

EUROPE PEACEFUL AND SECURE:
A VISION FOR OUR TIME

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

This enduring prophecy is worth recalling today as we experience astonishing changes in East-West relations and see remarkable opportunities for removing the threat of war in Europe and elsewhere in the northern third of the globe.

We in the United States have a special concern for Europe. It is the source of our language, many of our institutions, much of our music and art. A majority of U.S. citizens are of European descent. We have strong ties in trade, science, technology, and politics. Twice in this century we were drawn into European wars that became global. To prevent a Third World War we have stationed troops in Europe and formed an alliance with West European nations. We confront our principal national adversary, the Soviet Union, in Central and Southeastern Europe. We deploy our nuclear arsenal (including missiles, bombers, and submarines based in the United States) primarily to deter a European War, and to fight in one if it breaks out. Because such a war would quickly become global, our own national security is strongly tied to European security.

Because of this special concern for Europe, it is appropriate for us to offer a vision for Europe. Such a vision is essential if we want the dozens of necessary intermediate steps to move us toward the goals we want to achieve. Moreover, without a vision, the people perish.

What do we seek for Europe? We seek what we want for ourselves and what people throughout the world need and want: sufficient food, water, clean air, clothing, shelter, health care, love, family, friends, education, economic livelihood, personal safety, security from attack by outside enemies. We want societies possessing a panoply of freedom: personal, political, religious, economic. We want people of diverse ethnicity, religion, and national heritage to achieve self-expression without suppressing others. We want nations to refrain from military aggression against other nations, and themselves to feel secure from outside attack.

A solid foundation for achieving these goals requires the modern equivalent of beating swords into plowshares: disarmament and economic conversion. Here idealism and self-interest come together. The resources wasted on military production and maintenance of massive armed forces could be much better used for numerous other products and services. Trade restrictions that accompany military rivalry could be eliminated to the mutual benefit of contending nations. The

security objectives of forward-based defense, which inevitably is arrayed against the adversary's own forward-based defense (with both sides possessing offensive capability), could be achieved more readily, cheaper, and safer through withdrawal and demobilization of those forces.

[Etc.....]

Howard Hallman

May 9, 1989

A VISION FOR EUROPE

by Howard W. Hallman

It is becoming fashionable to offer a vision for Europe. Thus, in *Perestroika*, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has spoken of Europe as "our common home" -- a place "where geography and history have closely interwoven the destinies of dozens of countries and nations." He adds that the home is common, that is true, but each family has its own apartment, there are different entrances, too. But it is only together, collectively, and by following the sensible norms of coexistence that the Europeans can save their home, protect it against a conflagration and other calamities, make it better and safer and maintain it in proper order.ⁱ

And U.S. President George Bush has stated that the time is right to "let Europe be whole and free." He...ⁱⁱ

Others are offering their own visions for Europe. A lot of it is couched in habitual balance-of-power rhetoric, but some of it is directed toward breaking out of the old molds. I want to join in by offering my vision for Europe.

Why the Concern?

Although we Americans are always ready to offer our views on matters affecting all parts of the globe, Europeans might wonder why we feel impelled to offer a vision for their continent. The reasons are simple and complex.

The majority of Americans are transplanted Europeans -- though for most, three to ten generations beyond emigration. My ancestry, for example, has origins in Germany, Switzerland, and the British Isles. I have a grandson who can add Sweden, Hungary, and Italy to his heritage through further working of the American mixing pot.

Europe is the source of our primary language (English) and the most common second language (Spanish). Many of our institutions, our legal system, much of our music and art, our science and literature have European origins, even though we have placed a distinctive American stamp on them. Our Christian religious heritage, though traced back to Jerusalem, has the mark of Rome, Wittenburg, Geneva, Canterbury, and the European homes of dissenting innovators. Judaism in the United States also displays European influences.

To be sure, American life is deeply enriched by the contributions of persons from other lands: those who arrived here so long ago from Asia that they are considered Native Americans; persons whose

Spanish heritage blends in the cultures of indigenous peoples of Mexico and Central America; the forced migrants from Africa who never let go of their roots; the rich variety of Asian immigrants; and persons from the Moslem lands. But these building stones of American culture are placed on a European foundation.

Beyond these social and cultural ties, we are bound to Europe by trade, technology, and politics. Twice in this century we were drawn into European wars that became global. To prevent a Third World War we have stationed troops in Europe and formed an alliance with West European nations. We confront our principal national adversary, the Soviet Union, in Central and Southeastern Europe. We deploy our nuclear arsenal (including missiles, bombers, and submarines based in the United States) primarily to deter a European War, and to fight in one if it breaks out. Because such a war would quickly become global, our own national security is strongly tied to European security.

Indeed, such is the deployment of U.S. and Soviet military forces, along with their allies, that in considering European defense we should not think merely of the area from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ural Mountains, as some suggest, but rather a vaster area from the Rocky Mountains eastward across the North American continent (where our intercontinental missiles are based) and the North Atlantic (loaded with warships) to the Urals. And secondarily, from the Urals eastward across Siberia and the North Pacific to the Rockies, thus completing the sweep around the Northern Hemisphere and encompassing the location of almost all of the world's nuclear warheads. Because we Americans reside within the Rockies-to-Urals and Urals-to-Rockies territory, we must realize that European security and American security are inextricably linked.

So much for justification. On to the vision.

What People Want

The place to begin a vision for Europe is with the people -- not with national states, alliances, constellations of power, political arrangements, and military considerations. Let the vision derive from the hopes of the peoples of Europe, from people of many nationalities, varied ethnicity and language, different socio-economic groups, diverse religious, philosophical, and political beliefs. Let the vision also take into account their fears.

Suppose we took a public opinion poll in every nation, every district in Europe -- in the British Isles, the Iberian peninsula, France, the low countries, Scandinavia, Central and Eastern Europe, Italy, the Balkans, the Soviet Union and its major regions. Suppose we asked the people: What do you want most in life? What are your greatest hopes? Also, what are your gravest fears?

There would be many answers. I conjecture that prominent among what diverse Europeans

want in life are the following: Enough to eat. Shelter and clothing. Personal safety. Sanitary water, clean air. Perhaps wealth, social status, and the symbols of such status (possibly disguised rather than stated openly). Good friends. Successful courtship (if one is at that place in life). A loving spouse (in the future or one's present spouse to be more loving). Children and a happy family life. A good future for one's children and grandchildren. End of racial, ethnic, and religious discrimination (especially if one is a victim). Better personal communication within one's family, among friends, at work. Good health, lack of pain. Death to come after a long, happy life, to be painless and not a burden on one's family. An after life (if that is one's belief).

Also, one's favorite team to win the championship. Success in school. Success in business, profession, trade, or occupation. Better TV programs. For some, retention of incumbents holding positions of authority in government, church, club, or other organization. For others, their replacement. To win an election oneself. A nice vacation with good weather. If a farmer or a gardener, the right combination of rain and sunshine. The person in the next apartment to be less noisy. The neighbors next door to keep their dog under control. Better treatment from the bureaucracy -- of government, utilities, department stores, hotels, hospitals, political party, church structure. Lessening of restrictions on personal freedom. Restoration of lost independence (if one is in that situation). Never experiencing a nuclear war or any other kind of attack on your homeland. Have other nations quit threatening one's own country.

As to the people's fears, many replies would be the converse of their hopes: Fear of personal injury, verbal abuse, theft of property, death. Fear of unruly neighbors and disorderly youth. Loss of status. Loss of job and home. Nuclear attack. Invasion. Other fears would be matters of psychological discomfort: Fear of change and uncertainty. Fear of differences one doesn't like or understand. Fear of alien ideas. Fear of other social, political, and economic systems. Fear of losing first place, or fear of being considered second rate. Fear of being replaced (if one is in a position of authority).

Having conducted this imaginary opinion survey, I offer a vision of Europe as a place where people's hopes can be properly fulfilled and their fears avoided. All talk of defense, political and economic systems, and international relations should be grounded on a desire to achieve what is best for the people. All of the people, not merely the ruling elite.

i. Mikhail Gorbachev, *Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World*. New York: Harper

& Row, 1987. p.195.

ii. [to be added]

A VISION FOR EUROPE

(third version)

by Howard W. Hallman

[Poem about US/Canadian border.]

As the poet, [name], described the US/Canadian border, so also my vision for Europe is for every border on that continent to be [quote from poem]. The borders would be undefended because no nation would have the will or the power to intrude by force.

Within each nation there would be a second set of memorials, dedicated to diversity of nationality, ethnicity, language, religion, and political belief. But these would not be monuments of stone and brass but rather living memorials of mutual acceptance, willingness to work out differences peacefully, commitment to a greater whole which blends together variety. If this memorial needs a caption, let it borrow the U.S. motto: "E pluribus unum." Out of many, one. But "pluribus" remains as an integral part of "unum."

This would be a Europe freed from the fear of war and civil strife. In this setting governments, social institutions, and economic systems would be dedicated to serving the needs of the people rather than seeking aggrandizement of power. The needs of the people would come first, not the ambitions of political leaders, not institutional empire-building.

Meeting Human Needs

What needs? The basic needs and common desires of humans everywhere on Earth: Enough to eat. Adequate shelter and sufficient clothing. Personal safety. Sanitary water, clean air. Good friends. Successful courtship. A loving spouse. Children and a happy family life. A good future for one's children and grandchildren. Good health, lack of pain. Death to come after a long, happy life, to be painless and not a burden on one's family. An after life (if that is one's belief).

Beyond these basic needs are some other commonly held hopes and desires: Success in school. Success in business, profession, trade, or occupation. One's favorite team to win the championship. Better TV programs. A nice vacation with good weather. If a farmer or a gardener, the right combination of rain and sunshine. The person in the next apartment to be less noisy. The neighbors next door to keep their dog under control. These range from the profound to the mundane but all are within the scope of peoples hopes and expectations.

Beyond such everyday desires, which are mostly apolitical, are some shared concerns that move

into the political realm: Desire for better treatment from the bureaucracy -- of government, utilities, department stores, hotels, hospitals, political party, church structure. Lessening of restrictions on personal freedom. Restoration of lost independence (if one is in that situation). Never experiencing a nuclear war or any other kind of attack on your homeland. Have other nations quit threatening one's own country.

In sum, the Europe of our vision would be a continent where all the inhabitants have ample opportunities for human fulfillment, no longer fearing war and oppression.

Getting from Here to There

Bringing this vision into reality requires a combination of idealism and self-interest.

Wealth, social status, and the symbols of such status (possibly disguised rather than stated openly).

GERMAN REUNIFICATION AND EUROPEAN DISARMAMENT

A Statement by

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

As the likelihood of German reunification increases, it is important for this process to occur within a context of broader changes in Europe. If German reunification is to happen, it should be a completely militarized Germany existing in a demilitarized Europe. German reunification and general European disarmament should take place simultaneously.

Today in Europe armed forces with offensive capability are obsolete. No nation has any self-interest to invade another. And no bloc of nations has any self-interest to launch an attack on another bloc. Yet, the existence of large standing armies and powerful air forces runs the risk of accidental war of escalating proportions. At worst it could trigger a global nuclear holocaust. Half of the world's annual military expenditures is focused on Europe, and this is a gross economic waste for all nations involved. And the development of more-and-more high-tech weapon systems is a vast waste of human talent.

General and complete disarmament in Europe is clearly within the interest of all European nations and within the interest of the United States and Canada, which have troops stationed in Europe.

Achievement of this goal requires a number of major actions.

- 1. All armed forces based on foreign territory should be totally with-*

drawn. This should be completed no later than May 8, 1995, the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe.

This includes (a) all Soviet forces based in Eastern Europe, (b) all U.S. forces based in Western Europe, including Mediterranean countries, and (c) British, French, Belgian, Dutch, and Canadian forces in the Federal Republic of Germany.

The current proposal to reduce U.S. and Soviet forces in Central Europe to 195,000 with another 30,000 U.S. forces elsewhere in Western Europe, while a step in the right direction, lags far behind current political reality in Europe.

The governments of Czechoslovakia and Hungary, the leading political party in Poland, and the people in East Germany are all calling for the departure of Soviet forces. Therefore, the United States should not give the Soviet Union treaty rights to remain when the populace wants them out.

With the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact as a cohesive fighting force and with the preoccupation of the Soviet government with internal reform, the possibility of Soviet invasion of Western Europe has shrunk zero. Therefore, there is no longer any justification for U.S. forces to remain in Western Europe to defend against Soviet aggression. The subliminal purpose of "keeping Germany under control" can be better achieved through general disarmament.

2. All withdrawn forces should be demobilized in their homelands and all offensive fighting equipment should be destroyed. In addition, the Soviet Union and the United States should demobilize home-based troops now kept available for a European war and should destroy all of their offensive fighting equipment.

Withdrawal without demobilization and equipment destruction is insufficient. Otherwise, Western Europe can fear a return of Soviet forces. And this fear provides a rationale for the United States to retain bases in Europe.

