

June 10, 1996

Ms. Melanne Verveer
Office of the First Lady
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Melanne:

Recently I visited Hiroshima, Japan. It was a very emotional experience. It was also a challenge to work even harder for nuclear abolition.

One product is the enclosed letter to President Clinton, urging him to make a public commitment to nuclear abolition and to embark up a series of actions that move in that direction.

I would greatly appreciate your assistance in channeling my letter to the President's attention. I am also writing to Anthony Lake with a similar request.

These days an increasingly strong nuclear abolition movement is functioning in the United States and abroad. Many religious denominations and religious peace fellowships are becoming actively involved. Thus, there would be strong public support for initiatives that President Clinton might undertake in the quest for nuclear abolition.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Chair, Board of Directors

It's My Turn: Newsweek

An Offer We Shouldn't Refuse

by Howard W. Hallman

At last we have an opportunity to eliminate the only existing international threat to the physical safety of the U.S. homeland: an attack by long-range missiles armed with nuclear warheads.

Most of these dreaded devices that could strike the United States are under the control of the Russian Federation. Three other successor states to the Soviet Union -- Belarus, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan -- have intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) on their soil, but they are in the process of transferring them to Russia. Other possessors include Great Britain, France, and China. The first two are allies. China with relatively few is showing no military belligerency toward the United States. Israel, an unadmitted possessor, is a U.S. ally and anyway has no long-range delivery capacity.

Now Russia has offered to eliminate its threat by deactivating all of its long-range nuclear weapons. This would be accomplished by taking warheads off ICBMs and placing them in storage, by returning all submarines to their homeports and removing their missiles, and by transferring all bombs and missiles from strategic bombers to central storage. Russia will do this if the United will do likewise. It's an offer we should refuse.

Russian Foreign Minister Andrei Kosyrev made this offer in Geneva on February 12, 1992 at the Conference on Disarmament. The U.S. government was apparently lukewarm to the proposal, in part because of

uncertainty of who controlled the former Soviet nuclear missiles. Since then this matter has been clarified by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in working out refinements to the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (START). These negotiations have revealed that Belarus, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan want to move strategic missiles from their lands. This suggests that they would be willing to deactivate them during the interim period as part of a broader agreement involving the United States and the Russian Federation.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice, an organization I work for, has advocated this approach since last summer. Recently the General Conference of the United Methodist Church, the only unit that speaks for the denomination as a whole, voiced its support when it adopted a resolution entitled "Nuclear Disarmament: the Zero Option." More than 30 other national religious and peace organizations share this view.

We asked ourselves: Now that the Cold War is over, why should the United States continue to target Moscow, Minsk, Kiev, and Alma-Ata, the seats of reform governments? Or the airfields and seaports where American planes and ships are arriving with food supplies? Why should the Russian Federation target Washington, New York, and various American cities that have "sister" cities in Russia? The answer is obvious: it's ridiculous to continue Cold War targeting.

The situation is like two rival groups of boys in the school yard. They all have bricks in their hands, but they are tired of threatening each other. They want to quit to play basketball together, go home for supper, or do their homework. They agree that on signal they'll all drop their bricks. If some don't cooperate, they can pick them up again. So its, "one, two, three." They all comply. The threat is gone.

Likewise all possessors of long-range nuclear weapons (let's bring in

Great Britain, France, and China, too) should simultaneously deactivate all of them by separating warheads from delivery vehicles. There can be mutual inspection teams. The United Nations could provide nuclear observers. As warheads are placed in safe storage, each side will be assured that no accidental launch or unauthorized attack would occur.

The United States would also be reassured that a sudden coup in Russia or one of the other successor states would give renegade military officers armed ICBMs. If that unexpected event occurred, the United States could reactivate a portion of its strategic arsenal and could send some strategic submarines out to sea to reestablish nuclear deterrence.

Deactivation would build confidence and would provide security as negotiations continue for staged dismantlement. The START agreement, which will begin the process of strategic arms reduction, is the first step. In fact, even before the treaty has been ratified both the United States and Russia have started to dismantle ICBMs slated for elimination under START.

President Bush and President Yeltsin have made proposals for much deeper cuts. Leading citizens and legislators on both sides are advocating reduction to 1,000 strategic warheads or fewer. A growing number of people are saying, let's go all the way to zero.

While that debate continues and US/Russian negotiations proceed, we can be safer by taking the entire arsenal off alert and separating warheads from delivery vehicles. That's something that President Bush and President Yeltsin should agree upon when they meet in Washington in mid-June.

