

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

December 12, 2001

To: Dr. Condoleezza Rice

Fax: 202 456-9190

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Dr. Rice:

We are sending you a letter to President Bush, asking him not to withdraw from the ABM Treaty. Will you please give this letter to the President?

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Chair

Dear Interfaith Colleagues:

New Year's greetings! Another year, another time of opportunity to work toward our goal of global elimination of nuclear weapons.

I believe that we should put behind us our losses of recent years -- defeat of the CTBT in 1999, full funding of national missile defense and President Bush's notice of withdrawal from the ABM Treaty in 2001 -- and become bolder and more ambitious in 2002. I suggest that we develop and implement an approach that is both prophetic and practicable, focusing on standing down and completely eliminating the global nuclear arsenal.

In doing so we should go beyond public statements, sign-on letters, and general educational programs. We should help develop and work for a practicable program for eliminating nuclear weapons. We should realize that the faith community working alone cannot achieve this goal. We should seek a deeper working relationship not only with our current allies in the civil-sector peace and disarmament community and a wider relationship with military leaders and scientists who believe that nuclear weapons should be eliminated.

In thinking about the latter groups, I realize that the term "abolition", which I and others in the faith community and some in the civil sector use, doesn't readily appeal to military leaders and moderates in the civil sector. A couple of years somebody conducted a focus-group survey of ordinary citizens and learned that "elimination of nuclear weapons" gained a more positive response than "abolition". However, that isn't a very catchy phrase.

As an alternative, I suggest that we consider working for the "zero option" and that we form a "zero option coalition". Among other sources the term "zero" comes from statements by two military commanders.

On June 10, 1993 General Colin Powell, then serving as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (appointed by President George H.W. Bush), told a Harvard University commencement audience: "I declare my hope and declare it from the bottom of my heart that we will eventually see the time when the number of nuclear weapons is down to zero and the world is a much better place." While serving as commander of the U.S. Space Command, General Charles Horner (allied air forces commander during the Gulf War), said to the Defense Writers' Group at a breakfast meeting on July 15, 1994: "The nuclear weapon is obsolete. I want to get rid of them all....I want to go to zero."

I suggest we (to be defined below) ask General Horner, other military leaders who signed the June 2000 statement with religious leaders at the Washington National Cathedral, General Lee Butler, former civilian national security leaders (such as Robert McNamara), scientists and other civil-sector experts interested in eliminating nuclear weapons to offer a step-by-step schedule for reaching zero. Such a schedule would deal with categories of U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons and the nuclear arsenals of other states. It might encompass such steps as de-alerting, standing down, dismantling nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, and securing safe storage of fissile material. It should also include methods for achieving transparency and verification.

Perhaps there could be a web site where these ideas are presented and opened for debate. Persons from other countries around the world could be drawn in.

We would not necessarily seek a consensus on which plan is the most effective. Rather we would be able to indicate that a number of experts believe that a step-by-step approach to reaching zero is practicable, that several alternative schemes are possible. The "zero option" would become a catch phrase for what we are seeking.

As to the "we", it would be possible to work with the Center for Defense Information and other organizations that are part of the Coalition to Reduce Nuclear Dangers to solicit sets of going-to-zero proposals. The bigger challenge is for the faith community to become more actively engaged with military leaders who share the vision of zero nuclear weapons, and also with scientists who have technical knowledge of the subject. It isn't a customary alliance. The closest we've come is the National Cathedral statement, but this was a one-time event as far as connecting religious and military leaders.

We are aware that many military leaders are nervous about working with religious leaders, who they view as pacifists. We can speculate that most of them wouldn't be part of a broad alliance that includes such "radicals" as Peace Action, WAND, Greenpeace, and the like.

It might be possible, though, to form a zero option coalition (formal or informal) involving some top religious leaders (heads of communion or ecumenical officer level), retired generals and admirals, and leading scientists. They would offer their combined prestige to advance ideas on how to achieve the zero option. Staff support could come from existing organizations. Separately other organizations could pick up their proposals and press President Bush and members of Congress to endorse a step-by-step approach to reaching zero. "Support the zero option" would be the slogan.

We could also make this a global effort, first by making contact with counterparts in Russia, then in Great Britain and France, in other NATO countries, and elsewhere. Already we have connections with religious organizations in Europe and Canada with this interest, with the World Council of Churches, and Pax Christi International. Some civil-sector organizations are in touch with Russian organizations. Through these contacts there could be citizen diplomacy to help bring the United States and Russia together on a zero-option plan and then broaden it to other nuclear-weapon states.

