

To: "Greg Laszakovits" <glaszakovits\_gb@brethren.org>  
From: "Howard W. Hallman" <mupj@igc.org>  
Subject: Re: Letter to President Bush on nuclear weapons  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
X-Attachments:  
In-Reply-To: <sb5990a.086@brethren.org>  
References:

At 12:56 PM 10/11/01 -0500, you wrote:

>Howard,

>Please sign me on:

>Greg Davidson Laszakovits

>Coordinator

>Church of the Brethren Washington Office

>

>Also, is it too late to write the letter of support for you? My apologies in neglecting this for so long. If it would still be of use, I would be glad to do it.

>

Greg,

Thanks for signing the letter to President Bush.

At the moment I'm not looking for more letters of support. I received only four of about ten requested. Ploughshares Fund turned us down. Although staff of the W. Alton Jones Foundation requested us to send in a proposal, in early September the board decided to dissolve. I've previously been turned by other funders in this field.

At the moment I'm thinking of stepping down as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and let somebody take it on if there is an interest. I've been unable to get funding to support my work in this endeavor. Participation has been modest. People are now dealing with the war on terrorism, of which the nuclear issue is only one of many matters to consider.

I'll let you and others know if I go in this direction.

Shalom,  
Howard

**Howard W. Hallman**  
**6508 Wilmett Road**  
**Bethesda, MD 20817**  
Phone: 301 897-3668 Fax: 301 896-0013  
E-mail: mupj@igc.org

October 12, 2001

To: Saint Bartholomew's Catholic Church

Fax: 301 229-7998

No. of pages: 2

Dear Friends:

I would like to call to your attention a Forum on "Overcoming Poverty in Montgomery County", sponsored by the Community Ministry of Montgomery County. It will be held on Tuesday, October 23 from 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. at the Bethesda United Methodist Church, 8300 Old Georgetown Road, Bethesda, Maryland.

The forum will give people from the faith community an opportunity to learn what it means to be poor in Montgomery County and to consider what we can do about poverty in our midst. The attached flyer provides more details.

We hope that persons from your congregation who are working on social justice issues will be able to attend this interfaith gathering.

If you have questions, please call me at 301 897-3668.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman  
Member  
Bethesda United Methodist Church

August 6, 2001

Mr. James Dao  
The New York Times  
1627 I Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dear Mr. Dao:

I was interested in your article in today's Times about the conservative and defense industry campaign in behalf of national missile defense. Although the faith community cannot match this effort in money spent, we are vigorously opposed to national missile defense. You might want to describe our opposition in a future article.

Our reasons are stated in a March letter to President Bush and a July letter to members of House and Senate Armed Services Committees and Appropriations Committees. They are enclosed. We are concerned about the negative effects on arms control and disarmament and the risk of stimulating a renewed nuclear arms race. We believe that there are better ways to deal with the so-called "rogue" nations. We perceive this as a justice issue because of the huge amount of resources it will take away from greater needs, such as "Leave No Child Behind."

The United Methodist General Conference (the official governing body) has called for a halt of "all efforts to develop and deploy strategic antimissile defense systems because they are illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful". The United Methodist Council of Bishops has its own statement of opposition and so has the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. The best contact is Bishop C. Dale White at 401 847-3419. These documents are enclosed along with a piece on "National Missile Defense as a Moral Issue", which I wrote.

Other denominations are also opposed to national missile defense, as shown by who have signed the letters. For an overview of this opposition you may want to talk with the Rev. Dr. Bob Edgar, general secretary of the National Council of Churches in New York at 212 870-2141. As a former member of Congress (from the district in Pennsylvania now represented by Curt Weldon), he has a long acquaintance with this issue.

Mr. James Dao  
August 6, 2001  
Page two.

If I can provide you further information, please call me at 301 896-0013.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

August 7, 2001

Ms. Katherine Magraw  
Secure World Program  
W. Alton Jones Foundation  
232 East High Street  
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Dear Ms. Magraw:

We would like to apply for a grant from W. Alton Jones Foundation in support of interfaith advocacy and mobilization on nuclear disarmament issues. This occurs through the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, a coalition of more than 35 denominational offices and religious peace fellowships. Issues on the active agenda include opposition to national missile defense, support for de-alerting and deep cuts in the strategic arsenal, support for sufficient funding for the Nunn-Lugar cooperative threat reduction program, and adoption of a U.S. nuclear posture that encompasses nuclear disarmament as an integral objective.

We ask you to consider two phases of funding. The first part would be a grant of \$50,000 to Methodists United for Peace with Justice in support of my work as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. As the proposal explains, the catalytic leadership that I provide keeps the Interfaith Committee going and ties it into the activities of civil-sector organizations. The second part would be a grant of \$90,000 so that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament could hire a field coordinator to work with denominational grassroots networks to achieve more cohesive and stronger interfaith mobilization for nuclear disarmament at the local and state levels. The grants would go to the Methodists United Peace/Justice Fund, a 501(c)(3) entity, and would be administered for interfaith purposes.

Our proposal explains what the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has accomplished in the past year and what it will do in the future. I would welcome an opportunity to discuss this work with you in person. If you have any questions about our proposal, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

October 23, 2001

The Honorable George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

The campaign against terrorism is raising new and important questions about the role and future of nuclear weapons in the global security framework of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We would like to share with you our thinking on this matter.

First, we note that some of your advisors inside and outside of government favor using nuclear weapons against terrorist enclaves and against states that possess no nuclear weapons. Some advocate use of nuclear weapons in response to attacks by chemical and biological weapons. This would reverse the long-standing U.S. policy of using nuclear weapons primarily as a tool to deter other nuclear-weapon states. We believe that the policy of the United States should be no first use of nuclear weapons against any state, nuclear or non-nuclear, or against any other adversary at any time under any circumstance. We believe that such first use would be immoral and would constitute a crime against humanity. We also believe that nuclear weapons should never be used in response to an attack by biological and chemical weapons.

Second, we note that in January 2001 the Russia Task Force chaired by Howard Baker and Lloyd Cutler stated: "The most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today is the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nation states and used against American troops or citizens at home." The September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States emphasize the importance of this finding. Therefore, we believe that a substantial portion of anti-terrorist funds should go for full implementation of the Baker-Cutler report. In terms of relative priority, we suggest that funds be transferred from the missile defense budget to this and other urgent non-proliferation initiatives.