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003

FAX TRANSMITTAL MEMO

Date: October 7, 1993

To: Mr. Michael Van Dusen
House Committee on Foreign Affairs

FAX No. 202 226-3581

Telephone No. 202 255-3408

From: Howard W. Hallman, Issues Chair

FAX No. 1-301 695-0192

Telephone No. 1-301 694-2859

Dear Mike:

Here is our correspondence with Rep. Lee Hamilton and Ms. Nancy Hernreich at the White House, requesting an appointment with President Clinton for a small delegation of bishops and laity to discuss the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament." If you can help bring this about, we will be grateful.

With best regards,

October 28, 1993

Mr. R. Jeffrey Smith
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Mr. Smith:

I was interested in your article last week on "Nuclear Arms Doctrine to Be Reviewed." For your future reference in writing on this topic, I would like to share with you the enclosed material on the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament".

The Methodist Option has three main sources:

- Pastoral letter and foundation document *In Defense of Creation* (1986) of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, in which they said "no" to nuclear deterrence as a legitimate national policy. The 1988 United Methodist General Conference (the official governing body) affirmed this approach.
- A resolution on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option", adopted by the United Methodist General Conference in 1992. It proposes global elimination of all nuclear weapons, both strategic and tactical, a halt in all further testing and production, vigorous nonproliferation, and abandonment of efforts to develop strategic defense.
- A proposal on "Deactivation of the Global Strategic Arsenal" by Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity

and clergy. This elaborates a item from the 1992 Zero Option resolution calling for separation of warheads from delivery vehicles in the global strategic arsenal, pending complete dismantlement.

If you wish further information on these elements of the Methodist Option, please give me a call.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair

Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668

October 28, 1993

Mr. Aaron Tovish
211 E. 43rd Street, Suite 1604
New York, NY 10017

Dear Aaron:

Here is the material on the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament" that I promised to send you. It has three main sources:

- Pastoral letter and foundation document *In Defense of Creation* (1986) of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, in which they said "no" to nuclear deterrence as a legitimate national policy. The 1988 United Methodist General Conference (the official governing body) affirmed this approach.
- A resolution on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option", adopted by the United Methodist General Conference in 1992. It proposes global elimination of all nuclear weapons, both strategic and tactical, a halt in all further testing and production, vigorous nonproliferation, and abandonment of efforts to develop strategic defense.
- A proposal on "Deactivation of the Global Strategic Arsenal" by Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy. This elaborates a item from the 1992 Zero Option resolution calling for separation of warheads from delivery vehicles in the global strategic arsenal, pending complete dismantlement.

We are currently pushing the whole package, but especially the idea of deactivation, with people in the Clinton Administration. If you want further information on the Methodist Option, please give me a call.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair*

*Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668*

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003

FAX TRANSMITTAL MEMO

Date: October 28, 1993

To: Mr. Bart Handford
White House Scheduling Office

FAX No. 202 456-2641

Telephone No. 202 456-7560

From: Howard W. Hallman, Issues Chair

FAX No. 1 301 695-0192

Telephone No. 1 301 694-2859

Dear Mr. Handford:

Here is a copy of our request for a delegation of Methodist bishops and laity to meet with President Clinton to discuss the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament". The main body of these proposals has the endorsement of the United Methodist General Conference, the official governing body which meets quadrennially with elected delegates.

We believe that such a meeting is very timely because the Administration is now reviewing U.S. policies on nuclear weapons. Furthermore, our ideas are relevant to discussion which President Clinton may have with President Yeltsin when they meet in January.

Although we have presented the Methodist Option to officials on the staff of the National Security Council, at the Pentagon, and at the State Department, we are doubtful that this set of proposals will make its way through the national security bureaucracy to President Clinton.

We have some fresh ideas very relevant to the post-Cold War era which the President may want to take into consideration.

Sincerely yours,

November 1, 1993

Mr. Jim Stewart
CBS Evening News
2020 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Mr. Stewart:

On Saturday evening, October 30 you reported that the Clinton Administration is studying the future need for nuclear weapons. In your discussion you seemed to support the assumption that nuclear weapons will always be needed.

There is another view, which you folks in the mass media never report. It is that the global nuclear arsenal should be completely eliminated. This speaks from the perspective that use of nuclear weapons is immoral and so is the threatened use through policies of nuclear deterrence. It also speaks from a perspective the nuclear weapons have neither warfighting nor deterrent utility in the post-Cold War era. In no current conflict are nuclear weapons relevant either in combat or for deterrence. That is highly likely to be the case in future years.