I offer these ideas for your consideration. I know that some of the participants in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament prefer an incremental approach that focuses on "realistic" objectives. Therefore, those of us who want a bolder approach might want to form a sub-group to develop and push for more prophetic action. Having regained my optimism, I believe that a more ambitious effort is practicable and can be achieved if we develop a broader alliance. Even with our present resources.

I would be interested in your response. Because I haven't yet set up a list-serve, you can reply to all if you want to.

Shalom,
Howard

Dear Colleagues,

I am continuing to think about next steps in our quest for nuclear disarmament. I don't want to abandon what we've been doing together with sign-on letters and action alerts on immediate issues, but I would like to work together for longer-range goals in cooperation with other sectors.

I have tried out the idea of "zero option" among several people from civil-sector organizations. The term has been favorably received, but there is caution on how far we can push for this goal at this time. There is encouragement to form stronger ties between various sectors -- religious, military, scientific, etc. -- but realization that this will take time to develop.

I'm wondering whether a first step might be to encourage greater dialogue among persons from these sectors on what practical steps are needed to exercise the zero option. This could be done by setting up a web site -- www.zero-option.net or some such name -- dedicated to presentation and discussion of concrete proposals for elimination of nuclear weapons. We could ask retired military leaders, scientists, and other experts to present their ideas for getting to zero. Members of Congress and their staffs could be welcome to participate and also persons in the government to the extent they are willing. We could start in the United States and then broaden the effort to encompass experts and civil-sector organizations in Russia and other nations.

This web site might be sponsored primarily by denominational offices to give it identity and respectability. They would be identified on the home page. I'm willing to serve as moderator, but we would need someone with web site capability to help with entries.

There could be sections for (a) basic facts on number and type of nuclear weapons, by possessor (to be obtained from the Center for Defense Information), (b) various proposals for going to zero, (c) a collection of policy statements from denomination and other faith-based entities on the subject (with linkage to their web pages), and (d) a chat room for discussing the various proposals. The web site would be used exclusively for information sharing and discussion and would not be used for action alerts. A draft introductory statement is offered below.

As we engage retired military leaders and scientists in this kind of dialogue, we can then explore how we might work together to get governmental policy makers to adopt and carry out our ideas. This could start in the United States and then broaden to work with counterpart organizations abroad. This might lead to some citizen diplomacy to encourage the United States, Russia, and other possessors of nuclear weapons to agree upon steps for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

What do you think of this idea? What clarification do you want? What modification would you propose? Would your office be interested in participating in this venture? If we go ahead with it, do you have talent in your office who can help design and set up the web site?

Shalom,
Howard

###

Draft Introduction to Proposed Web Site (www.zero-option.net)

"The nuclear weapon is obsolete. I want to get rid of them all....I want to go to zero." General Charles Horner, July 15, 1994, at the time commander of the U.S. Space Command.

"I declare my hope and declare it from the bottom of my heart that we will eventually see the time when the number of nuclear weapons is down to zero and the world is a much better place." General Colin Powell, June 10, 1993, at the time chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Other military leaders have reached similar conclusions. For instance, Admiral Noel Gayler, while serving as commander-in-chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific from 1972 to 1976, became convinced that "there is no sensible military use for nuclear weapons." During the period from 1991 to 1994 when General Lee Butler was commander-in-chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, he began what he later described as "the long and arduous intellectual journey from staunch advocate of nuclear deterrence to public proponent of nuclear abolition."

Numerous religious organizations and religious leaders are on record as favoring the total elimination of nuclear weapons. They include Pope John Paul II, National Conference of Catholic Bishops (United States), World Council of Churches, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., many Protestant denominations, Jewish organizations, Muslim organizations, the Dalai Lama, and others.

The crucial question: How do we achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons from Earth -- the zero option?

Because we in the faith community lack technical expertise on the detailed steps for reaching zero, we turn to those who do. Therefore, we invite military leaders, scientists, civilian national security experts, and others to offer their proposals for practical steps and sequence of events that can lead to zero nuclear weapons. We also ask for ideas on how to bring about verification of the results and how to assure the secure storage of fissile material remaining after nuclear warheads are dismantled.

