, which the Germans had occupied. The Soviets annexed parts of Finland, Poland, East Prussia, Czechoslovakia, and Romania. Soviet forces occupied the rest of Romania, all of Bulgaria, Hungary, and what would become the new Poland, and a portion of German and Czechoslovakia. National forces allied with Moscow liberated Yugoslavia and Albania.

In the months that followed the Soviet Union moved to consolidate its hold over Eastern Europe. Quickly the Soviet occupiers set up communist governments in Romania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, whose previous regimes had joined the Axis and supported the invasion of the Soviet Union. The Soviets ignored the Yalta agreement to have all major interests represented in a new Polish government, instead installing a communist regime. For all four nations the Yalta commitment to free elections was ignored. For awhile Czechoslovakia had a coalition government of communists, social democrats, and populists. The communists had control of the police force and used this power to take over the government in February 1948 with Soviet blessing. National communist forces in Yugoslavia and Albania set up their own governments (later both regimes would split away from Moscow).

This Soviet expansionism into Eastern Europe, directed by Joseph Stalin, had three motivations: desire to spread Communism; ambition for territorial expansion, long a strong force in Russia going back to tsarist days; and a concern for security by establishing buffer states between the Soviet heartland and Germany, which had invaded Russia twice within 25 years. Whatever the reasons, U.S. leaders were appalled at what was occurring. This was not the kind of Europe envisioned by the Atlanta Charter, a set of postwar goals formulated by Roosevelt and Churchill in 194x:

Occupation enabled the Soviets to take control of Eastern Europe. But the United States was able to block Soviet expansion toward the southwest. In practice this was the beginning of U.S. containment in Europe.

The first event occurred in Iran, where Soviet, British, and U.S. forces were stationed during World War II. The British and the Soviets came originally to block a feared German takeover as well as to uphold historic interests in that region. The Americans arrived in connection with the lend-lease supply line that ran from the Persian Gulf into the Soviet Union. Soon after the war was over British and U.S. forces departed, but Soviet troops remained in Northern Iran until a vigorous diplomatic nudge by the United States caused them to evacuate.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union was putting pressure on Turkey to regain a couple of provinces

which had previously passed back and forth and to share in control of the Bosphorus and Darnanelles straits. In Greece the Soviet Union sided with and sent supplies to leftist partisans in a civil war which had broken out while World War II was still underway. Historically Great Britain had supported Turkey and Greece in great power competition, but in the postwar years Britain could no longer play this role. So the United States took up the slack. To demonstrate support for Turkey in face of Soviet demands, President Truman dispatched the battleship Missouri for a visit to Istanbul in the summer of 1946 and thereafter the U.S. 6th Fleet became a fixture in the Eastern Mediterranean. In January 1947 Truman requested Congress to provide economic and military aid for Greece and Turkey and in March gave a speech which set forth what became known as the Truman Doctrine: that "it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures." [quoted in Gaddis, 1982: 22. Look up original.]

Thus, two years after the end of World War II in Europe the two basic forces of Cold War I were well established: Soviet expansionism, particularly into Eastern Europe; and U.S. containment, the effort to block the peripheral expansion of the Soviet Union. The Soviets were able to expand by occupying territory liberated from Nazi conquest. The United States responded by seeking to stop Soviet expansion beyond the occupied zone.

In the West the intellectual basis for containment was laid out by George Kennan, first in a lengthy telegraphic message from his post at the U.S. embassy in Moscow in February 1946 and then in an article on "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," signed only as "Mr. X" in the July 1947 issue of Foreign Affairs when Kennan was director of the State Department's planning staff.

RELIGIOUS LEADERS' CALL FOR DISARMAMENT IN THE 1990s

The Cold War era that has dominated world politics since 1945 is coming to an end. Indeed, it is clear that ending Cold War confrontation is within the self-interest of both sides: the United States and its allies, the Soviet Union and its allies. Neither side can gain from war. Both sides would suffer unfathomable losses. And even if war never comes, Cold War confrontation is harmful to both sides because of the human and economic resources wasted and the danger of accidental conflict.

There are significant signs of hope. To be sure, the 1980s began with heightened tensions between the US and the USSR, leading to greater military buildup on both sides. But in the second half of the decade tensions eased. The 1987 treaty on Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) was the first agreement to eliminate an entire class of nuclear weapons. Presently serious efforts are underway to achieve a Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) and a treaty for Reduction of Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE). We are coming to the end of the decade with promising possibilities.

It is therefore appropriate to recall an ancient prophesy:

*And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
and their spears into pruning hooks;
Nations shall not lift up sword against nation,
neither shall they learn war any more.*

In our day we can translate this poetic language into two challenging tasks: **disarmament and economic conversion.**

These should be our twin goals as we move into the 1990s. While continuing and accelerating current arms reduction negotiations, we need to seek more ambitious objectives. We need to carry out bold, rapid, and thorough measures of nuclear disarmament and conventional force reduction. We should give particular attention to achieving **general disarmament in Europe**, where one-half of the world's military expenditures are concentrated. We should also seek **global abolition of nuclear weapons**.

Therefore, we the undersigned call upon the United States, the Soviet Union, and their respective allies to:

A. Promptly complete negotiations for

- o A **Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START)** to cut in half the strategic nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union.
- o A treaty for the first stage of **Conventional Force Reduction in Europe (CFE)**.

These two treaties should be ready for signing by early summer of 1990.

B. Seek **general disarmament in Europe** in the following manner:

- o Carry out the orderly **withdrawal of all armed forces based on foreign territory**. This includes:
 - Soviet forces based in Eastern Europe,
 - U.S. forces based in Western Europe, and
 - British and French forces based in the Federal Republic of Germany.This should be accomplished **within five years** so that the task can be completed by **May 8, 1995**, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe.
- o **Demobilize these withdrawn forces** in their homelands, destroy their fighting equipment, or convert it to civilian uses.

- o Simultaneously **reduce all national forces** in every European country to a level sufficient only for border defense with no offensive capability. As part of this process, **destroy all offensive fighting equipment** or convert it to civilian uses.
- o **Settle underlying political issues** in Europe to eliminate causes for future war.
- o **Establish mechanisms for achieving common security and resolving disputes** between and within European nations through peaceful means.

C. **Seek global nuclear disarmament** in the following manner:

- o Carry out successive stages of **mutual reduction of all types of nuclear weapons**, both strategic and tactical, and the elimination of their delivery systems, based on land, sea, and air.
- o Achieve **global abolition of all nuclear weapons by the year 2000**.
- o Rigorously enforce the provisions of the **Nuclear Nonproliferation Act** and extend its applications to all nations on Earth.
- o To foster these goals, immediately take the following steps:
 - > **Halt the production and further deployment** of all types of nuclear weapons and delivery systems by all nations.
 - > Institute a **moratorium on testing** nuclear weapons and then agree to a **Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB) treaty**.
 - > **Stop further development of strategic defense systems**.

D. **Convert resources** now used for the arms race and maintenance of strategic and forward-based forces into constructive, peaceful uses, including:

- o Solutions for **domestic social and economic problems**,
- o Improvement of living conditions in **less developed nations**, and
- o Dealing with **global environmental problems**.

E. Seek the above objectives through a combination of:

- o Treaty negotiation,*
- o Independent national initiatives, and*
- o Reciprocation of other nations' initiatives.*

In conclusion, we believe that disarmament and economic conversion should be major themes of the 1990s. By beating swords into plowshares we can foster world peace and can achieve significant improvement in living conditions for the people of Earth.

[Signed:]

*Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, Executive Director
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
421 Seward Square, SE, Washington, DC 20003*

(202) 546-5551

Regarding proposed "Religious Leaders' Call for Disarmament in the 1990s"

This proposed "Call" is initiated by Howard Hallman, who was recently appointed executive director of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national membership association of laity and clergy. Three years ago he developed and gained endorsements for "A Citizens' Declaration for Worldwide Nuclear Disarmament by the Year 2000".

The following schedule is proposed:

October 30–November 10. Initial circulation. Modifications can be proposed.

November 11–17. Recirculate if substantive modifications made.

November 18–December 8. Wider circulation.

December 11 or soon thereafter. Presentation to President Bush and President Gorbachev.

Invited to be initial signers:

Bishop C. Dale White

Bishop C. P. Minnick

Other United Methodist leaders on National Advisory Committee of Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Bishop Thomas Gumbleton

Edward Snyder

Rabbi David Saperstein

Arthur Waskow

Other selected individuals

Denominational leaders through Washington or headquarters offices of:

African Methodist Episcopal Church

African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church

American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A.

Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)

Christian Methodist Church

Church of the Brethren

Episcopal Church

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

National Baptist Convention of America

National Baptist Convention, U.S.A.

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Reformed Church in America

Unitarian Universalist Association

United Church of Christ

Leadership of selected religious organizations:

Americans Friends Service Committee

Choose Peace

Church Women United

Jesuit Social Ministries

Mennonite Central Committee

National Council of Churches

Network: A Catholic Social Justice Lobby

Pax Christi

Others

___ Yes, I am willing to be a signer of "A Letter from Religious Leaders to President Bush and President Gorbachev" on disarmament and economic conversion.

Signed _____ Date _____

Print name _____ Title _____

Organization _____ Telephone _____

Address _____
Street _____ City, state, zip _____

Please reply no later than Tuesday, November 21, 1989. You may provide this information by phone to (202) 546-5551, but please also send the completed form for our records.

Return to: Howard W. Hallman, Executive Director
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003

___ Yes, I am willing to be a signer of of "A Letter from Religious Leaders to President Bush and President Gorbachev" on disarmament and economic conversion.

Signed _____ Date _____

Print name _____ Title _____

Organization _____ Telephone _____

Address _____
Street _____ City, state, zip _____

Please reply no later than Tuesday, November 21, 1989. You may provide this information by phone to (202) 546-5551, but please also send the completed form for our records.

Return to:

*Howard W. Hallman, Executive Director
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003*

Bishop Thomas J. Gumbleton
Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit

Rev. John O. Humbert
General Minister and President
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)

Edward Snyder, Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Vern Preheim, General Secretary
General Conference Mennonite Church

James M. Lapp, Executive Secretary
Mennonite Church, General Board

John A. Lapp, Executive Secretary
Mennonite Central Committee

Rev. Edwin G. Mulder
General Secretary
Reformed Church in America

Rev. John Paarlberg
Minister for Social Witness
Reformed Church in America

Dr. William F. Schulz, President
Unitarian Universalist Association

Robert Z. Alpern
Director, Washington Office
Unitarian-Universalist Association

*Titles and organizations are listed
only for identification purposes.*

*Please reply: c/o Howard W. Hallman,
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
421 Seward Sq. SE, Washington, DC 20003*

From United Methodist Church:

Bishop George Bashore

Pittsburgh Area

Bishop Joseph B. Bethea

South Carolina Area

Bishop William Boyd Grove

West Virginia Area

Bishop Kenneth W. Hicks

Kansas Area

Bishop Felton E. May

Harrisburg Area

Bishop Calvin D. McConnell

Seattle Area

Bishop Susan Morrison

Philadelphia Area

Bishop William B. Oden

Louisiana Area

Bishop Roy I. Sano

Denver Area

Bishop F. Herbert Skeete

Boston Area

Bishop Forrest C. Stith

New York West Area

Bishop Melvin G. Talbert

San Francisco Area

Bishop Jack Tuell

Los Angeles Area

Bishop C. Dale White

New York Area

Bishop Joseph H. Yeakel

Washington Area

Dr. Edward W. Bauman, Co-Chair
Nat'l Advisory Ctte, Methodists
United for Peace with Justice
Berkley Bedell, Former Congressman
Spirit Lake, Iowa
Elinor Bedell, Member, Peace Links
Spirit Lake, Iowa
Professor Walter Brueggemann
Columbia Theological Seminary
Helen Marie Burns, RSM, President
Leadership Conf. of Women Religious
Rev. Nick Carter, Executive Director
SANE/FREEZE
Rev. William Sloane Coffin, President
SANE/FREEZE
Bob Edgar, Director
Committee for National Security
Professor Alan Geyer
Wesley Theological Seminary
Joseph R. Halcala, SJ, Director, National
Office Jesuits Social Ministries
Howard W. Hallman, Executive Director
Methodists United for Peace/Justice
Sherman W. Harris, Chair, Bd. of Dir.
Methodists United for Peace/Justice
Dr. Joshua Hutchins, Jr. , Co-Chair
Nat'l Advisory Ctte, Methodists
United for Peace with Justice
Mary Lou Kownacki, National Coordinator
Pax Christi, USA
Joseph Nangle, OFM, Justice/Peace Coord.
Conf. of Major Superiors of Men
Dr. Avery Post
Norwich, Vermont
Judge Woodrow Seals, Initiator, United
Methodist Peace Advocates Program
Professor James E. Will
Garrett-Evangelical Seminary

Doris Akers
Folett, Texas
Rev. Clifford A. Armour, Jr.
Newark, Delaware
Dr. Hilda C. M. Arndt
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Alice T. Ashton
Raleigh, North Carolina
Rev. Craig L. Barbour
Charlottesville, Virginia
Betty Jo Benton
Phoenix, Arizona
Rev. Risher Brabham
Rock Hill, South Carolina
Ralph L. Clark
Arlington, Virginia
Rev. Emmett W. Cocke, Jr.
Alexandria, Virginia
Rev. John Collins
New Rochelle, New York
John D. Copenhaver, Jr.
Stephens City, Virginia
Rev. Rick L. Cornwell
Safty Harbor, Florida
Eloise M. Cranke
Traer, Iowa
Rev. John R. Dicken
Fort Wayne, Indiana
Rev. Bruce K. Edwards
Thayer, Missouri
Rev. Charles A. Ellwood
West Liberty, West Virginia
Rev. W. David Erickson
Tappahannock, Virginia
Rev. J. Zachary Farr
Tucker, Georgia
Margaret Fertschneider
Atascadero, California
Rev. Jerry Franz
Greeley, Colorado
Jennifer L. Garvin-Sanchez
Richmond, Virginia
Rev. Kenneth E. Gelhaus

Kenosha, Wisconsin
Rev. Donald F. George
Albemarle, North Carolina
Larry George
Greenville, Texas
Joanne Gillis
Parma, Ohio
Rev. E. Ray Goodwin
Gadsden, Alabama
Brenda Hardt
Houston, Texas
Susan K. Holloway
Saratoga Springs, New York
Rev. Charles Kallaus
Rossville, Kansas
Rev. Thomas E. Kiracofe
Phoenix, Arizona
Rev. Phillip Lawson
Vallejo, California
Elsie Lewis
Oneonta, New York
Judith M. Pier Lybeck
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Edward G. Martin
Stratford, New Jersey
Rev. Robert E. McDonald
Springfield, Illinois
Rev. John M. Mecartney
Detroit, Michigan
Robert G. Miller
Baldwin City, Kansas
Carolyn D. Minus
Worthington, Ohio
Betty J. Nelson
Topeka, Kansas
Rev. Roy E. Nelson
Nickerson, Kansas
Eloise Folkers Nenon
Chatham, Virginia
Rev. K. Alan Nyhus
Delano, Minnesota
Rev. Calvin Peterson
Vermillion, South Dakota