Third, we believe that the improved relationship between the United States and Russia because of mutual concern over terrorism should be treated as an opportunity to make substantial progress in improving the security of deployed nuclear weapons and dismantling the nuclear arsenals still in place more than a decade after the Cold War ended. Specifically we ask you to implement your campaign promise to work with Russia to de-alert and stand down the respective nuclear arsenals and to achieve deep cuts in strategic nuclear weapons. Not only will this enhance the security of the United States and Russia by lowering the possibility of accidental launch, it will also reduce the danger that a renegade group could gain control of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles and use them for terrorist attack on the United States.

We urge you to carry out these recommendations as a means of achieving a safer and more peaceful world in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of religious organizations listed on next page.

James Matlack, Director  
Washington Office  
American Friends Service Committee

Ken Sehested, Executive Director  
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

Greg Davidson Laszakovits, Coordinator  
Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Tiffany Heath  
Washington, D.C. Legislative Office  
Church Women United

Rev. Joel J. Heim, Ph.D., Moderator  
Disciples Peace Fellowship

David Culp, Legislative Representative  
Friends Committee on National Legislation

The Rev. Mark B. Brown  
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Stan De Boe, OSST, Director  
Office of Justice and Peace  
Conference of Major Superiors of Men

Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Associate General  
Secretary for Public Witness  
National Council of the Churches of Christ  
in the USA

Marie Dennis  
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

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

(Ms.) Rabia Terri Harris, Coordinator  
Muslim Peace Fellowship

Kathy Thorton, RSM, National Coordinator  
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social  
Justice Lobby

Bishop Walter Sullivan, President  
Bishop Tom Gumbleton, Former President  
Dave Robinson, National Coordinator  
Pax Christi USA

Rev. Elenora Giddings Ivory, Director  
Washington Office  
Presbyterian Church (USA)

Mark J. Pelavin, Associate Director  
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

Andrew Greenblatt, Coordinator  
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Sr. Ann Rutan, President  
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

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

James Winkler, General Secretary  
General Board of Church and Society  
United Methodist Church

*This letter was facilitated by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, DC. Phone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)*

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

October 16, 2001

To: Dave Robinson

Fax: 814 452-4784

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Dave,

Here is the sign-on letter. I'm trying to get it wrapped up by Friday, October 19.

Thanks for your help,

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

October 19, 2001

To: Janet Horman

Fax: 202 488-5639

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Janet,

Here is the sign-on letter to President Bush on nuclear issues related to the war on terrorism. I'm trying to get it wrapped up by midday on Monday, October 22. I hope that Jim Winkler will be able to review it and sign when he returns that day.

Thanks for your help,

October 23, 2001

The Honorable Donald Rumsfeld  
Secretary of Defense  
U.S. Department of Defense  
Washington, DC 20301

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to share with you a letter to President Bush from representatives of 19 religious organizations on nuclear issues arising from the war on terrorism.

First, we believe that nuclear weapons have absolutely no legitimate role in the campaign against terrorism. Rather we believe that the policy of the United States should be no first use of nuclear weapons against any state, nuclear or non-nuclear, or against any other adversary at any time under any circumstance. We also believe that nuclear weapons should never be used in response to an attack by biological and chemical weapons.

Second, we believe that a substantial portion of anti-terrorist funds that Congress is appropriating should go for activities promoting the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. This should encompass full implementation of report of the Russia Task Force chaired by Howard Baker and Lloyd Cutler.

Third, we believe that the United States should work with Russia to improve the security of deployed nuclear weapons and to dismantle the nuclear arsenals still in place more than a decade after the Cold War ended. Specifically we recommend de-alerting and standing down the respective nuclear arsenals and achieving deep cuts in strategic nuclear weapons as soon as possible.

We would be interested in learning your views on these issues.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

October 23, 2001

The Honorable Colin Powell  
Secretary of State  
U.S. Department of State  
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to share with you a letter to President Bush from representatives of 19 religious organizations on nuclear issues arising from the war on terrorism.

First, we believe that nuclear weapons have absolutely no legitimate role in the campaign against terrorism. Rather we believe that the policy of the United States should be no first use of nuclear weapons against any state, nuclear or non-nuclear, or against any other adversary at any time under any circumstance. We also believe that nuclear weapons should never be used in response to an attack by biological and chemical weapons.

Second, we believe that a substantial portion of anti-terrorist funds that Congress is appropriating should go for activities promoting the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. This should encompass full implementation of report of the Russia Task Force chaired by Howard Baker and Lloyd Cutler.

Third, we believe that the United States should work with Russia to improve the security of deployed nuclear weapons and to dismantle the nuclear arsenals still in place more than a decade after the Cold War ended. Specifically we recommend de-alerting and standing down the respective nuclear arsenals and achieving deep cuts in strategic nuclear weapons as soon as possible.

We would be interested in learning your views on these issues.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

October 23, 2001

Dr. Condoleezza Rice  
National Security Advisor  
The White House  
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Dr. Rice:

I am sending to your attention a letter to President Bush from representatives of 20 religious organizations on nuclear issues related to the war on terrorism. At a time when some members of Congress are advocating use of nuclear weapons against the Taliban and the al Qaeda, we want to register our view that this is wrong. Rather we favor a no first use policy in all circumstances.

Our letter to the President also presents our views on the need to step up non-proliferation activities and to achieve de-alerting and deep cuts in the Russian and U.S. nuclear arsenals.

A delegation from the faith community would welcome an opportunity to meet with you and others in the Bush Administration to discuss the issues presented in our letter and also broader issues arising in the nuclear posture review.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman  
Chair

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

October 24, 2001

To: Mr. Frank Miller  
National Security Council

Fax: 202 456-9190

No. of pages: 4

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Mr. Miller:

Since the White House mail delivery may be halted or slowed down due to the anthrax scare, I am transmitting to you a copy of a letter sent yesterday to President Bush from representatives of 20 religious organizations. It deals with nuclear issues related to the war on terrorism and was sent to the attention of Dr. Condoleezza Rice. It adds a 20<sup>th</sup> signer to the 19 listed in the mailed letter.

