

First draft
Comments invited

A PROPOPOSAL FOR
STRATEGIC DISARMAMENT NOW ¹

Findings

The events that occurred in the Soviet Union during the week of August 19, 1991 have changed world history. Because the coup d'etat failed, we now have a significant opportunity to eliminate all strategic nuclear weapons. We also have an urgent need to complete this task before another coup is attempted by disgruntled Soviet military forces.

At one time U.S. policymakers believed that strategic deterrence was necessary as backup for NATO forces deterring Soviet invasion of Western Europe. Because of remarkable political change in Eastern Europe, dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, and withdrawal of Soviet troops from that region the possibility of Soviet invasion has disappeared. Presently there is no other major Soviet military threat to U.S. interests. As the Soviet Union transforms itself into a more decentralized Union of Sovereign States (U.S.S), the danger of a preemptive attack on the United States will completely dissipate.

Accordingly, what Robert S. McNamara, former U.S. secretary of defense, wrote five years ago is even more clearly true today: "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."²

Nevertheless, each side is vulnerable to strategic attack by the other through accidental launching of nuclear missiles, an irrational act by a crazed military officer, or rash action by some future coup leaders. For both the United States of American and the Union of Sovereign States (of Eurasia) such an unexpected strategic attack is the only contemporary threat to the sanctity of their respective homelands.

¹ This proposal has been developed by Howard W. Hallman, executive director, Methodists United for Peace with Justice. He received technical advice from Captain James T. Bush, Center for Defense Information, Steven Aftergood, Federation of American Scientists, and Robert Standish Norris, Natural Resources Defense Council, but Hallman is solely responsible for this first draft. To offer your comments, please call him at (301) 897-3668.

² Robert S. McNamara, *Blundering into Disaster*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1986. p. 30

The self-interest of both the United States and the Union of Sovereign States is to totally eliminate the strategic nuclear arsenals on a mutual basis as rapidly as possible. This would provide both nations with true homeland security from outside attack. It would also release resources both nations need for other purposes.

Two-phase Process for Strategic Disarmament

It is therefore proposed that the United States and the Union of Sovereign States embark together on a two-phase process for the complete elimination of all strategic nuclear weapons and their warheads.

Phase I. Immediate and simultaneous deactivation of all strategic nuclear delivery systems.

Phase II. Dismantlement of all warheads and delivery vehicles, staged in a manner to assure that no nation is at disadvantage or risk at any time during the dismantlement process.

Phase I: Deactivation

The start of the process should be immediate deactivation of all deployed strategic delivery systems. This should be accomplished on a mutual basis by the United States and the Union of Sovereign States. Great Britain, France, and China should be invited to join, but U.S. and U.S.S. action should not wait on these other nations with their much smaller strategic arsenals.

The United States and the Union of Sovereign States should proceed concurrently and virtually instantly. One option would be to deactivate all types of strategic weapons simultaneously: naval, land, and air. It could be completed in a matter of days or a few weeks. A second option would be to proceed in stages, such as naval first, then land-based missiles, and finally bombers.

In outline the following steps could be taken.

Naval

- 1. Bring all strategic submarines into port and remove their missiles.*
- 2. Bring in all attack submarines.*
- 3. Move all other ships capable of launching cruise missiles or a naval air attack out of range of the adversary's homeland.*

Land

- 1. Open all ICBM silos, take out the missiles, place them on the ground, and remove their warheads.*

2. Move all mobile ICBMs to fixed locations, take the missiles off the transport vehicles, and remove their warheads.

Air

1. Ground all strategic bombers, remove all bombs and missiles.

Observation and inspection

1. Satellite observation.
2. Ground inspection.
 - a. Mutually by U.S. teams in the Union of Sovereign States and U.S.S. teams in the United States, using procedures developed in the INF and START agreements.
 - b. Or, international teams under United Nations supervision.

Phase II. Dismantlement

After deactivation is accomplished, the United States and the Union of Sovereign States can work out a schedule for dismantling all strategic nuclear weapons and destroying their warheads. Great Britain, France, and China should join this schedule.

The START agreement provides a place to begin. The weapons that START would eliminate over a seven year period could be dismantled in a much shorter period, such as seven weeks or seven months.

Thereafter, the process could follow two tenets from the McCloy-Zorin "principles for disarmament negotiations", agreed by the United States and the Soviet Union in the 1961.

The process should be implemented in an agreed sequence until it is completed, with each measure and stage carried out within specified time-limits.

All measures should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation could any state gain military advantage.

The goal should be to complete strategic weapons dismantlement as quickly as practicable, perhaps in a four to five year period and at the longest by the year 2000.

As part of this process, all further development and production of strategic weapons should cease. Assembly of new delivery systems and warheads should be halted rather than completed for later dismantlement. Research and production personnel should be assisted in transferring to other work.

All testing of nuclear warheads should also cease, both strategic and tactical warheads. Testing

facilities should be closed.

Because strategic defense would no longer be necessary, research and development for this purpose should be terminated. Deployed strategic defense systems should be dismantled.

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

September 3, 1991

Contact: Howard W. Hallman at (301) 897-3668

Draft: Comments Invited

**A STATEMENT ON THE ZERO OPTION
FOR GLOBAL NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT**

On September 27, 1991 President George Bush offered a series of initiatives for reduction in global nuclear forces. Implementation of his proposals will make significant progress toward ridding the world of the curse of nuclear weapons. We applaud his action to undertake unilateral initiatives, and we offer our support to many of his recommendations.

- *We support President Bush's decision to eliminate the United States' entire worldwide inventory of nuclear artillery shells and short-range ballistic missile warheads. Based in Europe and South Korea, and perhaps elsewhere, they have no military utility because their use would have devastating effects on the countries they are intended to defend. With the Soviet army leaving Central and Eastern Europe, there is no adversary possessing theater nuclear weapons. Likewise in Korea the U.S. tactical nuclear force is arrayed against an adversary not possessing that type of weapon.*

- *We join in calling upon the Union of Sovereign States (U.S.S., formerly the Soviet Union) to destroy its entire inventory of ground-launched theater weapons, including nuclear artillery, nuclear warheads for short-range ballistic missiles, warheads for air-defense missiles, and nuclear land mines.*

- *We support the withdrawal of all U.S. tactical nuclear weapons from surface ships and attack submarines and from land-based naval aircraft. We urge that all of the warheads be dismantled and destroyed, not leaving any in storage for future use.*

- *We join in calling upon the U.S.S. to take similar steps with all of its naval tactical nuclear weapons, including dismantling and destroying all of the warheads.*

- *We agree with President Bush that the schedule for eliminating strategic nuclear weapons under the START agreement should be significantly accelerated and not allowed to drag out for seven years.*

- *We support the move to immediately stand down all U.S. strategic bombers from their alert posture and to remove their nuclear weapons.*

- *We join in calling upon the U.S.S. to confine its mobile missions to their garrisons, adding a recommendation to remove them from the transport vehicles and remove their warheads.*

- *We agree with President Bush that the programs for MX rail garrison and a new nuclear short-range attack missile for strategic bombers should be terminated.*

- *We point out the significance of actually destroying nuclear warheads and artillery shells*

under these initiatives. We recommend that the nuclear material should not be recycled into other forms of nuclear weapons and that an international system of inspection be put in bring this about.

While supporting these initiatives taken by President Bush, we believe that they lack sufficient boldness to respond to the extraordinary opportunity now offered to humankind. We live in a dramatically different world than existed during the first 45 years of the nuclear weapons era. Accordingly, we should undertake dramatic initiatives response to the amazing changes of the past two years.

The global nuclear arsenal grew to enormous size primarily because of the worldwide rivalry of the United States and the Soviet Union. The first theater nuclear weapons were deployed in Europe because of Cold War confrontation between the two blocs. The United States and the Soviet Union developed their fleets of strategic bomber force, intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) to hold each other hostage under a doctrine of mutual deterrence. Great Britain, France, and China became nuclear nations as a byproduct of the Cold War.

Now the Cold War is over. Eastern Europe is free of Soviet control, Soviet forces are rapidly evacuating, and the Warsaw Pact has dissolved. No threat to Western Europe remains to be deterred by nuclear might, including the ultimate threat of strategic attack upon the Soviet homeland. The

defeat of the attempted coup d'etat in the Soviet Union has removed from power the core of reactionary Soviet military and civilian leaders who were opposing peace and disarmament initiatives. The Union of Sovereign States and the associated republics are moving rapidly toward democracy and a free-market economy. This nation, or collection of nations, is no longer a threat to the security of the United States and its allies.

Accordingly, what Robert S. McNamara, former U.S. secretary of defense, wrote five years ago is even more clearly true today: "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."¹

Nevertheless, each side is vulnerable to strategic attack by the other through accidental launching of nuclear missiles, an irrational act by a crazed military officer, or rash action by some future coup leaders. For both the United States of American and the Union of Sovereign States (of Eurasia) such an unexpected strategic attack is the only contemporary threat to the sanctity of their respective homelands.

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

The self-interest of both the United States and the Union of Sovereign States is to totally eliminate the strategic nuclear arsenals on a mutual basis as rapidly as possible. This would provide both nations with true homeland security from outside attack. It would also release resources both nations need for other purposes.

The start of the process should be immediate deactivation of all deployed strategic delivery systems. This should be accomplished on a mutual basis by the United States and the Union of Sovereign States. Great Britain, France, and China should be invited to join, but U.S. and U.S.S. action should not wait on these other nations with their much smaller strategic arsenals.

The United States and the Union of Sovereign States should proceed concurrently and virtually instantly. One option would be to deactivate all types of strategic weapons simultaneously: naval, land, and air. It could be completed in a matter of days or a few weeks. A second option would be to proceed in stages, such as naval first, then land-based missiles, and finally bombers.

In outline the following steps could be taken.

Naval

- 1. Bring all strategic submarines into port and remove their missiles.*
- 2. Bring in all attack submarines.*

3. *Move all other ships capable of launching cruise missiles or a naval air attack out of range of the adversary's homeland.*

Land

1. *Open all ICBM silos, take out the missiles, place them on the ground, and remove their warheads.*
2. *Move all mobile ICBMs to fixed locations, take the missiles off the transport vehicles, and remove their warheads.*

Air

1. *Ground all strategic bombers, remove all bombs and missiles.*

Observation and inspection

1. *Satellite observation.*
2. *Ground inspection.*
 - a. *Mutually by U.S. teams in the Union of Sovereign States and U.S.S. teams in the United States, using procedures developed in the INF and START agreements.*
 - b. *Or, international teams under United Nations supervision.*

After deactivation is accomplished, the United States and the Union of Sovereign States can

work out a schedule for dismantling all strategic nuclear weapons and destroying their warheads.

Great Britain, France, and China should join this schedule.

The START agreement provides a place to begin. The weapons that START would eliminate over a seven year period could be dismantled in a much shorter period, such as seven weeks or seven months.

Thereafter, the process could follow two tenets from the McCloy-Zorin "principles for disarmament negotiations", agreed by the United States and the Soviet Union in the 1961.

The process should be implemented in an agreed sequence until it is completed, with each measure and stage carried out within specified time-limits.

All measures should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation could any state gain military advantage.

The goal should be to complete strategic weapons dismantlement as quickly as practicable, perhaps in a four to five year period and at the longest by the year 2000.

As part of this process, all further development and production of strategic weapons should cease. Assembly of new delivery systems and warheads should be halted rather than completed for

later dismantlement. Research and production personnel should be assisted in transferring to other work.

All testing of nuclear warheads should also cease, both strategic and tactical warheads. Testing facilities should be closed.

Because strategic defense would no longer be necessary, research and development for this purpose should be terminated. Deployed strategic defense systems should be dismantled.

**NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT: THE ZERO OPTION
NOW IS THE TIME!**

*A Statement by the
Board of Directors
Methodists United for Peace with Justice*

Saying "No" to Nuclear Deterrence

*In 1986 the United Methodist Council of Bishops, after nearly two years of prayerful and penitent study, adopted a pastoral letter and foundation document entitled *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. The bishops' statement was deeply rooted in biblical faith. They wrote:*

*At the heart of the Old Testament is the testimony of *shalom*, that marvelous Hebrew word that means peace. But the peace that is *shalom* is not negative or one-dimensional. It is much more than the absence of war. *Shalom* is positive peace: harmony, wholeness, health, and well-being in all human relationships. It is the natural state of humanity as birthed by God. It is harmony between humanity and all of God's good creation. All of creation is interrelated. Every creature, every element, every force of nature participates in the whole of creation. If any persons is denied *shalom*, all are thereby diminished.¹*

¹ United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. Nashville: Graded Press, 1986. p. 24.