Some may want to address some aspects, such as achieving zero alert for nuclear weapons without necessarily dismantling all of them at this time; or going almost to zero but leaving a residual on each side; or special issues, such as verification. Such ideas will be welcomed.

In addition to presentation of proposals for reaching zero, this web site has a chat room for discussion. It is open to all persons who have relevant observations to make about the proposals and the comments of others in the chat room.

[Instructions for submitting ideas. Perhaps rules for the chat room.]

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

January 22, 2002

To: Mr. Frank Miller
National Security Council

Fax: 202 456-9190

No. of pages: 2

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Mr. Miller:

Now that the Department of Defense has completed its Nuclear Posture Review, various religious organizations would like to study the conclusions and discuss them with their membership. Rather than relying only upon newspaper reports and analyses of civil-sector organizations, we would like to have a briefing on the NPR from someone in the Bush Administration. Would you be able to help us arrange for such a briefing?

I would like to invite representatives of the organizations involved in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, as shown on the attached listing. Some of these are out of town and wouldn't be able to attend, but I estimate that we might have around thirty participants. We are willing to go a government building, but if you would prefer, we can arrange for a conference room at the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE.

If by the time of the briefing an unclassified version of the Nuclear Posture Review is available, we would like to distribute copies to participants in advance. That would give us more time to hear deeper explanations and to ask more clarifying questions.

If a briefing is possible, could you suggest some alternate dates? That way can I check to be certain that there is no conflict with a major meeting in the faith community that would take away many of our potential participants.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Chair

Dear Colleagues:

There will be a briefing on the Bush Administration's Nuclear Posture Review for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Friday, February 15 from 11:00 a.m. to 12 noon in Conference Room 3, Methodists Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

The briefing will be conducted by Franklin C. Miller, Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Defense Policy and Arms Control for the National Security Council. Because of the importance of the subject and Mr. Miller's high rank in the Administration, I hope that every organization participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will send a representative.

RSVP now. I'll send background material latter.

Shalom,
Howard

Dear

I'm sorry that the briefing on the Nuclear Posture Review is scheduled on a day when you said you could not attend. I had to go with when Frank Miller was available.

I hope that someone else from your office can participate. If so, let me know who it will be.

Shalom,
Howard

Dear Colleague:

This is your third and final invitation to join the new list-serve of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. I will use it for all regular communications with participants in this Interfaith Committee. It will also be available for other participants to communicate with the whole group.

To become a subscriber, send an e-mail to: interfaithnd-subscribe@yahoogroups.com. Write subscribe on the subject line.

I understand that many people want to reduce their e-communications and you may be one of them. If you are not a subscriber, I will no longer send you meeting announcements and other information related to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament starting on February 4.

Shalom,
Howard

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

February 22, 2002

To: Ms. Vicki Clark

Fax: 202 456-9190

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Ms. Clark:

I would like to confirm the arrangements for Mr. Frank Miller to conduct a briefing for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on the Nuclear Posture Review. It will take place from 1:30 to 2:30 p.m. on Friday, March 22 in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

If something comes up again at the last minute, I can be reached until 12:30 that day at 301 896-0013. Later than that you can call the receptionist at the Methodist Building at 202 488-5600 or Janet Horman on the staff of the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society at 202 488-5647.

We look forward to this meeting with Mr. Miller.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman

First Draft

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

Dear Mr. President:

As you prepare for your next meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin, we would like to offer our observations on the place of nuclear weapons in the relationship between the United States and Russia. We were encouraged when the two of you met in Texas and told the world that the two nations are now friends rather than military rivals. You each promised to make substantial reductions in strategic nuclear weapons. This follows through on your desire to move beyond the Cold War and its doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD).

This gives us hope that substantial progress can be made toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. For decades religious leaders and religious organizations have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons. Increasingly retired military leaders have told us that nuclear weapons have no utility. In June 2000 these two strands were woven together in the attached statement by 18 military professionals and 21 religious leaders, who indicated, "We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. ...National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide."

With our hopes raised by your meeting with President Putin, we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). To be sure, the commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500 is a step in the right direction. Yet, we wonder why it should take ten years to accomplish. Surely this step could be completed by 2004. Furthermore, the reduction is mitigated by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. In contrast previous arms reduction agreements, such as Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty signed by President Ronald Reagan and START I signed by your father, President George H.W. Bush, provided for the destruction of the delivery vehicles.