Destruction of fighting equipment is essential so that it cannot be kept in reserve for a future European war, used for Third World military intervention, or sold to other nations.

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

Combined with superpower withdrawal, this scale of disarmament is the surest method for obtaining common security in Europe. In the process Germany army would be virtually disbanded, not singling out a reunified Germany but rather as part of a European-wide process of demilitarization. This would quiet fears of resurgence of German military might.

Equipment destruction would prevent future remilitarization and would keep these weapons out of the world's arms market.

4. European disarmament should occur within the political framework established by the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, which accepted postwar boundaries in Europe and set forth standards for human rights, and the Stockholm Final Document of 1986, which contained a pledge of nonaggression.

Achieving common security requires political settlements as well as military disarmament. These two agreements have established a framework in which every nation in Europe can determine its own form of government through free elections and can choose its own economic system.

5. International structures and processes should be established for achieving common security and for peaceful resolution of disputes between and within nations.

With disarmament the need for military alliances would disappear and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Treaty Organization can be dissolved. In their place other instruments of political and economic cooperation should be established.

6. Future relations involving European and North American nations should emphasize trade, economic cooperation, and joint endeavors to deal with environmental problems.

The new "enemy" should be poverty, other social ills, and environmental deficiencies. U.S. involvement should be economic and cultural, not military.

February 16, 1990

*General and Complete Disarmament in Europe
A Goal for the 1990s*

by Howard W. Hallman

Why I as an American advocate European disarmament

- (1) I want all peoples of Earth to live in peace*
- (2) My genealogical and cultural ties with Europe*
- (3) The wasted U.S. resources on military expenditures related to Europe*
- (4) The risk of nuclear holocaust triggered by a European war ("The Day After")*
- (5) The connection with strategic nuclear disarmament (deterrence doctrine)*

Action and Reaction

- 1936 -- German troops into Rhineland
Germany forms Axis with Italy and Japan.*
- 1936-38 -- Stalin purges Communist leadership through trials and executions.*
- 1938 -- March: German annexes Austria.
September: Czechoslovakia cedes Sudetenland to Germany (Munich agreement)*
- 1939 -- March: German forces occupy remainder of Czechoslovakia.
August: German-Soviet Nonaggression Pact (which secretly divides Poland between them.
September: Germany invades Poland; Great Britain and France declare war on Germany; Soviet forces move into Poland from east to line predetermined with Germany.
After German invasion of Poland, Congress repeals arms embargo.
November: Soviet forces invade Finland.*
- 1940 - Soviet Union takes control of three Baltic States.
Germany conquers the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, and France.
Hungary and Romania, ruled by Nazi sympathizers, join the Axis.
Roosevelt transfers 50 destroyers to Great Britain in exchange for leases to put bases on British territory in Western Hemisphere.*
- 1941 -- Bulgaria joins Axis.
March: Lend-Lease program to supply nations fighting against the Axis (in next four years one-half went to Great Britain, one-fourth to Soviet Union, and remainder to China and other allies)
June: German forces invade Soviet Union.*

December: After Pearl Harbor is attacked by Japan, United States declares war on Japan, Germany, and Italy.

1942 -- German forces penetrate deep into Soviet Union; enter Stalingrad (now Volgograd), reach outskirts of Moscow and Leningrad.

1941-45 -- Huge contingent of U.S. forces move throughout the world to fight against Axis powers.

1943 -- Beginning of German retreat from Soviet Union.

1943 -- Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin meet in Tehran to discuss war aims and postwar issues.

1945 -- The "Big Three" meet for a second time in Yalta, Crimea in the Soviet Union, especially to deal with postwar matters.

The three Allied governments in the Yalta declaration promised to assist the people "to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people."

1944-45 Soviets regained control of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Annexed parts of Finland, Poland, East Prussia, Czechoslovakia, and Romania.

Occupied the rest of Romania, all of Bulgaria, Hungary, and what would become the new Poland, and a portion of Germany and Czechoslovakia.

National forces allied with Moscow liberated Yugoslavia and Albania.

1945-46 Soviets install communist governments in Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. Ignore Yalta requirement for free elections.

Crises: Northern Iran, Turkey, Greece

1947 Truman doctrine: "it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures."

1946 February: Kennan telegram on containment (published June 1947)

1948 February: Communist coup in Czechoslovakia

June: Berlin blockade

Stalin tried unsuccessfully to overthrow Tito in Yugoslavia

1949 NATO formed. John Foster Dulles' reasons for support:

(1) Offset fear, give Europeans greater self-assurance

(2) Show Soviets the West is united for common defense

(3) Substantial economies: in European Recovery Plan & military budget

(4) Solve problem of Germany. That is, "the Germans would be too strong for the comfort and safety of our European allies, unless the west is strengthened by the adhesion of the United States."

John Foster Dulles testifying in favor of the North Atlantic Treaty at a 1949 ratification hearing:

I would say that first of all the pact should not be operated primarily as a military instrument.

There are those who believe that war with the Soviet Union is inevitable and that we must now concentrate on gaining tactical and strategic advantages which will help us to win that war when it comes. They would use the pact in that spirit.

I do not question the sincerity of those who hold such beliefs, but for myself I utterly reject them. I do not know of any responsible high official, military or civilian, in this Government or any other government, who believes that the Soviet now plans conquest by open military aggression.

Further action and reaction:

NATO -- WTO

Establishment of West Germany -- East Germany

Tactical nuclear weapons

Soviet suppression:

1953 East Germany

1956 West German

1968 Czechoslovakia

Several times Poland

Jump ahead to the mid-1970s. Harvard Professor Richard Pipes, a leading conservative scholar on the Soviet Union, made this assessment in a book entitled *Soviet Strategies in Europe* (1976):

The importance of Western Europe to the United States is such that, in the event of Russia's direct onslaught, the United States would certainly react in an appropriate manner....[F]or this very reason a direct military attack on Western Europe by the Red Army seems highly improbable. Not only do the Russians have no wish to trigger a nuclear exchange, but they also have less apocalyptic reasons for caution: the desire to maintain good working relations with the United States; lack of experience with coordinated offensive operations on hostile foreign territory; mistrust of satellite armies, and fear of disorders in the event of military reverses....True, the Soviet Union maintains very large troop concentrations in Europe...and it has shown little interest in reasonable mutual force reductions. But from this it does not follow that the Soviet High Command seriously envisages the deployment of its European troops in massive offensive operations. The primary purpose of the Soviet divisions stationed in Europe is to intimidate. They are to

preclude nationalist uprisings in Eastern Europe, and to remind Western Europe that over it always hangs the threat of a devastating war.

When in 1987 Jonathan Dean, former ambassador to the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) talks, reviewed the chance of Soviet attack on Europe, he indicated that the predominant view of Europeans in Northern Tier was

that although the Soviet Union probably remains prepared to use military force in Third World countries, militarily at least, the Soviet Union is a status quo power in Europe. That is, the Soviet Union would defend itself if attacked, could react irrationally in some circumstances, but will not on a deliberate and considered basis launch an aggressive attack on Western Europe for the purpose of conquering and hold Western Europe.

Dean stated that this view is probably correct.

Dean also took up the matter of Soviet political intimidation as a means of increasing its influence over Western Europe. This has been a continual concern of NATO leaders. Dean surveyed the record of intimidating Soviet actions and found a clear pattern.

It is one of repeated Soviet attempts to influence Western European, especially Federal German, policy, using Soviet military power as a basis for these efforts -- and of repeated failure of these attempts.

So by the spring of 1989, the 40th anniversary of NATO, the only functional role of Soviet forces in Eastern Europe was to retain political control of East European regimes. Less than a year later that role has vanished. Furthermore, the joint military force of the Warsaw Pact has disintegrated. A succession of U.S. political and military leaders have said that the possibility of Soviet invasion of Western Europe has virtually dissipated.

McGeorge Bundy, in his book *Danger and Survival: Choices about the Bomb in the First Fifty Years* (1988), has this to say about NATO:

The most important purpose of the Western Alliance is to underpin the political independence and self-confidence of its own members over the long run. The Soviets hope for gains in Europe, but the gains they seek are political. In the world words of Sir Michael Hower, the American military presence was need in the first place "not just in the negative role of a deterrent to Soviet aggression, but in the positive role of a reassurance to the West Europeans."

Reasons European disarmament is achievable

All past reasons for European military build up are now moot.

Soviets clearly have no intent to invade.

With collapse of Warsaw Pact as an effective military force, they lack capability.

The Soviets are no longer using military force for political control in Eastern Europe.

In the West, European allies don't need reassurance.

Laten desire "to keep Germans under control" can be better achieved through demilitarization of a unified Germany in a demilitarized Europe.

His Excellency Jürgen Ruhfus
Ambassador of the Federal
Republic of Germany
4645 Reservoir Road
Washington, DC 20007

Dear Mr. Ambassador:

Perhaps you saw in the March 1, 1990 edition of the Washington Post an excerpt from my statement on "German Reunification and European Disarmament." I would like to share the entire statement with you.

My consideration of this issue has arisen from an initial concern for the United States and the Soviet Union to achieve strategic nuclear disarmament. As I examined the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, I came to the conclusion that the primary purpose of the U.S. strategic arsenal has been to serve as backup of forward-based forces in Europe. Therefore, we cannot achieve strategic disarmament until there is substantial arms reduction in Central Europe.

With the astonishing changes taking place in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union, it is now possible to achieve European disarmament. These same events have brought to the fore the possibility of German unification. For me the two opportunities are linked: European disarmament and German unification. That's the point I make in this statement. I call for:

- o Withdrawal of all foreign-based forces by May 8, 1995.
- o Demobilization of these forces in their homelands.
- o Simultaneous demobilization of all national forces in Europe.

- o Observance of postwar political boundaries, as specified in the Helsinki Final Act of 1975.*
- o International structures and processes for achieving common security and peaceful resolution of disputes between and within nations.*

Within this framework, a unified Germany would be demilitarized along with the rest of Europe.

I would be interested in your response to my views. If you wish to reply in German, I can read the language though lack fluency in speaking and writing.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Friederich Ebert Stiftung
806 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Dear Friends:

Perhaps you saw in the March 1, 1990 edition of the Washington Post an excerpt from my statement on "German Reunification and European Disarmament." I would like to share the entire statement with you.

My consideration of this issue has arisen from an initial concern for the United States and the Soviet Union to achieve strategic nuclear disarmament. As I examined the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, I came to the conclusion that the primary purpose of the U.S. strategic arsenal has been to serve as backup of forward-based forces in Europe. Therefore, we cannot achieve strategic disarmament until there is substantial arms reduction in Central Europe.

With the astonishing changes taking place in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union, it is now possible to achieve European disarmament. These same events have brought to the fore the possibility of German unification. For me the two opportunities are linked: European disarmament and German unification. That's the point I make in this statement. I call for:

- o Withdrawal of all foreign-based forces by May 8, 1995.
- o Demobilization of these forces in their homelands.
- o Simultaneous demobilization of all national forces in Europe.
- o Observance of postwar political boundaries, as specified in the Helsinki Final Act of 1975.

o International structures and processes for achieving common security and peaceful resolution of disputes between and within nations.

Within this framework, a unified Germany would be demilitarized along with the rest of Europe.

I would be interested in your response to my views. If you wish to reply in German, I can read the language though lack fluency in speaking and writing.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Konrad Adenauer Stiftung
1330 New Hampshire Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Friends:

Perhaps you saw in the March 1, 1990 edition of the Washington Post an excerpt from my statement on "German Reunification and European Disarmament." I would like to share the entire statement with you.

My consideration of this issue has arisen from an initial concern for the United States and the Soviet Union to achieve strategic nuclear disarmament. As I examined the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, I came to the conclusion that the primary purpose of the U.S. strategic arsenal has been to serve as backup of forward-based forces in Europe. Therefore, we cannot achieve strategic disarmament until there is substantial arms reduction in Central Europe.

With the astonishing changes taking place in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union, it is now possible to achieve European disarmament. These same events have brought to the fore the possibility of German unification. For me the two opportunities are linked: European disarmament and German unification. That's the point I make in this statement. I call for:

- o Withdrawal of all foreign-based forces by May 8, 1995.
- o Demobilization of these forces in their homelands.
- o Simultaneous demobilization of all national forces in Europe.
- o Observance of postwar political boundaries, as specified in the Helsinki Final Act of 1975.

o International structures and processes for achieving common security and peaceful resolution of disputes between and within nations.

Within this framework, a unified Germany would be demilitarized along with the rest of Europe.

I would be interested in your response to my views. If you wish to reply in German, I can read the language though lack fluency in speaking and writing.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

*Friederich Nauman Stiftung
1758 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009*

Dear Friends:

Perhaps you saw in the March 1, 1990 edition of the Washington Post an excerpt from my statement on "German Reunification and European Disarmament." I would like to share the entire statement with you.