You may recall that I talked with you in July about arranging a meeting with members of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. You mentioned that it might occur some time after Labor Day. Before I made contact with you then, the tragic events of September 11 occurred. Now I would like to try again to set up a meeting with you, and if possible, also with Dr. Rice.

First, we would like to discuss the ideas of our letter to President Bush: (1) that nuclear weapons should not be used in the campaign against terrorism; (2) that much greater attention be given to non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including full funding of the recommendations of the Baker-Cutler report; and (3) that improved relations with Russia be used to achieve de-alerting and standing down of the respective nuclear arsenals and bringing about deep cuts of strategic weapons.

Second, we would like to discuss broader issues of the nuclear posture review, including our view that nuclear disarmament should be an integral component.

I will follow up this fax with a phone call to ask for such a meeting.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

October 23, 2001

The Honorable George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

The campaign against terrorism is raising new and important questions about the role and future of nuclear weapons in the global security framework of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We would like to share with you our thinking on this matter.

First, we note that some of your advisors inside and outside of government favor using nuclear weapons against terrorist enclaves and against states that possess no nuclear weapons. Some advocate use of nuclear weapons in response to attacks by chemical and biological weapons. This would reverse the long-standing U.S. policy of using nuclear weapons primarily as a tool to deter other nuclear-weapon states. We believe that the policy of the United States should be no first use of nuclear weapons against any state, nuclear or non-nuclear, or against any other adversary at any time under any circumstance. We believe that such first use would be immoral and would constitute a crime against humanity. We also believe that nuclear weapons should never be used in response to an attack by biological and chemical weapons.

Second, we note that in January 2001 the Russia Task Force chaired by Howard Baker and Lloyd Cutler stated: "The most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today is the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nation states and used against American troops or citizens at home." The September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States emphasize the importance of this finding. Therefore, we believe that a substantial portion of anti-terrorist funds should go for full implementation of the Baker-Cutler report. In terms of relative priority, we suggest that funds be transferred from the missile defense budget to this and other urgent non-proliferation initiatives.

Third, we believe that the improved relationship between the United States and Russia because of mutual concern over terrorism should be treated as an opportunity to make substantial progress in improving the security of deployed nuclear weapons and dismantling the nuclear arsenals still in place more than a decade after the Cold War ended. Specifically we ask you to implement your campaign promise to work with Russia to de-alert and stand down the respective nuclear arsenals and to achieve deep cuts in strategic nuclear weapons. Not only will this enhance the security of the United States and Russia by lowering the possibility of accidental launch, it will also reduce the danger that a renegade group could gain control of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles and use them for terrorist attack on the United States.

We urge you to carry out these recommendations as a means of achieving a safer and more peaceful world in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Sincerely yours,

James Matlack, Director  
Washington Office  
American Friends Service Committee

Ken Sehested, Executive Director  
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

Greg Davidson Laszakovits, Coordinator  
Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Tiffany Heath  
Washington, D.C. Legislative Office  
Church Women United

Rev. Joel J. Heim, Ph.D., Moderator  
Disciples Peace Fellowship

David Culp, Legislative Representative  
Friends Committee on National Legislation

The Rev. Mark B. Brown  
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Stan De Boe, OSST, Director  
Office of Justice and Peace  
Conference of Major Superiors of Men

Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Associate General  
Secretary for Public Witness  
National Council of the Churches of Christ  
in the USA

Marie Dennis  
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

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

(Ms.) Rabia Terri Harris, Coordinator  
Muslim Peace Fellowship

Kathy Thorton, RSM, National Coordinator  
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social  
Justice Lobby

Bishop Walter Sullivan, President  
Bishop Tom Gumbleton, Former President  
Dave Robinson, National Coordinator  
Pax Christi USA

Rev. Elenora Giddings Ivory, Director  
Washington Office  
Presbyterian Church (USA)

Mark J. Pelavin, Associate Director  
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

Andrew Greenblatt, Coordinator  
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Sr. Ann Rutan, President  
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

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

James Winkler, General Secretary  
General Board of Church and Society  
United Methodist Church



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

November 15, 2001

To: Jerry Powers

Fax: 202 541-3339

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Here is an article from the Washington Post that discusses how some persons within the Bush Administration would like to expand the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy.

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

November 19, 2001

To: Vicki Clark

Fax: 202 456-9190

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: Meeting with Frank Miller on November 20

Dear Ms. Clark:

There will be five persons in the interfaith delegation that will meet with Frank Miller on Tuesday, November 20 at 2:00 p.m. to discuss issues related to nuclear weapons. Their names, dates of birth, and social security numbers are as follows:

Gerard Francis Powers ("Jerry"), director, Office of International Justice and Peace, U.S. Catholic Conference  
March 6, 1958, 278-50-7468

Eleanor L. Wright ("Lisa"), Washington Office, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.  
December 7, 1960, 214-88-4382

Mark Pelavin, Associate Director, Religious Action Center for Reform Judaism  
October 2, 1961, 383-48-4477

Earl J. Volk ("Joe"), Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation  
February 28, 1945, 282-42-4946

Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
February 17, 1928, 512-20-7823

Will there be anybody in addition to Mr. Miller? We will have some policy statements and want to provide copies for all in attendance. Please let me know at phone/fax: 301 896-0013 or e-mail: mupj@igc.org.

Thanks for making the arrangements for this meeting.

Howard W. Hallman

## **Sample action alert on national missile defense and the defense authorization bill**

In September the U.S. Senate will make important decisions about national missile defense (NMD). Many in the faith community agree with the position of the United Methodist General Conference, which has described such systems as "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful." NMD will come before the Senate in the form of the defense authorization bill. As this occurs, Senator Charles Hagel of Nebraska may be called upon to vote on two significant issues: funding level for national missile defense and the need to preserve the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.

### **Reduce Funding for National Missile Defense**

President Bush is asking \$8.3 billion for missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. This is extravagant because presently there is no credible threat to the U.S. homeland from long-range missiles. It is also a misdirection of spending priorities, given the urgent need to increase funding of programs designed to "Leave No Child Behind", for health care and other social needs. True national security comes from providing greater opportunities for persons in need, not enriching defense contractors.