If the United States keeps so many warheads, Russia is likely to do the same. The more warheads that Russia has in reserve the greater the risk of some of them falling into the hands of terrorist organizations. The United States would be better off to forgo a large warhead reserve and instead enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia that requires elimination of both delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads taken out of service.

We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. In spite of talk of a change from a "traditional threat-based approach" to a "capabilities-based approach" which is not country specific, the NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". If you ask the Pentagon planners what these contingencies are, they are most likely to respond that Russian sites now

targeted by the single integrated operating plan (SIOP) will remain the top contingency. Thus, in practice the MAD doctrine prevails.

Not only is MAD continuing but also the practice of keeping large numbers of missiles on hair-trigger alert. During the presidential campaign you rightly told the American people that "for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch." You stated, "the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status -- another unnecessary vestige of Cold War confrontation." Yet, the Pentagon planners have made no provision for de-alerting in the Nuclear Posture Review. True friends do not keep nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert targeted at each other.

Indeed, the Pentagon plan seems to expand the role of nuclear weapons beyond the primary role of deterring nuclear-weapon states from attacking the United States and its allies. The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of flexibility for a range of contingencies. Although these contingencies are not spelled out, the PNR expresses a concern for the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and ballistic missile delivery systems. In your State of the Union Address you spoke of an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Some of your top appointees are previously on record as favoring use of nuclear weapons to deal with such contingencies. Since the NPR was released, John Bolton, undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, has revealed that your administration no longer stands behind previous U.S. policy of no first use of nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon state not allied with a nuclear-weapon state. We are greatly disturbed that your administration wants to expand rather than contract the role of nuclear weapons in the 21st century.

Our concern is reinforced by the approach to nuclear testing revealed in the Nuclear Posture Review. While we welcome reaffirmation of your commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, we are bothered by the NPR's call for the Department of Energy to reduce the time it would take to resume testing. This seems to go with your opposition to ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a treaty we support. This is compounded by the NPR's indication that the current nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 and that in the meantime the Department will "study alternatives for follow-ons" for nuclear delivery systems and warheads. Preparation to resume testing seems part of this scheme. This sounds like a commitment to nuclear weapons forever. We find this objectionable.

Therefore, Mr. President, we ask you to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards and have the Pentagon planners come up with a plan that will truly end the MAD doctrine and will steadily reduce the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy. We propose that nuclear disarmament objectives be incorporated into the Nuclear Posture Review in accordance to the U.S. obligation under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), signed originally by President Richard Nixon. As a point of departure, we call to your attention the practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference (see attachment). Among other things these practical steps set forth the principle of irreversibility and call for "an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

A revised Nuclear Posture Review along these lines would more nearly fulfill your goal of ending Cold War confrontation and achieving true friendship between the United States and

Russia. We urge you to exercise your presidential leadership in the direction of diminishing the role of nuclear weapons and eventually eliminating them from Earth. As you do, we will do what we can to help build support with the American people.

With best regards,

Signed by representatives of religious organizations

Meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
10:00 to 11:30 a.m., Thursday, December 13, 2001
Methodist Building, Conference Room 3

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. ABM Treaty
3. Future of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
 - a. Dissolve
 - b. Meet on call
 - c. Meet regularly
 - d. Rely on e-mail
 - e. Merge
 - f. Become more pro-active
 - g. Other
4. Leadership
5. Next meeting (if any)

The Zero Option

A Call for Eliminating Nuclear Weapons

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations note the recent commitment by U.S. President George W. Bush and Russian President Vladimir Putin to reduce deployed strategic nuclear warheads to under 2,000 on each side during a ten year period. We applaud this commitment as a start in the right direction. However, we believe that the proposed reduction does not go far enough or fast enough.

We are also concerned that a considerable number of strategic nuclear weapons will remain deployed on high alert -- enough to destroy the United States and Russia several times over. This retains the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD), a pernicious doctrine that is morally reprehensible.

There is a better way: the total elimination of nuclear weapons, strategic and tactical, as rapidly as practicable with full transparency and verification. Numerous religious bodies -- Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, other faiths -- favor this course.

A sizable number of active and retired military commanders also support the elimination of nuclear weapons. Statements made by General Colin Powell and General Charles Horner while in active service can serve as samples.

When General Powell was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (appointed by President George H.W. Bush), he spoke on the future of nuclear weapons in a commencement address at Harvard University on June 10, 1993. He stated: "I declare my hope and declare it from the bottom of my heart that we will eventually see the time when the number of nuclear weapons is down to zero and the world is a much better place."