My consideration of this issue has arisen from an initial concern for the United States and the Soviet Union to achieve strategic nuclear disarmament. As I examined the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, I came to the conclusion that the primary purpose of the U.S. strategic arsenal has been to serve as backup of forward-based forces in Europe. Therefore, we cannot achieve strategic disarmament until there is substantial arms reduction in Central Europe.

With the astonishing changes taking place in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union, it is now possible to achieve European disarmament. These same events have brought to the fore the possibility of German unification. For me the two opportunities are linked: European disarmament and German unification. That's the point I make in this statement. I call for:

- o Withdrawal of all foreign-based forces by May 8, 1995.*
- o Demobilization of these forces in their homelands.*
- o Simultaneous demobilization of all national forces in Europe.*
- o Observance of postwar political boundaries, as specified in the Helsinki Final Act of 1975.*

o International structures and processes for achieving common security and peaceful resolution of disputes between and within nations.

Within this framework, a unified Germany would be demilitarized along with the rest of Europe.

I would be interested in your response to my views. If you wish to reply in German, I can read the language though lack fluency in speaking and writing.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

To: Leaders in European Peace Movement

Dear Friends:

The astonishing changes taking place in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union and the resulting decrease in Cold War tensions are a welcome relief. Now is an opportune time to make major changes in European-North American relationships. My own view on what is possible is summarized in the enclosed statement on "German Reunification and European Disarmament." I want to share this with you and to ask for your comments.

My consideration of these issues has arisen from an initial desire for the United States and the Soviet Union to achieve strategic nuclear disarmament. As I examined the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, I came to the conclusion that the primary purpose of the U.S. strategic arsenal has been to serve as backup of forward-based forces in Europe. Therefore, we cannot achieve strategic disarmament until there is substantial arms reduction in Central Europe. So it is within U.S. interest to push for European disarmament, including withdrawal of both U.S. and Soviet forces from Europe and their demobilization at home.

Now, as a byproduct of changes occurring in Central Europe, German unification is in the offing. There are many opinion on this matter. My view is that German unification and European disarmament should be linked. That's the point I make in the enclosed statement. I call for:

- o Withdrawal of all foreign-based forces by May 8, 1995.
- o Demobilization of these forces in their homelands.
- o Simultaneous demobilization of all national forces in Europe.

- o Observance of postwar political boundaries, as specified in the Helsinki Final Act of 1975.*
- o International structures and processes for achieving common security and peaceful resolution of disputes between and within nations.*

Within this framework, a unified Germany would be demilitarized along with the rest of Europe.

I would be interested in your response to my views. I hope that we can establish dialogue on mutual concerns.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Dr. Johannes Schönherr
Möllenseestrasse 23
Berlin 1162
German Democratic Republic

Dear Dr. Schönherr:

I have the letter to citizens, parliaments, and governments of Europe, Canada, and the USA, which came out of a meeting in Berlin on February 28, 1990. It is an excellent statement and a noteworthy contribution to the European peace process.

In the same vein I would like to share with you the enclosed statement on "German Reunification and European Disarmament", which offers my views on this subject. I came to consider this issue in a roundabout way. I started with a desire for the United States and the Soviet Union to achieve strategic nuclear disarmament. As I examined the doctrine of nuclear deterrence, I came to the conclusion that the primary purpose of the U.S. strategic arsenal has been to serve as backup of forward-based forces in Europe. Accordingly, there cannot be strategic disarmament until there is substantial arms reduction in Central Europe. This led me to advocate complete and general disarmament in Europe, including total withdrawal of both U.S. and Soviet forces from Europe and their demobilization at home.

Now, as a byproduct of changes occurring in Central Europe, German unification is in the offing. My view is that German unification and European disarmament should be linked. That's the point I make in the

enclosed statement. I call for:

- o Withdrawal of all foreign-based forces by May 8, 1995.
- o Demobilization of these forces in their homelands.
- o Simultaneous demobilization of all national forces in Europe.
- o Observance of postwar political boundaries, as specified in the Helsinki Final Act of 1975.
- o International structures and processes for achieving common security and peaceful resolution of disputes between and within nations.

Within this framework, a unified Germany would be demilitarized along with the rest of Europe.

I would be interested in your response to my views. I would also like to receive a copy of the "Appeal of the 89". If you wish to reply "auf Deutsch", I can read German but do not write or speak it very well.

Sincerely yours

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

HOWARD W. HALLMAN
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

Mr. Mubarak E. Awad, President
Nonviolent International
P.O. Box 39127, Friendship Station, NW
Washington, DC 20016

Dear Mubarak:

For many years I've admired your notable contributions to nonviolent action. I've met you a couple of times at board meetings of the Civil-based Defense Association and once at your center. I hope that you will be able to play a significant role among Palestinians as they gain the opportunity for self-rule.

Over the years I have been heavily involved in various aspects of grassroots democracy in the United States: as an organizer, local government administrator, trainer, and provider of technical assistance. As democracy began to emerge in Eastern Europe, I felt that there are important lessons in American democracy that would be useful in these lands, not to precisely copy but rather as points of departure in developing their own systems. As a result I have done a lot of thinking on this subject, some writing, and have sought opportunities to make a contribution.

Perhaps some of my ideas would be useful to Palestinians embarking on self-rule. My basic framework rests on the concept that the consent of the governed -- a phrase from the American Declaration of Independence -- is a continuous,

interactive process. It is much more than voting and then leaving everything to elected officials. It requires full and on-going citizen participation in governmental decision-making. It needs structures and processes for citizen participation built into the governmental framework.

At least in the American experience the existence of numerous citizen associations, organized for a multiple of purposes, is essential for a flourishing democracy. Associations carry out important tasks and provide a base for citizen advocacy. They offer people first-hand experience in democratic practices and serve as a place for leadership development.

A fuller summation of my ideas is enclosed along with a piece on grassroots associations and an outline of topics for training and technical assistance. I would welcome an opportunity to discuss my ideas with you in person and to explore whether I might make a contribution to the development of democracy in the new Palestine.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

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

CIVIC ACTION INSTITUTE
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

June 28, 1994

Mr. Gershon Baskin
Israel/Palestine Center for
Research and Information
1 Nablus Road, P.O. Box 51358
East Jerusalem, Israel

Dear Mr. Baskin:

I was very interested in your op-ed piece, "Jerusalem Should Be Shared", which appeared in the Washington Post on June 26, 1994. I would like to suggest that you and others working for a shared Jerusalem might want to consider creation of neighborhood councils as a means of democratic participation and problem solving. Experience in the United States clearly demonstrates that neighborhood councils, first, contribute to social, economic, and physical development within their neighborhoods, and, second, provide a basis for representation on citywide bodies that permit citizens to work together in dealing with common concerns.

Over the years I have done a lot of work with neighborhoods in the United States. In 1983 I spent a month in Israel with my wife, who was then a theological student and is now a United Methodist minister. We were based at St. George's College in East Jerusalem, studying "The Bible and Its Setting." On my own I talked with a number of Israelis and Palestinians engaged in community organizing in their respective communities. I discovered many

common concerns.

In the United States a number of cities during the 1970s organized neighborhood councils or gave official recognition to existing neighborhood associations if they were broadly representative and democratically governed. These neighborhood councils then took on roles in neighborhood planning, determining budget priorities, self-help activities (such as housing rehabilitation, community crime prevention, services for children and youth). Representatives of these neighborhood councils met together to serve as an advisory body for city government.

Some of this experience is summarized in enclosed excerpts from my book, *Neighborhoods: Their Place in Urban Life* (1984). Earlier I had written about the emergence of these entities in *The Organization and Operation of Neighborhood Councils: A Practical Guide* (1977). A copy of the table of contents is enclosed. If you would like copies of these books, I would be pleased to send them to you.

More recently the Brookings Institution has published a scholarly analysis of neighborhood councils in four cities plus a different approach used in a fifth city: *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy* by Jeffrey M. Berry, Kent E. Portney, and Ken Thomson (1993). The table of contents is enclosed.

Neighborhood councils enable residents to work together on common concerns. In this manner they contribute to solving many different community problems. They also serve as primary schools of democracy by providing first-hand experience in decision-making and problem-solving. A considerable number of citizens then move on to take broader leadership roles in the city.

Mr. Gershon Baskin

June 28, 1994

Page two.

As neighborhood representatives work together in citywide bodies, they understand one another better, accommodate to one another's needs, and promote racial, ethnic, and religious harmony. The study of Berry, Portney, and Thomson demonstrated that increased civic participation in this manner greatly increased tolerance among the participants.

This became clear to me several years ago during a visit to Dayton, Ohio, a city which has had neighborhood councils (called "priority boards") since 1969. I have followed Dayton since the early 1970s and spent two days there to catch up on happenings. Throughout my visit I observed easy-going relationships between blacks and whites, who worked well together on citywide committees and as city officials (for instance, the mayor was black, the city manager was white). While awaiting my flight at the airport, I met a friend from Washington, who showed me a reprint of a series of newspaper articles on how Dayton was divided into two cities, one black, one white, mostly demarcated by a river running through the center of town. That was the residential pattern. But the pattern of civic participation I had seen was very well integrated. That's because neighborhood residents organized and elected their own leaders. These leaders then worked together through all-inclusive, community-wide mechanisms.

As I think back to the month I lived in Jerusalem and the community development personnel I talked to, I believe that some kind of neighborhood council system would be useful. It would provide democratic experience to residents who have been denied opportunities for civic participation. It

would establish structures for getting things done within neighborhoods. It would yield a core of grassroots leaders, chosen by residents, who could come together on a citywide basis to work for solutions to common problems. As Israelis and Palestinians meet together in this manner, they will come to realize that their mutual interests, derived from their common humanity, far exceed their differences. Then can they honor and respect their distinctiveness but not let this interfere with their efforts to work together harmoniously.

If I can provide you further information on neighborhood councils, please let me know. I have also done a lot of work on other kinds of participative processes in grassroots democracy and am willing to share other ideas if you are interested.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
President

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

cc. David Cohen

HOWARD W. HALLMAN
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

July 20, 1994

Dr. Hisham Sharabi
Professor of History
Georgetown University
Washington, DC 20057

Dear Dr. Sharabi:

I greatly appreciate your recent op-ed piece in the Washington Post, "Only a Democratic Palestine Can Survive." I fully agree with you.

In 1983 I had the privilege of living for a month in East Jerusalem at St. George's College. I was there with my wife, who was then a theological student and is now a United Methodist minister. We were studying "The Bible and Its Setting", but I managed to talk with a number of Palestinians, including a one day visit to Gaza. This helped me better appreciate the aspirations of the Palestinian people and gave me a better understanding their grievances.

Over the years I have been heavily involved in various aspects of grassroots democracy in the United States: as an organizer, local government administrator, trainer, and provider of technical assistance. I believe that there are important lessons in American democracy that would be useful in emerging democracies, including Palestine, not to precisely copy but rather as points of departure in developing their own systems.

I have written several pieces along these lines, which I would like to share with you. I'm also enclosing a topical list of items which the Civic Action Institute deals with. I would be pleased to have an opportunity to share my thinking in greater depth with you and others who are working for a democratic Palestine. Please let me know if I can help.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
President*

Telephone -- Mon-Thurs: 1-301 694-2859 (in Frederick, Md.)

Fri-Sat: 301 897-3668 (in Bethesda)

HOWARD W. HALLMAN
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

November 2, 1994

Ms. Karen Hanrahan
Nonviolent International
P.O. Box 39127, Friendship Station, NW
Washington, DC 20016

Dear Ms. Hanrahan:

To update the background material I sent to Mubarak Awad a year ago, I am sending you a fresh copy of my vita, a list of topics my organization, the Civic Action Institute, deals with related to democratic participation, and a paper on that subject. Much of my experience and interest relates to participation beyond elections, particularly how citizens can be involved in the ongoing decision-making processes of government. I also know enough about elections that I can serve as part of a team providing training and assistance on that topic.

Thus, if I fit into the need for training on democracy in Palestine at present or in the future, I am willing to serve.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman

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

REFLECTIONS ON THE FUTURE OF JERUSALEM

by Howard W. Hallman¹

On November 11, 1994 I attended a symposium on "The Middle East Peace Process: The Question of Jerusalem" sponsored by the Luther Institute and held in Washington, D.C. It was an enlightening and inspirational gathering. As follow-up I would like to offer my reflections on the future of Jerusalem. I write as a political scientist with a peace and justice orientation and as one of the children of Abraham who long for peace in Jerusalem.

At the symposium I was greatly impressed by the comment of Pastor Said Ailabouni that King David, in making Jerusalem his capital, chose a location between Israel and Judea. Thus, Jerusalem was a unifying element for the northern and southern divisions of the Jewish people. In a similar manner Jerusalem today could be a unifying factor for Israelis and Palestinians.