Ruth Anne Petrak
Rock Rapids, Iowa

Jeter A. Pruett
Fort Worth, Texas

Arthur Ribe
Sarasota, Florida

Rev. Betty Richardson
Boyd, Texas

Nancy Risch
Gulf Breeze, Florida

Rev. Larry D. Robertson
Ponchatoula, Louisiana

Eldon P. Roe
Berea, Ohio

Henry F. Schwarzmamm
Westminster, Maryland

Madeline T. Shore
Visalia, California

Bernice S. Smith
Decatur, Georgia

Thelma G. Soltman
Tacoma, Washington

Rev. Wm. Steven Stone, Sr
Clinton, Kentucky

Rev. Jonathan C. Terry III
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Adeline M. Tucker
Hamden, Connecticut

Rev. R. Tom Tucker
Twin Falls, Idaho

Rev. A. Spencer Turnipseed, Jr.
Floral, Alabama

Rev. Mark W. Wethington
Durham, North Carolina

Ed Youngblood
Fort Worth, Texas

Rev. James H. Zeisloft
York, Pennsylvania

Addendum:

James M. Lapp, Executive Secretary
Mennonite Church, General Board
Dr. Avery D. Post
Norwich, Vermont

From United Methodist Church:

Bishop Joseph B. Bethea
South Carolina Area
Bishop William Boyd Grove
West Virginia Area
Bishop William B. Oden
Louisiana Area

Addendum:

James M. Lapp, Executive Secretary
Mennonite Church, General Board
Dr. Avery D. Post
Norwich, Vermont

From United Methodist Church:

Bishop Joseph B. Bethea
South Carolina Area
Bishop William Boyd Grove
West Virginia Area
Bishop William B. Oden
Louisiana Area

Addendum:

James M. Lapp, Executive Secretary
Mennonite Church, General Board
Dr. Avery D. Post
Norwich, Vermont

From United Methodist Church:

Bishop Joseph B. Bethea
South Carolina Area
Bishop William Boyd Grove
West Virginia Area
Bishop William B. Oden
Louisiana Area

Addendum:

James M. Lapp, Executive Secretary
Mennonite Church, General Board
Dr. Avery D. Post
Norwich, Vermont

From United Methodist Church:

Bishop Joseph B. Bethea
South Carolina Area
Bishop William Boyd Grove
West Virginia Area
Bishop William B. Oden
Louisiana Area

Addendum:

James M. Lapp, Executive Secretary
Mennonite Church, General Board
Dr. Avery D. Post
Norwich, Vermont

From United Methodist Church:

Bishop Joseph B. Bethea
South Carolina Area
Bishop William Boyd Grove
West Virginia Area
Bishop William B. Oden
Louisiana Area

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

421 Seward Square, SE

Washington, DC 20003

(202) 546-5551

A Proposal on Zero Funding of Strategic Nuclear Modernization

by Howard W. Hallman

We at Methodists United are interested in allying ourself with other organizations which want to push for zero funding of U.S. strategic nuclear modernization in the FY 1991 federal budget. Our main contribution can be mobilization of United Methodists around the country: many of the 49 resident bishops and a network of church and society boards in 72 conferences, connected to district units and local churches. We recognize that such grassroots mobilization must be tied into the work of those who lobby intensely in Washington and those who can provide the rationale and facts for zero funding. We would prefer others to take primary leadership, and we would work as part of the team.

Here are some possible components of a zero funding campaign.

Making the Case

Although more than reasoning is required, the case for zero funding requires a firm intellectual foundation. Some of the elements are as follows.

Purpose. *The accepted purpose of U.S. strategic nuclear weapons is deterrence, not war-fighting. A review of theory and experience reveals*

that two, and only two, possible actions are now the focus of U.S. strategic deterrence:

- (1) A direct Soviet attack on the U.S. mainland.
- (2) Soviet invasion of Western Europe.

In the 1960s prevention of a Chinese attack on the U.S. may have been another purpose of strategic deterrence, but no longer. Lesser actions -- especially regional wars on various continents -- have not been, and cannot be, deterred by long-range, strategic nuclear weapons. It is doubtful that even short-range, tactical nuclear weapons serve as a viable deterrent in such situations (look at the many wars *not* deterred), but that point doesn't have to be proved to make the case against *strategic* nuclear weapons.

Threat perception. If the only function of the U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal is to deter the Soviet Union from attacking the U.S. mainland and from invading Western Europe, we should be asking: how serious are those threats?

Numerous witnesses over the years have insisted that the possibility of a direct Soviet attack against the U.S. is extremely remote. Among others, Herman Kahn made this point in his final book, published in 1984. In 1990 the possibility is far less likely than ever. Moreover, President Mikhail Gorbachev has several times indicated he is willing to eliminate all strategic nuclear weapons by the year 2000 (January '86, at Reykjavik in October '87, in his United Nations speech in December '88).

As to the prospects of Soviet invasion of Western Europe, this has long been exaggerated by U.S. policy makers. Even some conservative, anti-communists have said that this fear is overrated. For instance, John Foster Dulles, testifying as a private citizen in 1949 at the original hearings on the North Atlantic Treaty, said as much. In the mid-1970s Richard

Pipes wrote that a direct military attack on Western Europe by the Red Army was highly improbable. Rather Pipes saw the main purpose of Soviet forces in Eastern Europe as political control of the satellites. And now even this latter purpose seems to be eroding as the Soviet Union has permitted, and in some instances encouraged, actions that have led to the downfall of East European Communist regimes.

Deterrence doctrine. These recent events bring into question the entire doctrine of U.S. nuclear deterrence. Personally I have believed for several years that the doctrine is a delusion that we have chosen to believe; therefore, we could unilaterally eliminate all of the nuclear stockpile with no adverse affect on U.S. national security. Most persons wouldn't go this far, but many thoughtful strategists (such as Robert McNamara) believe that the residual functions of nuclear deterrence could be handled by a much smaller strategic nuclear arsenal (some say 100 warheads, others 500).

Arms reduction treaties. The prospect is excellent for a US/Soviet Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) by late spring to cut in half (symbolically, real numbers might be nearer a one-third reduction) the two nations' strategic nuclear arsenal. A START II treaty for a halving the remaining arsenal is quite possible. START III could go even further.

With such drastic reductions in the offing, the best of the current strategic weapons could handle the remaining role for deterrence as long as nuclear deterrence remains a part of the U.S. military posture. Modernization is not necessary. It is wasteful.

Summation. These arguments need to be developed more fully and articulated to the general public, opinion leaders, and decisions makers in the Executive Branch and Congress. There needs to be a strong, underlying factual analysis of (a) the existing supply of nuclear weapons and their utility,

(b) the weapons in the research, development, production, and deployment pipeline, and (3) the implications of halting further development at this time. Because strategic defense is an integral part of the U.S. strategic deterrence doctrine, it needs to be encompassed in factual presentations, analysis, and discussion.

All of this should come together as a coherent set of position papers to make a strong case for zero funding of strategic nuclear modernization. These papers would be the base for grassroots education, media discussion, and influencing congressional decisions.

Decision Points

Decisions on further funding of strategic nuclear modernization will be made at the usual three points in the congressional year: budget, authorization, and appropriations. We need to be prepared to contest this funding at all three points.

Budget resolution. The first crucial decision will be the level of military spending adopted in the budget resolution. Even the Pentagon is recognizing that the level adjusted for inflation will be lower than in the current year. Considerable pressure is building to make it substantially lower (at least a 10 percent reduction this year, some are arguing, with more in subsequent years).

The budget resolution has a single figure for the Department of Defense and does not specify what it will be spent for. However, there are underlying assumptions that will be later expressed as authorization and appropriations. Those wanting to cut the overall figure must be able to specify how realistic the proposed cuts are in budgetary savings. Therefore, it is important to have available an analysis of what zero funding of strategic

nuclear modernization means in terms of budgetary authority and outlays in FY 1991 and subsequent fiscal years. (The same holds true for other aspects of military spending reduction.)

This year there are a number of groups and coalitions which want to press for a substantially lower military spending figure in the budget resolution. They include the Citizens' Budget Campaign, the "Budget for a Strong America" Coalition, the Coalition on Human Needs, organizations representing local elected officials, and others. Most of them lack expertise on the military budget but would be willing to accept and push for budgetary figures developed by citizen organizations with expertise on military spending.

Therefore, it would be desirable to soon produce a position paper on the budgetary implications of zero funding of strategic nuclear modernization.

Authorization and appropriations. Regardless of what the budget resolution contains, the struggle will continue through the authorization and appropriations processes. As it gets more specific in these arenas, the voice of vested interests will become stronger: military service units, civilian bureaucracies, contractors, local communities with jobs at stake. This means that counterforces need to be strong and cohesive and also that ways are found to counter particularly the economic concern. Here a tie with economic conversion legislation is essential.

Hill lobbying. Clearly a coherent lobbying effort is needed to bring together as many supporters of zero funding as possible. Others with greater expertise than I can work out what is necessary to accomplish. Mainly I would urge the arms control/peace community to find ways to gain support from organizations concerned mostly with domestic issues.

Grassroots Mobilization. We will not succeed with zero funding of

strategic nuclear modernization (and other aspects of the military budget) unless there is strong grassroots mobilization. Some of this is already underway. For instance, the Citizens' Budget Campaign is now organizing a media campaign in about 30 congressional districts and a number of states from which congressional leaders and budget committee members come. The Budget for a Strong America Coalition has started grassroots education. Much more is needed, especially on a cooperative basis. It needs to have a progressively wider focus as decision making shifts from the budget committees to authorization and then appropriation committees, with votes by the entire Congress at intervals.

Great is the opportunity to make major changes in federal budgetary priorities. Zero funding for strategic nuclear modernization is one of them.

A Disarmament Forum

Proposed by Howard W. Hallman

Background

The decade of the 1990s offers us extraordinary opportunities for achieving significant progress toward global disarmament. This can provide a strong foundation for realizing important peace and justice objectives. We have reached this threshold because:

- o Remarkable changes are occurring in the Soviet Union under the leadership of Mikhail Gorbachev and the policies of *perestroika* and *glasnost*.
- o An astonishing metamorphosis is taking place in Eastern Europe as six nations from the Warsaw Pact move away from Communist dominance toward greater political pluralism and capitalism.
- o The Warsaw Treaty Organization is rapidly losing its character as a hegemonic international Communist alliance.
- o Strong popular forces in Western Europe are pushing for the end of Cold War confrontation.
- o The U.S. government under George Bush is less ideological and more pragmatic than the Reagan administration.

As these changes accumulate, the case for U.S. spending \$150 billion a year for European defense and considerable sums for strategic nuclear modernization is rapidly disappearing -- like snow in springtime. As melting snow produces fog, thereby temporarily obscuring visibility, so U.S. policy is now fogbound. But as the veil lifts, we will have an amazing opportunity for truly remarkable policy changes.

A Forum to Talk-It-Through

We in the U.S. peace movement need to articulate a coherent set of long-range policies for the 1990s to help lead the United States out of the mists of the thawing Cold War. To do this we need to talk through the kind of long-range policies we favor, and also intermediate objectives leading toward our goals. This can provide the basis for more effective action strategies.

To help accomplish the first stage of "talk-it-through" I propose setting up a **Disarmament Forum**. The Forum would meet once a month in Washington to hear presentations on particular issues and to discuss the ideas presented. It would be fairly informal and strictly educational. It would *not* be expected to be a vehicle for coordinated action.

How It Would Work

Each Forum should have one presenter (maybe occasionally two), who would prepare a paper in advance and have copies available for distribution. The presenter would take not more than 30 minutes to lay out her/his ideas. Then one or two respondents would offer their views, taking not more than ten minutes each (strictly controlled). Then the floor would be open for discussion. There would be a presiding moderator (this position could rotate).

Time and Place

Each monthly session might last 1 1/2 to 2 hours. One suggestion is to hold the Forum at midday (12 to 2) and bring your own lunch. Another suggestion is late afternoon, such as 3 to 5 o'clock, possibly on a Monday (which is relatively light day on Capitol Hill).

A regular meeting place would be desirable. One possibility is the Fellowship Hall at Capitol Hill United Methodists Church.

Invitees

The Disarmament Forum would be open to the public. Invitations would go particularly to people from peace organizations, key members of Congress and their staffs, contacts in the Bush Administration, research institutes, universities, and media representatives.

Sponsors

The Disarmament Forum could be sponsored by a number of organizations which are committed to exploring disarmament as a major focus for the 1990s and are willing to look well beyond what is considered "realistic" and "practical" this year in Congress and with the Bush Administration.

There might be a small steering committee to pick topics, presentors, respondents, and moderators, to lay out a schedule through June or July 1990, and then assess whether to continue in the fall.

Possible Topics

Among the topics which might be considered at monthly meetings of the Disarmament Forum are the following:

- o **General disarmament in Europe.** For instance, note the agenda in the attached letter from U.S. religious leaders to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev, including a proposal to remove and demobilize all troops based on foreign soil by May 8, 1995. Gorbachev himself has indicated that he could see the possibility of troop withdrawal being completed by the end of

the decade. Recently the new East German Communist Party chief, Gregor Gysi urged that all foreign troops leave both Germanies by 1999. Within the U.S. and European peace movements discussion has started on what we might expect from CFE II, that is, a second round of Negotiations on Conventional Forces in Europe. (CFE II can be seen as an intermediate objective toward the longer range goal of general disarmament in Europe.)

- o **European political issues.** Disarmament is not only a matter of military force reduction but also requires solving key political and economic issues. Seeking general European disarmament requires facing up to such matters as possible German reunification, boundary stability, the future of NATO and WTO, economic relations in a changing Europe.
- o **Strategic nuclear disarmament.** Close analysis indicates that the principal purpose of U.S. strategic nuclear weapons is to serve as a backup deterrent to prevent Soviet invasion of Western Europe. Now that this likelihood (always exaggerated) has virtually disappeared, the strategic arsenal has lost its last purpose, except to deter an unprovoked Soviet strategic nuclear attack on the United States (never thought to be likely by most experts). So it is important to address how all strategic weapons might be eliminated, such as through a succession of START agreements or in some other manner.
- o **Naval disarmament.** A mostly neglect topic (except by Greenpeace and a few others) is the need for naval disarmament. This encompasses strategic submarines, naval forces stationed in the North Atlantic related to getting U.S. troops to Europe for World War III (a rapidly dissipating need), and sea-based forces used to intimidate Third World nations.
- o **Independent (unilateral) initiatives.** An exploration of ways to supplement arms control negotiations by reciprocal, independent initiatives.
- o **Nuclear nonproliferation, comprehensive test ban.** These topics relate to upcoming international conferences on these topics. What does the U.S. peace movement want to be achieved in these forums?
- o **Chemical and biological weapons.** The possibilities and opportunities for global elimination of their production and stockpiling.
- o **Proliferation of intermediate-range ballistic missiles.** These weapons are now spreading faster than nuclear weapons and pose grave dangers for increased regional warfighting.
- o **Arms trade and military assistance to Third World nations.** Probably the greatest danger to world peace in the 1990s is the continuation and spread of regional wars in which the superpowers are only indirectly involved.

Comments Invited

If you have comments on this proposal and/or think your organization would like to be involved, please contact Howard Hallman. By phone on Tuesday and Thursday at (301) 795-7677 (long distance from D.C.) or on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday at (301) 897-3668 (local call in D.C. area).

*Methodists United for Peace with Justice
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003*

January 8, 1990

*You are invited
to participate in a*

DISARMAMENT FORUM

*On the Fourth Thursday of the Month
From 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.*

*In Fellowship Hall
Capitol Hill United Methodist Church
421 Seward Square, SE (just off Pennsylvania Avenue)
Washington, DC
(Use 5th Street Entrance)*

The purpose of the Disarmament Forum is to discuss opportunities for substantial disarmament during the 1990s and underlying political and economic issues.