General Horner, the allied air forces commander during the Gulf War, made a similar statement while serving as commander of the U.S. Space Command. Speaking at a breakfast meeting with the Defense Writers' Group on July 15, 1994, he said: "The nuclear weapon is obsolete. I want to get rid of them all....I want to go to zero."

We endorse the approach they recommend: the zero option. We believe that this opening decade of the 21st Century is the time to achieve the elimination of all nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles from Earth.

Moral Perspective

For more than fifty years religious leaders and religious bodies have questioned the morality of nuclear weapons. For example, in 1998 Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, and the Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, stated:

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment....When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent

people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt.

We endorse this perspective.

Disutility

We note that a number of military commanders with many years of practical experience have questioned the military utility of nuclear weapons. Here we quote four as examples and offer a fuller exposition of their views in an attachment.

Admiral Noel Gayler, U.S. Navy, was commander-in-chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific theater (extending around to the Middle East) from 1972 to 1976. In that post he realized the lack of utility of nuclear weapons and argued the case internally. Upon his retirement he wrote, "It is my view there is no sensible military use for nuclear weapons, whether 'strategic' weapons, 'tactical' weapons, weapons at sea or weapons in space....When I was Commander-in-Chief (Pacific) I could not find, in scrutinizing the whole of the Pacific Command, any area where it would conceivably have made sense to explode nuclear weapons in order to carry out our military objectives."

Shortly before his retirement in 1993 General Colin Powell met with the Defense Writers' Group. He told them, "With respect to nuclear weapons, I think their principal purpose remains deterrence against a major nuclear attack against the United States, however remote that might be....I have not been faced with a military situation in the several conflicts we've been involved in over the last four years where I thought there was going to be a need to resort to such weapons....We've had two wars [in Panama and the Persian Gulf], six rescues and 22 other major events in the last four years for these reluctant warriors in the Pentagon."

After his retirement from the U.S. Air Force, General Charles Horner told Jonathan Schell, "I just don't think nuclear weapons are usable." He continued, "In the Gulf War, we took inordinate measures to preclude unnecessary casualties. Nuclear weapons are such a gross instrument of power that they really have no utility. They work against you, in that they are best used to destroy cities, and kill women and children. Now first, that's morally wrong; it doesn't make sense; and then, of course, there is the threat that nuclear weapons in the hands of irresponsible or desperate powers. If you own them, you legitimize them just by your own ownership."

Query: How to Achieve the Zero Option for Nuclear Weapons

We, the undersigned representatives of religious organizations, welcome the initiative of President George W. Bush and President Vladimir Putin to make substantial reductions in the strategic nuclear arsenals of the United States and Russia. We agree with President Bush that the Cold War is over and that the doctrine of mutually assured destruction is obsolete. That being the case, we urge that nuclear arms reduction go deeper than the level now being considered and that reductions occur at a faster rate. Indeed, we believe that the goal should be the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, not only those of the United States and Russia but also those held by all other possessors.

We are not alone in calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Many top ranking U.S. military leaders have come to this conclusion. For example, Admiral Noel Gayler, while serving as commander-in-chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific from 1972 to 1976, became convinced that "there is no sensible military use for nuclear weapons." During the period from 1991 to 1994 when General Lee Butler was commander-in-chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, he began what he later described as "the long and arduous intellectual journey from staunch advocate of nuclear deterrence to public proponent of nuclear abolition."

General Colin Powell, when he was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (appointed by President George H.W. Bush), told a Harvard University commencement audience in June 1993: "I declare my hope and declare it from the bottom of my heart that we will eventually see the time when the number of nuclear weapons is down to zero and the world is a much better place." While serving as commander of the U.S. Space Command, General Charles Horner (allied air forces commander during the Gulf War), told the Defense Writers' Group at a breakfast meeting in July 1994: "The nuclear weapon is obsolete. I want to get rid of them all....I want to go to zero."

A crucial question is: how do we achieve the zero option? Not being military experts, we turn to military leaders, scientists, and other civilian experts for their answer to this question. We are interested in learning about alternative scenarios that outline a step-by-step approach to the elimination of various categories of nuclear weapons within a reasonable period of time. These steps might entail such processes as de-alerting, standing down, dismantling nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles, and providing for safe storage of fissile material.