I was also interested in the idea of Dr. Gershon Baskin of having a

¹ Howard W. Hallman is president of the Civic Action Institute of Bethesda, Maryland, a private nonprofit organization engaged in research, training, and technical assistance. His books include *Neighborhood Government in a Metropolitan Setting* (Sage, 1974), *The Organization and Operation of Neighborhood Councils: A Practical Guide* (Praeger, 1977), *Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis* (Sage, 1977), and *Neighborhoods: Their Place in Urban Life* (Sage, 1984). He is also chair, board of directors, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a national association of laity and clergy.

charter for Jerusalem embraced by both Israel and a Palestinian state. I took note of an observation by Dr. Mahadi Adul-Hadi that citizenship and residency are two different matters.

These ideas, combined with my own studies and writings on metropolitan governance, lead me to suggest the following possibilities for the governance of Jerusalem.

(1) Define the boundaries for a unified metropolis of Jerusalem so that now or in the future there would be a population of approximately equal numbers of Israelis and Palestinians, or so that the lesser number would be at least 40 percent of the total.

(2) Develop a Jerusalem city charter that would be adopted by both the Israeli and Palestinian parliaments.² Give the charter a twenty year life so that the unified city would have long term stability, though perhaps provide for a charter review commission after ten years. Eventually provide for greater home rule within a framework agreed upon by the two national parliaments.

² The writings of Daniel J. Elazar, who works from centers for the study of federalism in Philadelphia and Jerusalem, offer many insights on confederal arrangements.

(3) All residents of unified Jerusalem would be eligible to vote for municipal officials.

(4) Have two co-mayors, one Israeli and one Palestinian. Require each of them to approve municipal ordinances. At city hall have a common reception area for the co-mayors. Allow all residents to vote for both co-mayors with provision for runoff election if one received less than 40 percent of those voting. This means that Israeli candidates would likely need to appeal to Palestinian voters and vice versa.

(5) Have a non-partisan city council (as in many American cities). Some might be elected by districts and some (less than half) at large. Council districts could of approximately equal population. At-large councilors could be divided equally between Israelis and Palestinians. They could have the same runoff requirement as the co-mayors. In the city council chamber intermingle Israeli and Palestinian councilors in sitting arrangements and also in their office location in city hall.

(6) Organize neighborhood councils composed of persons elected by neighborhood residents. Assign them significant roles in formulating policies affecting their neighborhood. Encourage neighborhood councils to carry out self-help activities (such as neighborhood patrols, services for children and youth). Consider the possibility of delegating to neighborhood councils certain municipal services that can readily be decentralized.

(7) Form a conference of neighborhoods to bring together representatives from all neighborhoods to share ideas and advise the co-mayors and city council on policy issues. (American experience indicates that this can be a unifying experience because representatives of different races and ethnic groups come to realize that they have far more in common

than differences.)

(8) In the years ahead Israel, Palestine, and unified Jerusalem will all have multi-ethnic populations. Palestinians have resided in Israeli since it was established and will remain there. Jewish residents in settlements built in the occupied territory are likely to remain in a Palestinian state when it is established. Jerusalem is now and will continue to be multi-ethnic. Perhaps there can be dual citizenship for persons choosing such an option. Or citizenship in one state and permanent residence in the other (likewise for different parts of Jerusalem) but equal rights for all. In this manner sovereignty would be less exacting.

(9) With the Jerusalem question fairly settled, nations of world will be able to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. The Palestinian state could also establish its capital in Jerusalem.

(10) Whatever happens it is extremely important to work diligently to achieve a sense of community -- a "we feeling" -- for Jerusalem as a whole. In a book entitled *The Good City*, philosopher Lawrence Haworth noted:

In any genuine community there are shared values: the members are united through the fact that they fix on some object as preeminently valuable. And there is a joint effort, involving all members of the

community, by which they give overt expression to their mutual regard for that object.³

He further suggested:

The common cause that unifies the inhabitants of the city should be, simply, the city -- as it is, so far as it is good; as it might be, so far as it falls short of the ideal.⁴

In short, the New Jerusalem, the City of Peace.

All the children of Abraham cherish Jerusalem, both current residents and others scattered throughout the world. We all look forward to the day when peace will come to Jerusalem.

November 15, 1994

Howard W. Hallman
Civic Action Institute
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

³ Lawrence Haworth, *The Good City*. Bloomington, Indiana: University of Indiana Press, 1963. p. 86.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 100.

Mon-Thurs: (301) 694-2859

Fri-Sat: (301) 897-3668

CIVIC ACTION INSTITUTE
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

November 21, 1994

Dr. Gershon Baskin
Israel/Palestine Center for
Research and Information
1 Nablus Road, P.O. Box 51358
East Jerusalem, Israel

Dear Dr. Baskin:

I was pleased to meet you in person when you were in Washington for the symposium sponsored by the Lutheran Institute. I found the day very enlightening.

The discussion led me to bring together my own views, which I have expressed in the enclosed "Reflections on the Future of Jerusalem". I write as a political scientist with peace and justice concerns.

Among my proposals is the creation of neighborhood councils and a conference on neighborhoods to bring together people from the entire Jerusalem metropolis to deal with common concerns. I recall that you, too, have advocated neighborhood councils.

Over the years I have done a lot of research and writing on neighborhoods and alternative forms of neighborhood organizations in the United States. Under separate cover I am send you copies of two books on this subject:

The Organization and Operation of Neighborhood Councils: A Practical Guide and Neighborhoods: Their Place in Urban Life.

My organization, the Civic Action Institute, has previously conducted training and technical assistance for public officials and neighborhood leaders in the United States on matters of citizen participation and neighborhood organization. I am starting to do some work abroad on these topics. If there is some way I can assist you and others in Jerusalem, please let me know. My vita and a list of topics are enclosed.

Good luck to you and others seeking peace for Jerusalem. I hope that we will meet again.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
President

CIVIC ACTION INSTITUTE
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

November 21, 1994

*Dr. Mahdi Abdul-Hadi, President
Palestinian Academic Society for
the Study of International Affairs
P.O. Box 79545
Jerusalem, Israel*

Dear Dr. Abdul-Hadi:

I was pleased to meet you when you were in Washington for the symposium sponsored by the Lutheran Institute. I found the day very enlightening.

The discussion led me to bring together my own views, which I have expressed in the enclosed "Reflections on the Future of Jerusalem". I write as a political scientist with peace and justice concerns.

Among my proposals is the creation of neighborhood councils and a conference on neighborhoods to bring together people from the entire Jerusalem metropolis to deal with common concerns. This is a way to promote greater civic responsibility and to promote multi-ethnic cooperation.

Over the years I have done a lot of research and writing on neighborhoods and alternative forms of neighborhood organizations in the United States. Under separate cover I am send you copies of two books on this subject:

The Organization and Operation of Neighborhood Councils: A Practical Guide and Neighborhoods: Their Place in Urban Life.

My organization, the Civic Action Institute, has previously conducted training and technical assistance for public officials and neighborhood leaders in the United States on matters of citizen participation and neighborhood organization. I am starting to do some work abroad on these topics. If there is some way I can assist you and others in Jerusalem, please let me know. My vita and a list of topics are enclosed.

Good luck to you and others seeking peace for Jerusalem. I hope that we will meet again.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
President

CIVIC ACTION INSTITUTE
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

November 21, 1994

Mr. Hassan Abdel-Rahman
1730 K Street, NW, Suite 703
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Mr. Abdel-Rahman:

I was pleased to meet you recently at the symposium on Jerusalem sponsored by the Luther Institute. I found the day very enlightening.

The discussion led me to bring together my own views, which I have expressed in the enclosed "Reflections on the Future of Jerusalem". I write as a political scientist with peace and justice concerns.

I favor a unified, multi-ethnic Jerusalem, chartered by both Israel and a Palestinian state. I suggest a nonpartisan city council, chosen partly by districts and partly at large, and two co-mayors, an Israeli and a Palestinian. I also advocate the creation of neighborhood councils and a conference on neighborhoods to bring together people from the entire Jerusalem metropolis to deal with common concerns. This is a way to promote greater civic responsibility and to promote multi-ethnic cooperation.

These ideas incorporate my studies of metropolitan governance, presented in a book entitled *Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis*, and also my work dealing with neighborhoods, including *The Organization and*

Operation of Neighborhood Councils: A Practical Guide.

My organization, the Civic Action Institute, has previously conducted training and technical assistance for public officials and neighborhood leaders in the United States on matters of citizen participation and neighborhood organization. I am starting to do some work abroad on these topics. If there is some way I can assist the work of the Palestinian National Authority as it develops self-rule in Gaza and the West Bank, please let me know. My vita and a list of topics are enclosed.

Good luck to you and others seeking peace for Jerusalem. I hope that we will meet again.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
President

CIVIC ACTION INSTITUTE
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

November 21, 1994

The Rev. Said R. Ailabouni
909 E. Main Street
Barrington, IL 60010

Dear Rev. Ailabouni:

I was pleased to meet you recently at the symposium on Jerusalem sponsored by the Luther Institute. I found the day very enlightening.

The discussion led me to bring together my own views, which I have expressed in the enclosed "Reflections on the Future of Jerusalem". I write as a political scientist with peace and justice concerns.

I favor a unified, multi-ethnic Jerusalem, chartered by both Israel and a Palestinian state. I suggest a nonpartisan city council, chosen partly by districts and partly at large, and two co-mayors, an Israeli and a Palestinian. I also advocate the creation of neighborhood councils and a conference on neighborhoods to bring together people from the entire Jerusalem metropolis to deal with common concerns. This is a way to promote greater civic responsibility and to promote multi-ethnic cooperation.

These ideas incorporate my studies of metropolitan governance, presented in a book entitled *Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis*, and also my work dealing with neighborhoods, including *The Organization and*

Operation of Neighborhood Councils: A Practical Guide.

Good luck to you and others seeking peace for Jerusalem. I hope that we will meet again.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
President

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

CIVIC ACTION INSTITUTE
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

November 21, 1994

Mr. Jerome Segal
8604 2nd Avenue, Suite 317
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Mr. Segal:

I was pleased to hear you speak recently at the symposium on Jerusalem sponsored by the Luther Institute. I found the day very enlightening.

The discussion led me to bring together my own views, which I have expressed in the enclosed "Reflections on the Future of Jerusalem". I write as a political scientist with peace and justice concerns.

I favor a unified, multi-ethnic Jerusalem, chartered by both Israel and a Palestinian state. I suggest a nonpartisan city council, chosen partly by districts and partly at large, and two co-mayors, an Israeli and a Palestinian. I also advocate the creation of neighborhood councils and a conference on neighborhoods to bring together people from the entire Jerusalem metropolis to deal with common concerns. This is a way to promote greater civic responsibility and to promote multi-ethnic cooperation.

These ideas incorporate my studies of metropolitan governance, presented in a book entitled *Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis*, and also my work dealing with neighborhoods, including *The Organization and*

Operation of Neighborhood Councils: A Practical Guide.

Good luck to you and others seeking peace for Jerusalem.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
President*

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

CIVIC ACTION INSTITUTE
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

November 21, 1994

Dr. Michael Berenbaum, Director
Research Institute
U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum
100 Raoul Wallenberg Place, SW
Washington, DC 20024-2150

Dear Dr. Berenbaum:

I was pleased to hear you speak recently at the symposium on Jerusalem sponsored by the Luther Institute. I found the day very enlightening.

The discussion led me to bring together my own views, which I have expressed in the enclosed "Reflections on the Future of Jerusalem". I write as a political scientist with peace and justice concerns.

I favor a unified, multi-ethnic Jerusalem, chartered by both Israel and a Palestinian state. I suggest a nonpartisan city council, chosen partly by districts and partly at large, and two co-mayors, an Israeli and a Palestinian. I also advocate the creation of neighborhood councils and a conference on neighborhoods to bring together people from the entire Jerusalem metropolis to deal with common concerns. This is a way to promote greater civic responsibility and to promote multi-ethnic cooperation.

These ideas incorporate my studies of metropolitan governance, presented in

*a book entitled *Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis*, and also my work dealing with neighborhoods, including *The Organization and Operation of Neighborhood Councils: A Practical Guide*.*

Good luck to you and others seeking peace for Jerusalem.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
President*

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

CIVIC ACTION INSTITUTE
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

November 21, 1994

Rev. Mark B. Brown
Lutheran Office for Intergovernmental Affairs
122 C Street, NW, Suite 125
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mark:

Thank you for your contribution in arranging the recent symposium on Jerusalem. I found the day very enlightening. And thank you for providing me the addresses of several of the speakers.

The discussion led me to bring together my own views, which I have expressed in the enclosed "Reflections on the Future of Jerusalem". This is what I have sent to panelists who appeared at the symposium.