Thursday, February 23, 1990

"Where We've Come, Where We're Going with Disarmament"

Speaker: Ed Snyder, Executive Director

Friends Committee on National Legislation

Thursday, March 22, 1990

"Prospects for European Disarmament"

*CFE II. What should occur in the second round of Negotiations on
Conventional Forces in Europe -- Speaker*

*General Disarmament in Europe. Seeking total demilitarization in
Europe -- Speaker*

Thursday, April 26, 1990

"Strategic Nuclear Disarmament"

Reduction to Minimal Deterrence -- Speaker

Total Abolition of Strategic Weapons -- Speaker

Thursday, May 24, 1990

"Naval Disarmament"

Role of Navy in Post-Cold War Era -- Speaker

Options for Naval Disarmament -- Speaker

Thursday, June 28, 1990

"Economic Conversion during Disarmament"

Federal Leadership and Assistance -- Speaker

Achieved through Market Forces -- Speaker

Cosponsors

The Disarmament Forum is cosponsored by Organization A -- Organization B -- Organization C -- Etc.

For further information, contact Howard Hallman at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, (202) 546-5551.

Sponsors Consent for Disarmament Forum

We are willing to be a cosponsor of the Disarmament Forum.

Name of Organization _____

Address _____

Signed _____ *Title* _____

Contact person _____ *Telephone* _____

Suggested Speakers

Topic

Speaker

Please return to

*Howard W.Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003*

*You are invited
to participate in a*

DISARMAMENT FORUM

*On the Third Thursday of the Month
From 3:00 to 5:00 p.m., February to June, 1990*

The purpose of the Disarmament Forum is to discuss opportunities for substantial disarmament during the 1990s as the Cold War ends and to examine underlying political and economic issues.

First Session

*3:00 p.m., Thursday, February 15, 1990
Methodist Building, Conference Room 2
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.*

*"Where We've Come From, Where We're Going with Disarmament"
Speaker: Ed Snyder, Executive Director
Friends Committee on National Legislation*

Topics for future sessions (speakers to be announced)

*Thursday, March 15, 1990
"Prospects for European Disarmament"*

*Thursday, April 19, 1990
"Strategic Nuclear Disarmament"*

Thursday, May 17, 1990

"Naval Disarmament"

Thursday, June 21, 1990

"Economic Conversion during Disarmament"

Cosponsors

American Baptist Churches, Office for Governmental Affairs -- American Friends Service Committee -- British-American Security Information Council -- Council for a Livable World -- Friends Committee on National Legislation -- Jesuits Social Ministries, National Office -- Mennonite Central Committee -- Methodists United for Peace with Justice -- Network: National Catholic Social Justice Lobby -- Professionals' Coalition for Nuclear Arms Control -- SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security -- Unitarian-Universalist Association of Congregations -- United Church of Christ, Office of Church and Society -- Women Strike for Peace -- Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament -- Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

For further information, contact Howard Hallman at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, (202) 546-5551.

Sponsors Consent for Disarmament Forum

We are willing to be a cosponsor of the Disarmament Forum.

Name of Organization _____

Address _____

Signed _____ Title _____

Contact person _____ Telephone _____

Suggested Speakers

Topic

Speaker

Please return to

*Howard W.Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003*

List for Disarmament Forum

Center for National Security
Studies

122 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Christic Institute

1324 N. Capitol Street
Washington, DC 20002

National Peace Institute
Foundation

110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

William G. Miller

American Committee on
U.S. Soviet Relations
109 11th Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Episcopal Peace Fellowship
620 G Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Peace Links

747 8th Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Roosevelt Center for

American Policy Studies
326 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

World Federalist Association

418 7th Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Natural Resources Defense

Council
1350 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005

U.S. Catholic Convergence

xxx
Washington, DC xxxxx

Atlantic Council
1616 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

D.C. Commission
xzxx
xxxx

Steve Wolfe

Brookings Instituteion
1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. John Steinbrunner
Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

Carnegie Endowment for
International Peace
11 Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Bill Price

World Peacemakers
2025 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

Richard McSorley, SJ
Center for Peace Studies
Georgetown University
Washington, DC 20057

Washington Peace Center
2111 Florida Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009

*You are invited
to the next session of the*

DISARMAMENT FORUM

*3:00 to 5:00 p.m., Thursday, March 15, 1990
Methodist Building
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, WASHINGTON, D.C.*

PROSPECTS FOR EUROPEAN DISARMAMENT

*"CFE II: Possibilities for the Second Round of Talks on
Conventional Forces in Europe"*

David Shorr, British-American Security Information Council

*"General and Complete Disarmament in Europe: A Goal for the '90s"
Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice*

Topics for future sessions (speakers to be announced)

*Thursday, April 19, 1990
"Strategic Nuclear Disarmament"*

*Thursday, May 17, 1990
"Naval Disarmament"*

*Thursday, June 21, 1990
"Economic Conversion during Disarmament"*

The purpose of the Disarmament Forum is to discuss opportunities for

substantial disarmament during the 1990s as the Cold War ends and to examine underlying political and economic issues.

Cosponsors

American Baptist Churches, Office for Governmental Affairs -- American Friends Service Committee -- British-American Security Information Council -- Council for a Livable World -- Friends Committee on National Legislation -- Jesuits Social Ministries, National Office -- Mennonite Central Committee -- Methodists United for Peace with Justice -- Network: National Catholic Social Justice Lobby -- Professionals' Coalition for Nuclear Arms Control -- SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security -- Unitarian-Universalist Association of Congregations -- United Church of Christ, Office of Church and Society -- Women Strike for Peace -- Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament -- Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

For further information, contact Howard Hallman at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, (202) 546-5551.

Sponsors Consent for Disarmament Forum

We are willing to be a cosponsor of the Disarmament Forum.

Name of Organization _____

Address _____

Signed _____ *Title* _____

Contact person _____ *Telephone* _____

Suggested Speakers

Topic

Speaker

Please return to

*Howard W.Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003*

Washington-based Peace Organizations

Matt Bunn

Arms Control Association
11 Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Jack Mendelsohn

Arms Control Association
11 Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Captain Jim Bush

Center for Defense Information
1500 Massachusetts Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Dunbar Lockwood

Center for Defense Information
1500 Massachusetts Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Bob Edgar

Committee for National Security
1601 Connecticut Ave.NW,#301
Washington, DC 20009

Michael Mawby

Common Cause
2030 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Marc Rotenberg

Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Junior Bridges

Greenpeace, USA
1436 U Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Eric Fersht

Greenpeace, USA
1436 U Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Mary Brooks

League of Women Voters
1730 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Tom Cochran

Natural Resources Defense Council
1350 New York Ave.NW, #300
Washington, DC 20005

Maureen Thorton

Physicians for Social Responsibility
1000 16th Street, NW, #810
Washington, DC 20036

Adele Cuthbert

Psychologists for Social Responsibility
12026 Coldstream Drive
Potomac, MD 20854

Shira Flax

Sierra Club
408 C Street, NE
Washington, DC 20036

Laurie Tabachnik

Union of American Hebrew Congregations
2027 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

Carolyn Cottom

U.S. Comprehensive Test Ban Coalition
1000 16th Street, NW, #810
Washington, DC 20036

Julia Sweig

EXPRO

1601 Connecticut Ave, NW, #500
Washington, DC 20009

Nick Carter

SANE/FREEZE
1819 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Betty Bumpers

Peace Links
747 8th Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Morton Halperin

Center for National Security Studies
122 Maryland Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20002

World Federalist Association

418 7th Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Corrine Carey

Americans for Democratic Action
1511 K Street, NW, #941
Washington, DC 20005

Jerry Powers

U.S. Catholic Conference
3211 4th Street, NE
Washington, DC 20017

Washington Peace Center

2111 Florida Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20008

Marcus Raskin

Institute for Policy Studies
1601 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009

*Center for Theology and
Public Policy
4500 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20016*

*Richard Healy
Ploughshares Fund
1601 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009*

*Sojourners Peace Ministry
Box 29272
Washington, DC 20017*

*Dick Hoehn
Christic Institute
1324 N. Capitol Street
Washington, DC 20002*

*National Peace Institute
Foundation
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002*

*William G. Miller
American Committee on
U.S. Soviet Relations
109 11th Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003*

*Atlantic Council
1616 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006*

*Carnegie Endowment for
International Peace
11 Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036*

*Richard McSorley, SJ
Center for Peace Studies
Georgetown University
Washington, DC 20057*

*Bread for the World
802 Rhode Island Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20018*

*Roger Newell
Jobs with Peace
1747 Connecticut Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20009*

*John Steinbrunner
Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036*

Steve Wolfe

*Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036*

*Bill Price
World Peacemakers
2025 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036*

*American Association of
University Women
2401 Virginia Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20037*

Reasons for Disarmament

- 1. Morally right*
- 2. Self-interest*
 - a. Safety*
 - b. Economic*
- 3. No long-term advantage in arming for offensive purposes*
 - a. War-fighting is obsolete (result of nuclear weapons).*
 - b. Short-term gains from aggression don't last (imperialists are overthrown).*
 - c. A nation doesn't need a larger army to be great, to be respected.*

Necessary Alternatives

- 1. International structures and processes for dispute resolution*
- 2. Means of economic redirection*
- 3. Other "enemies" (hunger, homelessness, etc.)*
- 4. Other ways of overcoming economic injustice than violent revolution*

May 1, 1990

*You are invited
to the next session of the*

DISARMAMENT FORUM

*3:00 to 5:00 p.m., Thursday, May 17, 1990
Methodist Building, Conference Room 2
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, WASHINGTON, D.C.*

on

"NAVAL DISARMAMENT"

Speakers

*Captain James T. Bush, Center for
Defense Information*

Eric Fersht, Greenpeace

The purpose of the Disarmament Forum is to discuss opportunities for

substantial disarmament during the 1990s as the Cold War ends and to examine underlying political and economic issues.

Cosponsors

American Baptist Churches, Office for Governmental Affairs -- American Friends Service Committee -- British-American Security Information Council -- Council for a Livable World -- Friends Committee on National Legislation -- Jesuits Social Ministries, National Office -- Mennonite Central Committee -- Methodists United for Peace with Justice -- Network: National Catholic Social Justice Lobby -- Professionals' Coalition for Nuclear Arms Control -- SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security -- Unitarian-Universalist Association of Congregations -- United Church of Christ, Office of Church and Society -- Women Strike for Peace -- Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament -- Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

For further information, contact Howard Hallman at Methodists United for Peace with Justice, (202) 546-5551.

WHY? -- WHY NOT?

Some Questions Posed by Methodists United for Peace with Justice

1.

WHY does the United States have to spend so much on its military budget when the Cold War is over?

From the U.S. perspective the Cold War has consisted of Soviet expansionism countered by U.S. containment. From the Soviet perspective the Cold War has had the character of U.S. encirclement of the Soviet homeland and competition for power and influence in Third World nations.

Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, the end of Soviet military domination of Eastern Europe, and the beginning of troop withdrawal there has brought an end to Soviet expansion into adjacent territory. This has eliminated the need for U.S. military containment in Europe. Elsewhere around the globe US/Soviet direct and indirect rivalry has substantially lessened. Most military clashes between rival indigenous forces supported the two superpowers are being resolved.

So, the Cold War as we have known it for 45 year has virtually ended. Nonetheless, the level of armaments remains dangerously high. Both sides retain the momentum of expensive, and now unnecessary weapons modernization.

WHY NOT cut back military spending significantly? WHY NOT start this year with reduction of at least 10 percent annually for the next five years?

2.

WHY does the United States have to spend \$160 billion a year to deter and defend against a Warsaw Pact attack on Western Europe when the Pact has disintegrated as a viable, offensive military force?

None of the six East European members of the Warsaw Pact are viable military allies of the Soviet Union. East Germany is rapidly headed for dissolution as an independent state. Czechoslovakia and Hungary have requested Soviet forces to leave. So far Poland has not followed suit, partly because of nervousness over the future unified Germany, but Polish troops would not join an attack on Western Europe and the Polish people would disrupt any Soviet supply line through their country. Bulgarian forces have never been much of a factor, and even the old regime in Romania did not participate in the Pact military combine.

WHY NOT recognize the end of the Warsaw Pact as a military threat and begin immediately to make sharp reductions in military spending?

3.

WHY does the United States need to develop new weapon systems whose fundamental purpose is to fight a World-War-II type, ground-and-air war in Europe?

Among such weapons systems are

[Ask BASIC.]

WHY NOT terminate all funding for these weapons systems?

4.

WHY does the United States continue to deploy nuclear artillery and short-range nuclear missiles in Europe when they can only strike targets in soon-to-be-unified Germany and the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe?

At present U.S. tactical nuclear forces in Europe consist of

The Bush Administration has announced its intent to withdraw

WHY NOT undertake an independent U.S. initiative to remove all our tactical nuclear weapons from Europe and encourage the Soviet Union to do likewise?

5.

WHY does the United States have to maintain a huge military force in Europe when the possibility of a Soviet invasion has completely disappeared?

Admiral Crowe, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has stated:

President Bush has proposed

Senator Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has recommended that

Even this level is far higher than necessary in view of the imminent departure of Soviet forces from all Eastern European countries, certainly within the next five years.

WHY NOT bring about (a) total withdrawal of all forces based on foreign soil in Europe -- Soviet, U.S., British, French, Belgian, Dutch, and Canadian, (b) demobilization of these forces in their homelands, and (c) destruction of their offensive fighting equipment?

WHY NOT achieve this objective by May 8, 1995, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe?

6.

WHY does the "German question" -- the fear of a military resurgent, unified Germany -- have to prevent the mutual withdrawal of U.S. and Soviet forces from Central Europe?

The Soviet Union is reluctant to pull its troops out of what is now East Germany and Poland because the Soviets remember two German invasions in this century. A significant segment of West European political leadership wants the United States to maintain a military presence in Europe through NATO in order to keep an eye on unified Germany.

Yet, there are other ways to assure that unified Germany does not

become a threatening military power.

WHY NOT disband the Bundeswehr (West German arm) simultaneously with U.S. and Soviet withdrawal and the substantially diminution of other national military forces in Europe?

WHY NOT convert the 35-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) into an effective vehicle for European-North Atlantic common security? All members of NATO, including the United States and Canada belong to CSCE), all members of the Warsaw Pact, and a number of neutral, unaligned European nations.

WHY NOT use CSCE to oversee demilitarization of Europe, including Germany?

6.

WHY does the United States need to develop and deploy new strategic weapons when strategic nuclear deterrence is no longer a necessary policy?

After 45 years of experience, possible roles for strategic nuclear deterrence come down to two primary missions: (1) deterrence of Soviet invasion of Western Europe by, in effect, backing up forward-based forces in Europe; and (2) deterrence of Soviet strategic attack on the U.S. homeland.

Experience has shown that strategic nuclear weapons are unable to deter such "lesser" events as (a) The proof is that these events have all occurred, notwithstanding the powerful strategic arsenal. They were

undeterred.

Of the two "big" events that strategic weapons allegedly deter, Soviet invasion of Western Europe is no longer a possibility, as elaborated above. Political change in Eastern Europe has brought an end to the Warsaw Pact as a military force, and the Soviet Union is in no position to mount a unitary attack. Therefore, U.S. strategic weapons are no longer needed to safeguard Western Europe.