We realize that experts are likely to offer a variety of approaches on how to reach zero. We would like to receive their suggestions and share them with others in the religious community and the broader public. This can provide the basis for significant public discussion on how to eliminate nuclear weapons in a manner that makes the world a much better place.

Proposed signers: denominational representatives, such as heads of Washington offices and headquarters peace and justice officers.

ICND residual, 1-30-02

ograbc@aol.com,
tiller64@starpower.net,
bpinguel@afsc.org,
jmatlack@erols.com,
tlheath@churchwomen.org,
heathern@nccusa.org,
bgrieves@dfms.org,
jmskipper@aol.com,
thart@episcopalchurch.org,
gthunt@mdo.net,
stuwhis@enter.net,
disarm@forusa.org,
joe@fcnl.org,
CHouleMM@aol.com,
stiefr@ucc.org,
conoverp@ucc.org,
jhanson@umc-gbcs.org,
WorldPeaceMakers@compuserve.com,
mpf@forusa.org,
amygopp@hotmail.com,
sdeboe@csm.org,
76622.637@compuserve.com,
rsider@speakeasy.net,
wstarman@wesleysem.edu

<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2002/020109-D-6570C-001.pdf>

Suggested questions on Nuclear Posture Review, based upon Pentagon outline

Draft by Howard Hallman, 2-5-02.

1. MAD doctrine

Under "New Environment and President's Direction" it states: (a) "Cold War approach to deterrence no longer appropriate" and (b) "End relationship with Russia based on MAD", that is, mutually assured destruction. However, under the NPR plan 1,700 to 2,200 "operationally deployed warheads" will remain in service in 2012. Based upon the pattern of the present SIOP (single integrated operating plan), which the NPR doesn't seem to change, most of these will be available to strike targets in Russia. That's enough to destroy Russia several times over. Doesn't this mean that MAD will still be in effect in 2012?

Note: I asked the Public Affairs Office at the Pentagon what the composition of the operationally deployed warheads will be in 2012 and was told that this hasn't been determined. Bruce Blair of the Center for Defense Information has made his own estimates, and I have asked him to share them with us. I am trying to reach Stan Norris at the Natural Resources Defense Council for his estimates of targeting in 2012, for he has done an elaborate study on the likely pattern of the present SIOP.

2. Reserve

The NPR indicates that there will be a "force structure and downloaded warheads preserved for the responsive force." How large will that be? What is its composition? If the United States preserves a large reserve, will not Russia do likewise?

3. De-alerting

During the presidential election campaign, George W. Bush stated that "the United States should remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert, hair-trigger status -- another unnecessary of Cold War confrontation. Preparation for quick launch -- within minutes after warning of an attack -- was the rule during the era of superpower rivalry. But today, for two nations at peace, keeping so many weapons on high alert may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch." However, the Nuclear Posture Review says nothing about de-alerting.

(a) Is President Bush no longer committed to de-alerting?

(b) How many warheads will be on "high-alert, hair-trigger status" in 2012?

Note: Bruce Blair observes that the NPR's intent to take many warheads out of service and put them in reserve is a form of de-alerting (short of dismantlement) even though the NPR doesn't use this language. He has estimates on how many warheads are likely to be on hair-trigger alert in 2012 (ranging from 660 to 880, as I recall). I am seeking this information.

4. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

Under "Sustainment of Current Nuclear Forces" the NPR indicates: "current force projection to remain until 2020 or longer." In contrast, under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty the United States has an obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament. This was reaffirmed in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review conference in which the United States and other nuclear-weapon states made "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals". Does the Nuclear Posture Review signal that the United States is in effect withdrawing from its NPT commitment?

5. Testing

The NPR indicates that the United States will "accelerate DOE's test readiness". What does this mean in practical terms? Does this mean that the Bush Administration intends to resume testing?

Questions to Ask about the Nuclear Posture Review
(Page numbers refer to "Findings of the Nuclear Posture Review",
issued by the Department of Defense on January 9, 2002)

A. Sizing the Nuclear Force

The goal of the Nuclear Posture Review (p.9) is 1,700 to 2,200 "operationally deployed force" by 2012 for "immediate and unexpected contingencies". "Force structure and downloaded warheads" will be preserved in a "responsive force" for potential contingencies. "Preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies."