I write as a political scientist with peace and justice concerns. I favor a unified, multi-ethnic Jerusalem, chartered by both Israel and a Palestinian state. I suggest a nonpartisan city council, chosen partly by districts and partly at large, and two co-mayors, an Israeli and a Palestinian. I also advocate the creation of neighborhood councils and a conference on neighborhoods to bring together people from the entire Jerusalem metropolis to deal with common concerns. This is a way to promote greater civic responsibility and to promote multi-ethnic cooperation.

*These ideas incorporate my studies of metropolitan governance, presented in a book entitled *Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis*, and also my work dealing with neighborhoods, including *The Organization and Operation of Neighborhood Councils: A Practical Guide*.*

Good luck to you and others seeking peace for Jerusalem.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
President*

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

CIVIC ACTION INSTITUTE
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

November 21, 1994

Ms. Helena Cobban
2318 44th Street, MW
Washington, DC 20007

Dear Ms. Cobban:

I was pleased to hear you speak recently at the symposium on Jerusalem sponsored by the Luther Institute. I found the day very enlightening.

The discussion led me to bring together my own views, which I have expressed in the enclosed "Reflections on the Future of Jerusalem". I write as a political scientist with peace and justice concerns.

I favor a unified, multi-ethnic Jerusalem, chartered by both Israel and a Palestinian state. I suggest a nonpartisan city council, chosen partly by districts and partly at large, and two co-mayors, an Israeli and a Palestinian. I also advocate the creation of neighborhood councils and a conference on neighborhoods to bring together people from the entire Jerusalem metropolis to deal with common concerns. This is a way to promote greater civic responsibility and to promote multi-ethnic cooperation.

These ideas incorporate my studies of metropolitan governance, presented in a book entitled *Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis*, and also my work dealing with neighborhoods, including *The Organization and*

Operation of Neighborhood Councils: A Practical Guide.

Good luck to you and others seeking peace for Jerusalem.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
President*

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

*CIVIC ACTION INSTITUTE
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817*

December 13, 1994

*Dr. Michael Berenbaum, Director
Research Institute
U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum
100 Raoul Wallenberg Place, SW
Washington, DC 20024-2150*

Dear Dr. Berenbaum:

Thank you for your letter of November 29, 1994 in response to my ideas on the future of Jerusalem. I am a learner, and it helps me to clarify various points in my analysis.

I accept what you say about historic Jerusalem in the reigns of David and Solomon. Whatever Jerusalem was then, I still believe that a shared Jerusalem can be a unifying factor in achieving common interests for Israelis and Palestinians. I believe that the future holds two side-by-side, bi-ethnic states, Israeli and Palestine. It seems appropriate for both of them to have their capitals in Jerusalem, a unified city with shared governance.

Your letter and the article in the Washington Post today have helped me gain a clear picture of population distribution in and around Jerusalem. I lived there in May 1983 at St. George's College in East Jerusalem, joining my wife, who was then a seminary student and is now a United Methodist minister, in a study of the Bible and its setting. Since then it's apparent that policies of

the Israeli government has altered the ratio and distribution of population considerably. However, there is buildable land in the traditionally Palestinian part of Jerusalem so that it's possible that the Palestinian population will increase in the future.

Even if the population ratio is 70/30, my ideas about neighborhood councils and shared authority are valid. I know a number of U.S. cities with an African American population in the 20 to 30 percent range where neighborhood representatives come together in citywide endeavors and forge civic unity. Indeed, a common civic life can contribute to racial, religious, and ethnic harmony among a diverse population. Participants recognize and accept their differences while at the same time valuing their common humanity and their shared interest in a city which belongs to all of them.

That's what I'm trying to convey. If that is a common objective for Israelis and Palestinians,, the technicalities of governance can be worked out.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
President*

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

METHODISTS UNITED FOR PEACE WITH JUSTICE

421 Seward Square, SE

Washington, DC 20003

(202) 546-5551

REFLECTIONS ON MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

by Howard W. Hallman

*Methodists United for Peace with Justice was founded in 1987 to work for implementation of the United Methodist Council of Bishops' statement, *In Defense of Creation*, which gave primary attention to US/Soviet relationships and the need for nuclear disarmament. Accordingly, we have not developed policy positions on different cases of regional conflict (Central America, South Africa, Middle East). This statement, therefore, contains my personal observations.*

1. The Iraqi invasion and occupation of Kuwait, installation of a puppet government, and annexation of Kuwait to Iraq are all wrongful acts. They are further examples of the disregard for human life and international law displayed by the tyrannical regime of Saddam Hussein.

2. These acts immediately raise questions of how the international community should respond. The response should reflect a deep concern for means and ends, for as Mahatma Gandhi once observed, "the end is contained in the means." Christians realize that ultimately it is "not with swords loud clashing, nor roll of stirring drums" but rather "with deeds of love and mercy the heavenly kingdom comes."

3. As an affront to world peace, the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait requires

a response by the international community. As presently organized, the United Nations and the Arab League (as a regional federation) are in the best position to lead the response.

4. The UN Security Council responded quickly and correctly by passing a series of resolutions condemning Iraq's actions and calling for an international economic boycott to put pressure on Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. The Arab League, to which both Iraq and Kuwait belong, also took steps to condemn Iraq and stop further Iraqi aggression.

5. But before the UN-sponsored economic boycott had an opportunity to show its effect, the United States took unilateral military action by initiating a naval blockade (prior to authorization by the United Nations Security Council) and by sending a huge contingent of ground and air forces under U.S. (not UN) command to Saudi Arabia. In what has been called the "first post-Cold War engagement", the U.S. government chose to take on the role as the policeman of the world (at least selectively).

6. President Bush has articulated several purposes for the use of U.S. military force: "to preserve the American way of life" (which can be read to mean a continued flow of Middle East oil), to defend Saudi Arabia from Iraqi invasion, to drive Iraq out of Kuwait, to cause the downfall of Saddam Hussein's regime. So far the president has eschewed a negotiated settlement.

7. These purposes combine defensive and offensive intentions even though President Bush emphasizes the defensive. But analysis of military equipment sent to Saudi Arabia reveals that the U.S. has sent in stealth fighter planes, which have only offensive use, and M-1 tanks, which are primarily offensive weapons.

8. Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney has called up reserves to bolster U.S. military strength. This is essentially a political statement rather than a military necessity. The underlining intent is (a) to demonstrate U.S. resolve to Saddam Hussein and (b) to send a message to the U.S. Congress and the American public about the seriousness of the situation. But from a military standpoint, the United States has 340,000 troops standing idle in Western Europe with a huge supply of M-1 tanks which could have been dispatched to Saudi Arabia quicker and more cheaply than those sent from the United States. And the positions which reservists are filling to perform administrative, supply, and medical tasks could have been filled by reassigning personnel within the existing armed services of two million men and women.

9. Although President Bush has used the Middle East crisis as a way to bolster the case for the B-2 (stealth) bomber, MX intercontinental missiles, and the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), the situation in the Middle East has once again demonstrated the uselessness of the strategic nuclear arsenal (a) to deter aggression in regional conflict and (b) to use in combat. With the end of the Cold War, there is no longer any need to build and deploy new strategic weapons and defenses. It would be wrong for Congress to succumb to pressures for this kind of spending because of the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Indeed, extra military spending because of U.S. involvement there should be paid for by canceling strategic systems and transferring funds within the existing military budget.

10. The current Middle East crisis represents a lot of "chickens coming home to roost" at the same time: (a) historic injustices stemming from previous colonial rule and manipulation in the Middle East (earlier the Ottoman Empire and after World War I Great Britain, which drew present national boundaries and installed puppet regimes); (b) U.S. neglect of the

United Nations, which has not been allowed to develop an effective international, peacekeeping force; (c) previous Western support of Saddam Hussein (in Iraq's eight-year war against Iran the United States gave him satellite intelligence, helicopters, agricultural credits, and naval protection in the Persian Gulf; suppliers in various nations have provided weapons and technology related to chemical and nuclear weapon production); and (d) the Reagan Administration's termination of energy conservation programs and development of alternative energy sources.

11. Appropriate next steps in the Middle East should include the following measures:

- a. Continued international insistence that Iraq withdraw from Kuwait.
- b. Serious efforts to free all persons now detained by Iraq and a concern for the hundreds of thousand of Asian and Middle East nationals displaced because of Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.
- c. Emphasis upon international negotiations to achieve these objectives, led by the United Nations and the Arab League.
- d. Continuation of economic boycott to pressure Iraq, but exemption of food and medical supplies from the blockade. We should not try to pressure Saddam Hussein by starving the Iraqi people.
- e. Hiatus in the military buildup. Most analysts believe that further aggression by Saddam Hussein, such as invasion of Saudi Arabia, is highly unlikely. All U.S. offensive weapons should be withdrawn.
- f. Shift to UN command of all military forces. This is consider especially feasible with naval forces, which are the main ones actively engaged because of the blockade to enforce the economic boycott.
- f. Immediate adoption of oil conservation measures in the United States.
- g. Resist attempts to fund strategic nuclear weapons, which are useless.

September 1, 1990

Resolution on the Middle East Crisis

Basic Principles

1. *As United Methodists, "We dedicate ourselves to peace throughout the world, to freedom for all peoples, and to the rule of justice and law among nations." (from "Our Social Creed")*
2. *"We believe war is incompatible with the teaching and example of Christ. We therefore reject war as an instrument of national foreign policy and insist that the first moral duty of all nations is to resolve by peaceful means every dispute that arises among them." (from "Social Principles")*
3. *"The United Methodist Church categorically opposes interventions by more powerful nations against weaker ones. Such actions violate our Social Principles, and are contrary to the United Nations Charter and international law and treaties." (from "In Support of Self-Determination and Non-Intervention," a resolution adopted by the 1988 General Conference)*
4. *"Believing that international justice requires the participation of all peoples, we endorse the United Nations and its related bodies and the International Court of Justice as the best instruments now in existence to achieve a world of justice and law." (from "Social Principles")*

Findings

1. *On August 2, 1990 Iraqi military forces invaded and occupied Kuwait. Subsequently Iraq announced that it had annexed Kuwait. This is a case of intervention by a more powerful nation against a weaker one. Furthermore, Iraq is holding foreign citizens as hostages, contrary to international law.*
2. *The United Nations Security Council has adopted a series of resolutions condemning Iraqi occupation of Kuwait and instituting an economic boycott to put pressure on Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. The League of Arab States by majority vote has also denounced the invasion.*
3. *On August 7 the United States sent ground and air forces to Saudi Arabia with the stated intent of defending that nation from Iraqi invasion and insuring the continued flow of oil to the United States and other nations. By November U.S. troop strength is likely to reach 200,000 men and women. Other nations have sent much smaller military contingents.*
4. *Although President Bush has stated that U.S. forces are in Saudi Arabia only for defensive purposes, some of the weapons systems have primarily offensive capability. Administration officials*

have indicated that if war breaks out, U.S. forces will attack military installations in Iraq, might bomb cities, and could invade Kuwait and Iraq. If this occurred, it would be another case of military intervention by a more powerful nation against a weaker one.

Conclusions

1. We condemn the Iraqi attack and subsequent annexation of Kuwait and call for the immediate withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait.

2. The United Nations offers the best hope for developing and carrying out a peaceable solution to the conflict. Emphasis should be upon diplomacy and negotiations. The United States and other nations should work through and as part of the United Nations and should avoid unilateral actions.

3. The U.S. military build-up should be halted and the U.S. military presence should be reduced. Military forces mobilized to oppose Iraq should at the earliest possible date come under full UN authority and control.

4. It is wrong in all situations of conflict to use civilians as pawns, shields, and hostages. International humanitarian principles must be upheld. Therefore, Iraq should immediately free all civilians held as hostages, and food and medicine should be exempt from the U.N.-sanctioned economic blockade.

The international community, including the United States, should provide increased emergency assistance to meet the needs of refugees fleeing Kuwait and Iraq.

5. The current crisis must not be used as a rationale for increased arms sales and transfers to an already over-militarized region.

6. A strenuous effort should be made to deal with a wider range of issues in the Middle East, including achievement of self-determination for Palestinians residing in presently occupied territories, security for Israel, peace agreements between Israel and Arab states, and justice for the poor and dispossessed in the region.

7. Care must be taken to avoid demagoguery, manipulation, and image-making which labels Arabs and Muslims in a negative way and to refrain from stereotypical and bigoted statements against Muslims and Islam, Arabs and Arabic culture.

8. U.S. dependence upon oil imports should be substantially reduced through energy conservation policies and development of renewable sources of energy.

Call

We call upon United Methodists to:

- 1. Study issues that have produced decades of conflict in the Middle East and help formulation solutions.*
- 2. Support a diplomatic and negotiated settlement of the present crisis caused by Iraqi occupation of Kuwait under United Nations leadership and press for resolution of other crucial issues in the Middle East.*
- 3. Oppose unilateral U.S. military action in the Middle East and support efforts to bring all mobilized military forces under UN command.*
- 4. Oppose further arms sales and transfers to all nations in the Middle East.*

Statement on the Middle East Crisis
from
Board of Directors
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is a Pan-Methodist association of laity and clergy. In this instance, we draw particularly upon principles adopted by the General Conference of the United Methodist Church. We offer these ideas on the Middle East crisis for thoughtful study and prayer by members of African Methodist Episcopal, AME Zion, Christian Methodist Episcopal, and United Methodist Churches.