The remaining possible event deterred by the U.S. strategic arsenal is a Soviet direct attack on the U.S. homeland. Likewise, the primary purpose of the Soviet strategic arsenal is to deter a U.S. nuclear attack on the Soviet homeland. This boils down to strategic missiles deterring strategic missiles, for neither side has the capability of invading the others territory.

WHY NOT abandoned the outmoded doctrine of strategic nuclear deterrence and replace it with a mutual commitment to achieve the goal of total strategic, nuclear disarmament no later than the year 2000?

WHY NOT cease all modernization of strategic nuclear forces, which have lost their utility as a legitimate expression of national interest?

*How to Help the Soviet Union and Ourselves at the Same Time
Mutual Dismantlement of the Strategic Nuclear Arsenal*

*by Howard W. Hallman, Executive Director
Methodists United for Peace with Justice*

*Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, in accepting the Nobel Peace Prize, called upon the West for large-scale support to assure the success of *perestroika* (restructuring) in the Soviet Union. In providing this aid, he asserted that Western nations should not seek to dictate economic and political conditions.*

In response U.S. Secretary of State James A. Baker rejected a "big-bang" approach to helping the Soviet Union. Before aiding the Soviet economy, he has stated, the United States wants the Soviet Union to show a stronger commitment to free-market practices, reduce military spending, and demonstrate greater flexibility toward the Baltic republics.

Overlooked in this discussion is another possibility: accept a Gorbachev proposal to abolish all nuclear weapons by the year 2000. He made this offer in January 1986 by proposing a three-stage approach. Start with a 50 percent reduction during the first five to eight years, follow this with further reductions in stage two, and complete the process in stage three.

President Ronald Reagan explored this idea with President Gorbachev when they met at Reykjavik, Iceland on October 11-12, 1986. They agreed in principle to reduce strategic nuclear warheads to 6,000 in five years, a reduction of approximately 50 percent. For the second five years, Gorbachev wanted to abolish all strategic forces, including ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, and bombers while Reagan wanted to eliminate only the remaining ballistic missiles. They had a much deeper disagreement over the future of strategic defense. Reagan wanted research and development to continue but Gorbachev did not. This was the major stumbling block to a possibly far-reaching agreement.

Gorbachev's January '86 proposal, though hopeful, was incomplete for that period. It did not deal adequately with the huge deployment of conventional forces by the Soviet Union and the United States in Central Europe. Because defense of Western Europe has held a central place in U.S. nuclear policy, strategic disarmament alone would be insufficient. By now, though, this is a moot issue because Soviet forces are on their way out of Eastern Europe and the Warsaw Pact has dissolved. Therefore, we can come back to the Gorbachev proposal for total abolition of strategic nuclear weapons.

This is quite practicable because the respective arsenals have no function except to deter each other. Forty-five years' experience has shown that strategic nuclear weapons have no deterrent value

in preventing regional wars such as in Korea, Vietnam, and the Middle East. They did not deter the Soviet Union from repressing revolt in East Germany (1953), Hungary (1956), or Czechoslovakia (1968), from invading Afghanistan (1978), or from suppressing human rights at home. Whether the U.S. nuclear arsenal kept Soviet forces from invading Western Europe is doubtful, for this was probably never Soviet intent. Anyway this prospect no longer exists because the Soviet threat to Western Europe has totally dissipated during the last two years.

With the only remaining function of U.S. and Soviet strategic arsenals to be mutual deterrence, they could be disbanded simultaneously. This would provide much greater national security than the precarious threat of mutual destruction and the risk of accidental attack.

The course of strategic nuclear abolition could follow the arduous path of arms control negotiations, which is about to produce a Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) with a seven-year schedule to reduce the arsenal by 10 to 30 percent. This could be followed by START II with further reductions, then START III, and START IV stretching out for two decades.

A better way would be shut down the entire U.S. and Soviet strategic arsenals simultaneously and virtually instantly. Bring all the strategic submarines into port (and the attack submarines as well). Ground the strategic bombers and take their crews off alert. Seal the underground intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) silos and bring the crews out of the ground. Cease moving the mobile missiles around on trucks and trains. Close down the factories that are producing additional missiles, bombs, warheads, and bombers. Have the United Nations send in international teams of observers to assure that the missiles and bombers are demobilized.

After that is accomplished, the United States and the Soviet Union can work out a schedule for dismantling these weapons and destroying their warheads. This schedule should be balanced to assure that neither nation would be at a disadvantage at any time if some unexpected event interrupted the dismantlement process.

The savings for both nations would be enormous. Development of new strategic weapons is costing the United States \$18 to 20 billion dollars a year, and the Soviets are spending in that range, or more. Personnel and other operating costs of the submarines, bombers, missile silos, and mobile missile vehicles amount to many billions more. There would be transitional costs of retraining personnel and finding them other jobs, but that would be very much less than the cost of maintaining the unnecessary strategic arsenal.

For the Soviets the savings would surpass the economic aid requested from the West. For the United States the savings would be available for unmet domestic needs, ranging from health care to bridge repair, and for future-oriented space and science projects.

So if we really want to help the Soviet Union, let's accept President Gorbachev's 1986 proposal

for total nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. In helping the Soviet Union we would be helping ourselves economically while eliminating the only existing threat of attack on the U.S. homeland.

-30-

*Methodists United for Peace with Justice
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003*

(301) 897-3668

June 7, 1991

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003
(202) 546-5551

*Statement by Howard W. Hallman, Executive Director
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
at Public Scoping Meeting
Conducted by U.S. Department of Energy
on Reconfiguration of the Nuclear Weapons Complex
June 12, 1991, Washington, D.C.*

As you consider the possibility of reconfiguring the U.S. nuclear weapons complex, I would like to address the underlying purpose and need for nuclear weapons. Purpose and need are matters the Department of Energy is required to consider under federal regulations governing environmental impact statements (40 CFR §1502.13).

The main point I want to make is that no more nuclear weapons are needed for national security purposes. Therefore, no new or modernized nuclear weapons production facilities should be built.

I come to this conclusion through analysis of the current security needs of the United States and by examining the 45-year experience with the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

Repeatedly American presidents have indicated that U.S. nuclear weapons are primarily a deterrent of aggressive actions by our adversaries.

The principal adversary has been the Soviet Union, though from time to time some lesser adversaries have appeared. U.S. military doctrine provides for use of nuclear weapons against the enemy, even first use in the event of an overwhelming enemy attack by conventional forces. American political and military leaders have insisted that willingness to use nuclear weapons demonstrates U.S. determination, thereby strengthening the deterrent value of nuclear weapons.

Thus, nuclear weapons are like a gigantic security blanket, used as children use their security blankets to ward off the wooglies and other monsters. We the American people have accepted and clung to the nuclear weapons security blankets in order to assuage our fear of communism and the imperial ambitions of the Soviet Union.

With the Cold War over, it is time for us to grow up, to discard this unnecessary security blanket. It is time for us to realize that the international wooglies were never as threatening as we were led to believe. And now the imagined Soviet threat has virtually dissipated. There no lesser threats any place in the world that require nuclear deterrence or the prospective use of nuclear weapons.

I can show you this through empirical analysis of world events of the past 45 years. For your edification I will peel off one by one the nuclear weapons security blankets that weigh us down.

We can say for certain that the U.S. nuclear arsenal has failed to prevent 136 wars since the end of World War II. This is the number that have actually occurred. They have caused 22.5 million deaths. Nearly two-thirds of the victims were civilians. These data come from William Eckhardt of the Lentz Peace Research Laboratory.

Ninety-five of the 136 wars have been civil wars, that is, armed conflict within a nation. Sometimes the United States and the Soviet Union were involved indirectly by supplying weapons to one or the other set of combatants. Occasionally superpower military forces directly intervened, such as the United States in Central America and the Philippines and the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, but never at the same time. If we look ahead for the next 20 to 30 years, civil wars are likely to remain the dominant type of war on Earth. The U.S. nuclear deterrent has not prevented such wars in the past and will not prevent them in the future. So, let's peel off the first nuclear weapons security blanket as ineffective for preventing civil war.

Sixteen colonial wars have occurred in the past 45 years, mostly in the earlier part of this period when former colonies were casting off colonial rule. This process has pretty much run its course. If there are similar wars in the years ahead, they are likely to be parts of federated nations seeking independence, such as the Baltic republics and sections of Yugoslavia. Nuclear weapons cannot prevent wars of independence, and they have no utility in fighting such wars. So, let's discard the second nuclear weapons security blanket as unuseful in preventing colonial wars.

Twenty-two regional wars have take place in the past four and a half decades. From the U.S. perspective the Korean War and the Vietnam War were the largest of this variety. The Korean War broke out when the United States had overwhelming nuclear superiority, but that didn't deter North Korea from attacking South Korea, a U.S. ally. Nor was the Vietnam War prevented by the U.S. nuclear deterrent. And in fighting these regional wars, nuclear weapons were found to be useless. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower considered possible use in Korea. Presidents Johnson and Nixon considered possible use in Vietnam. They all concluded that nuclear weapons were not necessary to achieve the defined objectives of the war, which did not include obliterating P'yongyang and Hanoi. They decided that battlefield

objectives could be achieved with conventional weapons. They judged that if nuclear weapons were used, they would cause indiscriminate civilian harm. Moreover, they were concerned about the international political repercussions of attacking another Asian nation with nuclear weapons.

The most recent regional war took place in the Persian Gulf from August 1990 through February 1991. Clearly the U.S. nuclear arsenal didn't deter Saddam Hussein from attempting the conquest of Kuwait, and U.S. nuclear weapons were not needed for U.S.-led coalition forces to defeat Iraq.

If we look around the globe to possible sites of regional conflict in the coming years -- such as the Middle East, South Asia, Southeast Asia, and elsewhere, we must realize that the U.S. nuclear arsenal has no deterrent capacity. Thus, we can remove the third nuclear weapons security blanket as impotent to prevent regional wars.

Three wars since 1945 have consisted of one large nation attempting to conquer a less powerful adversary: Pakistan versus Kashmir (1947-49), India versus Hyderabad (1948), and Indonesia versus East Timor (1975-82). The U.S. nuclear arsenal was no factor in these events. So, we can take off the fourth nuclear weapons security blanket intended to prevent imperial conquest because it is ineffectual.

Another threat to the security of the United States and its citizens is terrorist attacks and taking hostages. There has been quite a bit of that, completely undeterred by nuclear weapons. Neither can nuclear might be used to retaliate against terrorists and hostage takers. So, we can throw off this fifth nuclear weapons security blanket.

In global competition with the Soviet Union during the past 45 years, the U.S. government has been deeply concerned about what some identified

as "captive nations" in Eastern Europe. They came under Soviet control because of Soviet occupation in the waning days of World War II. Repeatedly the people revolted but were suppressed by Soviet power: East Germans in 1953, Hungarians in 1956, Czechoslovakians in 1968, and Poles several times. The U.S. nuclear arsenal provided no protection from Soviet suppression. Nor did U.S. nuclear might protect Soviet citizens from human rights violations. The people in Eastern Europe finally won their freedom on their own, and the same thing is happening internally within the Soviet Union. So, this is a sixth nuclear weapons security blanket we can discard.

This leaves only two possible purposes for the U.S. nuclear deterrent: protection of Western Europe from Soviet invasion and protection of the U.S. mainland from direct Soviet attack.

During the past decade over half of the U.S. military budget has gone for the defense of Western Europe. Most of the tactical nuclear weapons have been assigned to this function. For many years some of us have felt that the U.S. government greatly overrated the threat of Soviet invasion, confusing capability with intent. But that argument is moot now. Soviet troops are rapidly pulling out of Eastern Europe. The Warsaw Pact, which formed to counter NATO, has dissolved. The Soviet economy is in disarray. By now the Soviet threat to Western Europe is down to zero. There is nothing to deter. Thus, we can rid ourselves of this heavily quilted nuclear weapons security blanket assigned to defend Western Europe because it's now obsolete.

This gets us down to one remaining nuclear weapons security blanket: the one designed to prevent an intercontinental strike against the United States by the Soviet Union. If we were having this hearing in the Soviet Union, a witness could say that the only purpose of Soviet nuclear weapons is to prevent an intercontinental strike against the Soviet Union by the United States. It's as former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara concluded five

years ago: "nuclear weapons serve no military purpose whatever. They are totally useless -- except to deter one's opponent from using them."

At this moment the United States and the Soviet Union are about to conclude a Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) to reduce the size of the strategic nuclear arsenal. Many advocate a START II agreement to reduce the supply further. Because this is happening, the existing U.S. arsenal has more than enough strategic weapons to deter Soviet strategic weapons without producing any more nuclear weapons material and assembling new nuclear warheads.

It is time for us to recognize that the true self-interest of both the United States and the Soviet Union would be to totally eliminate their entire nuclear arsenal. This would enormously enhance the national security of both nations.

Accordingly, we can remove the eighth and final nuclear weapons security blanket, the one intended to deter an intercontinental attack by Soviet strategic nuclear weapons. As we do so, we will discover that there are no wooglies, no monsters for a nuclear weapons security blanket to ward off. We will breathe a huge sigh of relief as we inhale the free air, no longer suffocated by security blankets that do us no good.

This gets us back to the focus of this hearing: the possible reconfiguration of nuclear weapons production facilities. The fundamental question is whether new or reconfigured facilities are needed. The answer is clearly "no".

Nuclear weapons have not and cannot deter "little wars". They can deter only other weapons. Furthermore, the existing supply of nuclear weapons is useless for warfighting purposes, as I have indicated. Their destructive power

is disproportionately too great for any legitimate military objective, and they would cause indiscriminate harm to civilians and the environment. Beyond that their use would be morally wrong and politically unsound.

Therefore, I urge you to conclude that the underlying purpose of nuclear weapons has disappeared, that no more nuclear warheads are needed, and accordingly, that reconfigured nuclear weapons production facilities are unnecessary.

-30-

*Methodists United for Peace with Justice
421 Seward Square, SE, Washington, DC 20003*

*Howard W. Hallman, Executive Director
(301) 897-3668*

A TWO-PHASE PLAN FOR STRATEGIC DISARMAMENT

Propositions

(1) *"Strategic nuclear weapons have lost whatever military utility may once have been attributed to them. Their sole purpose, at present, is to deter the other side's first use of strategic forces."*

Robert S. McNamara, 1986.¹

(2) *At present neither the United States nor the Soviet Union has any cause to initiate a strategic first strike against the other. Indeed, the greatest risk of strategic attack -- a byproduct of military confrontation in Europe -- has virtually disappeared.*

(3) *No realistic scenario for the foreseeable future can envision a circumstance in which either side would have a self-interest in initiating a strategic attack on the other.*

(4) *Nevertheless, each side is vulnerable to strategic attack by the other through accidental launching of nuclear missiles or an irrational act by a crazed military officer or political leader. For both the United States and the Soviet Union such an attack is the only existing threat to the sancity of their respective homelands.*

(5) *Accordingly, the self-interest of both the United States and the Soviet Union is to completely eliminate the strategic nuclear arsenals on a mutual basis.*

(6) *Total abolition is superior to keeping a small strategic arsenal for "minimal deterence" because abolition is safer than the risk of accidental or irrational launching of a minimal deterrent force.*

(7) *Strategic nuclear weapons have no military utility for the other open possessors -- Great Britain, France, and China. Therefore, it is in their self-interest to dismantle their strategic arsenal as the United States and the Soviet Union do.*

(8) *Although the knowledge of how to make nuclear weapons cannot be erased, it is possible to eliminate all production facilities, deactivate the deployed delivery systems, dismantle missiles, bombs, and their warheads, and institute safeguards against rearming.*

(9) *It is also possible to institute a global regime of nuclear nonproliferation to prevent other*

¹ Robert S. McNamara, *Blundering into Disaster*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1986. p. 30

nations from acquiring nuclear weapons. This would include dismantlement of all secret arsenals, research and development, and production facilities.