### **Preserve the ABM Treaty**

The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which restricts the deployment of a national missile defense, is part of the nuclear arms control structure that has served the world well during the past 30 years. U.S. withdrawal from the treaty in order to deploy missile defense runs the grave risk of causing this structure to collapse and re-fueling the nuclear arms race. Russia is likely to respond to U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty by withdrawing from other arms control agreements and by deploying new multi-warhead missiles. Russia might also abandon the cooperative threat reduction program whereby the United States provides financial assistance for dismantling Russian missiles and securing fissile material. China, too, is likely to increase its offensive nuclear arsenal. This will threaten India, which will counter by deploying more nuclear weapons. Pakistan will respond by increasing its nuclear arsenal. These are dire consequences of ill-advised U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Therefore, we urge you to ask Senator Hagel to support reduced funding for national missile defense and to support a prohibition in the defense authorization bill on expenditure of funds for any activity that would violate the ABM Treaty.

Write to: Senator Charles Hagel, 248 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510  
Call: 202 224-4224 or his district office nearest you.

## **Sample action alert on national missile defense and the defense authorization bill**

In September the U.S. Senate will make important decisions about national missile defense (NMD). Many in the faith community agree with the position of the United Methodist General Conference, which has described such systems as "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful." NMD will come before the Senate in the form of the defense authorization bill. As this occurs, Senator Gordon Smith of Oregon may be called upon to vote on two significant issues: funding level for national missile defense and the need to preserve the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.

### **Reduce Funding for National Missile Defense**

President Bush is asking \$8.3 billion for missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. This is extravagant because presently there is no credible threat to the U.S. homeland from long-range missiles. It is also a misdirection of spending priorities, given the urgent need to increase funding of programs designed to "Leave No Child Behind", for health care and other social needs. True national security comes from providing greater opportunities for persons in need, not enriching defense contractors.

### **Preserve the ABM Treaty**

The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which restricts the deployment of a national missile defense, is part of the nuclear arms control structure that has served the world well during the past 30 years. U.S. withdrawal from the treaty in order to deploy missile defense runs the grave risk of causing this structure to collapse and re-fueling the nuclear arms race. Russia is likely to respond to U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty by withdrawing from other arms control agreements and by deploying new multi-warhead missiles. Russia might also abandon the cooperative threat reduction program whereby the United States provides financial assistance for dismantling Russian missiles and securing fissile material. China, too, is likely to increase its offensive nuclear arsenal. This will threaten India, which will counter by deploying more nuclear weapons. Pakistan will respond by increasing its nuclear arsenal. These are dire consequences of ill-advised U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Therefore, we urge you to ask Senator Smith to support reduced funding for national missile defense and to support a prohibition in the defense authorization bill on expenditure of funds for any activity that would violate the ABM Treaty.

Write to: Senator Gordon Smith, 404 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510  
Call: 202 224-3753 or his district office nearest you.

## **Sample action alert on national missile defense and the defense authorization bill**

In September the U.S. Senate will make important decisions about national missile defense (NMD). Many in the faith community agree with the position of the United Methodist General Conference, which has described such systems as "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful." NMD will come before the Senate in the form of the defense authorization bill. As this occurs, Senator Lincoln Chafee of Rhode Island may be called upon to vote on two significant issues: funding level for national missile defense and the need to preserve the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.

### **Reduce Funding for National Missile Defense**

President Bush is asking \$8.3 billion for missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. This is extravagant because presently there is no credible threat to the U.S. homeland from long-range missiles. It is also a misdirection of spending priorities, given the urgent need to increase funding of programs designed to "Leave No Child Behind", for health care and other social needs. True national security comes from providing greater opportunities for persons in need, not enriching defense contractors.

### **Preserve the ABM Treaty**

The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which restricts the deployment of a national missile defense, is part of the nuclear arms control structure that has served the world well during the past 30 years. U.S. withdrawal from the treaty in order to deploy missile defense runs the grave risk of causing this structure to collapse and re-fueling the nuclear arms race. Russia is likely to respond to U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty by withdrawing from other arms control agreements and by deploying new multi-warhead missiles. Russia might also abandon the cooperative threat reduction program whereby the United States provides financial assistance for dismantling Russian missiles and securing fissile material. China, too, is likely to increase its offensive nuclear arsenal. This will threaten India, which will counter by deploying more nuclear weapons. Pakistan will respond by increasing its nuclear arsenal. These are dire consequences of ill-advised U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Therefore, we urge you to ask Senator Chafee to support reduced funding for national missile defense and to support a prohibition in the defense authorization bill on expenditure of funds for any activity that would violate the ABM Treaty.

Write to: Senator Lincoln Chafee, 141A Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510

Call: 202 224-2921 or his district office nearest you.

## **Sample action alert on national missile defense and the defense authorization bill**

In September the U.S. Senate will make important decisions about national missile defense (NMD). Many in the faith community agree with the position of the United Methodist General Conference, which has described such systems as "illusory, unnecessary, and wasteful." NMD will come first in the Senate Armed Services Committee, which will "mark up" the defense authorization bill immediately after Labor Day. As a member of this committee, Senator Joseph Lieberman of Connecticut will have an influential role. During "mark-up" he will be called upon to vote on two significant issues: funding level for national missile defense and the need to preserve the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.

### **Reduce Funding for National Missile Defense**

President Bush is asking \$8.3 billion for missile defense, a 57 percent increase over the current fiscal year. This is extravagant because presently there is no credible threat to the U.S. homeland from long-range missiles. It is also a misdirection of spending priorities, given the urgent need to increase funding of programs designed to "Leave No Child Behind", for health care and other social needs. True national security comes from providing greater opportunities for persons in need, not enriching defense contractors.

### **Preserve the ABM Treaty**

The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which restricts the deployment of a national missile defense, is part of the nuclear arms control structure that has served the world well during the past 30 years. U.S. withdrawal from the treaty in order to deploy missile defense runs the grave risk of causing this structure to collapse and re-fueling the nuclear arms race. Russia is likely to respond to U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty by withdrawing from other arms control agreements and by deploying new multi-warhead missiles. Russia might also abandon the cooperative threat reduction program whereby the United States provides financial assistance for dismantling Russian missiles and securing fissile material. China, too, is likely to increase its offensive nuclear arsenal. This will threaten India, which will counter by deploying more nuclear weapons. Pakistan will respond by increasing its nuclear arsenal. These are dire consequences of ill-advised U.S. withdrawal from the ABM Treaty.