This is the position presented in the enclosed statements that offer the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament." It starts with the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, in which they said "no" to nuclear deterrence. It offers a set of policy recommendations adopted by the United Methodist General Conference, the official governing body. It concludes with a proposal from our organization, first, to take the global nuclear strategic arsenal off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and, second, to dismantle all

nuclear weapons over a period of years. This should be accompanied a vigorous approach to nuclear nonproliferation.

Our recommendations recognize that all U.S. strategic nuclear weapons now do is deter Russian strategic nuclear weapons, and vice versa. It would be to both sides advantage to deactivate and then dismantle their entire nuclear arsenal on a mutual basis, joined along the way by Great Britain, France, and China.

In the interest of fairness and balance, we hope that you present these kinds of alternatives in future stories about nuclear weapons.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair*

*Please reply to 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668*

November 1, 1993

The Honorable John Spratt, Chairman
Energy and Nuclear Systems Subcommittee
House Armed Services Committee
2120 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Spratt:

During the past ten years United Methodists in the United States have carefully studied issues dealing with nuclear weapons and have developed sets of policy proposals. Because you are providing leadership in working out policies on denuclearization and related matters, we would like to discuss our ideas with you.

Our proposals can be considered the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament", as summarized in the enclosure. The Methodist Option starts with the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation*, in which they said "no" to nuclear deterrence. It continues with a resolution on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option", adopted by the 1992 United Methodist General Conference, the official governing body of the denomination. It concludes with a proposal for "Deactivation of the Global Strategic Arsenal" from our organization, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy. We recommend taking the global nuclear strategic arsenal off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and then dismantling all nuclear weapons over a period of years.

We observe that all U.S. strategic nuclear weapons now do is deter Russian strategic nuclear weapons, and vice versa. Otherwise nuclear weapons have

neither warfighting nor deterrent utility in the post-Cold War era. In no current conflict around the globe are nuclear weapons relevant either in combat or for deterrence, and that is highly likely to be the case in future years. It would, therefore, be advantageous for all current possessors of nuclear weapons to deactivate and then dismantle them on a mutual basis. This should be accompanied a vigorous approach to nuclear nonproliferation.

We believe that this is fresh thinking which your subcommittee should consider. For that we reason we request an opportunity to meet with you.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair*

*Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668*

November 2, 1993

Mr. Michael Van Dusen
House Foreign Affairs Committee
2170 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mike:

Here is a copy of our request for a delegation United Methodist bishops and laity to gain an appointment with President Clinton to discuss ideas on nuclear disarmament. It was referred to the White House Office of Scheduling and Advance, headed by Isabelle R. Tapia (456-7560). I have talked with one of her aides, Bart Handford, and on October 29 faxed him a fresh copy of our request and background documents (FAX: 456-2461).

We will greatly appreciate any help you can give us.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair

November 8, 1993

Dr. Ashton Carter
Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Security
U.S. Department of Defense
Washington, DC 20301

Dear Dr. Carter:

During the past ten years United Methodists in the United States have carefully studied issues dealing with nuclear weapons and have developed a series of policy recommendations on this subject. Because the Department of Defense is now undertaking a Nuclear Posture Review, we would like to share with you several statements that can be considered the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament".

We ask you to make our ideas available to the appropriate working groups and the overall steering committee of the Nuclear Posture Review. We also request an opportunity to meet with appropriate persons involved in this study so that we may explain our thinking in greater detail.

The starting point for the Methodist Option is the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation*, in which they said "no" to nuclear deterrence. It continues with a resolution on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option", adopted by the 1992 United Methodist General Conference, the official governing body of the denomination. It concludes with a proposal for "Deactivation of the Global Strategic Arsenal" from our organization, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy. We recommend taking the

global nuclear strategic arsenal off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and then dismantling all nuclear weapons over a period of years.

We observe that all U.S. strategic nuclear weapons now do is deter Russian strategic nuclear weapons, and vice versa. Otherwise nuclear weapons have neither warfighting nor deterrent utility in the post-Cold War era. In no current conflict around the globe are nuclear weapons relevant either in combat or for deterrence, and that is highly likely to be the case in future years. It would, therefore, be advantageous for all current possessors of nuclear weapons to deactivate and then dismantle them on a mutual basis, achieved with proper verification and other safeguards. This should be accompanied by a vigorous approach to nuclear nonproliferation.

We firmly believe that any thorough study of the future nuclear posture of the United States should give serious attention to the

Dr. Ashton Carter
November 8, 1993
Page two.

possibility of total, global nuclear disarmament and the means for achieving this objective. Therefore, we hope that the Nuclear Posture Review will give serious attention to our ideas.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair

Please reply to 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668

November 8, 1993

General John Shalikashvili, Chairman
Joint Chief of Staffs
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20318-9999

Dear General Shalikashvili:

We would like to share with you some ideas developed by United Methodists during the past ten years on issues related to nuclear weapons and the role they play in national security. We urge you and your colleagues to give consideration to the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament" as you participate in the Nuclear Posture Review, which is now underway. We would welcome an opportunity to meet with someone on your staff so that we may explain our thinking in greater detail.