(10) In addition to the practical reasons for nuclear disarmament, religious and ethical leaders have offered moral reasons for doing so, as summarized in Appendix A.

TWO-PHASE PLAN

The challenge is to devise and carry out a plan to apply the findings of the above propositions. This can be accomplished in two phases:

- Phase I. Immediate and simultaneous deactivation of strategic nuclear delivery systems.
- Phase II. Dismantlement of all warheads and delivery vehicles, staged in a manner to assure than no nation is at disadvantage or risk at any time during the dismantlement process.

Phase I: Deactivation

The start of the process should be deactivation of all deployed strategic delivery systems concurrently and virtually instantly. This should be completed in a matter of days. The United States and the Soviet Union should go first, joined quickly by Great Britain, France, and China. This would apply to sea, air, and land-based nuclear forces.

Naval

1. Bring all strategic submarines into port.
2. Bring in all attack submarines as well.
3. Move out of range all other ships capable of launching a cruise missile or naval air attack.

Air

*The Honorable Lech Walesa
Solidarity Headquarters
Warsaw, Poland*

Dear Mr. Walesa:

I note that you are working to achieve the total withdrawal of Soviet forces from Poland. In this connection I would like to share with you a letter which 120 religious leaders in the United States sent to President Bush and President Gorbachev prior to their Malta summit meeting. We asked them to make "Swords into Plowshares" the theme for the 1990s and to apply this theme by seeking general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion.

As part of general disarmament in Europe, we called for the complete withdrawal of all armed forces based in foreign territory by May 8, 1995, which is the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. We stated that these forces should be demobilized in their homelands and all offensive equipment destroyed. We also advocated that all national forces in Europe be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense without any offensive capability.

You are already working for this objective in Poland. I hope that you will use your leadership to seek this goal for all of Europe.

We wish you success in your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

DRAFT

The Honorable George Bush
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We applaud the initiative you took at the recent NATO Summit to develop a new NATO negotiating position on conventional arms reduction in Europe. The proposed lower ceilings on troops, aircraft, tanks, artillery pieces, and troop carriers are step in the right direction toward the eventual goal of demilitarizing East/West relations in Europe. We particularly like the sense of urgency you displayed by seeking an agreement within a year.

We also support the idea you advanced in Europe that it is time to move beyond containment. We agree with you that the Soviet Union is in a state of radical change and one result will be a less military aggressive Soviet Union. The outcome, as you stated, could be a united Europe, a Europe without as many artificial boundaries, much more freedom and democracy. As those things happen, you pointed out, "the role of NATO shifts, our own role shifts, from the main emphasis on deterrence to an emphasis on the economic side of things." We concur. It is time to move beyond containment and beyond deterrence.

With this as our goal, we can judge contemporary policies, arms reduction proposals, and defense budget requests on the basis of how they contribute to achieving this goal. In this light, we offer the following ideas for your consideration:

- (1) Because short-range nuclear forces are such an integral part of war-fighting capability of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact, they should be reduced along with conventional forces. The objective should be the elimination of all tactical nuclear forces in Europe as soon as possible. Given Soviet numerical superiority with such weapons, their total elimination would be advantageous for the West. We recommend prompt negotiation of such an agreement.
- (2) With this as the goal, we should postpone research and development on a Lance missile replacement. An agreement to eliminate all short-range nuclear forces in Europe would mean that Lance modernization will not be needed.
- (3) The level of conventional force reduction now under consideration by negotiators in Vienna should be viewed as a first step, to be followed by further conventional force reduction.

The next step should be a reduction to 50 percent of the present NATO level. This should be followed by further reduction, working toward the goal of complete withdrawal of all forces from foreign soil and demobilization in their homelands. At that stage all national forces should be reduced to a level sufficient only for self-defense with no offensive capability. We believe that it is within the self-interest of all European

The Honorable George Bush

Date

Page two.

nations and of the United States to achieve this level of disarmament before the end of the 1990s.

- (4) To speed the pace of military demilitarization in Europe, we believe the United States should take certain initiatives on its own to reduce the level of confrontation. For example, moving xxx back from the inter-German boundary; [other examples].

- (5) Moving beyond containment enables us to move beyond deterrence. This highlights the importance of Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) now going on in Geneva. Close examination reveals that the primary purpose of strategic nuclear deterrence is to serve as backup to frontline conventional and tactical nuclear forces in Central Europe. The primary act that the strategic nuclear arsenal deters is Soviet invasion of Western Europe. With the possibility of such Soviet aggression disappearing because of conventional arms reduction and troop withdrawal, it will be possible to substantially reduce and eventually eliminate the strategic arsenal. Therefore, we urge quick conclusion of a START agreement to reduce the number of US and Soviet strategic warheads by 50 percent. This should be followed by START II and START III agreements to bring about further reductions.

- (6) If we can move far enough beyond containment in Europe to achieve the goal of a demilitarized Europe by the end of the 1990s, we could also achieve the goal of global nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. We recommend long-range planning to bring this about.

Such possibilities are realistically down the line, Mr. President. Your NATO initiatives open the door of opportunity to move in this direction. Opening this door enables us to have a better vision of what can be achieved during the next decade. We are convinced that the goals we suggest are achievable because they are within the self-interest of the United States, the Soviet Union, and all other members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

Accordingly, we urge you to continue your creative leadership to take us in this direction. In this manner we can achieve a much more peaceful world than the perilous existence of the past 40 years.

[Signed by various organizations and/or their representatives.]

Drafted by Howard Hallman

June 8, 1989

Rev. John O. Humbert, General Minister & President
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
222S. Downey Avenue, Box 1986
Indianapolis, IN 46206

Dear Rev. Humbert:

These days we can be heartened by significant improvement in US/Soviet relations and by steps underway to slow the arms race. Soviet President Gorbachev has taken a number of important initiatives, and U.S. President Bush has articulated the view that it is time to "move beyond containment." Even so, we are not yet entirely free of Cold War mentality, and the pace of arms reduction is far too slow. In the United States the majority of the population is ready for much bolder steps than President Bush and the Congress are willing to take.

In this situation we need a broader vision, more ambitious goals. We need to move beyond the slow pace of treaty negotiations to more dramatic and rapid measures of arms reduction and disarmament. We need to offer far-reaching ideas to both U.S. and Soviet leadership and to give them a chance to say, "We'll do it if they will."

With that in mind I have drafted the attached "Religious Leaders' Call for Disarmament in the 1990s". It calls for global nuclear disarmament,

general disarmament in Europe, and economic conversion. The most innovative part is a recommendation that all armed forces based in foreign territory in Europe should totally withdraw and demobilize in their homelands by May 8, 1995, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. Though startling, this is a practicable goal. After all the United States demobilized 10 million military personnel and the Soviets 8 million within two years after World War II ended. What is needed is willingness.

Would you be willing to be an initial signer of this "Call"? Others invited to sign at this time are indicated on the attached schedule. At this stage we are willing to consider suggestions for modification in the text. If any substantive modifications are made after you consent to the draft, we will give you an opportunity to see the final version prior to circulation. For your convenience a return form and envelope are enclosed.

After this initial circulation we will distribute the "Call" to a wider circle of religious leaders for their signature. Then we will seek an opportunity to present the "Call" directly to President Bush and President Gorbachev, or if not to them, to the highest ranking officials we can reach. At that time we will release it to news media.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

Bishop C. Dale White
United Methodist New York Area
252 Bryant Avenue
White Plains, NY 10605

Bishop C. P. Minnick
Raleigh United Methodist Area
P.O. Box 10955
Raleigh, NC 27605

Edward Snyder
Friends Committee on National
Legislation
245 Second Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002

The Most Reverend Thomas J. Gumbleton
Archdiocese of Detroit
1234 Washington Boulevard
Detroit, MI 48226

Rabbi David Saperstein
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
2027 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Arthur Waskow, Director
The Shalom Center
Church Road & Greenwood Avenue
Wyncote, PA 19095

Dr. Ronald J. Sider, Chairperson
Evangelicals for Social Action
312 W. Logan Street
Philadelphia, PA 19144

Rev. Joseph Nangle
Conference of Major Superiors of Men
8808 Cameron Street
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dr. Gordon L. Sommers, President
Moravian Church, Northern Province
1021 Center Street, P.O. Box 1245
Bethlehem, PA 18016

Rev. Graham H. Rights, President
Moravian Church, Southern Province
459 S. Church Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27108

Sister Mary Lou Kownacki
Pax Christi USA
348 East Tenth Street
Erie, PA 16503

Rev. Joseph Halcala
Jesuit Social Ministries
1424 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

*Rev. John Paarlberg
Reformed Church in America
475 Riverside Drive
New York, NY 10115*

*Rev. John O. Humbert, General Minister
& President
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
222S. Downey Avenue, Box 1986
Indianapolis, IN 46206*

Sister Margaret Nulty
Leadership Conference of Women Religious
8808 Cameron Street
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Sister Margaret:

These days we can be heartened by significant improvement in US/Soviet relations and by steps underway to slow the arms race. Soviet President Gorbachev has taken a number of important initiatives, and U.S. President Bush has articulated the view that it is time to "move beyond containment." Even so, we are not yet entirely free of Cold War mentality, and the pace of arms reduction is far too slow. In the United States the majority of the population is ready for much bolder steps than President Bush and the Congress are willing to take.

In this situation we need a broader vision, more ambitious goals. We need to move beyond the slow pace of treaty negotiations to more dramatic and rapid measures of arms reduction and disarmament. We need to offer far-reaching ideas to both U.S. and Soviet leadership and to give them a chance to say, "We'll do it if they will."

With that in mind I have drafted the attached "Religious Leaders' Call for Disarmament in the 1990s". It calls for global nuclear disarmament,

general disarmament in Europe, and economic conversion. The most innovative part is a recommendation that all armed forces based in foreign territory in Europe should totally withdraw and demobilize in their homelands by May 8, 1995, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. Though startling, this is a practicable goal. After all the United States demobilized 10 million military personnel and the Soviets 8 million within two years after World War II ended. What is needed is willingness.

Would you be willing to enlist a national leader of the Leadership Conference of Women Religious to be an initial signer of this "Call"? Others invited to sign at this time are indicated on the attached schedule. At this stage we are willing to consider suggestions for modification in the text. If any substantive modifications are made after you consent to the draft, we will give you an opportunity to see the final version prior to circulation. For your convenience a return form and envelope are enclosed.

After this initial circulation we will distribute the "Call" to a wider circle of religious leaders for their signature. Then we will seek an opportunity to present the "Call" directly to President Bush and President Gorbachev, or if not to them, to the highest ranking officials we can reach. At that time we will release it to news media.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

Rev. Robert Tiller
American Baptist Churches in the U.S.A.
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Leland Wilson
Church of the Brethren
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

John Lillie
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
122 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Barbara Green
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC. 20002

Robert Alpern
Unitarian Universalist Association
100 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Jim Wetekam
United Church of Christ
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Jim Matlack
American Friends Service Committee
1822 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Keith Gingrich
Mennonite Central Committee
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Carl Casebolt
National Council of Churches
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 10002

Sally Timmel
Church Women United
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Sister Margaret Nulty
Leadership Conference of Women
Religious
8808 Cameron Street
Silver Spring, MD 20910

To: National Advisory Committee

At its recent meeting, our newly elected Board of Directors reaffirmed our initial commitment to devote attention to implementing policy proposals stemming from the United Methodist Bishops' pastoral letter and foundation document, *In Defense of Creation*. The Board took other actions, which we will communicate with you, including appointing the undersigned as executive director.

For several years I have been working in interreligious circles to promote ideas for both nuclear and conventional disarmament. In 1986, for instance, I developed and gained endorsements for "A Citizens' Declaration for Worldwide Nuclear Disarmament by the Year 2000".

As a further step along these lines I have developed the enclosed "Religious Leaders' Call for Disarmament in the 1990s." It calls for global nuclear disarmament, general disarmament in Europe, and economic conversion. The most innovative part is a recommendation that all armed forces based in foreign territory in Europe should totally withdraw and demobilize in their homelands by May 8, 1995, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. Though startling, this is a practicable goal. After all the United States demobilized 10 million military personnel and the

Soviets 8 million within two years after World War II ended. What is needed is willingness.

This "Religious Leaders' Call for Disarmament in the 1990s" is now being circulated among a sample of key leaders of major religious denominations the United States, inviting them to be initial signers. You too are invited to be an initial signer. At this stage we are willing to consider suggestions for modification in the text. If any substantive modifications are made after you consent to the draft, we will give you an opportunity to see the final version prior to circulation. For your convenience a return form and envelope are enclosed.

After this initial circulation we will distribute the "Call" to a wider circle of religious leaders for their signature. Then we will seek an opportunity to present the "Call" directly to President Bush and President Gorbachev, or if not to them, to the highest ranking officials we can reach. At that time we will release it to news media.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

To: Board of Directors

At our recent meeting, you, the newly elected Board of Directors of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, reaffirmed our initial commitment to devote attention to implementing policy proposals stemming from the United Methodist Bishops' pastoral letter and foundation document, *In Defense of Creation*. I am now taking initiative as a follow through of this decision.

For several years I have been working in interreligious circles to promote ideas for both nuclear and conventional disarmament. In 1986, for instance, I developed and gained endorsements for "A Citizens' Declaration for Worldwide Nuclear Disarmament by the Year 2000".

As a further step along these lines I have developed the enclosed "Religious Leaders' Call for Disarmament in the 1990s." It calls for global nuclear disarmament, general disarmament in Europe, and economic conversion. The most innovative part is a recommendation that all armed forces based in foreign territory in Europe should totally withdraw and demobilize in their homelands by May 8, 1995, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. Though startling, this is a practicable goal. After all the United States demobilized 10 million military personnel and the Soviets 8 million within two years after World War II ended. What

is needed is willingness.

This "Religious Leaders' Call for Disarmament in the 1990s" is now being circulated among a sample of key leaders of major religious denominations the United States, inviting them to be initial signers. You too are invited to be an initial signer. At this stage we are willing to consider suggestions for modification in the text. If any substantive modifications are made after you consent to the draft, we will give you an opportunity to see the final version prior to circulation. For your convenience a return form and envelope are enclosed.

After this initial circulation we will distribute the "Call" to a wider circle of religious leaders for their signature. Then we will seek an opportunity to present the "Call" directly to President Bush and President Gorbachev, or if not to them, to the highest ranking officials we can reach. At that time we will release it to news media.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 22, 1989

A LETTER FROM RELIGIOUS LEADERS TO

President George Bush
The White House
Washington, D.C., USA

President Mikhail Gorbachev
The Kremlin
Moscow, USSR

Dear Mr. Presidents:

We are pleased that the two of you will be meeting aboard ship in the Mediterranean Ocean in early December. It is an excellent opportunity to explore new ideas and to seek ways to improve relationships between the United States and the Soviet Union.

We the undersigned would like to offer you several suggestions for your consideration during the course of your informal talks.