Therefore, we urge you to ask Senator Lieberman to support reduced funding for national missile defense and to support a prohibition in the defense authorization bill on expenditure of funds for any activity that would violate the ABM Treaty.

Write to: Senator Joseph Lieberman, 706 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510  
Call: 202 224-4041 or his district office nearest you.

# **RLSP**

## What is Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities?

Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities is a joint project of Business Leaders for Sensible Priorities and the National Council of Churches. We believe that the federal budget is a moral document and that America should reduce spending on wasteful Pentagon programs like nuclear weapons and invest the savings in under-funded programs that help children - like education, HeadStart and healthcare.

To achieve this goal we will use state of the art polling and marketing techniques to help faith-based peace and justice groups be more effective and to help leaders of all religious denominations be more outspoken on our issues. Our goal is complement the work that these groups are doing both in Washington and at the grassroots level by helping to change the terms of the debate around budget issues. In the end, the goal is to make it safe for politicians to support our agenda.

By enrolling leading religious figures in our campaign we will be able to reach out to the public in two ways. First, we will be able to place these people in the media by writing and placing Op-Eds for them, inviting them to new conferences, and booking them on radio and television talk shows. Second, we will be able to write articles and create ads designed specifically designed to run in the religious press.

If you have any questions please contact Andrew Greenblatt at 212-870-2155 or [agreenblatt@nccusa.org](mailto:agreenblatt@nccusa.org).

## **Statement of Principles Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities**

*“...they shall beat their swords into plowshares,  
and their spears into pruning hooks...” - Isa. 2:4 (NRSV)*

**I AGREE** that our government’s budget is a profound moral document for our nation, that it allocates our precious resources, and that it announces to our country and the world where our government priorities are.

**I AGREE** that our elected leaders are spending too much of the people’s money on the Pentagon and not enough on programs that benefit our children and our future, such as education, and health care. Misplaced spending priorities fly in the face of our commitments to justice and kindness and threaten our duty to leave a viable planet to our progeny.

**I SUPPORT** the military experts who have demonstrated that the Pentagon budget can be cut without weakening the United States’ security.

**I BELIEVE** that it is immoral for our nation to continue wasting its money on unneeded weapons while so many of our children suffer from hunger, inadequate healthcare, and schools that fail them.

**I PLEDGE** to support efforts to reduce the Pentagon budget by at least 15 percent and to invest the savings in priorities such as education and health care, as well as to re-align Pentagon spending priorities in ways that support our soldiers while and cutting waste.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Please fax this form to Andrew Greenblatt at (212) 870-2817 or mail to RLSP; 475 Riverside Dr., 8<sup>th</sup> Fl; New York, NY 10115.**

**Questions? Call Andrew at (212) 870-2155.**

## Draft Action Alert on Missile Defense

The U.S. Senate will begin consideration of the defense authorization bill for the 2002 fiscal year on Monday, September 17. Voting will begin on Wednesday, September 19. There will likely be votes on (1) funding level for missile defense and (2) a provision related to the ABM Treaty.

(1) The bill as reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee cuts the Bush Administration's request for missile defense by \$1.3 billion. Even so the committee bill provides a 37% increase for missile defense over the 2001 appropriation. Ask your senator to support the \$1.3 billion cut and to vote against any further increase for missile defense.

(2) The committee bill requires a vote by Congress before the president could conduct a missile defense test or other activity that conflicts with the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Ask your senator to vote in favor this provision and to vote against any amendment that would remove this restriction on missile defense testing.

**Background.** Many religious organizations oppose national missile defense. In the first place, developing missile defense uses huge amounts of public funds, which have better uses, on an unproven technology to deal with a threat than can be better handled by other means. Its stated purpose is to provide protection against long-range ballistic missile attack from such states as North Korea, Iran, and Iraq. Yet none of them now have missiles capable of reaching the United States and can be prevented from gaining them through diplomacy, control of missile technology, and other non-proliferation measures. Moreover, if these states and terrorist groups want to attack the United States with weapons of mass destruction, they are more likely to smuggle the weapons into the United States or put them on a conventional airplane or ship. Missile defense offers no protection from this threat.

Second, full testing and deployment of the missile defense system proposed by the Bush Administration would violate the ABM Treaty. This treaty prohibits all but minimal missile defense on the grounds that mutual vulnerability provides security from missile attack. Although religious organizations do not necessarily endorse this doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD), they recognize that the ABM Treaty is part of the arms control and disarmament structure and therefore needs to be preserved. If the United States withdraws from the ABM Treaty, Russia and China are likely to increase their nuclear arsenals, followed by India and Pakistan. A renewed nuclear arms race is a far greater danger to the United States than the remote threat of ballistic missile attack in the distance future by a small nation.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman  
September 10, 2001

## **Pledge of Action on Missile Defense**

\_\_\_\_\_ Our organization will send out a general alert on missile defense and the Senate defense authorization bill.

\_\_\_\_\_ We will promote grassroots action in the following states:

Signed:

Organization:

Date:

**Immediate release**  
October 24, 2001

**Contact:** Howard W. Hallman  
Phone: 301 896-0013

## **RELIGIOUS LEADERS OPPOSE USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN AFGHANISTAN**

Representatives of 20 national religious organizations have written to President George W. Bush to oppose use of nuclear weapons in the campaign against terrorism. Recently two members of Congress, Rep. Steve Buyer (R-IN) and Rep. Peter T. King (R-NY), have recommended such action.

In contrast, the religious leaders register their belief that "the policy of the United States should be no first use of nuclear weapons against any state, nuclear or non-nuclear, or against any other adversary at any time under any circumstance." They also state that "nuclear weapons should never be used in response to an attack by biological and chemical weapons."

The religious leaders note the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material might be stolen from Russia and sold to terrorists. This was a finding of the January 2001 report of the Russia Task Force, chaired by Howard Baker and Lloyd Cutler. Therefore, the religious leaders propose that a substantial portion of anti-terrorist funds should go for full implementation of non-proliferation activities recommended in the Baker-Cutler report.