New Testament faith presupposes a radical break between the follies, or much so-called conventional wisdom about power and security, on the one hand, and the transcendent wisdom of shalom, on the other. Ultimately, New Testament faith is message of hope about God's plan and purpose for human destiny. It is a redemptive vision that refuses to wallow in doom.²

Based upon this faith the bishops in their pastoral letter stated unequivocally that:

we say a clear and unconditional No to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing.³

The implication is clear. If nuclear weapons cannot be legitimately used for either deterrence or warfighting, no nation should possess them. Accordingly, in the foundation document the bishops indicated:

We support the earliest possible negotiation of phased but rapid reduction of nuclear arsenals, while calling upon all other nuclear-weapon states to agree to parallel arms reductions, to the eventual goal of a mutual and verifiable dismantling of all nuclear armaments.⁴

² *Op. cit.*, p. 28.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 92.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

The World Today

Since 1986 remarkable events have occurred. The Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union has ended. The Berlin wall has fallen. Eastern Europe is free of Soviet control. Soviet forces are rapidly evacuating Eastern Europe and have already removed all nuclear weapons. The Warsaw Pact has dissolved. Elsewhere around the globe, confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union, and their allies, has ended. The Soviet Union is changing to the Union of Sovereign States (U.S.S.), committed to democracy and a free-market economy, although the transition has many uncertainties and potential instability.

The Cold War was the primary reason that the global nuclear arsenal grew to enormous size. The United States and the Soviet Union developed their fleets of strategic bombers, intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) to hold each other hostage under a doctrine of mutual assured destruction. The first theater nuclear weapons were deployed in Europe because of Cold War confrontation between the two blocs. Great Britain, France, and China became nuclear nations as a byproduct of the Cold War.

With the Cold War ended, now is the time to exercise the zero option: to eliminate all nuclear weapons throughout the globe. That means reducing to zero the supply of all types of nuclear weapons held by all possessors. It means a halt to all testing and weapons production. It means preventing all non-possessor nations from acquiring nuclear weapons.

A promising start on the journey has occurred through the initiative taken by U.S. President George Bush on September 21, 1991 and the response of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on October 5. We welcome

these initiatives. They constitute a good beginning. But much more should be done promptly. Therefore, we call for further steps of nuclear arms reduction.

Strategic Nuclear Weapons: Zero

Approximately one half of the global nuclear arsenal is composed of strategic weapons designed to attack the adversary's homeland from afar. They can be launched from land, sea, and air. From the perspective of both the United States and the Union of Sovereign States these strategic weapons are the *only* danger of foreign attack.

- We praise President Bush's initiative (a) to take all U.S. strategic bombers off alert and remove their bombs and missiles and (b) to take 350 Minutemen II ICBMs off alert for rapid firing. This unilateral deactivation of a portion of the strategic arsenal is an important precedent that can be extended further.
- We praise President Gorbachev's commitment (a) to take all U.S.S. heavy strategic bombers off alert and store their nuclear weapons in depots, (b) to remove 503 ICBMs from alert status, and (c) to keep mobile ICBMs in permanent sites rather than moving them about.
- We agree with President Bush that the U.S. programs for MX rail garrison, mobile basing of small ICBMs, and a new nuclear short-range attack missile for strategic bombers should be terminated.

- We support President Gorbachev's decision to stop development of compact mobile ICBMs.

These are excellent initial first steps, but they do not go nearly as far as the global situation requires and as current opportunities make possible. The best response would be to apply President Bush's deactivation approach to the entire strategic arsenal. Accordingly:

- We recommend that the United States and the Union of Sovereign States immediately and concurrently deactivate their entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal. They should:
 - Bring all strategic submarines into port, remove their missiles, and take off the warheads.
 - Open all ICBM silos, take out the missiles, place them on the ground, and remove the warheads.
- We hope that Great Britain, France, and China will understand the necessity to immediately deactivate their strategic arsenal: land-, air-, and sea-based.
- After deactivation is accomplished, the United States and the Union of Sovereign States should work out a schedule for dismantling all strategic nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles and destroying their warheads. Great Britain, France, and China should join this schedule. The process should be implemented in an agreed sequence that is balanced so that at no stage could any nation gain an advantage.

Tactical Nuclear Weapons: Zero

The other half of the global nuclear arsenal is composed of tactical nuclear weapons with relatively short range and intended for combat use on land, at sea, and in the air.

- We praise President Bush's decision to eliminate the United States' entire worldwide inventory of nuclear artillery shells and short-range ballistic missile warheads. Based in Europe and South Korea, and perhaps elsewhere, they have no military utility because their use would have devastating effects on the countries they are intended to defend. With the Soviet army leaving Central and Eastern Europe, there is no adversary possessing theater nuclear weapons. Likewise in Korea the U.S. tactical nuclear force is arrayed against an adversary not possessing this type of weapon.
- We support the withdrawal of all U.S. tactical nuclear weapons from surface ships and attack submarines and from land-based naval aircraft. We urge that all of the warheads be dismantled and destroyed, not leaving any in storage for future use.
- We also call for elimination of all U.S. nuclear bombs and missiles carried on tactical aircraft, a significant omission from President Bush's proposal. In Europe U.S. tactical aircraft have no adversaries to target with nuclear weapons because of the dissolution of the

Warsaw Pact, the freeing of Eastern Europe, the complete independence of the Baltic states, and the assertion of democracy in Russia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Kazakhstan, and the other sovereign republics. Moreover, there are no legitimate targets for U.S. tactical nuclear bombs and air-launched missiles anywhere else on Earth.

- We praise President Gorbachev's commitment to eliminate the entire Soviet inventory of nuclear artillery, nuclear warheads for short-range ballistic missiles, and nuclear land mines. They have no military utility in international warfare, and their elimination will prevent their use in internal conflict within the emerging Union of Sovereign States.

- We support the withdrawal of all Soviet tactical nuclear weapons from surface ships and multi-purpose submarines and the removal of all nuclear warheads from anti-aircraft missiles. We urge that all of these missiles and warheads be dismantled and destroyed, not leaving any in storage for future use.

- We anticipate that Great Britain, France, and China will choose to eliminate all of their tactical nuclear weapons and that any unadmitted possessors will do likewise.

Testing and Production: Zero

With a commitment to move to global nuclear disarmament -- the zero option, there is no further need to develop, test, and produce new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles. Therefore:

- *We call upon all nuclear weapon states immediately to:
 - Cease production of nuclear weapons material.
 - Halt all testing of nuclear warheads.
 - Stop assemblage of new warheads.*
- *We also call upon all nuclear weapon states to discontinue the manufacture of new missiles, bombers, and strategic submarines.*
- *We recommend the closure of all nuclear weapons production facilities, except as they might be used to disassemble nuclear warheads and convert nuclear material to non-weapon use.*
- *We recommend a program to assist workers, companies, and communities engaged in producing nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles to convert to non-military activities.*

Nonproliferation: Universal

It is essential that no other nation acquire nuclear weapons and delivery capacity while the current possessors are eliminating their nuclear arsenal. Accordingly:

- *We call upon all nations to become signatories the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to abide by its provisions.*

- We call for strengthening provisions of the Non-proliferation Treaty and for vigorous enforcement.
- We call for an international system to prevent the development, production, and deployment of ballistic missiles that can be used to attack an adversary's homeland and for the destruction of all such missiles now in existence.

Strategic Defense: Unnecessary

By moving promptly and resolutely to complete strategic disarmament and by achieving a diligent nonproliferation regime to block the spread of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles, no system of strategic defense will be required. The zero option provides necessary homeland security. Therefore:

- We call for the United States and the Union of Sovereign States to disband all efforts of develop and deploy a strategic defense system.
- We call upon the Union of Sovereign States to dismantle its existing ground-based strategic defense.

We believe that the danger of any new nation developing nuclear weapons and ICBM delivery capacity can be handled through an effective international nonproliferation regime. A strategic defense network is not needed for that purpose.

Conclusion

We fervently believe that these recommendations will greatly enhance

global security by eliminating the possibility of nuclear war. Furthermore, the resources of human talent, production capacity, and money released can become available to deal with urgent human problems around the globe. The zero option provides great hope for global peace and prosperity.

Adopted October 18, 1991 by Board of Directors

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a national association of laity and clergy. The organization has no official affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

For further information, write to:

Methodists United for Peace with Justice

421 Seward Square, SE

Washington, DC 20003

Or call Howard W. Hallman, Executive Director at (301) 897-3668.

A Proposed Book

ZERO OPTION
GLOBAL ELIMINATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Each chapter by a different author. Each chapter 15-20 pages double space.
Total manuscript: 240-320 pages.

1. Introduction

The remarkable changes that have occurred in recent years, such as end of the Cold War, rise of democracy in Eastern Europe, internal change within the Soviet Union -- an opportunity to try dramatic new approaches -- the zero option for nuclear disarmament -- brief reference to proposals of late 1940s for international control of nuclear weapons -- subsequent proposals for general and complete disarmament -- overview of chapters

Part I. Discarding Nuclear Deterrence Doctrine

2. Religious and Moral Objections

Initial response of late '40s and early '50s -- subsequently Catholic position -- Protestant viewpoints -- Jewish perspective -- humanists thought -- a view for the 1990s (post Cold-War, post-Soviet coup attempt)

3. Useless Weapons: Empirical Evidence

Numerous wars and other grievous events not deterred in past 45 years -- disutility of nuclear weapons in these wars -- NATO versus Warsaw Pact in Central Europe and role of nuclear deterrence; now over -- now only weapons deterring weapons, not other actions

4. Psychological Dependency

Clinging to nuclear deterrence doctrine, including minimal deterrence, when unnecessary -- psychological reasons and remedy

Part II. Eliminating Nuclear Weapons

5. Tactical Nuclear Weapons and the Zero Option

Tactical weapons defined -- global inventory -- where deployed -- disutility for current and future threats -- withdrawal under Bush and Gorbachev initiatives -- shortcomings -- bringing in other possessors -- how to finish job, including destruction of all warheads -- verification

6. Strategic Nuclear Weapons and the Zero Option

Strategic weapons defined -- how deployed, likely targets -- brief history strategic arms

control -- Bush and Gorbachev initiatives -- shortcomings -- bringing in other possessors -- how to finish the job through immediate deactivation, staged dismantlement, including destruction of warheads -- verification

7. Comprehensive Test Ban

History of idea -- first attempt of late '50s, early '60s, leading to Limited Test Ban Treaty -- record of testing before and after Limited Test Ban -- recent proposals -- what should be done now to achieve a global test ban, including verification

8. Halting Production

Of fissionable material, globally -- warhead production -- research and development for future weapons -- delivery vehicles in pipeline -- closing factories except as needed to disassemble warheads -- verification

9. Dismantling Warheads and Delivery Vehicles

Past experience (such as INF) -- methods -- how fast -- what to do with fissionable material -- verification

Part III. Nonproliferation

10. Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons

Experience with Treaty for Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) -- lessons from Iraq -- now to strengthen NPT -- what else should be done, such as use of international law with enforcement mechanism

11. Restricting Ballistic Missiles

Statement of problem -- present and potential possessors -- how to restrict, including verification and enforcement

12. International Dispute Resolution

Beyond principal Cold War competitors, nuclear weapons proliferation primarily related to regional conflict: Middle East (Israel, Iraq, potentially others); South Asia (India, Pakistan); Korea (North and South); Southern Africa; South America (Argentina, Brazil) -- regional dispute resolution to accompanying nuclear nonproliferation -- how accomplished

13. Strategic Defense Unnecessary

Idea of strategic defense -- elements in place, under development, and proposed -- abolition of strategic nuclear weapons, resolute nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, restrictions on ballistic missiles, and regional dispute resolution will make strategic defense unnecessary -- possibility of international operation of satellite surveillance

Part IV. Aftermath

14. Economic Conversion

Overview of research, testing, and production facilities and bases that will close under the zero option -- how to assist workers, companies, and communities to shift to other activities

15. Environmental Cleanup

Challenge -- extent -- what should be done -- estimated cost -- time table

16. Prologue

Summation of ideas of chapters -- who should do what, when, and how

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

(301) 897-3668

October 23, 1991

Zero Option book

Steps in Planning Phase

1. Work out chapter outline and specification
2. Obtain commitment from prospective authors

Simultaneously

3. Seek funding support
4. Seek publisher

Budget

Authors for 16 chapters @ \$500	\$ 8,000
Editor <u>2,000</u>	
	\$10,000

Time Table for Writing Manuscript

Authors write first drafts	3 months
Review, rewrite if necessary, complete prologue and epilogue	<u>3 months</u>
Total time to complete entire manuscript	6 months

For release Monday A.M., November 4, 1991

Contact: Howard W. Hallman, (301) 897-3668

TOTAL GLOBAL NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT PROPOSED

Now is the time to eliminate all nuclear weapons throughout the globe, so says Methodists United for Peace with Justice. This means exercising the zero option with these objectives:

- *Strategic nuclear weapons: zero*
- *Tactical nuclear weapons: zero*
- *Testing and production: zero*
- *Nonproliferation: universal*
- *Strategic defense: unnecessary*

The zero option can be carried out, according to Howard W. Hallman, executive director of Methodists United, because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. The doctrine of nuclear deterrence has always been immoral, and now it is obsolete.