Basic Principles Articulated by United Methodist Church

1. *"We dedicate ourselves to peace throughout the world, to freedom for all peoples, and to the rule of justice and law among nations." (from "Our Social Creed", United Methodist Church)*

2. *"We believe war is incompatible with the teaching and example of Christ. We therefore reject war as an instrument of national foreign policy and insist that the first moral duty of all nations is to resolve by peaceful means every dispute that arises among them." (from "Social Principles", United Methodist Church)*

3. *"The United Methodist Church categorically opposes interventions by more powerful nations against weaker ones. Such actions violate our Social Principles, and are contrary to the United Nations Charter and international law and treaties." (from "In Support of Self-Determination and Non-Intervention," a resolution adopted by the 1988 General Conference)*

4. *"Believing that international justice requires the participation of all peoples, we endorse the United Nations and its related bodies and the International Court of Justice as the best instruments now in existence to achieve a world of justice and law." (from "Social Principles")*

Findings

1. *On August 2, 1990 Iraqi military forces invaded and occupied Kuwait. Subsequently Iraq announced that it had annexed Kuwait. This is a case of intervention by a more powerful nation against a weaker one. Furthermore, Iraq is holding foreign citizens as hostages, contrary to international law.*

2. The United Nations Security Council has adopted a series of resolutions condemning Iraqi occupation of Kuwait and instituting an economic boycott to put pressure on Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. The League of Arab States by majority vote has also denounced the invasion.

3. On August 7 the United States sent ground and air forces to Saudi Arabia with the stated intent of defending that nation from Iraqi invasion and insuring the continued flow of oil to the United States and other nations. By November U.S. troop strength is likely to reach 200,000 men and women. Other nations have sent much smaller military contingents.

(over)

4. Although President Bush has stated that U.S. forces are in Saudi Arabia only for defensive purposes, some of the weapons systems have primarily offensive capability. Administration officials have indicated that if war breaks out, U.S. forces will attack military installations in Iraq, might bomb cities, and could invade Kuwait and Iraq. If this occurred, it would be another case of military intervention by a more powerful nation against a weaker one.

Conclusions

1. We condemn the Iraqi attack and subsequent annexation of Kuwait and call for the immediate withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait.

2. The United Nations offers the best hope for developing and carrying out a peaceable solution to the conflict. Emphasis should be upon diplomacy and negotiations. The United States and other nations should work through and as part of the United Nations and should avoid unilateral actions.

3. The U.S. military build-up should be halted and the U.S. military presence should be reduced so that it is no larger than 25 percent of the combined forces assembled to deal with Iraq.

4. Military forces mobilized to oppose Iraq should at the earliest possible date come under full UN authority and control.

5. It is wrong in all situations of conflict to use civilians as pawns, shields, and hostages. International humanitarian principles must be upheld. Therefore, Iraq should immediately free all civilians held as hostages, and food and medicine should be exempt from the U.N.-sanctioned economic blockade.

The international community, including the United States, should provide increased emergency assistance to meet the needs of refugees fleeing Kuwait and Iraq.

6. The current crisis must not be used as a rationale for increased arms sales and transfers to an already over-militarized region.

7. A strenuous effort should be made to deal with a wider range of issues in the Middle East, including achievement of self-determination for Palestinians residing in presently occupied territories, security for Israel, peace agreements between Israel and Arab states, and justice for the poor and dispossessed in the region.

8. Care must be taken to avoid demagoguery, manipulation, and image-making which labels Arabs and Muslims in a negative way and to refrain from stereotypical and bigoted statements against Muslims and Islam, Arabs and Arabic culture.

9. U.S. dependence upon oil imports should be substantially reduced through energy conservation policies and development of renewable sources of energy.

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

October 20, 1990

(202) 546-5551

421 Seward Square, SE, Suite B-10
Washington, DC 20003

For immediate release

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

**RELIGIOUS AND PEACE ORGANIZATIONS OPPOSE
OFFENSIVE MILITARY ACTION IN PERSIAN GULF**

Representatives of a dozen religious and peace organizations have written to President George Bush, opposing offensive military action in the Persian Gulf region. Instead, they favor patience and fortitude to give the UN-sponsored economic boycott direct against Iraq time to work.

The signers are particularly disturbed by the announcement of Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney of an intent to send 100,000 additional U.S. troops to the Persian Gulf. When combined with the large American force already there and the nature of the weapons they possess, there would be a strong possibility of U.S. action to invade occupied Kuwait and Iraq.

The religious and peace organization representatives point out to President Bush that this would cost lives of thousands of American men and women, plus thousands of human casualties on the other side. Yet, this is a war that can be avoided, the signers insist.

Therefore, they oppose offensive military action and strategic attacks against Iraq. They maintain that UN-led diplomacy and negotiations are far superior to US-initiated military action.

Signers of the letter to President Bush include persons from American Baptist, Church of the Brethren, Friends, and United Methodist organizations, from women's peace groups and several other peace organizations. A full list of the signers and the text of the letter are attached.

Draft

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

To express the sense of Congress for unfaltering economic sanctions and steadfast negotiations as the principal means for achieving Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring):

Section 1. Support for Economic Sanctions.

The Congress steadfastly supports the continuous rigorous application of the economic sanctions against Iraq authorized by the United Nations Security Council, with proper allowance for essential food and medical supplies, until such time as Iraq withdraws its forces from Kuwait.

Section 2. Support for Negotiations.

To accompany patient and unfaltering application of economic sanctions, the Congress supports negotiations through the United Nations, the Arab League, and directly with Iraq to achieve a peaceful settlement of the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

Section 3. Opposition to Offensive Military Action at This Time.

In order to give negotiations and economic sanctions sufficient time to achieve Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, the Congress opposes offensive military action against Kuwait at this time.

Section 4. Congressional Authority to Declare War.

Because the Constitution of the United States vests all power to declare war in the Congress of the United States, any offensive action against Iraq must be explicitly approved by the Congress before such action may be initiated.

*Drafted by Howard W. Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
(301) 897-3668*

January 3, 1991

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION COVER LETTER

Two pages including cover letter

To: Robert Alpern
Unitarian Universalist Association

FAX No. (202) 544-5852

TEL No. (202) 547-0254

From: Howard Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

FAX No. (301) 652-8516 (Trio Copy Center, Bethesda, MD)

TEL No. (301) 897-3668

Here is a draft "sense of Congress" resolution, supporting continued economic sanctions against Iraq and opposing offensive military action at this time. The language draws heavily on the "Resolution on the Gulf and the Middle East Crisis" adopted by the National Council of Churches in November 1990. It adds a "war powers" section taken from the Bennett-Durbin resolution.

I urge Churches for Middle East Peace to consider adopting this resolution, with whatever modifications are considered appropriate, and to seek sponsorship in the House and Senate. I suggest going beyond the usual sponsors for this kind of resolution to others who might be supportive, such as Senators Nunn, Sarbanes, Biden, Representative Hamilton, etc.

Church leaders and grassroots church activists around the country could easily be mobilized to urge members of Congress to become sponsors and vote for the "interfaith resolution" (called that until significant sponsorship emerges). I know that this is certainly true for the United Methodist network. And I think that we could get some African Methodist Episcopal and AME Zion leaders to support this kind of resolution.

Please let me know how I can help further.

WE'VE COME A LONG WAYS FROM GUERNICA

by Howard W. Hallman

On April 26, 1937 during the Spanish Civil War, German planes serving General Franco's insurgent army spent 3¼ hours dropping more than 3,000 bombs and incendiary projectiles on the undefended Basque city of Guernica. Fighter pilots machine-gunned fleeing citizens. The attack killed 1,654 civilians and wounded 889. This aroused worldwide indignation. Among others, 76 prominent Americans issued a statement of condemnation, saying "We refuse to condone such atrocities by our silence." Pablo Picasso caught the grotesqueness in his famous mural.

The Franco forces, though maintaining that Guernica was a legitimate military target, denied responsibility. Instead they put the blame on alleged Basque incendiaries who, they claimed, were trying to excite the populace. But foreign journalists, interviewing eye-witnesses, confirmed the role of the German aircraft.

On February 13, 1991 during the Persian Gulf War, two American aircraft each dropped a bomb on a structure in Baghdad, built in the early 1980s as an airraid shelter. With technological efficiency the two bombs killed more than 400 civilians. Worldwide television broke the news by showing charred corpses being removed from the shelter. To preempt world indignation the Bush Administration quickly paraded a series of spokesmen to assert that the destroyed structure was really a military command-and-control center, and therefore a suitable target.

Television network news, both commercial and public, took the bait and the Administration's representatives dominated the airwaves. No

prominent Americans issued any statement of condemnation. The day after the bombing a Washington Post-ABC news poll found that 79 percent of U.S. respondents held Saddam Hussein or Iraq responsible for the deaths. Only 7 percent put responsibility on President Bush or the U.S. military, which dropped the bombs.

In the early months of 1938 the Franco forces unleashed repeated bombing attacks against Barcelona and other coastal cities. They claimed that they were attacking military objectives. But according to historian F. Jay Taylor in *The United States and the Spanish Civil War* (1956), bombs fell on all sections of Barcelona, "residential as well as business. At least 1,000 persons were reported killed and twice that number wounded." This again aroused the American public. Secretary of State Cordell Hull declared that "this Government holds that no theory of war can justify such conduct as the bombing of civilians during the recent air raids."

In the first 30 days of the Persian Gulf War, American aircraft flew approximately 75,000 sorties against Iraqi forces. A great volume of explosive power hit targets in Baghdad and other population centers. The U.S. military command insists that only military installations and weapons are targeted. In a war where military censors on both sides control the news, casualty figures are difficult to obtain. The U.S. government speaks only of "collateral damage" when civilians are injured or killed. However, it seems likely that civilian deaths in Iraq number in the thousands and Iraqi military deaths in the tens of thousands. Most American are relieved that U.S. combat deaths number in the dozens.

Why the shock of the 1930s and the complacency of the 1990s? One explanation is that we were outsiders looking in at the Spanish Civil War while in the Persian Gulf War it is "us" versus "them." Coached by

government propaganda to view Saddam Hussein as wholly evil and the Iraqi people as the enemy, we have freed ourselves from thinking of the victims as human beings like ourselves.

Another explanation is that the enormous aerial destruction of World War II, when deaths numbered in the millions, has numbed us from the lesser damage of this smaller war. Furthermore, 45 years with a foreign policy rooted in the threat of even vaster nuclear destruction has hardened our hearts. Military strategy that has accepted targeting "command and control centers" of the Soviet Union, including those dispersed in and around Moscow, Leningrad, and other Soviet cities where millions of civilians reside. This indoctrination has made it easier for military commanders to substitute the abstraction of "collateral damage" for the reality of civilian deaths.

Yes, we have come a long ways from an initial British debate of 1928 over the prospect of strategic bombing. As related by Freeman Dyson in *Weapons and Hope* (1984), Sir Hugh Trenchard, Chief of the Air Staff, stated "the object to be sought by air action will be to paralyse from the very outset the enemy's productive centres of munitions of war of every sort and to stop all communications and transportation." Sir George Milne, Army Chief of Staff, raised ethical objections over "a doctrine which, put in plain English, amounts to one which advocates unrestricted warfare against the civilian population of one's enemy." Trenchard's viewpoint prevailed within the British government, and it has reigned supreme ever since in every government possessing an air force.

Many have gone beyond striking simply military targets. Thus, when Italy invaded Ethiopia in 1935, Benito Mussolini unleashed bombs against undefended towns. (It is interesting to note that the League of Nations' economic sanctions against Italy were so weak that oil was specifically

exempted from the embargo.) Two years later the Franco forces attacked Spanish cities. Nazi Germany under Adolph Hitler applied the same strategy against British cities. From September 1940 until May 1941 the Luftwaffe bombed London nearly every night and hit other British cities. More than 60,000 civilians were killed.

The Allies adopted the identical strategy against Germany with even greater destructive power. For instance, more than 1,000 bombers attacked Cologne on the night of May 30, 1942, devastating nearly eight square miles. Essen got the same treatment the next night and Bremen in June. In February 1945 British and American bombers hit Dresden with saturation bombing, killing 100,000 persons. This occurred in a period when the Nazis were completing the extermination of 6,000,000 Jews.

As part of the war against Japan, an American incendiary raid against Tokyo in March 1945 killed 83,000 persons, burned out nearly 16 square miles, and left one million homeless. In the next five months similar attacks on 63 other Japanese cities killed more than 400,000 civilians and made homeless 30 percent of the urban population. The climax came in August 1945 when the first atomic bomb killed 70,000 to 80,000 people in Hiroshima and the second killed 30,000 to 40,000 in Nagasaki. Two bombs killed over 100,000 human beings.