In light of the improved relationship between the United States and Russia, the religious leaders ask President Bush to work with Russia to de-alert and stand down the respective nuclear arsenals and to achieve deep cuts in strategic nuclear weapons. They indicate that this would lower the possibility of accidental launch. It would also reduce the danger that a renegade group could gain control of deployed Russian nuclear weapons and launch them in a terrorist attack on the United States.

-30-

A copy of the letter to President Bush and list of signers is attached.

*The letter and this news release has been facilitated by Howard W. Hallman, chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036. Phone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: mupj@igc.org*

## News Release from Methodists United for Peace with Justice

**Immediate release**  
October 24, 2001

**Contact:** Howard W. Hallman  
Phone: 301 896-0013

### **RELIGIOUS LEADERS OPPOSE USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN AFGHANISTAN**

Representatives of 20 national religious organizations have written to President George W. Bush to oppose use of nuclear weapons in the campaign against terrorism. Recently two members of Congress, Rep. Steve Buyer (R-IN) and Rep. Peter T. King (R-NY), have recommended such action.

In contrast, the religious leaders register their belief that "the policy of the United States should be no first use of nuclear weapons against any state, nuclear or non-nuclear, or against any other adversary at any time under any circumstance." They also state that "nuclear weapons should never be used in response to an attack by biological and chemical weapons."

The religious leaders note the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material might be stolen from Russia and sold to terrorists. This was a finding of the January 2001 report of the Russia Task Force, chaired by Howard Baker and Lloyd Cutler. Therefore, the religious leaders propose that a substantial portion of anti-terrorist funds should go for full implementation of non-proliferation activities recommended in the Baker-Cutler report.

In light of the improved relationship between the United States and Russia, the religious leaders ask President Bush to work with Russia to de-alert and stand down the respective nuclear arsenals and to achieve deep cuts in strategic nuclear weapons. They indicate that this would lower the possibility of accidental launch. It would also reduce the danger that a renegade group could gain control of deployed Russian nuclear weapons and launch them in a terrorist attack on the United States.

-30-

October 23, 2001

The Honorable George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

The campaign against terrorism is raising new and important questions about the role and future of nuclear weapons in the global security framework of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We would like to share with you our thinking on this matter.

First, we note that some of your advisors inside and outside of government favor using nuclear weapons against terrorist enclaves and against states that possess no nuclear weapons. Some advocate use of nuclear weapons in response to attacks by chemical and biological weapons.

This would reverse the long-standing U.S. policy of using nuclear weapons primarily as a tool to deter other nuclear-weapon states. We believe that the policy of the United States should be no first use of nuclear weapons against any state, nuclear or non-nuclear, or against any other adversary at any time under any circumstance. We believe that such first use would be immoral and would constitute a crime against humanity. We also believe that nuclear weapons should never be used in response to an attack by biological and chemical weapons.

Second, we note that in January 2001 the Russia Task Force chaired by Howard Baker and Lloyd Cutler stated: "The most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today is the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nation states and used against American troops or citizens at home." The September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States emphasize the importance of this finding. Therefore, we believe that a substantial portion of anti-terrorist funds should go for full implementation of the Baker-Cutler report. In terms of relative priority, we suggest that funds be transferred from the missile defense budget to this and other urgent non-proliferation initiatives.

Third, we believe that the improved relationship between the United States and Russia because of mutual concern over terrorism should be treated as an opportunity to make substantial progress in improving the security of deployed nuclear weapons and dismantling the nuclear arsenals still in place more than a decade after the Cold War ended. Specifically we ask you to implement your campaign promise to work with Russia to de-alert and stand down the respective nuclear arsenals and to achieve deep cuts in strategic nuclear weapons. Not only will this enhance the security of the United States and Russia by lowering the possibility of accidental launch, it will also reduce the danger that a renegade group could gain control of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles and use them for terrorist attack on the United States.

We urge you to carry out these recommendations as a means of achieving a safer and more peaceful world in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Sincerely yours,

James Matlack, Director  
Washington Office  
American Friends Service Committee

Ken Sehested, Executive Director  
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

Greg Davidson Laszakovits, Coordinator  
Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Tiffany Heath  
Washington, D.C. Legislative Office  
Church Women United

Rev. Joel J. Heim, Ph.D., Moderator  
Disciples Peace Fellowship

David Culp, Legislative Representative  
Friends Committee on National Legislation

The Rev. Mark B. Brown  
Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Stan De Boe, OSST, Director  
Office of Justice and Peace  
Conference of Major Superiors of Men

Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Associate General  
Secretary for Public Witness  
National Council of the Churches of Christ  
in the USA

Marie Dennis  
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns

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

(Ms.) Rabia Terri Harris, Coordinator  
Muslim Peace Fellowship

Kathy Thorton, RSM, National Coordinator  
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social  
Justice Lobby

Bishop Walter Sullivan, President  
Bishop Tom Gumbleton, Former President  
Dave Robinson, National Coordinator  
Pax Christi USA

Rev. Elenora Giddings Ivory, Director  
Washington Office  
Presbyterian Church (USA)

Mark J. Pelavin, Associate Director  
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

Andrew Greenblatt, Coordinator  
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Sr. Ann Rutan, President  
Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace

Rev. Meg A. Riley, Director

Washington Office for Faith in Action  
Unitarian Universalist Association  
of Congregations

James Winkler, General Secretary  
General Board of Church and Society United Methodist Church

*This letter was facilitated by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 1500 16<sup>th</sup> Street, NW, Washington, DC. Phone/fax: 301 896-0013. E-mail: [mupj@igc.org](mailto:mupj@igc.org)*

## **A Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and the Russian Federation**

### **Findings**

1. In the decade following World War II the United States and the Soviet Union developed and deployed large arsenals of nuclear weapons. The stated purposes emphasized deterrence of conventional war in Europe and deterrence of attack by long-range strategic weapons. This occurred in the atmosphere of the Cold War.
2. The Cold War has ended. There is no longer any military confrontation between the Russian Federation, as successor to the Soviet Union, and the United States and its NATO allies. That means that the sole remaining purpose of the strategic nuclear arsenals is to deter the other side from attacking with its strategic weapons.
3. In this situation it is to the mutual advantage of the United States and Russia to eliminate their respective strategic arsenal. This should be achieved in a manner that assures mutual security throughout the process.