The starting point for the Methodist Option is the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation*, in which they said "no" to nuclear deterrence. It continues with a resolution on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option", adopted by the 1992 United Methodist General Conference, the official governing body of the denomination. It concludes with a proposal for "Deactivation of the Global Strategic Arsenal" from our organization, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy. We recommend taking the global nuclear strategic arsenal off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and then dismantling all nuclear weapons over a period of years.

We observe that all U.S. strategic nuclear weapons now do is deter Russian strategic nuclear weapons, and vice versa. Otherwise nuclear weapons have

neither warfighting nor deterrent utility in the post-Cold War era. In no current conflict around the globe are nuclear weapons relevant either in combat or for deterrence, and that is highly likely to be the case in future years. It would, therefore, be advantageous for all current possessors of nuclear weapons to deactivate and then dismantle them on a mutual basis, achieved with proper verification and other safeguards. This should be accompanied by a vigorous approach to nuclear nonproliferation.

We firmly believe that any thorough study of the future nuclear posture of the United States should give serious attention to the possibility of total, global nuclear disarmament and the means for achieving this objective.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair*

*Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668*

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

*421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003*

November 18, 1993

*Mr. John Isaacs
Council for a Livable World
100 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20003*

Dear John:

Here is information on the Nuclear Posture Review, which the Pentagon now has underway.

Also enclosed is a set of papers on the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament", which we have sent to Assistant Secretary Ashton Carter and to others in the Clinton Administration.

If you submit anything to the Nuclear Posture Review, I hope that you'll share a copy with me.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair*

Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

421 Seward Square, SE

Washington, DC 20003

November 18, 1993

Rev. Robert Tiller

American Baptist Churches USA

100 Maryland Avenue, NE

Washington, DC 20002

Dear Bob:

Here is information on the Nuclear Posture Review, which the Pentagon now has underway.

Also enclosed is a set of papers on the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament", which we have sent to Assistant Secretary Ashton Carter and to others in the Clinton Administration.

If you submit anything to the Nuclear Posture Review, I hope that you'll share a copy with me.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

Issues Chair

Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003

November 18, 1993

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

Dear Bob:

Here is information on the Nuclear Posture Review, which the Pentagon now has underway.

Also enclosed is a set of papers on the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament", which we have sent to Assistant Secretary Ashton Carter and to others in the Clinton Administration.

If you submit anything to the Nuclear Posture Review, I hope that you'll share a copy with me.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair

Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

*421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003*

November 18, 1993

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

Dear Joe:

In case you haven't seen it, I am sending you information on the Nuclear Posture Review, which the Pentagon now has underway. This seems to be the most serious effort of the Clinton Administration to reassess U.S. policy on nuclear weapons.

We have submitted the enclosed set of papers on the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament" to Assistant Secretary Ashton Carter and to others in the Clinton Administration.

I would urge you to offer your views. If you do, I hope that you'll share a copy of your submission with me.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

Issues Chair

*Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668*

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

*421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003*

November 18, 1993

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

Dear Jeremy:

You're probably aware of the Nuclear Posture Review, which the Pentagon now has underway. But in case you missed it, I'm sending you a copy of the news release. This seems to be the most serious effort of the Clinton Administration to reassess U.S. policy on nuclear weapons.

We have submitted the enclosed set of papers on the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament" to Assistant Secretary Ashton Carter and to others in the Clinton Administration.

I would urge you to offer your views. If you do, I hope that you'll share a copy of your submission with me.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

Issues Chair

Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817

Mon-Thurs: 1-301 694-2859; Fri-Sat: 301 897-3668

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE
421 Seward Square, SE
Washington, DC 20003

FAX TRANSMITTAL MEMO

Date: November 30, 1993

To: Ms. Tanya Dean
White House Scheduling Office

FAX No. 202 456-2317

Telephone No. 202 456-7560

From: Howard W. Hallman, Issues Chair

FAX No. 1 301 695-0192

Telephone No. 1 301 694-2859

Dear Ms. Dean:

Here is a copy of our request for a delegation of Methodist bishops and laity to meet with President Clinton to discuss the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament". The main body of these proposals has the endorsement of the United Methodist General Conference, the official governing body which meets quadrennially with elected delegates.