In its detailed recommendations Methodists United calls for immediately and concurrently deactivating the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal. This would be accomplished by

- *Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and*
- *Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.*

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic

warheads and their delivery vehicles.

This action would build upon the initiative of President George Bush to take strategic bombers and 350 Minuteman II intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) off alert and President Mikhail Gorbachev's reciprocal response with similar action. Methodists United also calls upon both nations to totally eliminate all tactical nuclear weapons, including bombs and air-launched missiles not included in President Bush's initiative.

In addition, Methodists United recommends that Great Britain, France, and China deactivate and dismantle all of their nuclear weapons. The organization calls for all nations to cease testing and producing new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles and for a rigorous nonproliferation regime. With this accomplished strategic defense would be unnecessary.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a national association of laity and clergy. The organization has no official affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

For immediate release

Contact: Howard W. Hallman, (301) 897-3668

TOTAL GLOBAL NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT PROPOSED

Now is the time to eliminate all nuclear weapons throughout the globe, so says Methodists United for Peace with Justice. This means exercising the zero option with these objectives:

- *Strategic nuclear weapons: zero*
- *Tactical nuclear weapons: zero*
- *Testing and production: zero*
- *Nonproliferation: universal*
- *Strategic defense: unnecessary*

The zero option can be carried out, according to Howard W. Hallman, executive director of Methodists United, because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. The doctrine of nuclear deterrence has always been immoral, and now it is obsolete.

In its detailed recommendations Methodists United calls for immediately and concurrently deactivating the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal. This would be accomplished by

- *Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and*
- *Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.*

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic

warheads and their delivery vehicles.

This action would build upon the initiative of President George Bush to take strategic bombers and 350 Minuteman II intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) off alert and President Mikhail Gorbachev's reciprocal response with similar action. Methodists United also calls upon both nations to totally eliminate all tactical nuclear weapons, including bombs and air-launched missiles not included in President Bush's initiative.

In addition, Methodists United recommends that Great Britain, France, and China deactivate and dismantle all of their nuclear weapons. The organization calls for all nations to cease testing and producing new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles and for a rigorous nonproliferation regime. With this accomplished strategic defense would be unnecessary.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a national association of laity and clergy. The organization has no official affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

For immediate release

*Contact: Howard W. Hallman
(301) 897-3668*

DEACTIVATE THE ENTIRE STRATEGIC NUCLEAR ARSENAL NOW

*A Statement by
Methodists United for Peace with Justice*

We fully support the initiative of Senators Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar to provide \$500 million from the defense budget to help the Soviet Union dismantle its nuclear arsenal. This would be another important step toward ridding the world of these disastrously dangerous but ultimately useless weapons. It would build upon President Bush's initiative of September 21 and President Gorbachev's reciprocal response on October 5.

Now is the time to go even further because the Cold War is over and the disintegrating Soviet Union is no longer a threat to the United States.

*Therefore, we call for the **immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal.** This would be accomplished by*

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and*
- Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.*

This action should commence with the United States and the Soviet Union and then bring in Great Britain, France, and China.

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all

strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles. This two-phase approach would be very stabilizing. Immediate deactivation would quickly eliminate the threat of surprise or accidental strategic nuclear attack. Then over a period of time the strategic arsenal would be totally dismantled in a carefully balanced sequence.

Immediate deactivation provides a solution to the question: what are now the targets for strategic missiles in the name of nuclear deterrence? Does the United States target the airfields and ports where U.S. planes and ships may be soon be arriving with food supplies? Do we target the command and control center in Moscow where Russian President Boris Yeltsin is leading a strong effort to achieve a free-market economy? Or St. Petersburg where the mayor is leading a movement of democratic reform? Or the capitals of the various independent republics? Through deactivation there would be no specific targets, but a supply of missiles would be held in reserve until mutual dismantlement can occur.

-30-

November 22, 1991

*If We're Feeding the Soviets,
Why Do We Still Threaten to Nuke 'em?*

by Howard W. Hallman¹

What a strange anomaly! The United States is ready to feed the people of the disintegrating Soviet Union. At the same time the U.S. strategic arsenal has more than 10,000 nuclear warheads on missiles now aimed at various sites within the Soviet Union. If we're going to feed them, why do we continue to threaten them with nuclear destruction?

The U.S. strategic targets are set forth in a highly secret document call the Single Integrated Operations Plan, or SIOP (pronounced "sigh-op" in military jargon). I'm not privy to the listing of Soviet targets specified in SIOP, but I note that a learned committee of the National Academy of Sciences recently described three types of targets: (1) most Soviet nuclear and conventional military forces; (2) the industrial and logistical base for supporting and reconstituting these forces; and (3) significant targetable command and control and leadership elements. The industrial base is located primarily in and around cities. Major command and control centers are also urban-based. Thus, a huge portion of the Soviet population is within killing range of installations targeted by U.S. strategic missiles.

This means that missiles on U.S. submarines submerged in the Atlantic ocean and elsewhere and in silos scattered around the Great Plains are at this very moment targeted at airfields and ports where U.S. planes and ships will

¹ Howard W. Hallman is executive director of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy.

soon be arriving with food supplies. Our missiles are actively targeted at the central command and control headquarters in Moscow, where Russian President Boris Yeltsin is leading a strong effort to achieve a free-market economy. U.S. missiles are currently aimed at St. Petersburg, sister city of Los Angeles, though the SIOF probably uses the old name, Leningrad. And it seems quite likely that the United States is now targeting missiles at Minsk, sister city of Detroit, capital of the independent republic of Byelorussia, and at Odessa, sister city of Baltimore, in the in the independent republic of Ukraine.

Why? The Cold War is over. The Soviet Union is no longer a viable military adversary of the United States. Yet, SIOF keeps U.S. strategic missiles actively targeted against the people residing within the former Soviet Union. Isn't it time for drastic change in our approach?

We can do it by cutting through the outmoded nuclear deterrence doctrine that the Pentagon and the military-funded think tanks have developed. What to do is not difficult to understand, and it should not be too hard to achieve.

Think of our current situation as similar to two groups of contending boys on a schoolyard. The boys stand facing one another with rocks and broken bricks in their hands. Each group threatens to throw rocks at the other group if one of them throws first. They've stood around for a long time and are tired of the stand-off. They would like to do other things, such as challenge the other side to a game of soccer, or just go home for supper. But they don't know how to end the impasse.

Then the leader of one group says to the opposing leader, "We'll lay down our rocks if you'll lay yours down." The other leader asks, "How do we know

it's not a trick?" The first leader replies, "We'll all count to three together and then everyone drops his rocks at the same time. If somebody on your side keeps his, or even starts throwing, we'll just pick ours up again and throw back."

So they agree. "One. Two. Three." Everyone drops his rocks at once. The threat of battle is over. Amazingly the two groups merge, and some boys previously on opposite sides walk off together.

This is a fair analogy because U.S. and Soviet political and military leaders are basically grown boys (no women are involved). They still possess big hunks of childhood psychology. Nuclear deterrence and warfighting theory is fancified, though more dangerous, application of the meaner side of schoolyard interaction.

So why not undertake an international equivalent of schoolyard peacemaking? One, two, three. Immediately and simultaneously bring all U.S. and Soviet strategic submarines into port, remove their missiles, take off their warheads. Open all ICBM silos, take out the missiles, place them on the ground in plain sight, remove their warheads. Get Great Britain, France, and China to do likewise.

Does this sound preposterous? It's actually a logical extension of the initiative that President Bush launched on September 21 when he decided to take all U.S. strategic bombers off alert and remove their bombs and to take 350 Minuteman II ICBMs off alert for rapid firing. On October 5 President Gorbachev reciprocated by taking all Soviet heavy strategic bombers off alert, removing 503 ICBMs from alert status, and keeping mobile ICBMs in permanent sites rather than moving them about.

Complete deactivation of the entire global strategic arsenal would, of

course, be only the first step. Then we should go about dismantling all of the delivery vehicles and destroying the warheads. Dismantlement might begin with the weapons specified in the START agreement, except accomplished in 7 weeks or at most 7 months rather than 7 years. Then the remaining US/Soviet arsenal could be cut in half within another year or so. This could be followed by reduction to a level that some advocate as "minimal deterrence", such as 300, 500, or 1,000 warheads on each side.

Some might want a next-to-last stage with a few missiles remaining, certainly less than 50, as precautionary measure for dealing with potential new nuclear-weapon states until a rigorous nonproliferation regime has proven its effectiveness. The final stage would go the rest of the way to zero, bringing about the complete elimination of the strategic weapons of all possessors. This should be accomplished no later than the year 2000.

Clearly a strong and universal system of nuclear nonproliferation should accompany the elimination of the current strategic arsenal. And also a halt in the spread of ballistic missiles capable of attacking an adversary's homeland. But in fact nonproliferation will be easier to achieve if the big boys give up their strategic missiles and nuclear warheads. U.S. and Soviet preaching on nuclear nonproliferation is like a drunkard advocating alcoholic abstinence. Conduct contradicts words.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1969 was based upon a commitment of the nuclear possessors to work toward disarmament in exchange for other nations not acquiring nuclear capability. As the possessors live up to their side of the bargain, most of the nonpossessors will easily resist the desire for nuclear weapons of their own. For the handful of nations that retain nuclear ambition, the world community can exercise pressure and invoke sanctions to thwart their desire.

Thus, prompt deactivation of the U.S. and Soviet strategic submarines and intercontinental ballistic missiles, joined soon by Great Britain, France, and China, would have multiple achievements. It would remove an ever-present danger of accidental launch. It could keep strategic weapons out of the hands of any future perpetrators of another coup in the Soviet Union. It would be enormously stabilizing in US/Soviet relations. It would improve chances for nonproliferation. It would save billions of dollars. Above all it would free children everywhere from their anxiety over nuclear war.