### **De-alerting and Standing Down**

Schedule

Verification

### **Dismantling Nuclear Weapons and Delivery Vehicles**

Schedule

Verification

### **Safeguarding Fissile Material**

Arrangements

Verification

November 26, 2001

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

Here are some notes on a meeting held November 20, 2001 with Franklin C. Miller, special assistant to the president and senior director for defense policy and arms control, National Security Council. Attendees from the faith community consisted of Jerry Powers, U.S. Catholic Conference; Joe Volk, Friends Committee on National Legislation; Lisa Wright, National Council of Churches; and Howard Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

Mr. Miller started by stating the view of President Bush that the Cold War is over. The president's response has three components: (1) end the notion that the United States and Russia are military rivals and draw Russia closer to the West; (2) reduce the level of nuclear weapons; (they will still play a role in security, for the world is not ready for nuclear disarmament); (3) get out of the ABM Treaty, an underpinning for mutual annihilation. Bush's War College speech of May 1 is the best statement of his current views.

The reductions of U.S. strategic weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 that Bush announced while meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin will take place over ten years. This is a unilateral declaration that reflects U.S. interests and needs. They don't want a traditional arms control treaty with its long delays. The arms control bureaucracy is an impediment to progress. Putin will subsequently announce a reduction to 1,500. He wants codification of the mutual reductions, so there will be more discussion. Likely the verification and transparency provision of START I will be used.

Joe asked about the Smith provision in defense authorization that prohibits U.S. reductions. Miller wasn't well informed on the status on Capitol Hill, but he said they support the Senate provision for outright repeal.

Jerry asked about what kind of targeting guidance goes with the 1,700 figure. Miller said that the number is a presidential decision to get out of the cold war vestige, for there is no military confrontation with Russia anywhere. The Pentagon will have several months to come up with a targeting plan that reflects this number. Reductions will include the 50 MX missiles and four Trident submarines. However, warheads will be retained. Tactical nuclear weapons are not covered. The White House will ultimately decide on new guidance for a smaller nuclear force.

Howard asked why stop at 1,700. Miller gave a long exposition about how nuclear deterrence prevented war in Europe and is still a necessity of U.S. policy. Getting under 2,000 is a significant improvement.

Regarding de-alerting, Miller stated that the idea is cosmetically attractive but impractical. If you de-alert only part of the arsenal, the remaining weapons become more vulnerable. Total de-alerting can't be verified. However, not all of the 1,700 U.S. will be on operational alert. Bombers will take several hours to reload their nuclear weapons. Only some of the submarine fleet will be at sea at any one time. Likewise Russian subs are not at sea and mobile missiles are in their home bases. They are working with Russia on a joint warning system and are not worried about launching by mistake. The commitment to de-alerting expressed in Bush's May 2000 campaign speech does not reflect current presidential policy.

Regarding the ABM Treaty, it is based upon mutual fear, said Miller. They'll work it out with Russia, for Putin is pragmatic.

Lisa asked about nonproliferation policies, including the lifting of sanctions on India and Pakistan. Miller said they were counterproductive because denying Pakistan assistance on conventional weapons has made them rely more on nuclear weapons. There is a need to rethink sanctions.

They continue to be concerned about the spread of nuclear weapons and are worried about the deal between Russia and Iran. The key is to keep fissile material safe. The money spent on Nunn-Lugar and other measures in the past ten years has been a good investment. The Clinton administration tried but failed to help Russia shut down three nuclear power reactors that produce plutonium as a by-product. Now Rumsfeld opposes this initiative.

Howard asked about the possible expanding role for nuclear weapons, such as in response to biological and chemical weapons and for use against bunkers and caves. Miller reaffirmed the traditional policy of nuclear deterrence to prevent aggression against the United States by any means, including conventional and all kinds of weapons of mass destruction. They don't want any nation to think it can use biological or chemical weapons against U.S. without a strong response. (He emphasized "state actor".) Therefore, they will not say "no first use".

Joe asked whether deep cuts will lead to developing new kinds of nuclear weapons. Miller said, "absolutely not". He dismissed the need for a mini-nuke because it meets no military requirement.

Returning to targeting, Miller said that in his previous role in the Pentagon in 1995 he had found that multiplication of targets in urban areas led to de facto city-busting. He helped bring about a change away from targeting urban populations. In this discussion he referred to just war theory and international law.

November 21, 2001. Revised December 4, 2001.

Responses to Hallman's e-letter of November 5 on Current and Future Activities of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and his November 30 e-letter on the forthcoming December 13 meeting.

November 5 from Janet Horman

Howard:

Thank you for raising the issue of the future of the Interfaith Committee in light of current realities. My preference, I suppose, would be to broaden the committee's focus at this time to include both disarmament and anti-war work. I would like to thank you for your tireless efforts to keep us all together. I think that many of us have so many issues under our umbrella that we find ourselves spread rather thin. Your prompting and sign-ons have allowed me to express our agency's voice on important issues(I am available on November 20th and would like to be a part of the delegation to meet Frank Miller). I also think that it would be a shame to throw away an interreligious structure at this time...unless we are sure that we can pull it together again in a hurry if the issues on the horizon change.

I can certainly understand that you cannot work without additional income..and I'm also certain that you must have pursued the MUPJ board's thoughts in this regard. Work-wise, I am stretched rather thin at the moment, and, although I'd love to have an interreligious group continue to meet(especially if the focus is broadened), I do not think I should offer to chair it at this time. You have been extremely faithful in efforts to pull us together and keep us on task, and I do greatly admire your efforts and deeply appreciate them. I know that these thoughts do not solve the problem, but they do reflect my thoughts at the moment.

I look forward to the input of others.

Janet Horman  
Program Director for Peace with Justice  
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society

###

November 4 from Larry Egbert, Unitarian Universalist Association

Howard,

Thank you for this note. I received it in Washington yesterday and have called David Culp. I cheer your wonderful persistence and thoroughness. You have led us and challenged us and it has been a pleasure to have helped a bit with this incredibly complicated business.