We believe that such a meeting is very timely because the Administration is now reviewing U.S. policies on nuclear weapons. We believe that the "Methodist Option" should be considered in the nuclear posture review. Furthermore, our ideas are relevant to discussion which President Clinton may have with President Yeltsin when they meet in January.

Although we have presented the Methodist Option to officials on the staff of the National Security Council, at the Pentagon, and at the State Department, we are doubtful that this set of proposals will make its way through the national security bureaucracy to President Clinton.

We have some fresh ideas very relevant to the post-Cold War era which the President may want to take into consideration.

Sincerely yours,

December 9, 1993

Mr. Michael R. Gordon
New York Times
1627 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Mr. Gordon:

I was interested in your story on December 6 that the United States is considering aiming its missiles away from Russia for safety's sake and in recognition of the end of the Cold War.

For the last two years Methodists United for Peace with Justice has been advocating that the United States and Russia go even farther by separating all warheads on strategic missiles from their delivery vehicles, bringing strategic submarines into port and placing their missiles in safe storage, and keeping bombs and missiles off all strategic bombers. This should be accomplished with proper verification. As the United States and Russia near the completion of this task, Great Britain, France, and China should join them. After deactivation is completed, staged dismantlement can occur over several years, completing the job at least by the year 2000.

The United Methodist General Conference, the church's official governing body with 1,000 elected delegates, endorsed this position in May 1992 by adopting a resolution entitled "Nuclear Disarmament; The Zero Option" (enclosed). This was a follow-on to the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document, *In Defense of Creation*, from the United Methodist Council of Bishops in which they said "no" to nuclear deterrence. The 1988 General Conference supported the bishops' statement.

Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy, has continued to work for the zero option. Our latest statement on "Deactivation of the Global Strategic Arsenal" is enclosed. We urge you to bring this point of view into your future reports on how to deal with the nuclear arsenal.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair*

*Please reply to 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668*

December 16, 1993

Mr. Thomas F. McLarty III
Chief of Staff
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. McLarty III:

Recently we received a letter from Mr. Roy M. Neel, indicating that President Clinton would not be able to meet with a delegation of United Methodist bishops and laity to discuss our ideas on nuclear disarmament, as we requested. We appreciate President Clinton's extremely busy schedule and realize that he cannot meet personally with every group that would like to talk with him. Since Mr. Neel has now left the White House staff, we are writing to you with a follow-up request.

At President Clinton's direction, the Department of Defense is conducting a Nuclear Posture Review. We have had an opportunity to present our ideas, as contained in the enclosed "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament", to staff of the National Security Council and the Pentagon's Office of Nuclear Security and Counter Proliferation. We were received courteously and listened to, but we are doubtful that they will give serious consideration to our ideas and include them in options offered to President Clinton for his choice.

Therefore, we ask you to give President Clinton the "Methodist Option" papers for his perusal. We would hope that he would then instruct the Nuclear Posture Review to work out how our approach might be implemented, to consider pros and cons. This would give the President an additional choice when he makes his decision on nuclear posture.

In February 1992 Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev public expressed a strong interest in one of our main ideas: to achieve a zero alert posture by separating all warheads from strategic nuclear missiles with proper verification. This would provide much greater security than the pending proposal merely to target missiles on the open seas, an action that is unverifiable and can be quickly reversed. President Clinton might want to explore with President Yeltsin the possibility of mutually deactivating all strategic weapons and then later dismantling them, an approach within the mutual self-interest of both nations.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair

cc. Rep. Lee Hamilton

Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668

December 16, 1993

The Honorable Albert Gore, Jr.
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. Vice President:

Because you are likely to be playing a leading role in the Nuclear Posture Review that is now underway, we would like to share with you a set of papers on the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament."

I would like to call particular attention to the proposal that the United States and Russia move quickly to separate all warheads on strategic missiles from their delivery vehicles, bring strategic submarines into port and place their missiles in safe storage, and keep bombs and missiles off all strategic bombers. This should be accomplished with proper verification. As the United States and Russia near the completion of this task, Great Britain, France, and China should join them. After deactivation is completed, staged dismantlement can occur over several years, completing the job at least by the year 2000.

The United Methodist General Conference, the church's official governing body with 1,000 elected delegates, endorsed this position in May 1992 by adopting a resolution entitled "Nuclear Disarmament; The Zero Option" (enclosed). This was a follow-on to the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document, *In Defense of Creation*, from the United Methodist Council of Bishops in which they said "no" to nuclear deterrence. The 1988 General Conference supported the bishops' recommendations.

The enclosed statement on "Deactivation of the Global Strategic Arsenal"

explains the views of our organization, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy.