Mr. Paul Walker
Institute for Peace and
International Studies
91 Harvey Street
Cambridge, MA 02140

Mr. Ralph Fine
International Physicians for
Prevention of Nuclear War
126 Rogers Street
Cambridge, MA 02142

Ms. Marjorie Smith
Women's Action for
Nuclear Disarmament
691 Massachusetts Ave.
Arlington, MA 02174

Ms. Lisa Harper
War Resisters League
339 Lafayette Street
New York, NY 10012

Mr. Aaron Tovish
Parliamentarians for Global Action
211 E. 43rd Street, #1604
New York, NY 10017

Ms. Mia Adjali
UM Women's Division
777 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017

Mr. Peter Drucker
Mobilization for Survival
45 John Street, #811
New York, NY 10038

Rev. George D. McClain
Methodist Federation for
Social Action
76 Clinton Avenue
Staten Island, NY 10301

Mr. David Shilling
Fellowship of Reconciliation
P.O. Box 271
Nyack, NY 10960

Mr. Tom Cordaro
Pax Christi USA
348 East Tenth Street
Erie, PA 16503

Bruce Birchard
American Friends Service Committee
1501 Cherry Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102

Ms. Jane Midgely
Women's International League
for Peace and Freedom
1213 Race Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107

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

Mr. Denis Frado
Evangelical Lutheran Church
in America
122 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Mr. Carl Casebolt
National Council of Churches
110 Maryland Avenue
Washington, DC 20002

Rev. Robert Tiller
American Baptist Churches
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Rev. Jay Lintner
United Church of Christ
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Mr. Delton Franz
Mennonite Central Ctte
110 Maryland Ave. NE
Washington, DC 20002

Rev. Jim Bell
Interfaith/Impact
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Ms. Barbara Green
Presbyterian Church (USA)
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Joe Volk
Friends Committee on
National Legislation
245 Second Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Ms. Edith Villastrigo
Women Strike for Peace

105 Second Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Mr. Robert Alpern
Unitarian Universalist Assn
100 Maryland Ave., NE
Washington, DC 20002

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

Mr. Tim McElwee
Church of the Brethren
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Ms. Betty Bumpers
Peace Links
747 8th Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Mr. Tom Zamora
Friends of the Earth
218 D Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Mr. Darryl Fagim
Americans for Democratic Action
1511 K Street, NW, #941
Washington, DC 20005

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

Mr. Jim Raffel
National Commission on Economic
Conversion and Disarmament
1801 18th St., NW, #9
Washington, DC 20009

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

Ms. Claire Greensfelder
Greenpeace, USA
1436 U Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009

Mr. Marcus Raskin

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

Rev. Jim Wallis
Sojourners Peace Ministry
Box 29272
Washington, DC 20017

Ms. Nancy Sylvester
NETWORK
806 Rhode Island Ave., NE
Washington, DC 20018

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

Mike Zampelli, SJ
Jesuit Social Ministries
1424 16th St. NW, #300
Washington, DC 20036

Dick Mark
20/20 Vision
1000 16th St, NW, #810
Washington, DC 20036

Ms. Elizabeth Lyman
Lawyers Alliance for World Security
1120 19th Street, NW, #615
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Michael Wessels
Psychologists for Social
Responsibility
Randolph Macon College
Ashland, VA 23005

Professor Sarah Harder
Women for Meaningful Summits
Univ. of Wisconsin at Eau Claire
Eau Claire, WI 54701

Mr. Ed Kyser
Foundation for Global Communities
222 High Street
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Mr. John Parachini
Committee for National Security
1601 Connecticut Avenue NW, #301
Washington, DC 20009

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

Mr. Robert Musil
Professionals' Coalition for
Nuclear Arms Control
1616 P Street, NW, #320
Washington, DC 20036

Mr. Spurgeon M. Keeny, Jr.
Arms Control Association
11 Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Rear Admiral Gene R. La Rocque
Center for Defense Information
1500 Massachusetts Ave, NW
Washington, DC 20005

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

Dr. Randall Forsberg
Institute for Defense
and Disarmament
675 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139

Mr. Stanley Norris
National Resources Defense Council
1350 New York Ave. NW, #300
Washington, DC 20005
Stan

Ms. Julia A. Moore
Physicians for Social Responsibility
1000 16th Street, NW, #810
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Howard Ris
Union of Concerned Scientists
26 Church Street
Cambridge, MA 02238

Professor McGeorge Bundy
NYU Department of History
19 University Place
New York, NY 10003

Mr. William E. Colby
Donovan & Leisure
1250 24th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr.
1800 K Street, NW, #400
Washington, DC 20006

Professor Robert F. Drinan
Georgetown University Law Center
600 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Dr. Richard L. Garwin
IBM Thomas I. Watson Research Center
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

Admiral Noel Gayler
2111 Mason Hill Drive
Alexandria, VA 22306

General David C. Jones
2426 S. Queen Street
Arlington, VA 22202

Dr. Carl Kaysen
Defense and Arms Control Program
M.I.T.
Cambridge, MA 02139

Professor Catherine M. Kelleher
Center for International Security Studies
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20740

Dr. George Kennan
Institute for Advance Study
Princeton, NJ 08540

Mr. James Leonard
Council on Nonproliferation
1601 Connecticut Avenue, NW, #303
Washington, DC 20009

Mr. Robert S. McNamara
1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Dr. W. K. H. Panofsky
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center
Stanford University

Palo Alto, CA 94305

Dr. George W. Rathjens
Defense and Arms Control Program
M.I.T.
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Carl Sagan
Space and Science Building
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Mr. Gerard C. Smith
1616 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

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

Dr. Frank von Hippel
Center on Energy and
Environmental Studies
Princeton, NJ 08544

Dr. Michael B. Wallerstein
National Academy of Sciences
2101 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20418

Mr. Paul C. Warnke
Clifford & Warnke
815 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner
Massachusetts Institute
of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139

September 3, 1991

Dear Colleague:

During the last several months I have been working on some ideas about what kind of strategic arms reduction to seek beyond the START agreement. The failed coup in the Soviet Union has made this task more urgent and has also opened an opportunity to move rapidly to achieve total strategic disarmament.

With that in mind I have drafted the enclosed proposal for a two phase process for mutual action by the United States and the Union of Sovereign States:

- I. Immediate deactivation of all strategic delivery systems.
- II. Staged dismantlement of all warheads and delivery vehicles.

This is a first draft and is open for suggestions and refinement. I hope that after appropriate revisions this approach could gain the endorsement of a number of U.S. peace and arms control organizations.

Then I suggest that we offer this idea to members of Congress and seek their support. Simultaneously organizations with contacts in the Union of Sovereign States could share the proposal with citizen organizations and parliamentarians there and seek their endorsement.

With bilateral citizen-parliamentarian endorsement lined up, we can then present the proposal to top U.S. officials and leaders of the Union of Sovereign States and the major member republics. We could even make some informal soundings earlier.

Please call me with your comments, suggestions for refinement, analysis of pitfalls, and indication of possible interest in supporting and working on this approach. I can be reached at (301) 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

September 7, 1991

Mr. William E. Colby
Donovan & Leisure
1250 24th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Dear Mr. Colby:

During the last several months I have been working on some ideas about what kind of strategic arms reduction to seek beyond the START agreement. The failed coup in the Soviet Union has made this task more urgent and has also opened an opportunity to move rapidly to achieve total strategic disarmament.

With that in mind I have drafted the enclosed proposal for a two phase process for mutual action by the United States and the Union of Sovereign States:

- I. Immediate deactivation of all strategic delivery systems.
- II. Staged dismantlement of all warheads and delivery vehicles.

I am sharing it with you at the suggestion of John Parachini, who tells me that you are giving consideration to ideas on a "zero option" for strategic nuclear weapons. I would be interested in your ideas and also would welcome a critique of mine, including suggestions for refinement and analysis of pitfalls.

I am also circulating this proposal to a number of U.S. peace and arms control organizations. My hope is that we can achieve a consensus for a bold approach that responds to the opportunity offered by the remarkable change

that has occurred in the former Soviet Union, now the Union of Sovereign States. Then I suggest that we offer our ideas to members of Congress and seek their support. Simultaneously organizations with contacts in the Union of Sovereign States could share our approach with citizen organizations and parliamentarians there and seek their endorsement.

With bilateral citizen-parliamentarian endorsement lined up, we could propose some bold steps to top U.S. officials and leaders of the Union of Sovereign States and the major member republics. We could even make some informal soundings earlier.

If you want to get in touch with me, I can be reached by phone at (301) 897-3668 in Bethesda.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

September 7, 1991

*Mr. James Leonard
Washington Council on Nonproliferation
1601 Connecticut Avenue, NE, #303
Washington, DC 20009*

Dear Mr. Leonard:

During the last several months I have been working on some ideas about what kind of strategic arms reduction to seek beyond the START agreement. The failed coup in the Soviet Union has made this task more urgent and has also opened an opportunity to move rapidly to achieve total strategic disarmament.

With that in mind I have drafted the enclosed proposal for a two phase process for mutual action by the United States and the Union of Sovereign States:

- I. Immediate deactivation of all strategic delivery systems.*
- II. Staged dismantlement of all warheads and delivery vehicles.*

I am sharing it with you at the suggestion of John Parachini, who tells me that you are giving consideration to ideas on a "zero option" for strategic nuclear weapons. I would be interested in your ideas and also would welcome a critique of mine, including suggestions for refinement and analysis of pitfalls.

I am also circulating this proposal to a number of U.S. peace and arms control organizations. My hope is that we can achieve a consensus for a bold approach that responds to the opportunity offered by the remarkable change

that has occurred in the former Soviet Union, now the Union of Sovereign States. Then I suggest that we offer our ideas to members of Congress and seek their support. Simultaneously organizations with contacts in the Union of Sovereign States could share our approach with citizen organizations and parliamentarians there and seek their endorsement.

With bilateral citizen-parliamentarian endorsement lined up, we could propose some bold steps to top U.S. officials and leaders of the Union of Sovereign States and the major member republics. We could even make some informal soundings earlier.

If you want to get in touch with me, I can be reached by phone at (301) 897-3668 in Bethesda.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

September 9, 1991

*Dr. Frank von Hippel
Woodrow Wilson School
Center for Energy & Environmental Studies
Princeton, NY 08544*

Dear Dr. von Hippel:

During the last several months I have been working on some ideas about what kind of strategic arms reduction to seek beyond the START agreement. The failed coup in the Soviet Union has made this task more urgent and has also opened an opportunity to move rapidly to achieve total strategic disarmament.

With that in mind I have drafted the enclosed proposal for a two phase process for mutual action by the United States and the Union of Sovereign States:

- I. Immediate deactivation of all strategic delivery systems.*
- II. Staged dismantlement of all warheads and delivery vehicles.*

I am sharing it with you at the suggestion of Aaron Tovish of Parliamentarians Global Action. I would be interested in your reaction to this idea, your analysis of possible pitfalls and unanswered questions, and any suggestions you might have for refinement.

I am now circulating this proposal to a number of U.S. peace and arms control organizations. My hope is that we can achieve a consensus for a bold approach that responds to the opportunity offered by the remarkable change that has occurred in the former Soviet Union, now the Union of Sovereign

States. Then I suggest that we offer our ideas to members of Congress and seek their support. Simultaneously organizations with contacts in the Union of Sovereign States could share our approach with citizen organizations and parliamentarians there and seek their endorsement.

With bilateral citizen-parliamentarian endorsement lined up, we could propose some bold steps to top U.S. officials and leaders of the Union of Sovereign States and the major member republics. We could even make some informal soundings earlier.

If you want to get in touch with me, I can be reached by phone at (301) 897-3668 in Bethesda.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

September 9, 1991

Dr. Ted Taylor

P.O. Box 39

3833 Weatherby Road

West Clarkesville, NY 14786

Dear Dr. Taylor:

During the last several months I have been working on some ideas about what kind of strategic arms reduction to seek beyond the START agreement. The failed coup in the Soviet Union has made this task more urgent and has also opened an opportunity to move rapidly to achieve total strategic disarmament.

With that in mind I have drafted the enclosed proposal for a two phase process for mutual action by the United States and the Union of Sovereign States:

- I. Immediate deactivation of all strategic delivery systems.*
- II. Staged dismantlement of all warheads and delivery vehicles.*

I am sharing it with you at the suggestion of Aaron Tovish of Parliamentarians Global Action. I would be interested in your reaction to this idea, your analysis of possible pitfalls and unanswered questions, and any suggestions you might have for refinement.

I am now circulating this proposal to a number of U.S. peace and arms control organizations. My hope is that we can achieve a consensus for a bold approach that responds to the opportunity offered by the remarkable change that has occurred in the former Soviet Union, now the Union of Sovereign

States. Then I suggest that we offer our ideas to members of Congress and seek their support. Simultaneously organizations with contacts in the Union of Sovereign States could share our approach with citizen organizations and parliamentarians there and seek their endorsement.