A Theme for the 1990s

First, we suggest that you consider and then adopt an ancient prophesy as the theme of the 1990s:

*And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
and their spears into pruning hooks;
Nations shall not lift up sword against nation,
neither shall they learn war any more.*

If this poetic language needs translation into practical tasks, then let the theme of the nineties be the twin goals of **disarmament** and **economic conversion**.

General Disarmament in Europe

We ask you to give particular attention to the need for general disarmament in Europe. This is where one-half of the world's military expenditures are concentrated and where the longest confrontation between forces of the two superpowers and their allies has occurred. For Europe we suggest the following objectives:

- o **By May 8, 1995 complete the orderly withdrawal of all armed forces based in foreign territory.** This includes:
 - > Soviet forces based in Eastern Europe,
 - > U.S. forces based in Western Europe, and
 - > British, French, Belgian, Dutch, and Canadian forces in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The chosen date marks the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. It comes 5 years and 5 months after your shipboard meeting. If that seems like a short time, please remember that total length of World War II in Europe was 5 years and 8 months and direct U.S. involvement was 3 years and 5 months. Moreover, at the end of that war the United States demobilized 10 million men and women from its armed forces within two years and the Soviet Union demobilized 8 million. Therefore, it is a practicable objective.

- o **Demobilize these withdrawn forces in their homelands, destroy their offensive fighting equipment, or convert it to civilian uses.**
- o **Simultaneously reduce all national forces in every European country to a level sufficient only for border defense with no offensive capability.** As part of this process, destroy all offensive fighting equipment or convert it to civilian uses. As a model, we offer the US/Canadian border, 4,000 miles long without a military outpost.
- o **Settle underlying political issues in Europe to eliminate causes for future war.** Already there is a strong foundation in the Helsinki

Final Act of 1975, which accepted postwar boundaries in Europe and set forth standards for human rights, and the Stockholm Final Document of 1986, which contained pledges of nonaggression. Within this framework the stage is set to allow every nation in Europe to determine its own form of government through free elections and to choose its own economic system.

- o Establish mechanisms for achieving common security and resolving disputes between and within European nations through peaceful means.*
- o Emphasize trade, economic cooperation, and joint endeavors to deal with environmental problems.*

Global Nuclear Disarmament

The second major area where the "swords into plowshares" theme has applicability is the goal of global nuclear disarmament. We ask that you give consideration to these objectives:

- o In the course of European disarmament, remove and destroy all tactical nuclear weapons based on land, sea, and air in the European sector. Simultaneously destroy all tactical nuclear weapons based elsewhere and held in reserve.*
- o Quickly complete and sign the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) to cut the strategic nuclear arsenal in half. Then promptly move on to other measures for the mutual, staged elimination of all remaining strategic nuclear weapons.*
- o As superpower nuclear disarmament proceeds, get other possessors of nuclear weapons to totally eliminate their nuclear arsenals.*

- o *Complete global abolition of all nuclear weapons by the year 2000.*
- o *Fulfill the obligations of nuclear weapons states under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to end the arms race and prevent further nuclear proliferation.*
- o *To help in the achievement of these objectives, immediately take the following steps:*
 - > *Halt the production and further development of all types of nuclear weapons and delivery systems by all nations.*
 - > *Institute a moratorium on testing nuclear weapons and then promptly complete negotiations on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.*
 - > *Stop the futile effort to develop strategic defense systems.*

Economic Conversion

Along with disarmament, we ask you to consider the second major theme for the 1990s: economic conversion. The whole world is crying out for constructive, peaceful uses of resources now wasted on the arms race.

- o *Top priority for the use of these converted resources should be to:*
 - > *Solve domestic social and economic problems now plaguing many nations in Europe and North America,*
 - > *Offer resources to developing nations to assist in overcoming hunger and poverty and improving living conditions, and*
 - > *Deal with global environmental problems.*
- o *Nations with flourishing economies should assist nations facing economic difficulties and undergoing progressive economic change.*

- o Economic cooperation should replace arms competition.*

We are convinced that the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union would much rather spend their resources for social and economic improvements than for production and deployment of weapons and military forces.

Conclusion

We realize that we are offering you an ambitious agenda, far beyond what can be considered in detail in two days of talks. But at least we hope that you will give careful attention to the broad themes of disarmament and economic conversion. We pray for your success in leading the world into a new era where nations do indeed beat swords into plowshares and no longer war against one another. We pledge that we will use our influence in the religious community to support this course of action. Together we can brighten the prospects for enduring world peace and significant social and economic progress.

With best regards,

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

421 Seward Square, SE

Washington, DC 20003

(202) 546-5551

Dear Religious Leader:

The announcement of a shipboard summit meeting between President Bush and President Gorbachev changes the situation regarding the proposed "Religious Leaders' Call for Disarmament in the 1990s", which I just sent you. If there is support for such a statement, it would be preferable to issue it prior to their meeting.

Therefore, I have revised the "Call" and converted it into an open letter to President Bush and President Gorbachev. Would you be willing to be an initial signer of this letter prior to its circulation to a wider group of religious leaders for signing?

To be effective we need to accelerate the schedule so that the final letter with as many names as possible can be released at least a week before the summit. That means that the deadline for signatures for the final version would need to be November 21. To meet that deadline we would need to send out the letter with the names of the initial signers by November 10.

I'll try to reach you by telephone to find out what you think of this idea.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

421 Seward Square, SE

Washington, DC 20003

(202) 546-5551

November 2, 1989

To: Board of Directors & National Advisory Committee

The announcement of a shipboard summit meeting between President Bush and President Gorbachev changes the situation regarding the proposed "Religious Leaders' Call for Disarmament in the 1990s", which I just sent you. If there is support for such a statement, it would be preferable to issue it prior to their meeting.

Therefore, I have revised the "Call" and converted it into an open letter to President Bush and President Gorbachev. Would you be willing to be an initial signer of this letter prior to its circulation to a wider group of religious leaders for signing? If so, we need a quick response.

To be effective we need to accelerate the schedule so that the final letter with as many names as possible can be released at least a week before the summit. That means that the deadline for signatures for the final version would need to be November 21. To meet that deadline we would need to send out the letter with the names of the initial signers by November 10.

So if you are willing to be an initial signer, please call me at the above number. Leave a message if I'm not there. And for the record, please send sign the consent form and send it in.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

**YOU ARE REQUESTED TO SIGN A LETTER
TO PRESIDENTS BUSH AND GORBACHEV
BEFORE THEIR SHIPBOARD SUMMIT.**

**IF YOU ARE WILLING, PLEASE SIGN THE ENCLOSED
CONSENT FORM IMMEDIATELY AND RETURN IT TO US.**

November 10, 1989

Dear Religious Leader:

The upcoming shipboard summit meeting between President Bush and President Gorbachev on December 2-3 offers us an extraordinary opportunity to "speak truth to power." It comes at a time of improved US/Soviet relations, an easing of Cold War tensions, and serious efforts to reverse the arms race. This is very encouraging. Yet we are not entirely free of Cold War mentality, and the pace of arms reduction is far too slow.

What is needed is a broader vision, more ambitious goals. We need to move beyond the slow pace of treaty negotiations to more dramatic and rapid measures of arms reduction and disarmament. We need to offer far-reaching ideas to both U.S. and Soviet leaders and to give them a chance to say, "We'll do it if they will."

That is the purpose of the enclosed letter to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev. It asks them to make "swords into plowshares" the theme of the 1990s. It calls for applying this theme by achieving global nuclear disarmament, general disarmament in Europe, and economic conversion of military production to useful civilian endeavors during the coming decade.

We invite you to join some initial signers of this letter to the U.S. and Soviet presidents. Their names are listed. Time is short. We need to hear from you no later than **Tuesday, November 21**. That will give us time to get the letter to the two leaders and to issue a news release before the summit. We will also seek to present the letter to each of them in person, or to the highest ranking official we can reach.

If you want to be a signer, please complete the enclosed consent form immediately and return it to us. To expedite your response, you may call us at (202) 546-5551. Please give your name, title, organization, and city. If you do call, also please mail your written consent for our records. We thank you for your support.

Sincerely yours,
Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

November 13, 1995

Mr. Doug Wead
Mr. Charles Bacarisse
Office of Public Liaison
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. Wead and Mr. Bacarisse:

I would like to share with you a letter addressed to President Bush and President Gorbachev which we are circulating among religious leaders. We intend to send it officially to these two leaders on or about November 22, prior to their shipboard summit meeting. Page three of the letter indicates the initial signers. By next week we expect to have heads of communion and other prominent leaders in major religious denominations in the United States.

This letter suggests that President Bush and President Gorbachev consider and adopt "swords into plowshares" as the theme for the 1990s. We propose that this theme be applied (1) by achieving general disarmament in Europe, (2) bringing about global nuclear disarmament, and (3) accomplishing economic conversion from heavy military expenditures to socially useful civilian endeavors. The letter specifies proposed actions to achieve these objectives. The most timely proposal, based upon current events in Europe, is one for the complete withdrawal of all armed forces based in foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. This should be accompanied by the reduction of all national forces to a level sufficient only for border defense without any offensive capability.

We are requesting an opportunity for a small delegation of religious leaders, including several bishops, to meet with a high U.S. and Soviet official prior to the summit meeting to discuss our ideas. Our aspirations are high, so we request a meeting with President Bush, and if not with him, with Secretary Baker or General Scowcroft. Similarly we are requesting to meet with the Soviet Ambassador Dubinin and are willing to send a delegation to Moscow if President Gorbachev will meet with us.

I will call you to discuss the possibility of a White House meeting.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 14, 1989

Dr. Arthur Waskow
The Shalom Center
7318 Germantown Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19119

Dear Arthur:

Thank you for your thoughtful response to the draft letter to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev which included a call for withdrawal of all armed forces from foreign territory in Europe.

I don't view Europe as a self-enclosed bubble but rather as part of a structure like those we built with tinkertoys as children, or like models of molecular structures made by chemists. Every element is connected to every other element, but some connections are more direct than others. In the case of arms reduction measures, the impact tends to be greatest on the nearest adjacent territories. As you correctly point out, there is a potential impact on the Middle East. Likewise there would be an effect on Northern Africa and the North Atlantic (where the U.S. has been concerned with maintaining sea lanes to reinforce troops in Europe). Any complete global policy needs to take all of these factors into consideration. But that need not inhibit us from raising issues and making proposals intended to break out of the status quo and to put forth policy options at a time when there is an opportunity for innovation.

Regarding the Middle East, I believe it is inappropriate for the United States to use its power as an occupying authority in West Germany to store fighting equipment and maintain troops for deployment into the Persian Gulf area or other battlefronts in that region. To be sure, the United States has a role to

play in finding solutions to conflict in the Middle East. As you point out, the conflict has other causes than the Cold War (although US/Soviet rivalry has been one factor), and solutions must occur in ways beyond ending the Cold War in Europe. Policy proposals must be developed beyond those applying to Europe, and such policies should be implemented while demilitarization is occurring in Europe. But I believe that we should not hold back taking advantage of present opportunities to remove military confrontation in Europe because every contingency in adjacent lands is not worked out.

Therefore, I feel comfortable in issuing a prophetic call that goes well beyond current policies. Moreover, in this case I believe that the policy recommendations are sound and practicable and that their implications for other policies can be dealt with properly within the time span of our proposal.

With best regards,

cc. David Saperstein,

Dale White

Howard W. Hallman

Draft

President George Bush
The White House
Washington, D.C., USA

President Mikhail Gorbachev
The Kremlin
Moscow, USSR

Dear Mr. Presidents:

We have seen and reviewed the letter of [date] to the two of you from religious leaders in the United States. Without necessarily endorsing every detailed proposal, we wholeheartedly support the spirit and the general principles of their letter.

We, too, believe that "swords into plowshares" should be a major theme of the 1990s for the United States, the Soviet Union, and for all allies of the two superpowers. We agree that this theme should be applied by seeking during the coming decade:

General disarmament in Europe.

Global nuclear disarmament.

Economic conversion from military production to
socially useful civilian production.

We hope that you will explore these ideas when you meet aboard ship in the Mediterranean Ocean on December 2 and 3. You can be assured that we will support positive actions you agreed upon to implement the theme of "swords into plowshares."

With best regards,

[Signers]

Mr. David Cohen
The Advocacy Institute
1730 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Dave:

I am currently circulating the enclosed letter to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev among religious leaders in the United States to obtain their endorsement and signatures. We will be sending this letter to them formally on November 22 (we have already shown it to staff at the White House and the Soviet Embassy). We release it publicly on or about Sunday, November 26.

At that point we would find it desirable to have some major professional and civic arms control and peace organization offer their endorsement of the main ideas of our letter. Not necessarily all of the detailed proposals. With that in mind I have drafted the enclosed letter. It would go to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev on November 27.

Would you or someone else from the Professionals' Coalition be willing to sign it? I'll be in touch soon by telephone.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

cc. Bob Musil
Mr. John Isaacs
Council for a Livable World
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Captain Jim Bush
Center for Defense Information
1500 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Dr. Jeremy J. Stone, President
American Federation of Scientists
307 Massachusetts Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Mr. David Lewis
Physicians for Social Responsibility
1000 16th Street, NW, Suite 810
Washington, DC 20036

Mr. David Cohen
The Advocacy Institute
1730 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

To: Leaders of U.S. Peace and Arms Control Organizations

If we are to keep up with the current leaders of the peace movement -- the people on the streets in Eastern Europe, we need to raise our sights and increase our demands for changes in U.S. policy. Along those lines I would like to share two things with you.

First, 105 religious leaders have signed the enclosed letter to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev, urging them to adopt "swords into plowshares" as the theme for the 1990s. The letter proposes three applications of this theme: general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion. On the first, the letter calls for total withdrawal of all armed forces from foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995 -- the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. These forces should be demobilized and their offensive fighting equipment destroyed. Similar demobilization should occur for all national forces in Europe.

Second, attached is a proposal to push for zero funding for U.S. strategic modernization in the FY 1991 federal budget. That's a position Methodists United favors, and we would like to work with organizations who share this objective. In fact, we would hope that others with greater knowledge of the subject than we have would take the lead. We would be part of such an effort, particularly through grassroots mobilization.

Similar far-reaching strategies are needed to deal with other aspects of the military budget, including tactical nuclear weapon modernization, conventional forces, naval forces, and various new weapon systems now in the development and production pipeline but which are not needed as the

military threat to U.S. security recedes during the 1990s.

I would like to hear from you particularly on what you think of pushing for zero funding of U.S. strategic nuclear modernization.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Mr. Robert J. McCartney
Washington Post Foreign Service
1150 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Mr. McCartney:

I was interested in your discussion of the issue of German reunification in the November 27, 1989 edition of the Washington Post.

Recently we initiated the enclosed letter from religious leaders of the United States to President Bush and President Gorbachev in anticipation of their shipboard meeting. Among other things the letter calls for general disarmament in Europe. This would include total withdrawal of all armed forces from foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995 -- the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. Such forces should be demobilized and their offensive fighting equipment should be destroyed. Similar demobilization should occur for all other national forces in Europe -- to a level sufficient only for border defense without any offensive capability.

Although our letter doesn't discuss the possibility of German reunification directly, our recommendations if carried out would provide plenty of safeguards to overcome fears of a reunited, militarized Germany. Demobilization would in effect lead to the virtual dissolution of the Bundeswehr. Similar demobilization would occur in the GDR. Acceptance of the postwar political boundaries would remove the prospect for "revanchism." Demilitarization throughout Europe would eliminate the military role of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. If they wanted to keep

together for political and economic reasons, they would not be militarily dangerous. But in all probably trans-European, trans-Atlantic economic relationships will become a more dominant force.