Now, clearly financial support is lousy for no one

seems to think a nuclear war is brewing. I saw the headline that W Bush was concerned about nuclear war in Eastern Europe! I respect your need to make a slightly better income especially considering the mountain of work you have taken on. However, there are other ways to solve this. How about dumping some of the tasks on others? David sounded interested in helping. I am willing to do some the chores of mailing and calling.

This whole project has been a useful stimulant for our Washington Office of the Unitarian Universalist Association and I think we should continue. I regret that the Veatch Foundation did not pour money into our coffers!

Janet Horman sent me a copy of her letter to you. I think David Culp would agree to contribute. David DID say that they are having Quaker Meetings in large scale right now so he will be out of pocket for several weeks.

Do not depart! PEACE! Larry

###

November 13 from Daryl Byler, Mennonite Central Committee

Hi Howard:

I agree that there doesn't seem to be a strong legislative focus just now and that a meeting in November is not necessary. It wasn't clear to me, though, the connection between taking a short breather, and your stepping down as chair.

In my judgment, this group continues to serve a significant purpose. Perhaps in the present season, we only need to meet every other month or once a quarter.

Unfortunately, if there is a meeting in December, I will miss it. I'm planning on being out on a 6 week study leave.

Warm regards,  
Daryl Byler

###

November 30 from Larry Egbert

Hello, Howard,

Thanks for the notice of the meeting on th 13th, unfortunatly, I have a previous commitment so will not

make it.

I would say that we should NOT dissolve. We SHOULD MEET regularly and meeting would include e-mail. thinking of e-mail, I have never communicated by e-mail with anyone in the Interfaith Committee except you so I would need some addresses. I took a college course last year and they had the capability of sending a letter to the professor AND the whole class simultaneous. Thus, we read questions to the professor that we wished we had thought of!

Merging with other organizations in the peace movement seems good. We could, for example, volunteer for BACK FROM THE BRINK. I would be interested in some kind of inventory of other ecumenical peace organizations in D.C.

Thanks again. Sorry to miss the meeting.  
---PEACE! Larry

###

December 5 from Bob Tiller, Baptist Peace Fellowship

Dear Howard and other colleagues,

I am sorry to report that I will not be able to attend tomorrow's meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. [note: He had the date wrong.] With the workload that I am carrying at Bread for the World, I am finding it very difficult to participate in Interfaith Committee meetings, even though I am strongly committed to the goals and work of the group.

I wish that I could be present for the discussion of the future of the Interfaith Committee. If I were there, I would begin by saying that I am very grateful to you for getting the Interfaith Committee together, and for your determined efforts in shaping its growth and its actions. I highly commend you for your initiative, imagination and hard work. I had hoped that it would become stronger than it has, and I had also hoped that I could contribute more than I have.

Unfortunately, the response from many religious groups that might have helped build the Interfaith Committee has been tepid. Several organizations and denominations that could and should participate apparently do not have the will or the resources to make the Interfaith Committee a strong and active organization. I agree with your statement that "among competing priorities, nuclear disarmament seems not to rank very high for overtaxed staff of religious organizations." The struggle to build the Interfaith Committee has provided further evidence that nuclear disarmament just does not register as an urgent issue in the minds of most people these days, so other issues get the resources.

As noted above, I myself am having great difficulty in getting to the meetings and representing the Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America in a meaningful way, because of the claims of my job and also because of my wife's health. The BPFNA has fewer resources than many other groups that have been invited to participate in the Interfaith Committee, but I think it could find someone whose schedule will allow more participation than I have given. Thus I am strongly considering asking the leadership of BPFNA to search for someone else to serve as their representative; I will await the outcome of tomorrow's meeting before I take a step to implement that possibility.

Your recent e-mail posed five alternatives for the Interfaith committee:

- (1) Dissolve.
- (2) Meet on call when specific issues arise.
- (3) Meet regularly (such as monthly).
- (4) Use e-mail communication rather than meeting.
- (5) Merge with other interfaith endeavors on peace and disarmament issues.

I do not have a strong preference for or against any of them. I would be disappointed if the group chooses to dissolve, but I would see it as a reasonable decision to make. Options 2 and 4 both appear to provide a way to keep the group alive while making fewer demands for attendance, but I think it would be difficult for the organization to thrive and have an impact if it chooses either option 2 or 4. Option 5 could be attractive, but in reality choosing option 5 would probably be a lot like dissolving. And I think it would be hard to plow ahead with option 3 when attendance is often small and when you are feeling like you need to step down from the chair. So I feel kind of stuck, and unable to express a choice for any of them.

I wish you and the entire group well in the meeting tomorrow, and I look forward to hearing about the discussion and the decision. By the way, I have only seen one reply to your e-mail of November 5th. Have there been others? If there has only been one (prior to this), that tells us something.

Shalom,  
Bob Tiller

###

December 5 from Mark Brown, Lutheran Office for Intergovernmental Affairs

<< Your recent e-mail posed five alternatives for the Interfaith committee:

- (1) Dissolve.
- (2) Meet on call when specific issues arise.
- (3) Meet regularly (such as monthly).
- (4) Use e-mail communication rather than meeting.
- (5) Merge with other interfaith endeavors on peace and disarmament issues. >>

Howard:

Bob's comments resonate with my own situation of wanting to be supportive, but also being pulled in many other directions at the moment. I suggest a combination of options 2 and 4.

Thanks for all your work.

Mark

###

From Carol Q. Cosby, Disciples Peace Fellowship

Howard,

It was great to attend the initial meeting of this group. At the same time it was frustrating, knowing that I would not be able to be there again. From Indianapolis to DC is too far and too expensive a trip to make very often unless it is combined with other meetings.

I do appreciate your having taken leadership on this issue and believe that it is more important now than ever. In light of the various options you presented, the one that makes the most sense for those of us who are out of town is to meet by email. Our Disciples Peace Fellowship uses this for our executive committee and at times it works quite well.

shalom,  
Carol

###

December 6

I vote for #5. Please pass on inasmuch I don't have the correct email address.

Thanks, Murray Polner, Jewish Peace Fellowship

###