We would welcome an opportunity to discuss our ideas in depth with you or with your national security advisor.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair*

*Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668*

February 8, 1994

The Honorable William J. Perry
Secretary
U S. Department of Defense
Washington, DC 20301

Dear Dr. Perry:

We wish to congratulate you on your appointment as secretary of defense. Among other reasons we hope that this will provide continuity to the nuclear posture review now underway, leading to a substantial reduction of U.S. dependence on the doctrine of nuclear deterrence.

We are pleased with progress made in recent weeks by the Clinton Administration to lessen the risk of nuclear war: the agreement for removal of all strategic weapons from Ukraine, the change in targeting of U.S. and Russian strategic missiles, the beginning of negotiations in Geneva for a comprehensive test ban treaty. Together they constitute a good beginning, but only a beginning. There is much more to be accomplished

We believe that the next step should be complete deactivation of U.S. and Russian strategic weapons by separating warheads from all ICBMs and bringing all strategic submarines into port and removing their missiles, all accomplished with adequate verification. This would build upon the policy you yourself advocated in the Brookings monograph on *A New Concept of Cooperative Security*, coauthored with Ashton Carter and John Steinbruner. You recommended "the immediate removal of the warheads from all launchers slated for eventual deactivation" under START II. That's the next step, and it can be accomplished quickly. That should be promptly followed

by similar removal of warheads from all remaining strategic launchers, both ICBMS and those on submarines. We advocate that this be completed by August 6, 1995, the 50th anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima. Thereafter, these missiles and their launchers can be dismantled and the nuclear material disposed of properly over a period of years.

Our ideas are more fully developed in the enclosed statement on "Deactivation of the Global Strategic Arsenal". Also enclosed are other statements which together offer the Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair*

*Please reply to 6508 Wilmet Road, Bethesda, MD 20817
Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668*

February 8, 1994

Mr. Franklin Miller
Deputy Assistant Secretary
for Nuclear Security
U.S. Department of Defense
Washington, DC 20301

Dear Mr. Miller:

We would like to share with you a letter we wrote to the new secretary of defense, William J. Perry. In it we reiterate our proposal for prompt deactivation of the global strategic arsenal by separating warheads from delivery vehicles with proper verification, an idea we discussed with you last summer.

As further background, I am enclosing a set of papers on the "Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament", which restates our ideas and presents the official policy of the United Methodist Church.

We hope that our ideas are being given consideration in the nuclear posture review, which is now underway.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair

Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817

Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668

February 8, 1994

Dr. Ashton Carter
Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Security
U.S. Department of Defense
Washington, DC 20301

Dear Dr. Carter:

We would like to share with you a letter we wrote to the new secretary of defense, William J. Perry. In it we reiterate our proposal for prompt deactivation of the global strategic arsenal by separating warheads from delivery vehicles with proper verification.

This builds on an idea from the Brookings monograph on "cooperative security", which you coauthored with Dr. Perry and John Steinbruner. You applied it to START II weapons. We believe the same idea is applicable to the whole strategic arsenal, as spelled out in the enclosure.

We hope that our ideas are being given consideration in the nuclear posture review, which is now underway.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Issues Chair

Please reply to 6508 Wilmett Road, Bethesda, MD 20817

Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668

June 28, 1994

The Honorable William J. Perry
Secretary of Defense
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301

Attn: Ms Melba Boling
Executive Assistant

Dear Dr. Perry:

As the Pentagon works toward the conclusion of the Nuclear Posture Review, we request an opportunity for a delegation of Methodists to meet with you and General John Shalikashvili to discuss our ideas on this subject. Our thinking is summarized in the enclosed resolution entitled "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option", adopted by the 1992 United Methodist General Conference, the official governing body of the denomination.

Previously we submitted this resolution and other material to Pentagon personnel who were engaged in the Nuclear Posture Review. We would now like to make our case directly to you and General Shalikashvili before you make your final decisions on the nuclear posture of the United States.

Depending upon their schedules, our delegation would consist of the following persons:

Bishop C. Dale White. He chaired the committee of the United Methodist Council of Bishops which in 1985-86 developed the pastoral letter and foundation document *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. He was chosen by his peers to deliver the Episcopal Address at the 1992 General Conference, the quadrennial policy-making body of the United Methodist Church.

Bishop Joseph H. Yeakel, resident bishop in the Washington area and president of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. Last year he was president of the Council of Bishops and negotiated with the Russian Federation and Russian Orthodox Church so that the United Methodist Church could establish an office in Moscow.