With bilateral citizen-parliamentarian endorsement lined up, we could propose some bold steps to top U.S. officials and leaders of the Union of Sovereign States and the major member republics. We could even make some informal soundings earlier.

If you want to get in touch with me, I can be reached by phone at (301) 897-3668 in Bethesda.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

September 9, 1991

*Dr. Steve Fetter
Center for International Security Studies
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20740*

Dear Dr. Fetter:

During the last several months I have been working on some ideas about what kind of strategic arms reduction to seek beyond the START agreement. The failed coup in the Soviet Union has made this task more urgent and has also opened an opportunity to move rapidly to achieve total strategic disarmament.

With that in mind I have drafted the enclosed proposal for a two phase process for mutual action by the United States and the Union of Sovereign States:

- I. Immediate deactivation of all strategic delivery systems.*
- II. Staged dismantlement of all warheads and delivery vehicles.*

I am sharing it with you at the suggestion of Aaron Tovish of Parliamentarians Global Action. I would be interested in your reaction to this idea, your analysis of possible pitfalls and unanswered questions, and any suggestions you might have for refinement.

I am now circulating this proposal to a number of U.S. peace and arms control organizations. My hope is that we can achieve a consensus for a bold approach that responds to the opportunity offered by the remarkable change that has occurred in the former Soviet Union, now the Union of Sovereign

States. Then I suggest that we offer our ideas to members of Congress and seek their support. Simultaneously organizations with contacts in the Union of Sovereign States could share our approach with citizen organizations and parliamentarians there and seek their endorsement.

With bilateral citizen-parliamentarian endorsement lined up, we could propose some bold steps to top U.S. officials and leaders of the Union of Sovereign States and the major member republics. We could even make some informal soundings earlier.

If you want to get in touch with me, I can be reached by phone at (301) 897-3668 in Bethesda.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

September 30, 1991

Dear Colleagues:

I was working on a second draft of a "zero option" proposal on global nuclear disarmament as President Bush announced his initiative for nuclear arms reduction. I have written the attached draft to reflect these initiatives.

For the first time the United States is taking significant unilateral initiatives to reduce nuclear weapons, especially tactical weapons. This deserves support. Taking strategic bombers and Minuteman II ICBMS off alert is also a worthy step. It is a beginning of deactivation of the nuclear arsenal, as my earlier draft called for.

As important as these initiatives are, they do not go far enough. The draft for the zero option indicates what else should be done.

There will be a meeting at 3:00 p.m., Thursday, October 3, 1991 at the Center for Defense Information, 1500 Massachusetts, NW in Washington, D.C. to discuss this draft and related ideas that other people have on seeking global nuclear disarmament. You are invited to participate.

If you cannot come but want to share your comments, please call me at (301) 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman

Executive Director

October 24, 1991

*Mr. Paul Walker
Institute for Peace and
International Studies
91 Harvey Street
Cambridge, MA 02140*

Dear Paul:

As a further step in advancing the "zero option" idea, our Board of Directors has adopted and is releasing the enclosed statement. The statement rejects nuclear deterrence, and it calls for reducing tactical and strategic nuclear weapons to zero globally, halting all further testing and production, achieving universal nonproliferation, and disbanding efforts of strategic defense. A major innovation is a recommendation for immediate deactivation of the entire strategic arsenal of the United States, the Union of Sovereign States (U.S.S.), and other possessors, followed by staged dismantlement of all strategic warheads and delivery vehicles. All tactical nuclear weapons would also be dismantled.

We are releasing this statement to the news media. We will make it available to citizen organizations in the United States, members of Congress, and the Bush administration. We will also seek to reach citizens, parliamentarians, and top executive officials in U.S.S. and the major republics. We would appreciate your suggestions for such contacts and for any other assistance you can provide in disseminating these ideas.

Since talking with you the other day, I have further developed the idea of producing a book on the "zero option" for global nuclear disarmament.

Enclosed is a tentative chapter outline and synopsis, suggesting 16 chapters, each to be written by a different author. As you suggested the next task after settling the outline is to line up authors who would be willing to write the chapters. If we can obtain funding, we would offer to pay \$500 for each chapter and expect a product in three months. As soon as we have tentative authors for most of the chapters, we will approach possible funding sources and publishers. We will need a commitment from authors, funder, and publisher before we go ahead.

I would appreciate your critique of this outline: strengths, weaknesses, omissions, and your suggestions for authors, a publisher, a funding source? One of my Board suggested that it would be useful to have a well-known person to write the introduction, for this would help with marketing the book and therefore in getting a publisher. I would welcome your ideas on such a person. You can reach me at (301) 897-3668.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

October 24, 1991

Professor Alan Geyer
Wesley Theological Seminary
4500 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20016

Dear Alan:

I want to share with you a statement on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option", as adopted by our Board of Directors on October 18. Following the lead of the United Methodist bishops, the statement rejects nuclear deterrence, and it calls for reducing tactical and strategic nuclear weapons to zero globally, halting all further testing and production, achieving universal nonproliferation, and disbanding efforts of strategic defense. A major innovation is a recommendation for immediate deactivation of the entire strategic arsenal of the United States, the Union of Sovereign States (U.S.S.), and other possessors, followed by staged dismantlement of all strategic warheads and delivery vehicles. All tactical nuclear weapons would also be dismantled.

We are releasing this statement to the news media. We will make it available to citizen organizations in the United States, members of Congress, and the Bush administration. We will also seek to reach citizens, parliamentarians, and top executive officials in U.S.S. and the major republics. We would appreciate your suggestions for such contacts.

To further advance the zero option, I have developed the enclosed outline of a book, suggesting 16 chapters, each to be written by a different authors. I would appreciate your critique of this outline: strengths, weaknesses, omissions. After settling the outline, we want to line up authors who would

be willing to write the chapters. If we can obtain funding, we would offer to pay \$500 for each chapter and expect a product in three months. As soon as we have tentative authors for most of the chapters, we will approach possible funding sources and publishers. We will need a commitment from authors, funder, and publisher before we go ahead.

Would you be willing to write the chapter on "Religious and Moral Objections" if we put these pieces together? Do you have suggestions for other authors, a publisher, a funding source? It would be useful to have a well-known person to write the introduction, for this would help with marketing the book and therefore in getting a publisher. One suggestion is Carl Sagan, whom I believe you know. What would be your idea? You can reach me at (301) 897-3668.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

October 24, 1991

Mr. Aaron Tovish
Parliamentarians for Global Action
211 E. 43rd Street, #1604
New York, NY 10017

Dear Aaron:

As a further step in advancing the "zero option" idea, our Board of Directors has adopted and is releasing the enclosed statement. The statement rejects nuclear deterrence, and it calls for reducing tactical and strategic nuclear weapons to zero globally, halting all further testing and production, achieving universal nonproliferation, and disbanding efforts of strategic defense. A major innovation is a recommendation for immediate deactivation of the entire strategic arsenal of the United States, the Union of Sovereign States (U.S.S.), and other possessors, followed by staged dismantlement of all strategic warheads and delivery vehicles. All tactical nuclear weapons would also be dismantled.

Following up our earlier conversations, I hope that your executive committee will consider and endorse the idea of immediate deactivation. Some other peace organizations seem to be supportive.

As soon as we get a printed version, we will release this statement to the news media and make it available to citizen organizations in the United States, members of Congress, and the Bush administration. We also want to reach citizens, parliamentarians, and top executive officials in U.S.S. and the major republics. We would appreciate your suggestions for doing this and any assistance you can provide in disseminating these ideas.

To further develop the zero option idea, I have developed the enclosed outline of a book, suggesting 16 chapters, each to be written by a different author. After settling the outline, we want to line up authors who would be willing to write the chapters. If we can obtain funding, we would offer to pay \$500 for each chapter and expect a product in three months. As soon as we have tentative authors for most of the chapters, we will approach possible funding sources and publishers. We will need a commitment from authors, funder, and publisher before we go ahead.

I would appreciate your critique of this outline: strengths, weaknesses, omissions, and your suggestions for authors, a publisher, a funding source? One of my Board suggested that it would be useful to have a well-known person to write the introduction, for this would help with marketing the book and therefore in getting a publisher. To offer your ideas, you can reach me at (301) 897-3668.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

October 24, 1991

Dr. Arthur Waskow
Shalom Center
7319 Germantown Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19119

Dear Arthur:

As a further step in advancing the "zero option" idea, our Board of Directors has adopted and is releasing the enclosed statement. The statement rejects nuclear deterrence, and it calls for reducing tactical and strategic nuclear weapons to zero globally, halting all further testing and production, achieving universal nonproliferation, and disbanding efforts of strategic defense. A major innovation is a recommendation for immediate deactivation of the entire strategic arsenal of the United States, the Union of Sovereign States (U.S.S.), and other possessors, followed by staged dismantlement of all strategic warheads and delivery vehicles. All tactical nuclear weapons would also be dismantled.

As soon as we get a printed version, we will release this statement to the news media and make it available to citizen organizations in the United States, members of Congress, and the Bush administration. We want to work closely with organizations such as the Shalom Center who share our goals so that we can mobilize public support for a significant response to current opportunities. We also want to reach citizens, parliamentarians, and top executive officials in U.S.S. and the major republics.

To further develop the zero option idea, I have developed the enclosed outline of a book, suggesting 16 chapters, each to be written by a different author. After settling the outline, we want to line up authors who would be willing to

write the chapters. If we can obtain funding, we would offer to pay \$500 for each chapter and expect a product in three months. As soon as we have tentative authors for most of the chapters, we will approach possible funding sources and publishers. We will need a commitment from authors, funder, and publisher before we go ahead.

I would appreciate your critique of this outline: strengths, weaknesses, omissions, and your suggestions for authors, a publisher, a funding source. One of my board members suggested that it would be useful to have a well-known person to write the introduction, for this would help with marketing the book and therefore in getting a publisher. To offer your ideas, you can reach me at (301) 897-3668.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

October 25, 1991

Mr. Michael Christ
IPPNW
126 Rogers Street
Cambridge, MA 02142

Dear Michael:

As a further step in advancing the "zero option" idea, our Board of Directors has adopted the enclosed statement. We reject nuclear deterrence and call for reducing tactical and strategic nuclear weapons to zero globally, halting all further testing and production, achieving universal nonproliferation, and disbanding efforts of strategic defense. One of the key recommendations is a proposal for immediate deactivation of the entire strategic arsenal of the United States, the Union of Sovereign States (U.S.S.), and other possessors, followed by staged dismantlement of all strategic warheads and delivery vehicles. All tactical nuclear weapons would also be dismantled.

Is there any possibility that IPPNW would endorse the idea of immediate deactivation of the strategic arsenal, which is the principal innovative idea in our statement? Some other peace organizations seem to be supportive of this concept.

As soon as we get a printed version, we will release this statement to the news media and make it available to citizen organizations in the United States, members of Congress, and the Bush administration. We also want to reach citizens, parliamentarians, and top executive officials in U.S.S. and the major republics. We would appreciate your suggestions for doing this and any assistance you can provide in disseminating these ideas.

To further develop the zero option idea, I have developed the enclosed outline of a book, suggesting 16 chapters, each to be written by a different author. After settling the outline, we want to line up authors who would be willing to write the chapters. If we can obtain funding, we would offer to pay \$500 for each chapter and expect a product in three months. As soon as we have tentative authors for most of the chapters, we will approach possible funding sources and publishers. We will need a commitment from authors, funder, and publisher before we go ahead.

I would appreciate your critique of this outline: strengths, weaknesses, omissions, and your suggestions for authors, a publisher, a funding source? We would like to have a well-known person to write the introduction, for this would help with marketing the book. To offer your ideas, you can reach me at (301) 897-3668.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

November 2, 1991

The Honorable George Bush
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

As an organization long concerned with the need to reduce the world's nuclear arsenal, we are pleased with your initiative of September 21 to withdraw and dismantle tactical nuclear weapons and take a portion of the U.S. strategic arsenal off alert. We are pleased that President Gorbachev has taken reciprocal initiatives.