Six months ago these possibilities may have been perceived as an idle dream. Now the people on the streets in Eastern Europe have made these ideas and many more a decided possibility.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Mr. Eric Pace:
New York Times
229 W. 43rd Street
New York, NY 10036

Dear Mr. Pace:

I was interested in your discussion of what scholars say about German reunification in the November 26, 1989 edition of the New York Times. Although I am not a scholar of Germany, I would like to share with you something that relates to this discussion.

Recently we initiated the enclosed letter from religious leaders of the United States to President Bush and President Gorbachev in anticipation of their shipboard meeting. Among other things the letter calls for general disarmament in Europe. This would include total withdrawal of all armed forces from foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995 -- the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. Such forces should be demobilized and their offensive fighting equipment should be destroyed. Similar demobilization should occur for all other national forces in Europe -- to a level sufficient only for border defense without any offensive capability.

Although our letter doesn't discuss the possibility of German reunification directly, our recommendations if carried out would provide plenty of safeguards to overcome fears of a reunited, militarized Germany. Demobilization would in effect lead to the virtual dissolution of the Bundeswehr. Similar demobilization would occur in the GDR. Acceptance of the postwar political boundaries would remove the prospect for

"revanchism." Demilitarization throughout Europe would eliminate the military role of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. If they wanted to keep together for political and economic reasons, they would not be militarily dangerous. But in all probably trans-European, trans-Atlantic economic relationships will become a more dominant force.

Six months ago these possibilities may have been perceived as an idle dream. Now the people on the streets in Eastern Europe have made these ideas and many more a decided possibility.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Mr. George C. Wilson
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Mr. Wilson:

I was interested in your discussion of prospective cuts in the U.S. military budget in the November 28, 1989 edition of the Washington Post. Closely related to this subject is the enclosed letter which we initiated, going from religious leaders in the United States to President Bush and President Gorbachev in anticipation of their shipboard meeting.

Under a theme for the 1990s of "swords into plowshares" our letter calls for general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion. On the first main objective we recommend the total withdrawal of all armed forces from foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995 -- the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. Such forces should be demobilized and their offensive fighting equipment should be destroyed. Similar demobilization should occur for all other national forces in Europe -- to a level sufficient only for border defense without any offensive capability. We make similar far-reaching recommendations to achieve total global nuclear disarmament by the year 2000.

Obviously such a major shift in U.S. foreign and military policy would reduce the need for U.S. armed forces far below what the Pentagon is now considering. Six months ago this prospect would have been perceived as an idle dream. Now the people on the streets in Eastern Europe have made

these ideas and many more a decided possibility.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Mr. William Safire
New York Times
1000 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Mr. Safire:

I was interested in your "Advice to Sherpas" in the November 27, 1989 edition of the New York Times. I guess we all want to advise Presidents Bush and Gorbachev. That's what we did in the enclosed letter from religious leaders in the United States, which we initiated. I would like to share it with you.

Under a theme for the 1990s of "swords into plowshares" our letter calls for general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion. On the first main objective we recommend the total withdrawal of all armed forces from foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995 -- the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. Such forces should be demobilized and their offensive fighting equipment should be destroyed. Similar demobilization should occur for all other national forces in Europe -- to a level sufficient only for border defense without any offensive capability. We make similar far-reaching recommendations to achieve total global nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. Substantial economic conversion would have to occur, and this would be beneficial to both nations.

Six months ago these recommendations would have been perceived as an idle dream. Now the people on the streets in Eastern Europe have made these ideas and many more a decided possibility.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

421 Seward Square, SE

Washington, DC 20003

(202) 546-5551

Mr. Doug Wead

Office of Public Liaison

The White House

Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. Wead:

We greatly appreciate the opportunity we had to meet yesterday with Joe Watkins in order to discuss the letter from U.S. religious leaders to President Bush and President Gorbachev. We felt it was a productive discussion.

In the course of our conversation we talked about the possibility of a somewhat larger group of representatives from religious organizations meeting with staff from the National Security Council and the Office of Policy Development in order to explore key issues raised in the letter. This could be a briefing of the Administration's policy initiatives and a dialogue in which we could offer our views. I would guess that we would find many areas of agreement where the religious community would be supportive of President Bush's policies. It is also likely that we would offer some suggestions for further initiatives along the path to peace.

Upon reflection we believe that there might best be two briefing sessions in which the composition of the religious representatives might vary. One could take up the parts of the religious leaders' letter dealing with general

disarmament in Europe and global nuclear disarmament, with the addition of some discussion of chemical weapons, which is a related concern of ours. A second session could take up matters of economic conversion, both as it relates to a transition from military production and demobilization of armed forces as arms reduction proceeds and also as it raises questions of budgetary priorities in the shifting pattern of federal expenditures.

We see a delegation of perhaps 12 to 15 persons for each of these sessions. If at all possible we would like to have the first one before Christmas while the ideas of the Malta summit are still fresh in mind. This would, of course, depend upon the convenience of staff in the Executive Office of the President. But if at all possible, we would want to do complete both sessions before Congress reconvenes in January and the President's budget goes to Congress.

We look forward to a continuing relationship with your office.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

cc. Joe Watkins

December 8, 1989

Dear Letter Signer:

Here is a copy of the letter to President Bush and President Gorbachev, which you and 104 other religious leaders signed. We delivered copies to the White House and the Soviet Embassy in Washington and also mailed President Gorbachev a copy in Moscow.

Four of the signers -- Robert Alpern, Joseph Halcala, Edward Snyder, and myself -- met with White House staff three days before the summit to discuss the letter. It had already been sent to the National Security Council staff for review. We don't know whether the letter ultimately reached President Bush. But at least some presidential advisors were exposed to our far-reaching ideas. Furthermore, as a result of this meeting we are setting up another session for a broader group from the religious community to meet directly with National Security Council staff for a briefing and dialogue on arms reduction and economic conversion.

I had a couple of telephone conversations with Soviet Embassy staff but was not able to arrangement an appointment.

As you have read and heard, the two presidents didn't announce a bold program that encompassed all we recommended. Nevertheless, it was a constructive summit. It opens the door for further progress toward disarmament.

So thanks to you for joining in this initiative.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Dear Friend:

Thank you for adding your name to the letter from religious leaders to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev. We received your endorsement after the letter was sent to the two leaders, but we have sent a supplemental letter adding the names of persons whose signatures came in late.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

President George Bush
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

On November 22, 1989 approximately 120 religious leaders in the United States wrote to you and President Gorbachev, urging that "swords into plowshares" become the theme of the 1990s and that this theme be applied through general European disarmament, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion.

After the letter went to you the following persons indicated that they would like to add their names to the list of signers:

Bishop Rueben P. Job
United Methodist Iowa Area
Bishop L. Bevel Jones III
United Methodist Charlotte (NC) Area
Rev. David W. Diller
Rosebud Texas
Ann S. Harrison
Readmeld, Maine
Ruth S. Laws
Dover, Delaware
Rev. Kenneth S. Uselton
Nashville, Tennessee

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

President Mikhail Gorbachev
c/o Embassy of USSR
1125 16th Street
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Mr. President:

On November 22, 1989 approximately 120 religious leaders in the United States wrote to you and President Gorbachev, urging that "swords into plowshares" become the theme of the 1990s and that this theme be applied through general European disarmament, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion.

After the letter went to you the following persons indicated that they would like to add their names to the list of signers:

Bishop Rueben P. Job
United Methodist Iowa Area
Bishop L.Bevel Jones III
United Methodist Charlotte (NC) Area
Rev.David W. Diller
Rosebud Texas
Ann S. Harrison
Readmeld, Maine
Ruth S. Laws
Dover, Delaware
Rev. Kenneth S. Uselton
Nashville, Tennessee

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Denise Peeters
c/o Pax Christi (Wallonie-Bruxelles)
Rue du Marteau 19
B 1040 - Brussels, Belgium

Dear Ms. Peeters:

At a meeting in Washington on November 6, I mentioned a letter to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev which we were circulating among U.S. religious leaders. Here is the final version of this letter and the names of the signers.

Perhaps the most dramatic proposal is to complete the withdrawal of all armed forces based on foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995. Such forces should be demobilized and their offensive equipment destroyed. At the same time all national forces in Europe should be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense and their offensive equipment destroyed. In short, this would achieve general disarmament in Europe.

Although our letter doesn't go into depth on all the political issues, it states some general principles. For example, on the matter of German reunification, which has quickly risen to the forefront of discussion, our letter speaks of self-determination but within the framework of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 with its acceptance of postwar boundaries and its standards for human rights. If our disarmament recommendations are accepted, both German states would demobilize almost all of their armed forces. A united Germany would be disarmed, would accept the eastern boundary, and therefore would not be a military threat to the rest of Europe.

I would be interested in your reaction to our ideas. If you think they are worth discussion, please feel free to circulate our letter to your contacts in Europe.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Wim Bartels
Interchurch Peace Council
Pablox 18747
2502 E.S. Den Haag
The Netherlands

Dear Mr. Bartels:

I met you a year ago when you were in Washington, D.C. with a delegation of European peace leaders. Now I would like to share with you the enclosed letter to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev from U.S. religious leaders.

Perhaps the most dramatic proposal is to complete the withdrawal of all armed forces based on foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995. Such forces should be demobilized and their offensive equipment destroyed. At the same time all national forces in Europe should be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense and their offensive equipment destroyed. In short, this would achieve general disarmament in Europe.

Although our letter doesn't go into depth on all the political issues, it states some general principles. For example, on the matter of German reunification, which has quickly risen to the forefront of discussion, our letter speaks of self-determination but within the framework of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 with its acceptance of postwar boundaries and its standards for human rights. If our disarmament recommendations are accepted, both German states would demobilize almost all of their armed forces. A united Germany would be disarmed, would accept the eastern boundary, and therefore would not be a military threat to the rest of Europe.

I would be interested in your reaction to our ideas. If you think they are worth discussion, please feel free to circulate our letter to your contacts in Europe.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Ms. Shelly Anderson
Disarmament Campaign
Anna Paulownaplein 3
2518 B.K., The Hague
The Netherlands

Dear Ms. Anderson:

At the suggestion of Joanne Landy I would like to share with you the enclosed letter to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev from U.S. religious leaders.

Perhaps the most dramatic proposal is to complete the withdrawal of all armed forces based on foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995. Such forces should be demobilized and their offensive equipment destroyed. At the same time all national forces in Europe should be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense and their offensive equipment destroyed. In short, this would achieve general disarmament in Europe.

Although our letter doesn't go into depth on all the political issues, it states some general principles. For example, on the matter of German reunification, which has quickly risen to the forefront of discussion, our letter speaks of self-determination but within the framework of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 with its acceptance of postwar boundaries and its standards for human rights. If our disarmament recommendations are accepted, both German states would demobilize almost all of their armed forces. A united Germany would be disarmed, would accept the eastern boundary, and therefore would not be a military threat to the rest of Europe.

I would be interested in your reaction to our ideas. If you think they are

worth discussion, please feel free to publicize our letter and circulate it to your contacts in Europe.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Mr. Luc Delines
International Peace Communications
and Coordinating Center
van Elewijckstrek 35
1050 Brussels, Belgian

Dear M. Delines:

At the suggestion of Joanne Landy I would like to share with you the enclosed letter to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev from U.S. religious leaders.

Perhaps the most dramatic proposal is to complete the withdrawal of all armed forces based on foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995. Such forces should be demobilized and their offensive equipment destroyed. At the same time all national forces in Europe should be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense and their offensive equipment destroyed. In short, this would achieve general disarmament in Europe.

Although our letter doesn't go into depth on all the political issues, it states some general principles. For example, on the matter of German reunification, which has quickly risen to the forefront of discussion, our letter speaks of self-determination but within the framework of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 with its acceptance of postwar boundaries and its standards for human rights. If our disarmament recommendations are accepted, both German states would demobilize almost all of their armed forces. A united Germany would be disarmed, would accept the eastern boundary, and therefore would not be a military threat to the rest of Europe.

I would be interested in your reaction to our ideas. If you think they are

worth discussion, please feel free to publicize our letter and circulate it to your contacts in Europe.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

December 14, 1989

Dear Friend:

Last month I circulated to you a letter to President Bush and President Gorbachev for which we were seeking signatures of religious leaders. Although you did not participate in this effort, I want to share with you the final version and the listing of signers.

Four of the signers -- Robert Alpern, Joseph Hacala, Edward Snyder, and myself -- met with White House staff three days before the summit to discuss the letter. It had already been sent to the National Security Council staff for review. We don't know whether the letter ultimately reached President Bush. But at least some presidential advisors were exposed to our far-reaching ideas. Furthermore, as a result of this meeting we are setting up another session for a broader group from the religious community to meet directly with National Security Council staff for a briefing and dialogue on arms reduction and economic conversion.

I had a couple of telephone conversations with Soviet Embassy staff but was not able to arrangement an appointment.

As you have read and heard, the two presidents didn't announce a bold program that encompassed all we recommended. Nevertheless, it was a constructive summit. It opens the door for further progress toward disarmament. I look forward to working with you in the future as we share our mutual concern for this goal.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

The Honorable George J. Mitchell
176 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Mitchell:

I appreciate the leadership you are offering these days to help the country take advantage of opportunities for peace and economic progress.

We too are seeking to offer ideas on new directions. With this in mind we circulated and got 120 U.S. religious leader to sign the enclosed letter to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev before their recent summit meeting. We asked the two presidents to adopt "swords into plowshares" as the theme of the 1990s and to apply that theme to achievement of general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion.

Perhaps the most dramatic aspect of our letter is a proposal to complete the withdrawal of all armed forces based on foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995. Such forces should be demobilized and their offensive equipment destroyed. At the same time all national forces in Europe should be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense and their offensive equipment destroyed. In short, this would achieve general disarmament in Europe.

Although our letter doesn't go into depth on all the political issues, it states some general principles. For example, on the matter of German reunification, which has quickly risen to the forefront of discussion, our letter speaks of self-determination but within the framework of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 with its acceptance of postwar boundaries and its standards for

human rights. If our disarmament recommendations are accepted, both German states would demobilize almost all of their armed forces. A united Germany would be disarmed, would accept the eastern boundary, and therefore would not be a military threat to the rest of Europe.

We would be interested in your reaction to the views of the letter from religious leaders to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

The Honorable Lee Hamilton
2187 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Hamilton:

I would like to share with you a letter which went from some U.S. religious leader to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev before their recent summit meeting. We asked the two presidents to adopt "swords into plowshares" as the theme of the 1990s and to apply that theme to achievement of general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion.

Perhaps the most dramatic aspect of our letter is a proposal to complete the withdrawal of all armed forces based on foreign territory in Europe by May 8, 1995. Such forces should be demobilized and their offensive equipment destroyed. At the same time all national forces in Europe should be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense and their offensive equipment destroyed. In short, this would achieve general disarmament in Europe.

Although our letter doesn't go into depth on all the political issues, it states some general principles. For example, on the matter of German reunification, which has quickly risen to the forefront of discussion, our letter speaks of self-determination but within the framework of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 with its acceptance of postwar boundaries and its standards for human rights. If our disarmament recommendations are accepted, both German states would demobilize almost all of their armed forces. A united Germany would be disarmed, would accept the eastern boundary, and

therefore would not be a military threat to the rest of Europe.