Maybe it's these huge numbers from World War II than make so many Americans willing to trivialize the killing in Baghdad and throughout Iraq. Also, it comes back to "them" rather than "us." This makes us fail to see the human impact of attacking command-and-control centers that are situated in cities.

What if we were the ones attacked under this doctrine? What if some

of the bombs and missiles aimed at the U.S. command-and-control centers drifted slightly off their targets? It wouldn't matter much for the Pentagon, for it sits by itself in the Potomac basin flatland. Office buildings are around the White House for several blocks, but there are apartments right across the street from the State Department. Houses and churches are quite near the congressional office buildings and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (for the U.S. has struck a similar agency in Baghdad).

In outlying areas around Washington the CIA headquarters in Langley, Virginia has lots of nice houses nearby. The Department of Energy's complex in Germantown, Maryland (where planning the nuclear arsenal occurs) has many townhouses, single-family houses, and shopping centers close by. Throughout the country hundreds of other military command centers, communication installations, defense research and development facilities, and weapons production plants are located in the vicinity of housing and civilian business areas.

What would we think if our civilians were "inadvertently" hit? Suppose, for instance, that the employees of a U.S. defense manufacturer and their families were gathered to celebrate the success of one of their weapon systems in the war. Suppose the enemy picked up a story that the president of the United States was going to drop in for a surprise visit. Suppose the enemy bombed the plant or had infiltrators lobbed in some mortar shells. Suppose that the president wasn't there after all, but 400 civilians, two-thirds of them women and children, were killed. Wouldn't we call this an unconscionable act of terrorism? But if the enemy applied our doctrine, wouldn't they say that they were striking a legitimate military target? Wouldn't they insist that they cannot be responsible for "collateral" damage?

Oh, for the days when the world was outraged over deaths of innocent

civilians in Guernica. If we could restore that feeling, we wouldn't be so eager to go to war with the likes of Iraq. We would be much more patient with thorough-going, international economic sanctions of the kind we laid down against Saddam Hussein. We would be more willing to pursue negotiations. We wouldn't build such intense, personalized hatred toward our adversary.

We would realize that when we go to war we are killing human beings like ourselves: sons, daughters, mothers, fathers, grandparents. Instead of depending so much on the high technology of destruction, we would use our creative talents to figure out various ways that peace can be attained and preserved without resort to killing.

###

Howard W. Hallman is executive director of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

February 25, 1991

6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817

(301) 897-3668

Unshakable Grief: The War's Aftermath

by Howard W. Hallman¹

It's been a month since the initial ceasefire in the Persian Gulf War. It's said that millions of Americans are euphoric over the victory, but I can't shake a feeling of abiding grief.

*Grief has replaced a sense of foreboding that came on me two days before the war started. That evening I was at the Washington Cathedral, joining an unexpectedly large crowd in a worship service that preceded a candlelight march to the White House. During a period of silent prayer my thoughts went forth to the soldiers on either side of the Kuwaiti-Saudi Arabian border who were awaiting combat. Through my mind flashed similar scenes: from Shakespeare's plays, from Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, from movie versions of the American Civil War. Young men (and now women) preparing to settle old men's disputes.*

Temporarily hope replaced foreboding as we walked along Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House. Illuminated by hundreds of candles, some quietly sang "Kum ba yah", others "Give peace a chance", and still others "Goin' study war no more". We prayed that President Bush would realize that responding to violence with violence only begets more violence, that the wiser course is to overcome evil with good, as the Apostle Paul wrote.

Two nights later I was back at the White House with a hastily crafted sign, "Stop the War". With me were my daughter and 2½ year old grandson. He's just learning to share toys and not shove playmates. What kind of world are we offering him, I wondered, that relies on war to settle disputes between nations. That's when my feeling of grief began.

Soon within the peace movement, many were saying, "We support the troops. It's the war we oppose." In a sense that was right because a policy of war avoidance and the patient pressure of sanctions could save lives of service men and women and prevent some from becoming prisoners of war. But my feeling was grief -- grief that they had to risk their lives for failed policies, for the years of U.S. coddling of Saddam Hussein because we hated the Iranians more. I grieved for children whose parents were sent to war. I grieved for young men and women whose only chance for higher education and job opportunity was to join the armed services.

My grief intensified on February 13 when two U.S. "smart bombs" killed 400 civilians in an airraid shelter. Worldwide television broke the news by showing the removal of charred corpses. To preempt a world outcry the Bush Administration quickly paraded a series of spokesmen to assert that

¹ The author is executive director of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

the destroyed structure was really a military command-and-control center, and therefore a suitable target. Television network news, both commercial and public, took the bait and the Administration's representatives dominated the airwaves.

In my mind's eye, though, flashed the grotesque mural which Picasso painted of Guernica. That was the undefended Basque village that General Franco's insurgent arm attacked on April 26, 1937 during the Spanish Civil War. German planes spend 3½ hours dropping more than 3,000 bombs and incendiary projectiles. Fighter pilots machine-gunned fleeing citizens. The attack killed 1,654 civilians and wounded 889. At first the Franco forces denied responsibility, but added, even so, the city was a legitimate military target.

These are the facts I dug up from the library by reading microfilm of *New York Times* accounts. What startled me most was the worldwide indignation aroused by Guernica. Among others, 76 prominent Americans issued a statement of condemnation, saying, "We refuse to condone such atrocities by our silence." The following year when the Franco forces unleashed repeated bombing attacks against Barcelona and other coastal cities, the American public was again aroused. Secretary of State Cordell Hull declared that "this Government holds that no theory of war can justify such conduct as the bombing of civilians during the recent air raids."

In contrast, no prominent Americans issued any statement of condemnation after the U.S. raid on the Baghdad airraid shelter. Indeed, the day after the bombing a Washington Post-ABC news poll found that 79 percent of U.S. respondents held Saddam Hussein or Iraq responsible for the deaths. Only 7 percent put responsibility on President Bush or the U.S. military, which dropped the bombs.

That's when my grief deepened. I asked myself, why the shock of the 1930s and the complacency of the 1990s? One explanation is that we were outsiders looking in at the Spanish Civil War while in the Persian Gulf War it is "us" versus "them." Coached by government propaganda to view Saddam Hussein as wholly evil and the Iraqi people as the enemy, we have freed ourselves from thinking of the victims as human beings like ourselves.

But I doubt that this is God's view. God must be quite unimpressed by the argument that killing 80,000 to 100,000 Iraqis was necessary "to save American lives." Each human life is precious to God. God, too, grieves over these deaths.

Another explanation is that the enormous aerial destruction of World War II, when deaths numbered in the millions, has numbed us from the lesser damage of this smaller war. Hitler sent his bombers over London almost nightly from September 1940 to May 1941, killing 60,000 civilians. Later his ruthlessness murdered six million Jews. From the Allied side U.S. and British bombers devastated Cologne, Bremen, Essen, Dresden, Berlin, and dozens of other German cities, killing hundreds of thousands. U.S. raids gutted Tokyo and 65 other Japanese cities with fire bombs, killing

half a million. Then a pair of atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki took the lives of 120,000 people. So maybe it's these huge numbers from World War II that make so many Americans willing to trivialize the killing in Baghdad and throughout Iraq.

Furthermore, 45 years with a foreign policy rooted in the threat of even vaster nuclear destruction has hardened our hearts. Military strategy that has accepted targeting "command and control centers" of the Soviet Union, including those dispersed in and around Moscow, Leningrad, and other Soviet cities where millions of civilians reside. This indoctrination has made it easier for military commanders to substitute the abstraction of "collateral damage" for the reality of civilian deaths. But when U.S. bombs missed their targets, as 75 percent did, they killed hundreds of people. They were human beings. As sons and daughters, mothers and fathers, grandparents, aunts, and uncles, they were deeply grieved by the survivors.

My grief brought on by killing civilians enlarged after the ground war began and U.S. fighter planes caught fleeing Iraqis on the road out of Kuwait. "It was like shooting ducks in a pond" or "fish in a barrel" was how pilots described it. How different was that, I wondered, from German pilots strafing people in the meadows around Guernica.

My grief continues as, sure enough, violence is begetting more violence. Iraqi viciousness going into Kuwait has been compounded by retribution levied during their departure. It's as if they were taking out their anger against U.S. forces, whom they cannot reach, on the Kuwaitis. In Kuwait, Palestinians previously mistreated by Kuwaitis got some revenge during the occupation and now are receiving counter-revenge. In Iraq civil war, brought on by military defeat, is causing a bloodbath. Meanwhile, children and old folks are dying in Baghdad and other cities because of shortage of food and medicine, poor water supply, lack of sewage treatment, and absence of adequate medical care.

A Hebrew proverb states (14:12-13):

There is a way which seems right to a man,
but its end is the way to death.
Even in laughter the heart is sad,
and the end of joy is grief.

Yet, grief can also be a beginning. As an expression of caring, grief cleanses and heals. So restored, we can renew our efforts to achieve justice through positive actions. Justice so achieved is the sure foundation of peace.

Howard W. Hallman, Executive Director

March 23, 1991

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

(301) 897-3668

HOWARD W. HALLMAN
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
(301) 897-3668

October 2, 1990

Bishop Joseph Yeakel
9226 Colesville Road
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dear Joe:

As you requested, I have drafted a resolution on the Middle East for your use with the General Board of Church and Society and/or the Council of Bishops.

It incorporates statements of United Methodist policy from the Discipline and the Book of Resolutions. It draws heavily upon material from Churches for Middle East Peace and also incorporates some points from a statement issued by six United Methodist leaders. Copies of this material are enclosed.

If I can help further on this issue, please let me know.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

October 2, 1990

*Mr. Robert Alpern
Unitarian-Universalist Association
100 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002*

Dear Bob:

Thanks for taking time to discuss the Middle East situation with me and for sharing the several documents.

Enclosed is a draft resolution which I am sending to Bishop Joseph Yeakel for his use with United Methodist boards. It incorporates points and language from Churches for Middle East Peace. If you see anything that is egregious wrong with, please give me a call at (301) 897-3668.

My work with Bishop Yeakel is informal, sorta off-the-record.

Some other Methodist documents on this issue are also enclosed.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

421 Seward Square, SE, Suite B-10
Washington, DC 20003

November 7, 1990

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

Dear Mr. President:

The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and the taking of hostages rightly shocked and angered most Americans. Such outright aggression aimed at taking the territory and treasure of another nation cannot be tolerated.

The collective security measures being taken under United Nations auspices to compel Iraq to withdraw are appropriate and help to strengthen the rule of international law. As part of this response, we believe that all military forces assembled to enforce the economic boycott of Iraq and to defend Saudi Arabia from Iraqi attack should come under full UN authority and control at the earliest possible date.

We are deeply disturbed by the announcement of Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney that over 100,000 additional U.S. troops are going to be dispatched to the Persian Gulf region. This would add to the more than 200,000 U.S. military personnel already there. This combined force is far beyond the number needed for U.S. participation in the international boycott and defense of Saudi Arabia -- the two purposes of U.S. deployment that you have announced.

This large U.S. force and the nature of military equipment and weapons they possess strongly suggest the possibility of unilateral U.S. action to invade occupied Kuwait and Iraq. We know from past experience that a small incident, real or conjured, can be used to justify military action once an attack force is assembled. We fervently oppose offensive military action and strategic attacks against Iraq. It will cost the lives of thousands of American men and women, plus thousands of human casualties on the other side in a war that can be avoided.

Instead of initiating a military attack on Iraq, the United States is much better advised to have patience and fortitude to give the measures adopted by the UN Security Council time to achieve their objectives. UN-led diplomacy and negotiations are far superior to US-initiated military action.

Therefore, Mr. President, we urge you to work primarily through the United Nations to resolve the Persian Gulf crisis peacefully and to refrain from authorizing unilateral military action.

With best regards,

Signers on next page

*cc. Secretary of State James Baker
Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney
National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft*

Signers of letter of November 7, 1990 to President Bush, opposing offensive military action in the Persian Gulf region.

*Robert W. Tiller
Office of Government Relations
American Baptist Churches USA*

*Melva B. Jimerson
Washington Office
Church of the Brethren*

*Joe Volk
Friends Committee on National Legislation*

*Howard W. Hallman
Methodists United for Peace with Justice*

*Robert Musil
Professionals' Coalition for Nuclear Arms Control*

*Ira Shore
SANE/FREEZE: Campaign for Global Security*

*Dick Mark
20/20 Vision*

*Mary Sue Robinson
Africa-Europe-Middle East Office, World Division
United Methodist General Board of Global Ministries*

*Women's Division
United Methodist General Board of Global Ministries*

*Suzy Kerr
Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament*

*Edith Villastrigo
Women Strike for Peace*

Isabel Guy

Women's International League for Peace & Freedom

HOWARD W. HALLMAN
6508 Wilmett Road
Bethesda, MD 20817
(301) 897-3668

October 29, 1990

President George Bush
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

I writing you as a United Methodist layman who is active in an association known as Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Although Congress has adjourned for the year, I want you to know that I am watching the course of action you pursue in dealing with conflict in the Middle East.