Recently our Board of Directors reviewed these measures and concluded that they constitute a good beginning. Our Board believes that now is the time to take even more dramatic steps. Accordingly, the Board adopted the attached statement advocating global nuclear disarmament and recommending that all possessors of nuclear weapons exercise the zero option with these objectives:

- Strategic nuclear weapons: zero
- Tactical nuclear weapons: zero
- Testing and production: zero
- Nonproliferation: universal
- Strategic defense: unnecessary

One of our principal recommendations is immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles,

and taking off their warheads, and

- *Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.*

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles.

We specifically recommend that Great Britain, France, and China join in the deactivation and dismantlement of nuclear weapons. We call for all nations to cease testing and producing new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles and for a rigorous nonproliferation regime. With this accomplished strategic defense would be unnecessary.

We believe that these recommendations are achievable because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. Therefore, we present the zero option for your careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 2, 1991

The Honorable James A. Baker
Department of State
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Mr. Secretary:

As an organization long concerned with the need to reduce the world's nuclear arsenal, we are pleased with President Bush's initiative of September 21 to withdraw and dismantle tactical nuclear weapons and take a portion of the U.S. strategic arsenal off alert. We are pleased that President Gorbachev has taken reciprocal initiatives.

Recently our Board of Directors reviewed these measures and concluded that they constitute a good beginning. Our Board believes that now is the time to take even more dramatic steps. Accordingly, the Board adopted the attached statement recommending that all possessors of nuclear weapons exercise the zero option with these objectives:

- Strategic nuclear weapons: zero
- Tactical nuclear weapons: zero
- Testing and production: zero
- Nonproliferation: universal
- Strategic defense: unnecessary

One of our principal recommendations is immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and

- *Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.*

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles.

We specifically recommend that Great Britain, France, and China join in the deactivation and dismantlement of nuclear weapons. We call for all nations to cease testing and producing new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles and for a rigorous nonproliferation regime. With this accomplished strategic defense would be unnecessary.

We believe that these recommendations are achievable because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. Therefore, we would like an opportunity to meet with a member of your staff to discuss the zero option in more detail.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 2, 1991

The Honorable Brent Scowcroft
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear General Scowcroft:

As an organization long concerned with the need to reduce the world's nuclear arsenal, we are pleased with President Bush's initiative of September 21 to withdraw and dismantle tactical nuclear weapons and take a portion of the U.S. strategic arsenal off alert. We are pleased that President Gorbachev has taken reciprocal initiatives.

Recently our Board of Directors reviewed these measures and concluded that they constitute a good beginning. Our Board believes that now is the time to take even more dramatic steps. Accordingly, the Board adopted the attached statement recommending that all possessors of nuclear weapons exercise the zero option with these objectives:

- Strategic nuclear weapons: zero
- Tactical nuclear weapons: zero
- Testing and production: zero
- Nonproliferation: universal
- Strategic defense: unnecessary

One of our principal recommendations is immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and

- *Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.*

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles.

We specifically recommend that Great Britain, France, and China join in the deactivation and dismantlement of nuclear weapons. We call for all nations to cease testing and producing new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles and for a rigorous nonproliferation regime. With this accomplished strategic defense would be unnecessary.

We believe that these recommendations are achievable because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. Therefore, we would like an opportunity to meet with a member of your staff to discuss the zero option in more detail.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 5, 1991

President Mikhail Gorbachev
The Kremlin
Moscow, USSR

Dear Mr. President:

We are an organization long concerned with the need to reduce the world's nuclear arsenal. Therefore, we are pleased with the initiatives which you and President Bush have taken to withdraw and dismantle tactical nuclear weapons and take a portion of the strategic arsenal off alert. They are sound steps on the road away from nuclear confrontation.

We believe that now is the time to take even more dramatic steps. Accordingly, our Board of Directors has adopted the attached statement advocating global nuclear disarmament and recommending that all possessors of nuclear weapons exercise the zero option with these objectives:

- Strategic nuclear weapons: zero
- Tactical nuclear weapons: zero
- Testing and production: zero
- Nonproliferation: universal
- Strategic defense: unnecessary

One of our principal recommendations is immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and
- Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the

ground, and removing their warheads.

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles.

We recommend that Great Britain, France, and China join in the deactivation and dismantlement of nuclear weapons. We call for all nations to cease testing and producing new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles and for a rigorous nonproliferation regime. With this accomplished strategic defense would be unnecessary.

We believe that these recommendations are achievable because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. Therefore, we present the zero option for your careful consideration. We would be very interested in what you think of our ideas.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 5, 1991

President Boris Yeltsin
The Russian Federation
Moscow, USSR

Dear Mr. President:

We are an organization long concerned with the need to reduce the world's nuclear arsenal. Therefore, we are pleased with the initiatives which President Bush and President Gorbachev have taken to withdraw and dismantle tactical nuclear weapons and take a portion of the strategic arsenal off alert. They are sound steps on the road away from nuclear confrontation.

We believe that now is the time to take even more dramatic steps. Accordingly, our Board of Directors has adopted the attached statement advocating global nuclear disarmament and recommending that all possessors of nuclear weapons exercise the zero option with these objectives:

- Strategic nuclear weapons: zero
- Tactical nuclear weapons: zero
- Testing and production: zero
- Nonproliferation: universal
- Strategic defense: unnecessary

One of our principal recommendations is immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and

- *Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.*

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles.

We recommend that Great Britain, France, and China join in the deactivation and dismantlement of nuclear weapons. We call for all nations to cease testing and producing new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles and for a rigorous nonproliferation regime. With this accomplished strategic defense would be unnecessary.

We believe that these recommendations are achievable because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. Therefore, we present the zero option for your careful consideration. We would be very interested in what you think of our ideas.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 5, 1991

President Nursultan Nazarbayev
The Republic of Kazakhstan
Alma-Ata, Kazakhstan, USSR

Dear Mr. President:

We are an organization long concerned with the need to reduce the world's nuclear arsenal. Therefore, we are pleased with the initiatives which President Bush and President Gorbachev have taken to withdraw and dismantle tactical nuclear weapons and take a portion of the strategic arsenal off alert. They are sound steps on the road away from nuclear confrontation.

We believe that now is the time to take even more dramatic steps. Accordingly, our Board of Directors has adopted the attached statement advocating global nuclear disarmament and recommending that all possessors of nuclear weapons exercise the zero option with these objectives:

- Strategic nuclear weapons: zero
- Tactical nuclear weapons: zero
- Testing and production: zero
- Nonproliferation: universal
- Strategic defense: unnecessary

One of our principal recommendations is immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and

- *Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.*

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles.

We recommend that Great Britain, France, and China join in the deactivation and dismantlement of nuclear weapons. We call for all nations to cease testing and producing new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles and for a rigorous nonproliferation regime. With this accomplished strategic defense would be unnecessary.

We believe that these recommendations are achievable because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. Therefore, we present the zero option for your careful consideration. We would be very interested in what you think of our ideas.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 5, 1991

President Leonid Kravchuk
Republic of Ukraine
Kiev, The Ukraine Republic

Dear Mr. President:

We are an organization long concerned with the need to reduce the world's nuclear arsenal. Therefore, we are pleased with the initiatives which President Bush and President Gorbachev have taken to withdraw and dismantle tactical nuclear weapons and take a portion of the strategic arsenal off alert. They are sound steps on the road away from nuclear confrontation.

We believe that now is the time to take even more dramatic steps. Accordingly, our Board of Directors has adopted the attached statement advocating global nuclear disarmament and recommending that all possessors of nuclear weapons exercise the zero option with these objectives:

- Strategic nuclear weapons: zero
- Tactical nuclear weapons: zero
- Testing and production: zero
- Nonproliferation: universal
- Strategic defense: unnecessary

One of our principal recommendations is immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and

- *Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.*

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles.

We recommend that Great Britain, France, and China join in the deactivation and dismantlement of nuclear weapons. We call for all nations to cease testing and producing new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles and for a rigorous nonproliferation regime. With this accomplished strategic defense would be unnecessary.

We believe that these recommendations are achievable because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. Therefore, we present the zero option for your careful consideration. We would be very interested in what you think of our ideas.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 7, 1991

Mr. Stephen S. Rosenfeld
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Mr. Rosenfeld:

I was very interested in your October 4 op-ed piece on "Scrap 'em All?" because at the time we were developing a statement on the zero option. Since then our Board of Directors has met and adopted the enclosed statement, "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option. Now Is the Time!"

We propose the following objectives:

- Strategic nuclear weapons: zero
- Tactical nuclear weapons: zero
- Testing and production: zero
- Nonproliferation: universal
- Strategic defense: unnecessary

To move rapidly in this direction we recommend immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and
- Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles. In this manner we could quickly eliminate the threat of nuclear attack. Then over a period of time the

strategic arsenal could be totally dismantled in an agreed sequence that is balanced so that at no stage could any nation gain an advantage.

This approach both answers affirmatively your question of why not go all the way to zero and also provides a way to do so. In our view it is a superior approach to stopping at "minimal deterrence" with 1,000 or so strategic warheads as some are now proposing.

The problem with minimal deterrence is that there are no legitimate targets for U.S. missiles in the Soviet Union, and vice versa. If the United States targets Soviet strategic missiles, this is preparation for a first strike, a tactic that is clearly wrong. So, do we target the command and control center in Moscow where Russian President Boris Yeltsin is leading a strong effort to achieve a free-market economy? Do we target St. Petersburg (sister city of Los Angeles) where the mayor is leading a movement of democratic reform? Do we target Minsk (sister city of Detroit), the capital of the independent Republic of Byelorussia, or the port of Odessa (sister city of Baltimore) in the independent Republic of Ukraine? Do we target airfields where U.S. military planes may soon be landing with food supplies? And an analogous set of questions can be asked about strategic targets in the United States for Soviet missiles.

Mr. Stephen S. Rosenfeld

November 7, 1991

Page two.

We would be pleased if you would discuss our ideas in a follow-up piece to "Scrap 'em All?" I would welcome an opportunity to talk with you more about our approach, either by telephone or in person, such as at lunch. Or if you would want me to write an op-ed piece to present our ideas for the zero option, I would be glad to do so. You can reach me at (301) 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

November 7, 1991

Mr. David Evans
Chicago Tribune
1615 L Street, NW, #300
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Mr. Evans:

Here is our statement on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option. Now Is the Time!" and a news release that indicates the highlights.

In the current debate we note that others are advocating "minimal deterrence" with 1,000 or so strategic warheads on each side. The problem with minimal deterrence is that there are no legitimate targets for U.S. missiles in the Soviet Union, and vice versa.

If the United States targets Soviet strategic missiles, this is preparation for a first strike, a tactic that is clearly wrong. So, do we target the command and control center in Moscow where Russian President Boris Yeltsin is leading a strong effort to achieve a free-market economy? Do we target St. Petersburg (sister city of Los Angeles) where the mayor is leading a movement of democratic reform? Do we target Minsk (sister city of Detroit), the capital of the independent Republic of Byelorussia, or the port of Odessa (sister city of Baltimore) in the independent Republic of Ukraine? Do we target airfields where U.S. military planes may soon be landing with food supplies? And an analogous set of questions can be asked about strategic targets in the United States for Soviet missiles.

Therefore, we are convinced that the zero option is superior both for moral

and practical reasons.

If you would like to discuss our ideas in greater depth, please call me at (301) 897-3668. Or perhaps we could talk in person, such as at lunch some day.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 7, 1991

Mr. Paul Nielsen
MacNeil/Lehrer News Hour
3620 S. 27th Street
Arlington, VA 22206

Dear Mr. Nielsen:

Here is our statement on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option. Now Is the Time!" that I mentioned on the phone, and a news release.

Our perception is that views on nuclear arms reduction these days tend to fall into three categories: (1) the conservative view to go slow, achieve some reductions, but keep on modernization, as epitomized by the Bush administration; (2) advocacy of minimal deterrence, such as by Robert McNamara, getting down to 1,000 or so strategic warheads on each side; and (3) the zero option. Discussion of the issue, therefore, should properly have all three positions represented.

Our quarrel with the Bush administration is that we now have a window of opportunity to move rapidly to rid the world of the scourge of nuclear weapons. Our disagreement with minimal deterrence advocates is that there are no legitimate targets for U.S. missiles in the Soviet Union, and vice versa.