1. Why will it take until 2012 to reach the 1,700 to 2,200 goal? Why can't it be accomplished much sooner?
2. How many warheads and delivery vehicles will be preserved in the responsive force, that is, held in reserved rather than be dismantled?
3. What will be the status of warheads and delivery vehicles placed in the responsive force in terms of how fast they might be re-deployed? In what circumstances will this occur?
4. Is "preplanning" for immediate and potential contingencies in effect a new version of SIOP (single integrated operating plan)?

B. Targeting

The NPR outline speaks (p. 7) of a "capabilities-based approach" that will not be country-specific but as a priority will maintain capabilities for unexpected and potential threat contingencies. The NPR outline (p. 9) also indicates that force sizing is not driven by an immediate contingency involving Russia.

1. If Russia is not an immediate contingency, is it still considered a potential threat that requires preplanning and targeting by the deployed operational force? If so, how many warheads in the operationally deployed force will be assigned to Russia?
2. What about China? Is it considered a potential threat requiring the targeting of nuclear weapons in preplanning? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to China?
3. In his State of Union address President Bush mentioned an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Are they considered a potential threat that requires targeting of nuclear weapons? If so, how many warheads will be assigned to these states?
4. What other potential threats will be taken into account in preplanning? For instance, will nuclear weapons be committed to response to biological and chemical weapons?
5. Whereas previous administrations had a policy of no-first-use against any non-nuclear-weapons state (unless allied with a nuclear-weapons state), the NPR and statements by President Bush and others in his administration seem to indicate a willingness to use nuclear weapons against such states. Is this so? If this is the case, does not this expand the use of nuclear

weapons in the military strategy of the United States beyond the deterrence of nuclear attack, which is the current primary justification?

6. Civil-sector analysts indicate that if Iraq, Iran, and North Korea are considered potential threats, they likely would have targets in the 10 to 20 range each and that potential targets in China might number in the low hundreds. This would leave 1,200 to 1,600 warheads to be assigned in preplanning to deal with Russia. Is this a reasonable estimate?

C. MAD Doctrine

The NPR outline (p. 5) indicates that the Cold War approach to deterrence is no longer appropriate, and it calls for an end to the relationship with Russia based on MAD (mutually assured destruction). During the past year President Bush, Secretary Rumsfeld, and Secretary Powell have all called for the end of MAD. However, the "preplanning" targeting of the 1,700 to 2,200 warheads in the operationally deployed force seems most likely to be directed primarily toward Russia.

1. In practical terms, will not the MAD doctrine still be in effect in 2012?
2. Furthermore, the NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the current force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. Does not this mean that MAD will prevail during the first two decades of the 21st century?

D. Dealing with Terrorism

President Bush's State of the Union address focused primarily upon dealing with terrorism. He expressed a concern that terrorist organizations might acquire and use nuclear weapons. One place this might occur is Russia where nuclear warheads and fissile material seem to be less than totally secure. The Nunn-Lugar program and related elements of the Cooperative Nuclear Reduction Program are dealing with this. However, if the United States reserves a large number of warheads in its responsive force, Russia is more likely to do likewise.

1. Since this would make more warheads available at risk for acquisition by terrorist organizations, would not the United States be better off to enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia with a commitment that neither side would hold nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles in reserve?

E. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

According to the NPR outline (p. 10) the current force projection will remain until 2020 or longer. In contrast under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty the United States has an obligation for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament. This was reaffirmed in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review conference in which the United States and other nuclear-weapon states made "an unequivocal undertaking...to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals".

1. Does the Nuclear Posture Review signal that the United States is in effect withdrawing from its NPT commitment?

F. De-alerting

1. During presidential campaign George W. Bush stated that keeping nuclear weapons on high-alert “may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch”. He added that the U.S. “should work with other nuclear nations to remove as many weapons as possible from hair-trigger status.” Is this still President Bush's position? There seems to be nothing in the Nuclear Posture Review about de-alerting.

2. Under the policies of the Nuclear Posture Review, how many warheads will be on high-alert, hair-trigger status in 2012?

3. If we have a new relationship with Russia, why can't the U.S. move quickly to remove as many weapons as possible from high-alert status and encourage the Russians to do the same?

G. Testing

1. The NPR outline (p. 10) indicates that the United States will "accelerate DOE's test readiness. What does this mean in practical terms?

2. Does this mean that the Bush Administration intends to resume testing?

H. Tactical Nuclear Weapons

1. The Nuclear Posture Review makes no mention of tactical nuclear weapons. What will be the status of tactical nuclear weapons in the next ten years?