Rev. Thomas White Wolf Fassett, general secretary of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, the official social action agency. As a Native American, he understands the human rights dimension of nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Howard W. Hallman (myself), chair, Board of Directors, Methodists United for Peace with Justice. I am author of more than 50 articles and papers on nuclear disarmament and related issues.

The Honorable William J. Perry

June 28, 1994

Page two.

The United Methodist Church has given considerable attention to nuclear arms and nuclear deterrence over the years. In 1986 after a thorough, two-year study the United Methodist Council of Bishops issued their pastoral letter and foundation document, *In Defense of Creation*, in which they said "no" to nuclear deterrence. The 1988 United Methodist General Conference endorsed the bishops' recommendations. Four years later the 1992 General Conference adopted the resolution on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option", mentioned earlier.

Since then our organization, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy, offered a more fully developed proposal on "Deactivation of the Global Strategic Arsenal" (copy enclosed). We recommend taking the entire global nuclear strategic arsenal off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and then dismantling all nuclear weapons over a period of years.

These are the ideas we would like to discuss with you and General Shalikashvili. We hope that you might have some time for us this summer or in early fall.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Board of Directors

Mon-Thurs: (301) 620-0232; Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668

July 20, 1994

General Charles A. Horner
U.S. Space Command
Department of Defense
Washington, DC 20301

Dear General Horner:

I read in the Frederick (Md) News-Post that you favor the global elimination of nuclear weapons and that you believe the United States should take the high moral ground by leading the way toward that goal. We agree with you.

Over the years the United Methodist Church has given considerable attention to nuclear arms and nuclear deterrence. In 1986 after a thorough, two-year study the United Methodist Council of Bishops issued a pastoral letter and foundation document, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*, in which they said "no" to nuclear deterrence. The 1988 United Methodist General Conference endorsed the bishops' recommendations. Four years later the 1992 General Conference adopted a resolution on "Nuclear Disarmament: The Zero Option" (copy enclosed), laying out an agenda for achieving a world free of nuclear weapons.

Since then our organization, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy, has offered a more fully developed proposal on "Deactivation of the Global Strategic Arsenal" (copy enclosed). We recommend taking the entire global nuclear strategic arsenal off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and then dismantling all nuclear weapons over a period of years.

We would welcome an opportunity to meet with you, learn your views more completely, and share our thinking. In the meantime we would appreciate receiving any public statement you have made on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Board of Directors*

Mon-Thurs: 1-301 620-0232; Fri-Sat: 301 897-3668

September 6, 1994

Dr. Ashton B. Carter
Assistant Secretary of Defense
for International Security Policy
Department of Defense
Washington, DC 20301-2600

Dear Dr. Carter:

We appreciate your July 26 reply to our letter to Secretary Perry in which we offered the Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament. We stressed particularly the desirability of taking all nuclear weapons throughout the world off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and bringing all strategic submarines into port and removing their missiles, all this with proper verification.

We are pleased with progress achieved in recent years, which you summarized. We are glad that the Clinton Administration is willing to take executive initiatives in addition to treaty negotiations, such as no longer targeting Russia or any other nation with strategic ballistic missiles.

In recent weeks two more pieces have fallen into place in the quest for global nuclear disarmament: (1) the announced agreement by Russia and China to no longer target one another with nuclear missiles and (2) the final withdrawal of all Russian troops from Germany and the Baltic Republic. For many years the only two "reasonable" justifications for U.S. strategic missiles were as a backup deterrent to Soviet aggression in Western Europe and as deterrence of Soviet attack on the U.S. mainland. Europe is now totally free from the threat of Russia invasion, and it is clear that Russia has no desire to

attack the U.S. homeland.

That is why we think that complete deactivation makes a lot of sense and is in the national interest of all parties concerned. It is the next logical step after de-targeting one another: the United States and Russia, Russia and China. Now that these strategic missiles are de-targeted, they might as well be taken out of the ground and off the submarines and have their warheads placed in safe, observed storage until they can be totally dismantled.

We hope that the Department of Defense will include such a recommendation in its report to President Clinton on U.S. nuclear posture.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Board of Directors*

September 6, 1994

Dr. W. Anthony Lake
Assistant to the President
for National Security
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Dr. Lake:

From time to time we have corresponded with you and met with some of your aides to offer the Methodist Option for Nuclear Disarmament. We have stressed particularly the desirability of taking all nuclear weapons throughout the world off alert by separating warheads from delivery vehicles and bringing all strategic submarines into port and removing their missiles, all this with proper verification.

We are pleased with progress achieved during the last year and a half. We are glad that the Clinton Administration has been willing to take executive initiatives in addition to treaty negotiations, such as no longer targeting Russia or any other nation with strategic ballistic missiles.