Thus, if the United States targets Soviet strategic missiles, this is preparation for a first strike, a tactic that is clearly wrong. So, do we target the command and control center in Moscow where Russian President Boris Yeltsin is leading a strong effort to achieve a free-market economy? Do we

target St. Petersburg (sister city of Los Angeles) where the mayor is leading a movement of democratic reform? Do we target Minsk (sister city of Detroit), the capital of the independent Republic of Byelorussia, or the port of Odessa (sister city of Baltimore) in the independent Republic of Ukraine? Do we target airfields where U.S. military planes may soon be landing with food supplies? And an analogous set of questions can be asked about strategic targets in the United States for Soviet missiles.

Therefore, we are convinced that the zero option is superior both for moral and practical reasons.

If there is an opportunity to have our viewpoint represented in News Hour discussion, I am available to serve as spokesperson. As the enclosed vita suggests, I am a self-educated citizen advocate in this field and have concentrated on nuclear disarmament issues for the past eight years. You can reach me at (301) 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

November 7, 1991

Mr. Thomas J. Tozer
NEWSCOPE
P.O. Box 801
Nashville, TN 37202

Dear Tom:

Here is the statement of our Board of Directors on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option. Now Is the Time!", which I mentioned on the phone, and a news release indicating the highlights.

We would greatly appreciate your mentioning this statement in NEWSCOPE. Any reader wanting a free copy may write to us at 421 Seward Square, SE, Washington, DC 20003.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

November 7, 1991

Mr. Peter L. Kelley
National Security News Service
1701 K Street, NW, #901
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Peter:

Thanks for the leads you gave me on contacts for our statement on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option". Several of them were fruitful.

Here is the statement and a news release with highlights. If you have any further ideas for contacts, please call me at (301) 897-3668.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

November 21, 1991

General John A. Gordon
National Security Council
Room 386, Old Executive Office Building
Washington, DC 20506

Dear General Gordon:

I would like to share with you a letter and an enclosure we sent to General Scowcroft on November 2. We request an appointment to discuss with you the ideas contained in the statement on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option" as adopted by our Board of Directors. We would especially emphasize the idea of immediate deactivation of the global strategic arsenal. This step should involve the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, and China. It builds upon President Bush's September 21 initiative and President Gorbachev's October 5 reciprocal response but goes much farther and much faster.

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles. Our Board hasn't projected a detailed schedule, but dismantlement might begin with the weapons specified in the START agreement, except accomplished in 7 weeks or at most 7 months rather than 7 years. Then the remaining US/Soviet arsenal could be cut in half within another year or so. This could be followed by reduction to a level that some advocate as "minimal deterrence", such as 300, 500, or 1,000 warheads on each side. The final stage would go the rest of the way to zero, eliminating all strategic weapons of all possessors.

This two-phase arrangement would, through immediate deactivation, quickly

eliminate the threat of surprise or accidental strategic nuclear attack. This would be very stabilizing. Then over a period of time the strategic arsenal would be totally dismantled in an agreed sequence that is balanced so that at no stage could any nation gain an advantage or feel threatened.

With the Cold War over and the Soviet Union coming apart, we argue that total deactivation of the global strategic arsenal is now appropriate, even from the standpoint of minimal deterrence advocates, because there are no legitimate targets for U.S. missiles in the Soviet Union, and vice versa.

These are some of the ideas we would like to discuss with you in greater depth. Therefore, we would like to talk with you in person some time in early December. I can be reached by phone at (301) 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 21, 1991

The Honorable Eduard Shevardnadze
Office of Foreign Ministry
The Kremlin
Moscow, USSR

Dear Mr. Shevardnadze:

We are pleased that you have returned to office as foreign minister of the Soviet Union. You gave creative leadership during your previous service, and we look forward to your further contributions to the cause of world peace.

As you once again deal with the issue of what to do with nuclear weapons, we would like to share with you a statement on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option", as adopted by our Board of Directors. We advocate total, global nuclear disarmament and recommend that all possessors of nuclear weapons exercise the zero option with these objectives:

- Strategic nuclear weapons: zero
- Tactical nuclear weapons: zero
- Testing and production: zero
- Nonproliferation: universal
- Strategic defense: unnecessary

One of our principal recommendations is immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and
- Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the

ground, and removing their warheads.

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles.

We recommend that Great Britain, France, and China join the United States and the Soviet Union in the deactivation and dismantlement of all nuclear weapons. We call for all nations to cease testing and producing new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles and for a rigorous nonproliferation regime. With this accomplished strategic defense would be unnecessary.

We would be very interested in what you think of our ideas.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 22, 1991

The Honorable Sam Nunn
303 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Nunn:

We are pleased with your initiative to provide Pentagon funds to help the Soviet Union dismantle its nuclear arsenal and with your parallel initiative to provide aid for relief of human distress within the various republics of the disintegrating Soviet Union. We fully support both measures.

We would like to call your attention to a proposal from our Board of Directors which fits into your efforts. It is a call for the **immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal**. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and
- Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.

This action should commence with the United States and the Soviet Union and then bring in Great Britain, France, and China. It builds upon President Bush's September 21 initiative and President Gorbachev's October 5 reciprocal response but goes much farther and much faster.

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles. This two-phase approach would be very stabilizing. Immediate deactivation would quickly eliminate the threat of surprise or accidental strategic nuclear attack. Then over a period of time

the strategic arsenal would be totally dismantled in a carefully balanced sequence.

Immediate deactivation provides a solution to the question: what are now the targets for strategic missiles in the name of nuclear deterrence? Does the United States target the airfields and ports where U.S. planes and ship may be soon be arriving with food supplies? Do we target the command and control center in Moscow where Russian President Boris Yeltsin is leading a strong effort to achieve a free-market economy? Or St. Petersburg where the mayor is leading a movement of democratic reform? Or the capitals of the various independent republics? Through deactivation there would be no specific targets, but a supply of missiles would be held in reserve until mutual dismantlement can occur.

We would like to talk with you directly about these ideas and will call your office to request an appointment.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 22, 1991

The Honorable Richard G. Lugar
306 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Lugar:

We are pleased with your initiative to provide Pentagon funds to help the Soviet Union dismantle its nuclear arsenal and with your support for provision of aid to relieve human distress within the various republics of the disintegrating Soviet Union. We fully support both measures.

We would like to call your attention to a proposal from our Board of Directors which fits into your efforts. It is a call for the **immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal**. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and
- Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.

This action should commence with the United States and the Soviet Union and then bring in Great Britain, France, and China. It builds upon President Bush's September 21 initiative and President Gorbachev's October 5 reciprocal response but goes much farther and much faster.

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles. This two-phase approach would be very stabilizing. Immediate deactivation would quickly eliminate the threat of surprise or accidental strategic nuclear attack. Then over a period of time

the strategic arsenal would be totally dismantled in a carefully balanced sequence.

Immediate deactivation provides a solution to the question: what are now the targets for strategic missiles in the name of nuclear deterrence? Does the United States target the airfields and ports where U.S. planes and ship may be soon be arriving with food supplies? Do we target the command and control center in Moscow where Russian President Boris Yeltsin is leading a strong effort to achieve a free-market economy? Or St. Petersburg where the mayor is leading a movement of democratic reform? Or the capitals of the various independent republics? Through deactivation there would be no specific targets, but a supply of missiles would be held in reserve until mutual dismantlement can occur.

We would like to talk with you directly about these ideas and will call your office to request an appointment.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 22, 1991

Mr. Scott Williams
Office of Senator Nunn
303 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Williams:

Because you have been my contact in Senator Nunn's office in the past, I want to transmit my letter to him through you.

I'm wondering if you could help me arrange an appointment with Senator Nunn some time after Thanksgiving, if he is going to be in Washington. I will greatly appreciate your assistance. You can reach me by phone at (301) 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

November 22, 1991

Ms. Jodie Allen
Editor, Outlook
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Ms. Allen:

I am submitting for your consideration for use in Outlook an article entitled "If We're Feeding the Soviets, Why Do We Still Threaten to Nuke 'em?" In it I point out that presently the U.S. strategic arsenal has missiles aimed at airfields and ports where U.S. planes and ships will soon be arriving with food supplies. U.S. missiles are also targeted at Moscow where Boris Yeltsin is trying to install a free-market economy, at St. Petersburg where a reform-minded mayor is at work, and at capitals and ports in now independent republics. It just doesn't make sense.

As a remedy I propose the immediate deactivation of the U.S. and Soviet strategic arsenal. This would be accomplished by bringing all U.S. and Soviet strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, taking off their warheads; also opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground in plain sight, and removing their warheads. Great Britain, France, and China would need to do likewise. This would be followed by staged dismantlement of all delivery vehicles and warheads.

There's more to my proposal, as you can see. If you want an even longer article, I can provide more material.

If you decide that this article is unsuitable for Outlook, would it be possible for you to transfer it to the Op-ed editor for consideration? Otherwise, you can return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 27, 1991

Mr. Andrei Lebedev, First Secretary
Embassy of USSR
1125 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Mr. Lebedev:

I would like to share with you a statement on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option", as adopted by our Board of Directors. We advocate total, global nuclear disarmament and recommend that all possessors of nuclear weapons exercise the zero option with these objectives:

- Strategic nuclear weapons: zero
- Tactical nuclear weapons: zero
- Testing and production: zero
- Nonproliferation: universal
- Strategic defense: unnecessary

This builds upon the initiatives of President Bush and President Gorbachev to withdraw and dismantle tactical nuclear weapons and take a portion of the strategic arsenal off alert, but we would go much farther and must faster.

I want particularly to call your attention to our recommendations for immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and
- Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic

warheads and their delivery vehicles.

We recommend that Great Britain, France, and China join the United States and the Soviet Union in the deactivation and dismantlement of all nuclear weapons. We call for all nations to cease testing and producing new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles and for a rigorous nonproliferation regime. With this accomplished strategic defense would be unnecessary.

Some time in the near future I would like to have an opportunity to discuss these ideas with you in person. I shall call to request an appointment. Or if you want to reach me, please call (301) 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

November 27, 1991

Dr. Mihmaz Ispahani
National Democratic Institute
for International Affairs
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 605
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Dr. Ispahani:

I understand that some of Russian President Boris Yeltsin's staff will be in Washington in December at the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs. I realize that it is not your role to offer advice on foreign and military policy, but I am wondering if you would be willing to call their attention to a statement recently adopted by our Board of Directors on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option".

We recommend that all possessors of nuclear weapons exercise the zero option with these objectives:

- Strategic nuclear weapons: zero
- Tactical nuclear weapons: zero
- Testing and production: zero
- Nonproliferation: universal
- Strategic defense: unnecessary

One of our principal recommendations is the immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. This would be accomplished by

- Bringing all strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, and taking off their warheads, and

- *Opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground, and removing their warheads.*

Deactivation would be followed by a staged program to dismantle all strategic warheads and their delivery vehicles.

If these officials from the Russian Federation would like to talk to me about our proposals, I can be reached at (301) 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

December 5, 1991

General John A. Gordon
National Security Council
Room 386, Old Executive Office Building
Washington, DC 20506

Dear General Gordon:

For some reasons our communications to you never arrive, so we are trying again to reach you with our proposal for immediate deactivation of the global strategic nuclear arsenal. This would be followed by staged dismantlement.

As events unfold weekly, this idea makes more and more sense. The latest event is the vote for independence of Ukraine, the site of a sizable number of strategic nuclear missiles and thousands of tactical nuclear weapons. Neither the United States nor the various independent republics of the former Soviet Union have any self-interest in attacking the other. Rather self-interest lies in deactivation and dismantlement.

Immediate deactivation would provide a solution to the question: what are now the targets for U.S. strategic missiles in the name of nuclear deterrence? Does the United States target the airfields and ports where U.S. planes and ships may be soon be arriving with food supplies? Do we target the command and control center in Moscow where Russian President Boris Yeltsin is leading a strong effort to achieve a free-market economy? Or St. Petersburg where the mayor is leading a movement of democratic reform? Or the capitals of the various independent republics, such as Kiev and Minsk (sister city of Detroit), or the port of Odessa (sister city of Baltimore)? Through deactivation there would be no specific targets, but a supply of

missiles would be held in reserve until mutual dismantlement can occur.