I am watching your work with the UN Security Council. I firmly believe that the United States should look to the United Nations to play the lead role in collective action to deal with Iraq's aggressive behavior: to enforce the economic boycott, to conduct negotiations, to use other means of diplomacy to get Iraq to leave Kuwait.

I am watching to see that the United States does not take unilateral military action against Iraq. Frankly I am deeply concerned with the U.S. military buildup in Saudi Arabia. Especially with the addition 100,000 troops that Secretary Cheney wants to send, it looks as if the United States is preparing to invade Iraq. That would be the wrong course. It would be like Vietnam all over again -- costing the lives of thousands and thousands of

American lives.

So, Mr. President, I urge you to be patient and steadfast with U.S. support of UN economic pressures and fully supportive of UN diplomatic initiatives. I will be carefully watching to see that we don't have another "Gulf of Tonkin" incident to be used as an excuse for U.S. military action.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman

October 29, 1990

Ms. Corrine Whitlach
Churches for Middle East Peace
110 Maryland Avenue, NE #108
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Corrine:

I want to share with you two draft letters addressed to President Bush, both relating to the need to keep the United States from taking offensive military action.

The first is a sign-on letter, which I distributed today at the Monday Lobby and also at a meeting of the WISC Task Force on Foreign Policy. The letter will be discussed at a special meeting of the Monday Lobby on Wednesday morning, October 31, along with other matters on the Persian Gulf crisis.

The second is a sample letter of a suggested "eyes on the President", grassroots effort. The message is: "Mr. President, we're watching you. We want to you to work through the United Nations and not take unilateral military action while Congress is out of town."

If you have any comments, please call me at (301) 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

October 31, 1990

To:

I am circulating among peace and religious organizations the enclosed letter addressed to President Bush to oppose offensive military action in the Persian Gulf region.

Will you or some one else from your organization be willing to sign it? If so, please call me at (301) 897-3668.

Howard W. Hallman

November 27, 1990

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

Dear Representative Hamilton:

We are much concerned the way in which the United States seems to be rushing into war in the Middle East. Our government seems to lack patience with the pressures of economic boycott and diplomacy. It would be far preferable for the boycott/diplomacy options to run for a year or more rather than embark on a military campaign that would cost the lives of tens of thousands of American men and women and tens of thousand human casualties on the other side.

I hope that Congress will quickly examine what is going on through hearings by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. In the process I urge you to hear testimony from religious leaders, for the issues are as much moral as military and political.

For example, you might want to invite Bishop Lerop Hodapp of Indianapolis, who is current president of the United Methodist Council of Bishops (see attached statement). Other possible witnesses would include Presiding Bishop Edmund Browning of the Episcopal Church, a representative of the Roman Catholic bishops, somebody like Jim Wallis of Sojourners, who brings an evangelical perspective. Indeed, most major denominations in the United States have adopted policies on the Middle East crisis, so there are many

religious leaders available to offer their studied viewpoints.

For your information, I am enclosing a statement on the Middle East, which our own Board of Directors adopted last month. I would be interested receiving copies of your statements and speeches on this situation.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

Dear President Bush:

We urge patience in bringing about Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait. We favor giving the economic boycott and negotiations a longer time to achieve this objective rather than rushing to war.

March 23, 1991

Ms. Meg Greenfield
Editor, Editorial Page
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Ms. Greenfield:

I am submitting for your consideration an article entitled "Unshakable Grief: The War's Aftermath" for possible publication on your op-ed page. It offers a viewpoint which I haven't seen in the Post on the Persian Gulf War.

The article is written to appear on or about March 28, that is, a month after the ceasefire. However, it could be adjusted to appear somewhat later by changing the beginning sentence to read "It's been a little over a month...."

If you decide not to publish this article, please return it to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director

April 18, 1991

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

Dear Representative Hamilton:

We want to thank you for the leadership you have shown in recent months on Middle East issues: your sponsorship of the resolution in January to continue sanctions and not rush into offensive military action; your standing up for this position in midst of "victory" euphoria; your efforts to achieve a pause in arms sales to the Middle East.

As our contribution to the debate on where we go from here, we have just published the enclosed *Peace Leaf* offering our "Perspectives on a New World Order". As you will note, we lay out an alternative to the Bush Doctrine. Our approach emphasizes reducing warfighting capability, instituting international mechanisms for dispute resolution and peacekeeping, using nonviolent methods, and displaying a strong concern for justice.

We sent your op-ed piece from the March 10 Washington Post, entitled "Who Voted 'Wrong'?" to our network along with a *Peace/Justice Alert* (copy enclosed). I've received positive feedback from people who opposed going to war and are grateful for reassurance that this position still has merit. Also, I sent to all United Methodist resident bishops a copy of the April 4 letter from you and other House leaders to President Bush, urging a unilateral pause in arms sales to the Middle East. The Council of Bishops is meeting on April 26-28, and I think this letter may help them formulate their position on the issue.

On this matter, we are working with a number of other Washington-based organizations who favor a moratorium on arms sales to the Middle East, starting with unilateral U.S. action and followed by a broader international effort. They include such groups as Churches for Middle East Peace, Council for a Livable World, 20/20 Vision, the Professionals' Coalition, and others. We would like an opportunity to talk with you directly on this issue, to share our ideas, and to explore with you how we can support your initiatives. I will check with your appointment secretary about this request. Or, I can be reach at 301 897-3668.

With best regards,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

April 23, 1991

Dear Journalist:

It's nearly two months since the end of the Gulf War. Inevitably unforeseen consequences of war are unfolding, in this case, the plight of Kurdish and Shiite refugees. It is time for reflection on the meaning of this war as the first chapter of the "new world order" that President George Bush has proclaimed.

As our contribution to this discussion, we want to share with you this issue of our newsletter, *Peace Leaf*. In it we offer our view on what should be the foundation for world order: a commitment to One God, One People, One World and to freedom and justice. We analyze the lessons of the Gulf War, including pre-invasion failures, post-invasion successes, and post-invasion failures. We voice our disagreement with the approach taken by the United States, both in relation to goals and means utilized.

As an alternative approach to a new world order, we offer the following agenda:

- Curtailment of warfighting capability
 - Halt world arms trade
 - Curb proliferation of weapons of mass destruction
 - Achieve substantial arms reduction
 - Dismantle Cold War militarism
 - Regional disarmament
- Enhanced capacity for dispute resolution
 - United Nations
 - World Court

Regional bodies

■ *Increased use of peacekeeping forces*

United Nations

Regional

■ *Nonviolent responses*

Economic sanctions

Civilian-based, nonviolent defense

■ *Establishment of greater justice*

Remove remnants of colonialism

Protect human rights

Reduce maldistribution of resources

Shift from military spending to human needs

If you would be interested in discussing these ideas with me in greater detail, you can reach me at (301) 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

*Howard W. Hallman
Executive Director*

April 23, 1991

Dear Religious Leader:

Many of us in the U.S. religious community worked hard to prevent the initiative of offensive military action in the Persian Gulf. We failed. Now we grieve for lives lost, destruction wrought, continued suffering of the Iraqi people, especially Kurds and Shiites, as the repressive regime of Saddam Hussein remains in power. Noting that President George Bush indicated that this war was necessary as a first step in establishing a "new world order", we ask: what kind of world order? How is it to be achieved?

Our views are contained in this issue of our newsletter, *Peace Leaf*, which we share with you. In it we offer our view on what should be the foundation for world order: a commitment to One God, One People, One World and to freedom and justice. We analyze the lessons of the Gulf War, including pre-invasion failures, post-invasion successes, and post-invasion failures. We voice our disagreement with the approach taken by the United States, both in relation to goals and means utilized.

As an alternative approach to a new world order, we offer the following agenda:

- Curtailment of warfighting capability
 - Halt world arms trade
 - Curb proliferation of weapons of mass destruction
 - Achieve substantial arms reduction
 - Dismantle Cold War militarism
 - Regional disarmament
- Enhanced capacity for dispute resolution
 - United Nations
 - World Court

Regional bodies

- *Increased use of peacekeeping forces*

United Nations

Regional

- *Nonviolent responses*

Economic sanctions

Civilian-based, nonviolent defense

- *Establishment of greater justice*

Remove remnants of colonialism

Protect human rights

Reduce maldistribution of resources

Shift from military spending to human needs

We would be interested in learning what you think of our approach and to receive your ideas on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman

Executive Director

Dear Conferee, Defense Authorization Act:

[Draft]

We believe that Herblock is right. When the Conference Committee on the Defense Authorization Act of 1989 meets, the best and wisest compromise would be:

End programs the Pentagon would terminate (with the Senate agreeing)

and

Cut programs Congress (specifically the House of Representatives) would trim.

This could be accomplished by accepting the lowest level of funding in the respective House and Senate versions of the Defense Authorization bill. This is shown below. Given the easing of international tensions, these reductions can be achieved without harm to national security. We believe that the resulting savings of \$x.x billion should be released from the defense budget and used either for deficit reduction or for funding programs meeting urgent human needs.

Proposed authorization

V-22

House \$x.x billion

Senate 0.0 billion

\$x.x billion

savings

F-14D

House \$x.x billion

Senate 0.0 billion

\$x.x billion
savings

MX rail garrison

Senate \$1.1 billion

House 0.5 billion

\$0.6 billion

savings

B-2 bomber

Senate \$2.8 billion

House 1.8 billion

\$1.0 billion

savings

Strategic Defense Initiative

Senate \$4.4 billion

House 3.1 billion

\$1.3 billion

savings

Total savings: \$x.x billion

Sincerely yours,

1st signer

2nd signer

Etc.

*Signers continued on next
page.*

*Suggested by Howard
Hallman*

*Methodists United for
Peace with Justice.*

Telephone:

MWF: 897-3668

Tu,Th: (301) 795-7677

Recommendations from Center for Defense Information (CDI) and Federation of American Scientists (FAS) on SDI, B-2 bomber, MX rail garrison, V-22 aircraft.

Strategic Defense Initiative

CDI: Terminate research/development of space-based components of SDI program. Continue research only for land-based ABM system consistent with ABM treaty. Reason: U.S. security increases if both U.S. and USSR comply with ABM Treaty. An effective space-based defense is not achievable in this century, if ever.

FAS: Reduce significantly the budget for SDI research and testing.

The Reagan Administration spent nearly \$20 billion over the past six years on ballistic missile defense research and testing, yet we are no closer to rendering nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete" than when the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) was launched in 1983. The program has been continually restructured and SDI's rapidly changing mission and objective reflects the confusion and lack of consensus on what -- if any -- useful strategic mission a missile defense could perform.

Proceeding with advanced development and deployment of a partial anti-missile system, as the program is currently configured, would have only the objective of making our strategic offensive forces more survivable, something that can be done if deemed necessary, more cheaply and simply by other means (e.g. ICBM mobility).

Etc.

Draft letter for grassroots to send to their representative and senators.

Dear [to be filled in by writer]:

When the Conference Committee on the Defense Authorization Act of 1989 meets, I urge you to support Herblock Compromise. This could be accomplished by accepting the **lowest level of funding** in the respective House and Senate versions of the Defense Authorization bill. This is shown below:

Proposed Authorization

| | |
|--------|-------------------------------|
| | V-22 Osprey Aircraft |
| House | \$x.x billion |
| Senate | <u>0.0 billion</u> |
| | \$x.x billion savings |
| | F-14D Fighter Aircraft |
| House | \$x.x billion |
| Senate | <u>0.0 billion</u> |
| | \$x.x billion savings |
| | MX Rail Garrison |
| Senate | \$1.1 billion |
| House | <u>.7 billion</u> |
| | \$.4 billion |
| | B-2 Bomber |
| Senate | \$4.4 billion |
| House | <u>3.5 billion</u> |

\$.9 billion

Strategic Defense

Initiative

Senate \$4.5 billion

House 3.1 billion

\$1.4 billion

Total savings: \$x.x billion

Given the easing of international tensions, these reductions can be achieved without harm to national security. As President Bush pointed out in his May speech at Texas A&M University, "Now is the time to move beyond containment, to a new policy for the 1990s; one that recognizes the full scope of change taking place around the world, and in the Soviet Union itself."

I suggest to you that the savings of \$x.x billion from the Herblock Compromise be released from the defense budget and made available to the Budget Committees for reallocation. This money could then be used either for deficit reduction or for funding programs meeting urgent human needs.

Sincerely yours,

*Suggested by Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Telephone: MWF, 897-3668; TuTh, (301) 795-3668*