In recent weeks two more pieces have fallen into place in the quest for global nuclear disarmament: (1) the announced agreement by Russia and China to no longer target one another with nuclear missiles and (2) the final withdrawal of all Russian troops from Germany and the Baltic Republic. For many years the only two "reasonable" justifications for U.S. strategic missiles were as a backup deterrent to Soviet aggression in Western Europe and as deterrence of Soviet attack on the U.S. mainland. Europe is now totally free from the threat of Russia invasion, and it is clear that Russia has no desire to

attack the U.S. homeland.

That is why we think that complete deactivation makes a lot of sense and is in the national interest of all parties concerned. It is the next logical step after de-targeting one another: the United States and Russia, Russia and China. Now that these strategic missiles are de-targeted, they might as well be taken out of the ground and off the submarines and have their warheads placed in safe, observed storage until they can be totally dismantled.

We hope that the nuclear posture review, now underway at the Pentagon, will conclude that a worthy approach to enhance U.S. security will be the mutual deactivation of all nuclear missiles by all the possessing nations.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Board of Directors*

September 22, 1994

President William J. Clinton
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Please say it isn't so: that you have decided to retain the Bush-era nuclear arms posture, as the Washington Post reported today. Although President Bush's arms reduction approach had creative elements for that period, we can do better in 1994. When General Shalikashvili meets amicably with the Russian chief-of-staff, when Secretary Perry is photographed peering down a Russian strategic silo, when American and Russian troops conduct joint maneuvers, there is no need to continue deploying the vast strategic arsenal.

As we have written to you previously, we advocate immediate deactivation of the entire, global strategic arsenal by separating warheads from all land-based ICBMs and bringing all strategic submarines into port and removing their missiles. All this should be achieved with proper verification. Then this arsenal can be dismantled on a reciprocal schedule.

The policy your administration negotiated with Russia to de-target one another moves in this direction. Now Russia has worked out a similar agreement with China. Let's continue that momentum.

Another disappointment for us is the nature of the nuclear posture review that the Pentagon has just completed. It was done the old way: mostly in secret except for some consultation with favored outsiders in the defense

establishment. We submitted recommendations and were able to talk to a couple of middle level staff persons, but we never had an opportunity to make our case directly to policy-makers, as we requested. We were hoping for a much more open process in the Clinton Administration.

*It's not too late. We urge you yourself to conduct public hearings on the proposed policy and listen to views of a cross-section of persons who are knowledgeable on the subject. For instance, we would suggest United Methodist Bishop Dale White, who chaired the committee of the Council of Bishops which drew up the policy statement, *In Defense of Creation* in 1986.*

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Board of Directors*

September 22, 1994

Ms. Melanne Verveer
Office of the First Lady
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Melanne:

It was good to see you at the Baroni fete. It was encouraging to see that so many people retain the conviction and dedication to make life better in neighborhoods.

For your information I am sharing our latest correspondence on nuclear arms posture. We sent to the attention of Dr. Anthony Lake. If you think it appropriate, you might share it with Mrs. Clinton.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Board of Directors

September 22, 1994

The Honorable Ronald Dellums, Chair
House Armed Services Committee
2120 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Dellums:

We note in today's Washington Post that President Clinton has decided to retain the Bush nuclear arms policy and not to seek further reductions in the nuclear arsenal beyond what is called for in START I and START II. We believe that this is shortsighted and misses an opportunity for further reductions.

As usual, the Pentagon conducted its nuclear posture review in secret except for bringing in a few favored outsiders from the defense establishment. We asked for an opportunity to present our views to policy-makers, but the best we could do was to meet with a couple of middle-level staff.

Now that the Pentagon has completed its work, we urge you to convene a set of hearings by the House Armed Services Committee to hear the views of the Pentagon, President Clinton's advisers, and a broad cross-section of persons knowledgeable on the subject. For instance, we would suggest United Methodist Bishop Dale White, who chaired the committee of the Council of Bishop which drew up the policy statement *In Defense of Creation* in 1986. He can discuss the resolution on "Nuclear Disarmament: the Zero Option", adopted by the 1992 United Methodist General Conference (copy enclosed).

Our organization, a national association of laity and clergy, would like to make a presentation at such a hearing. We advocate immediate deactivation of the entire, global strategic arsenal by separating warheads from all land-based ICBMs and bringing all strategic submarines into port and removing their missiles. All this should be achieved with proper verification. Then this arsenal can be dismantled on a reciprocal schedule. (See enclosed statement.)

By holding such hearings, your committee could stimulate adoption of a much more imaginative and far-reaching policy to rid the world of useless but dangerous nuclear weapons.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Board of Directors