I hope that we will be able to meet with you in the near future to discuss these ideas in greater detail.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

December 7, 1991

Op-Ed Editor
New York Times
229 W. 43rd Street
New York, NY 10036

Dear Friend:

I am submitting for your consideration an op-ed article entitled "If We're Feeding the Soviets, Why Do We Still Threaten to Nuke 'em?" In it I point out that presently the U.S. strategic arsenal has missiles aimed at airfields and ports where U.S. planes and ships will soon be arriving with food supplies. U.S. missiles are also targeted at Moscow where Boris Yeltsin is trying to install a free-market economy, at St. Petersburg where a reform-minded mayor is at work, and at capitals and ports in now independent republics. It just doesn't make sense.

As a remedy I propose the immediate deactivation of the U.S. and Soviet strategic arsenal. This would be accomplished by bringing all U.S. and Soviet strategic submarines into port, removing their missiles, taking off their warheads; also opening all ICBM silos, taking out the missiles, placing them on the ground in plain sight, and removing their warheads. Great Britain, France, and China would need to do likewise. This would be followed by staged dismantlement of all delivery vehicles and warheads.

There's more to my proposal, as you can see. It is based upon a statement adopted by the Board of Directors of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, as published in the enclosed issue of our bulletin, *Peace Leaf*.

*If you decide that this article is unsuitable for your use, please return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. You can keep the issue of *Peace Leaf*, or give it to one of your editorial writers for background information.*

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

December 10, 1991

The Honorable James A. Baker
Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Mr. Secretary:

What extraordinary events are occurring within the former Soviet Union! The latest move is the creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States by the three slavic republics with the possibilities of others joining. This seems to be a positive development, but a lot of uncertainty remains.

We are particularly concerned that the strategic nuclear arsenal is still in place. U.S. missiles remain actively targeted at sites throughout the independent states and republics, including those controlled by reformers. Meanwhile, Soviet missiles remain actively targeted at sites throughout the United States. But what happens if another coup occurs in what remains the Soviet government and military and these strategic missiles fall into the hands of irresponsible hardliners?

From the perspective of both the United States and the independent states and republics of the former Soviet Union, the wisest and most secure course would be to take the entire strategic arsenal completely out of service as quickly as possible. President Bush started in this direction with his September 21 initiative, and President Gorbachev moved in the same direction with his October 5 reciprocal response. Now is the time to go much farther and much faster.

Therefore, we propose the *immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe.* Already U.S. and Soviet strategic bombers are off alert. The next steps should be to:

- *Bring all strategic submarines into port, remove their missiles, and take off their warheads, and*
- *Open all ICBM silos, take out the missiles, place them on the ground, and remove their warheads.*

The lead should be taken the United States and the four former Soviet republics where strategic missiles are based, plus the remaining Soviet central command. Great Britain, France, and China should join in. As a safeguard there could be reciprocal observation teams, or international observers under United Nations auspices, to assure that missiles and delivery vehicles remain deactivated.

With the immediate threat of strategic nuclear attack eliminated, the nuclear possessor nations should then embark upon a carefully balanced program to dismantle all strategic delivery vehicles and their warheads. Dismantlement can begin with the weapons specified in the START agreement, except accomplished in 7 weeks or at most 7 months rather than 7 years. Then the remaining US/Soviet arsenal could be cut in half within

The Honorable James A. Baker

December 10, 1991

Page two.

another year or so. This could be followed by reduction to a level that some advocate as "minimal deterrence", such as 300, 500, or 1,000 warheads on each side. The next-to-last stage could keep a small number of strategic warheads, certainly 50 or less, as a precautionary measure for dealing with potential new nuclear-weapon states until a rigorous nonproliferation regime has proven its effectiveness. The final stage would go the rest of the way to zero, encompassing all of the strategic weapons of all possessors.

This two-phase approach would be very stabilizing. Immediate deactivation would quickly eliminate the threat of surprise, accidental, or diabolical strategic nuclear attack. Then over a period of time the strategic arsenal would be totally dismantled in a carefully balanced sequence.

We believe that these recommendations are achievable because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. We would be interested in knowing your views about our ideas.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman

Executive Director

December 10, 1991

The Honorable Robert Strauss
Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Ambassador Strauss:

What extraordinary events are occurring within the former Soviet Union! The latest move is the creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States by the three slavic republics with the possibilities of others joining. This seems to be a positive development, but a lot of uncertainty remains.

We are particularly concerned that the strategic nuclear arsenal is still in place. U.S. missiles remain actively targeted at sites throughout the independent states and republics, including those controlled by reformers. Meanwhile, Soviet missiles remain actively targeted at sites throughout the United States. But what happens if another coup occurs in what remains the Soviet government and military and these strategic missiles fall into the hands of irresponsible hardliners?

From the perspective of both the United States and the independent states and republics of the former Soviet Union, the wisest and most secure course would be to take the entire strategic arsenal completely out of service as quickly as possible. President Bush started in this direction with his September 21 initiative, and President Gorbachev moved in the same direction with his October 5 reciprocal response. Now is the time to go much farther and much faster.

Therefore, we propose the *immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe.* Already U.S. and Soviet strategic bombers are off alert. The next steps should be to:

- *Bring all strategic submarines into port, remove their missiles, and take off their warheads, and*
- *Open all ICBM silos, take out the missiles, place them on the ground, and remove their warheads.*

The lead should be taken the United States and the four former Soviet republics where strategic missiles are based, plus the remaining Soviet central command. Great Britain, France, and China should join in. As a safeguard there could be reciprocal observation teams, or international observers under United Nations auspices, to assure that missiles and delivery vehicles remain deactivated.

With the immediate threat of strategic nuclear attack eliminated, the nuclear possessor nations should then embark upon a carefully balanced program to dismantle all strategic delivery vehicles and their warheads. Dismantlement can begin with the weapons specified in the START agreement, except accomplished in 7 weeks or at most 7 months rather than 7

The Honorable Robert Strauss

December 10, 1991

Page two.

years. Then the remaining US/Soviet arsenal could be cut in half within another year or so. This could be followed by reduction to a level that some advocate as "minimal deterrence", such as 300, 500, or 1,000 warheads on each side. The next-to-last stage could keep a small number of strategic warheads, certainly 50 or less, as a precautionary measure for dealing with potential new nuclear-weapon states until a rigorous nonproliferation regime has proven its effectiveness. The final stage would go the rest of the way to zero, encompassing all of the strategic weapons of all possessors.

This two-phase approach would be very stabilizing. Immediate deactivation would quickly eliminate the threat of surprise, accidental, or diabolical strategic nuclear attack. Then over a period of time the strategic arsenal would be totally dismantled in a carefully balanced sequence.

We believe that these recommendations are achievable because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. We would be interested in knowing your views about our ideas.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

December 10, 1991

The Honorable Arnold Kanter
Under Secretary of State
Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Secretary Kanter:

What extraordinary events are occurring within the former Soviet Union! The latest move is the creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States by the three slavic republics with the possibilities of others joining. This seems to be a positive development, but a lot of uncertainty remains.

We are particularly concerned that the strategic nuclear arsenal is still in place. U.S. missiles remain actively targeted at sites throughout the independent states and republics, including those controlled by reformers. Meanwhile, Soviet missiles remain actively targeted at sites throughout the United States. But what happens if another coup occurs in what remains the Soviet government and military and these strategic missiles fall into the hands of irresponsible hardliners?

From the perspective of both the United States and the independent states and republics of the former Soviet Union, the wisest and most secure course would be to take the entire strategic arsenal completely out of service as quickly as possible. President Bush started in this direction with his September 21 initiative, and President Gorbachev moved in the same direction with his October 5 reciprocal response. Now is the time to go much farther and much faster.

Therefore, we propose the immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. Already U.S. and Soviet strategic bombers are off alert. The next steps should be to:

- Bring all strategic submarines into port, remove their missiles, and take off their warheads, and*
- Open all ICBM silos, take out the missiles, place them on the ground, and remove their warheads.*

The lead should be taken the United States and the four former Soviet republics where strategic missiles are based, plus the remaining Soviet central command. Great Britain, France, and China should join in. As a safeguard there could be reciprocal observation teams, or international observers under United Nations auspices, to assure that missiles and delivery vehicles remain deactivated.

With the immediate threat of strategic nuclear attack eliminated, the nuclear possessor nations should then embark upon a carefully balanced program to dismantle all strategic delivery vehicles and their warheads. Dismantlement can begin with the weapons specified in the START agree-

The Honorable Arnold Kanter

December 10, 1991

Page two.

ment, except accomplished in 7 weeks or at most 7 months rather than 7 years. Then the remaining US/Soviet arsenal could be cut in half within another year or so. This could be followed by reduction to a level that some advocate as "minimal deterrence", such as 300, 500, or 1,000 warheads on each side. The next-to-last stage could keep a small number of strategic warheads, certainly 50 or less, as a precautionary measure for dealing with potential new nuclear-weapon states until a rigorous nonproliferation regime has proven its effectiveness. The final stage would go the rest of the way to zero, encompassing all of the strategic weapons of all possessors.

This two-phase approach would be very stabilizing. Immediate deactivation would quickly eliminate the threat of surprise, accidental, or diabolical strategic nuclear attack. Then over a period of time the strategic arsenal would be totally dismantled in a carefully balanced sequence.

We believe that these recommendations are achievable because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. We request an opportunity to meet with you in order to present our ideas more fully and to hear your response. I can be reached at (301) 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

December 10, 1991

Mr. Dennis Ross
Director of Policy Planning
Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Mr. Ross:

What extraordinary events are occurring within the former Soviet Union! The latest move is the creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States by the three slavic republics with the possibilities of others joining. This seems to be a positive development, but a lot of uncertainty remains.

We are particularly concerned that the strategic nuclear arsenal is still in place. U.S. missiles remain actively targeted at sites throughout the independent states and republics, including those controlled by reformers. Meanwhile, Soviet missiles remain actively targeted at sites throughout the United States. But what happens if another coup occurs in what remains the Soviet government and military and these strategic missiles fall into the hands of irresponsible hardliners?

From the perspective of both the United States and the independent states and republics of the former Soviet Union, the wisest and most secure course would be to take the entire strategic arsenal completely out of service as quickly as possible. President Bush started in this direction with his September 21 initiative, and President Gorbachev moved in the same direction with his October 5 reciprocal response. Now is the time to go much farther and much faster.

Therefore, we propose the immediate and concurrent deactivation of the entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal throughout the globe. Already U.S. and Soviet strategic bombers are off alert. The next steps should be to:

- *Bring all strategic submarines into port, remove their missiles, and take off their warheads, and*
- *Open all ICBM silos, take out the missiles, place them on the ground, and remove their warheads.*

The lead should be taken the United States and the four former Soviet republics where strategic missiles are based, plus the remaining Soviet central command. Great Britain, France, and China should join in. As a safeguard there could be reciprocal observation teams, or international observers under United Nations auspices, to assure that missiles and delivery vehicles remain deactivated.

With the immediate threat of strategic nuclear attack eliminated, the nuclear possessor nations should then embark upon a carefully balanced program to dismantle all strategic delivery vehicles and their warheads. Dismantlement can begin with the weapons specified in the START agree-

Mr. Dennis Ross

December 10, 1991

Page two.

ment, except accomplished in 7 weeks or at most 7 months rather than 7 years. Then the remaining US/Soviet arsenal could be cut in half within another year or so. This could be followed by reduction to a level that some advocate as "minimal deterrence", such as 300, 500, or 1,000 warheads on each side. The next-to-last stage could keep a small number of strategic warheads, certainly 50 or less, as a precautionary measure for dealing with potential new nuclear-weapon states until a rigorous nonproliferation regime has proven its effectiveness. The final stage would go the rest of the way to zero, encompassing all of the strategic weapons of all possessors.

This two-phase approach would be very stabilizing. Immediate deactivation would quickly eliminate the threat of surprise, accidental, or diabolical strategic nuclear attack. Then over a period of time the strategic arsenal would be totally dismantled in a carefully balanced sequence.

We believe that these recommendations are achievable because the Cold War is over and no nation on Earth has any self-interest to attack another nation with nuclear weapons. We request an opportunity to meet with you in order to present our ideas more fully and to hear your response. I can be reached at (301) 897-3668

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director