We would be interested in your reaction to the views of the letter from religious leaders to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

President Vaclav Havel
President's Headquarters
Prague, Czechoslovakia

Dear Mr. President:

It has been exciting and fulfilling to see the remarkable changes that have occurred in Czechoslovakia in recent months. You deserve congratulations for the leadership you have provided.

I note that you will soon be visiting Moscow and Washington to urge Soviet and U.S. troop withdrawals from Europe. In that connection I would like to share with you a letter which 120 religious leaders in the United States sent to President Bush and President Gorbachev prior to their Malta summit meeting. We asked them to make "Swords into Plowshares" the theme for the 1990s and to apply this theme by seeking general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion.

As part of general disarmament in Europe, we called for the complete withdrawal of all armed forces based in foreign territory by May 8, 1995, which is the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. We stated that these forces should be demobilized in their homelands and all offensive equipment destroyed. We also advocated that all national forces in Europe be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense without any offensive capability.

We hope that you will be urging such far-reaching objectives when you talk with President Gorbachev and President Bush. Perhaps you might consider

endorsing the goal of complete withdrawal by May 8, 1995. We wish you success in your mission.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

*cc: c/o Czechoslovakian Embassy
Washington, D.C.*

The Honorable Gyula Horn
Foreign Ministry of Hungary
Budapest, Hungary

Dear Mr. Foreign Minister:

I note that you are working to achieve the total withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungary by the end of the year. In this connection I would like to share with you a letter which 120 religious leaders in the United States sent to President Bush and President Gorbachev prior to their Malta summit meeting. We asked them to make "Swords into Plowshares" the theme for the 1990s and to apply this theme by seeking general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion.

As part of general disarmament in Europe, we called for the complete withdrawal of all armed forces based in foreign territory by May 8, 1995, which is the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. We stated that these forces should be demobilized in their homelands and all offensive equipment destroyed. We also advocated that all national forces in Europe be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense without any offensive capability.

You are already working for this objective in Hungary. I hope that you will use your leadership to seek this goal for all of Europe. We wish you success in your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

cc: c/o Hungarian Embassy
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable Hans Modrow
Office of the Prime Minister
German Democratic Republic
Berlin, GDR

Dear Mr. Prime Minister:

These days as Cold War tensions are coming to an end, it is apparent to many of us that the huge concentration of armed forces in Central Europe is outmoded. In many countries people are calling for the withdrawal of both Soviet and U.S. forces.

In this connection I would like to share with you a letter which 120 religious leaders in the United States sent to President Bush and President Gorbachev prior to their Malta summit meeting. We asked them to make "Swords into Plowshares" the theme for the 1990s and to apply this theme by seeking general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion.

As part of general disarmament in Europe, we called for the complete withdrawal of all armed forces based in foreign territory by May 8, 1995, which is the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. We stated that these forces should be demobilized in their homelands and all offensive equipment destroyed. We also advocated that all national forces in Europe be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense without any offensive capability.

We urge you to give consideration to these goals and to work for their

achievement in the Democratic Republic of Germany and in all of Europe.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman

Executive Director

P.S. If you wish to respond in German, I can read the language but lack sufficient confidence to write to you in German

cc: GDR Embassy

Washington, D.C.

Mr. Jim Hoagland
Washington Post Foreign Service
1150 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Mr. Hoagland:

I notice that recently you have been writing stories about calls for Soviet troop withdrawal from Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. In this connection I would like to share with you a letter which 120 religious leaders in the United States sent to President Bush and President Gorbachev prior to their Malta summit meeting. We asked them to make "Swords into Plowshares" the theme for the 1990s and to apply this theme by seeking general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion.

As part of general disarmament in Europe, we called for the complete withdrawal of all armed forces based in foreign territory by May 8, 1995, which is the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. We stated that these forces should be demobilized in their homelands and all offensive equipment destroyed. We also advocated that all national forces in Europe be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense without any offensive capability.

What we proposed two months ago is even more relevant today as all six Eastern European members of the Warsaw Pact have become non-communist or at least multi-party states. Furthermore, with the emergence of the issue of German reunification, one of the surprisingly

missing ingredients in the discussion is the necessity for a united Germany to be completely demilitarized, to disband rather than consolidate the Bundeswehr and the GDR army at the time of confederation and later unification. A disarmed Germany in a disarmed Europe would pose no military danger to the rest of Europe to world peace.

So perhaps in a future article about troop reduction in Europe, you might mention the ideas of these U.S. religious leaders.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

The Honorable Gregor Gysi
Communist Party Headquarters
East Berlin, GDR

Dear Mr. Gysi:

I have noticed that you have called for all foreign troops to leave German soil by 1999. In this connection I would like to share with you a letter which 120 religious leaders in the United States sent to President Bush and President Gorbachev prior to their Malta summit meeting. We asked them to make "Swords into Plowshares" the theme for the 1990s and to apply this theme by seeking general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion.

As part of general disarmament in Europe, we called for the complete withdrawal of all armed forces based in foreign territory by May 8, 1995, which is the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. We stated that these forces should be demobilized in their homelands and all offensive equipment destroyed. We also advocated that all national forces in Europe be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense without any offensive capability.

Thus, our proposal goes in the same direction as yours, but we have a faster timetable. We urge you to give consideration to the May 8, 1995 goal, both for its symbolic value and because it truly responds to the security interests of all nations of Europe. We wish you success in your efforts to achieve substantial disarmament in Europe.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

P.S. If you wish to respond in German, I can read the language but lack sufficient confidence to write to you in German.

Mr. Haynes Johnson
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Mr. Johnson:

The latest news is that both Gregor Gysi, Communist Party chief in East Germany, and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev acknowledge that German reunification is a possibility some time in the future. This reminds me that in December I had intended to write you on this subject after you discussed it on the PBS Week in Review.

What is missing in all the discussion of German reunification is the necessity to achieve a totally demilitarized Germany, living in a totally demobilized Europe. Just this possibility was proposed in a letter which 120 U.S. religious leaders sent to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev prior to their Malta summit meeting (copy enclosed).

We proposed that "Swords into Plowshares" should be the theme of the 1990s and that this should be applied by achieving general disarmament in Europe, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion. Regarding Europe, we proposed that all troops be withdrawn from foreign territory by May 8, 1995, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II, and demobilized with their offensive fighting equipment destroyed.

Simultaneously all national forces in Europe should be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense and their offensive fighting equipment destroyed. Although we didn't get into the German reunification issue directly, other points of our letter stated basic conditions for achieving this

kind of political change.

As is usually the case with such recommendations from a "noncredentialed" group, our ideas were ignored by the news media. But two months later they are even more relevant. In this period leaders in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland have called for total Soviet troop withdrawal from their country. Gregor Gysi has advocated complete disarmament of Europe by 1999. Oleg Grinevsky, the Soviet Ambassador to CFE negotiations in Vienna, has raised the possibility of complete East-West troop withdrawal by 1995 (previously President Gorbachev stated that this might be possible by the end of the decade). In the West, Belgium has indicated its intent to withdraw its forces from West Germany. Thus, the votes are accumulating for the May 8, 1995 deadline!

Therefore, I urge you to think about this possibility and to write about in the Washington Post.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

February 8, 1990

President George Bush
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We applaud your State-of-the-Union proposal for further reduction of U.S. and Soviet forces in Europe in Central Europe. That's a step in the right direction. But let's go even further. **Let's get all armed forces out of foreign territory in Europe: all Soviet forces out of Eastern Europe; all U.S. forces out of Western Europe; British, French, Belgian, Dutch, and Canadian forces out of West Germany. A proposed goal for completion of this troop withdrawal is May 8, 1995.** That date is the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. A half-century of their presence there is long enough.

The May 8, 1995 goal was proposed to you and President Gorbachev prior to your Malta summit meeting by 120 U.S. religious leaders. Since then some related, independent proposals have emanated from European leaders. Newly installed President Vaclav Havel of Czechoslovakia has asked for withdrawal of all Soviet troops based in his country and favors total Soviet and U.S. troop withdrawal from Europe. Hungarian Foreign Minister Gyula Horn has demanded that all Soviet troops leave Hungary by the end of the year. Polish Solidarity leader Lech Walesa has likewise asked all Soviet forces to leave Poland. Gregor Gysi, chief of the East German Communist Party, has urged that all foreign troops leave the two Germanys by 1999. Ambassador Oleg Grinevsky, chief Soviet negotiator on conventional force reduction, has indicated Soviet willingness for mutual withdrawal of U.S. and Soviet forces within five years. Belgium has announced an intent to withdraw its troops now stationed in West Germany. These indicators

suggest that the May 8th '95 goal for complete withdrawal is realistic and achievable.

To go with troop withdrawal all such forces should be demobilized in their homeland and their offensive fighting equipment be destroyed.

Simultaneously all national forces in every European country should be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense with no offensive capability and all their offensive fighting equipment should be destroyed.

This is especially relevant for the two Germanys. If German reunification is to occur, it should be a completely demilitarized Germany existing in a demilitarized Europe. It would be a Europe where every nation is able to determine its own form of government through free elections, to choose its own economic system, but is united with other nations through economic cooperation. It would be a Europe where the human rights standards of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 are observed and where the pledge of nonaggression contained in the Stockholm Final Document of 1986 is honored.

Therefore, Mr. President, we strongly urge you to follow through on your State-of-the Union initiative and press for even deeper cuts in European forces, moving toward general disarmament in Europe by what could be a glorious 50th anniversary celebration of the end of World War II on May 8, 1995.

With best regards,

Signers on following page.

*Signers of February 8, 1990 letter to President Bush on European
Disarmament*

Joseph R. Hacala, S.J.

Jesuits Social Ministry, National Office

Delton Franz

Mennonite Central Committee

Howard W. Hallman

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Bob Musil

** Proceionals'Coalition for Nuclear Arms Control*

Mark Harrison

SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security

Robert Alpern

Unitarian-Universalist Association of Congregations

Edith Villastrigo

Women Strike for Peace

Isabel Guy

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

** Organization indicated for identification purpose only.*

Please reply c/o Howard W. Hallman, Executive Director, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 421 Seward Square, SE, Washington, DC 20003

February 9, 1990

*Mr. Doug Wead
Office of Public Liaison
The White House
Washington, DC 20500*

Dear Mr. Wead:

We would greatly appreciate your assistance in directing this letter to President Bush's attention, and also to appropriate people in the National Security Council and the State Department.

Thanks for your help.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

McNeil/Lehrer News Hour

Gentlemen:

On the matter of German reunification, I appreciate the quality of reporting and analysis by distinguished guests appearing on the McNeil/Lehrer News Hour. However, missing from all of the discussion is a seemingly obvious solution to the fears of a resurgent Germany: **German demilitarization in a demilitarized Europe.**

That is solution several national organizations recently proposed in the enclosed letter to President Bush. It is also implicit in a letter which 120 U.S. religious sent to Presidents Bush and Gorbachev prior to their Malta summit meeting (copy enclosed).

Between them these two letters contain a broad outline for achieving European disarmament and political and economic stability, as follows:

Mr. Tom Longstreth
Federation of American Scientists
307 Massachusetts Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Tom:

Following up our telephone conversation, I invite you to make a presentation on "Minimal Deterrence" at a session of the Disarmament Forum scheduled for 3:00 to 5:00 p.m, Thursday, April 19, 1990. The overall topic for the session is "Strategic Nuclear Disarmament". A second speaker will talk about "Total Abolition." It will take place at the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE.

We would want you to discuss the concept of minimal deterrence and to summarize how it is defined by principal advocates, including specifics on number of warheads and types of delivery systems. If you have your own view on this issue, please state it. Your opening presentation should be about 20 minutes long. The second speaker will take the same amount of time. Then there will be discussion. If you want to prepare a written paper for distribution, that would be a plus, but it's not required.

The Disarmament Forum is a series of monthly meetings to discuss opportunities for substantial disarmament during the 1990s. The focus is upon long-range goals and objectives. Ed Snyder opened the series in February by considering "Where We've Come From, Where We Are Going". The rest of the schedule through June and the cosponsors are shown on the attachment.

If you want to discuss this with me further, please call me at 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Captain Jim Bush
Center for Defense Information
1500 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, Dc 20005

Dear Jim:

Following up our telephone conversation, I invite you to make a presentation on "Naval Disarmament" at a session of the Disarmament Forum scheduled for 3:00 to 5:00 p.m, Thursday, May 17, 1990. It will take place at the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE. A representative of Greenpeace will also make a presentation. We want each of you to take about 20 minutes for your opening presentation. This will be followed by discussion.

We would want you to consider what kind of naval forces are appropriate in the 1990s as the Cold War winds down: particularly U.S. forces but also those of other nations. What kind of reductions would you favor? What should be scene be like by the end of the decade? What kind of naval disarmament negotiations or unilateral actions are desirable? And related matters. We are asking for an oral presentation, but if you want to prepare a written paper for distribution, that would be a plus though it's not required.

The Disarmament Forum is a series of monthly meetings to discuss opportunities for substantial disarmament during the 1990s. The focus is upon long-range goals and objectives. Ed Snyder opened the series in February by considering "Where We've Come From, Where We Are Going". The rest of the schedule through June and the cosponsors are shown on the

attachment.

*If you want to discuss this with me further, please call me at
897-3668.*

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Mr. Tom Longstreth
Federation of American Scientists
307 Massachusetts Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Tom:

Following up our telephone conversation, I invite you to make a presentation on "Minimal Deterrence" at a session of the Disarmament Forum scheduled for 3:00 to 5:00 p.m, Thursday, April 19, 1990. The overall topic for the session is "Strategic Nuclear Disarmament". A second speaker will talk about "Total Abolition." It will take place at the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE.

We would want you to discuss the concept of minimal deterrence and to summarize how it is defined by principal advocates, including specifics on number of warheads and types of delivery systems. If you have your own view on this issue, please state it. Your opening presentation should be about 20 minutes long. The second speaker will take the same amount of time. Then there will be discussion. If you want to prepare a written paper for distribution, that would be a plus, but it's not required.

The Disarmament Forum is a series of monthly meetings to discuss opportunities for substantial disarmament during the 1990s. The focus is upon long-range goals and objectives. Ed Snyder opened the series in February by considering "Where We've Come From, Where We Are Going". The rest of the schedule through June and the cosponsors are shown on the attachment.

If you want to discuss this with me further, please call me at 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Mr. Marcus Raskin
Institute for Policy Studies
1601 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Dear Mark:

We are looking forward to your participation in the next session of the Disarmament Forum scheduled for 3:00 to 5:00 p.m, Thursday, April 19, 1990. It will take place in Conference Room 2 of the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE. As I discussed with Joan Drake, the overall topic is "Strategic Arms Reduction in the 1990s". Tom Longstreth from the Federation of American Scientists is going to discuss "Deep Reductions beyond START I", including the idea of minimal deterrence. We want you to deal with "General Disarmament and Abolition of Strategic Weapons", that is, with an approach which goes beyond minimal deterrence towards the complete elimination of strategic weapons. We ask each of you to take about 20 minutes in your opening presentation. Then we will open the meeting to discussion from the floor.

Enclosed is a publicity flyer we are distributing. It shows the cosponsors. We send the flyer around Washington to persons in the arms control/peace community, to Capitol Hill staff, to press contacts, and some others. If you would like a supply to send to your own contacts, please let me know. You can reach me at 897-3668.

Thank you for your willingness to take part in this event.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director