2. Will such weapons now stored at air bases in Europe be returned to the United States?

3. Are there any plans to dismantle tactical nuclear weapons?

4. How will be United States deal with Russia's stockpile of tactical nuclear weapons?

Nuclear Posture Review: A Missed Opportunity

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

On January 9, 2002 the U.S. Department of Defense released the results of its comprehensive Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). Mandated by Congress, the NPR lays out the direction for American nuclear forces for the next ten years and beyond.

On the positive side the Nuclear Posture Review sets forth the desirable objective of reducing the number of deployed strategic warheads. This is counterbalanced, however, by some highly undesirable features, including continuation of the Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD), an expansion of the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy, and a commitment to retain nuclear weapons forever.

Accordingly, the Nuclear Posture Review represents a missed opportunity to make substantial progress toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. This is the goal advocated by numerous religious bodies, retired military officers, and civilian national security experts. Moreover, in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) the United States and other nuclear weapon states have a commitment to achieve this goal.

Moral Perspective

At a time when the United States is re-examining its core values, it is important to consider nuclear weapons from a moral perspective. From this viewpoint religious leaders and religious bodies of many faiths have long questioned the moral legitimacy of nuclear weapons. In recent years they have been joined by retired military leaders with command experience, who are concerned about the morality of nuclear weapons and have also express grave doubts about their military utility.

The concern of these two sectors came together in a Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement signed by 21 religious leaders and 18 admirals and generals and released at the Washington National Cathedral on June 21, 2000. Among other things the religious leaders and military professionals stated:

We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family.

National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide.

The religious and military leaders offered two truths:

first, that the most commonly postulated threats to our national security are not susceptible to nuclear deterrence; second, that our nation's effort to provide effective leadership in opposing the growing threat of nuclear proliferation will be credible only if our policies and those of the other nuclear powers demonstrate a commitment to the universal outlawing of these weapons.

We also believe that reliance on a nuclear deterrent in the long run calls into question our stewardship of God's creation.

These powerful words from denominational leaders, generals, and admirals provide a basic for evaluating the conclusions of the Nuclear Posture Review.

Nuclear Weapons Reduction

The Nuclear Posture Review offers the goal of 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed strategic warheads for the United States by 2012. This is a reduction from the approximately 6,500 warheads now deployed and the goal of 3,500 by 2007 under the second Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START II), which has never gone into effect. This is a positive step in the right redirection. If achieved, it will be a worthy improvement over the lack of reductions during the Clinton Administration, deadlocked as it was with the Republican-controlled Congress.

As desirable as this reduction is, we should ask two questions. First, why wait until 2012 to reach 1,700-2,200 level? The NPR speaks of a new relationship with Russia. President Bush and President Putin have stated that the two nations are now friends rather than adversaries. President Putin has expressed a desire to have a 1,500 level for Russian strategic warheads. Why drag out the process when it is quite feasible to achieve the U.S. goal of 1,700 to 2,200 by 2004?

The NPR indicates that by 2004 the 50 multi-warhead MX missiles will be eliminated and four Trident submarines will be converted to carry cruise missiles not nuclear weapons. The other missiles in the reduction plan will not be eliminated but rather downloaded and shifted to a reserve known as the "responsive force". This could be easily accomplished in two years.

Second, why stop at 1,700 warheads? Why not set forth a plan for their total elimination, as religious and military leaders have recommended? Instead the Nuclear Posture Review indicates that the current force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. In effect this is saying that we will have nuclear weapons forever. This walks away from commitment made by the United States and other nuclear weapon states at the 2000 NPT Review Conference to "an unequivocal undertaking to eliminate their nuclear arsenals".

MAD Continues

The Nuclear Posture Review speaks of an intention to encourage and facilitate a new framework for cooperation with Russia. It indicates that the Cold War approach to deterrence is no longer appropriate. It declares a desire to end the relationship with Russia based on mutual assured destruction (MAD). In speeches and news conferences President Bush has repeatedly stated an intent to move away from MAD. So have Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and

Secretary of State Colin Powell. Rumsfeld has acknowledged that the "deterrent of massive retaliation, or MAD -- mutual assured destruction -- did not do anything to deter the Korean War or the Vietnam War or Desert Storm or dozens of other events."

However, their words about moving away from MAD are contradicted by the level of the operationally deployed nuclear force and the warheads and delivery vehicles held in reserve under the plans of the Nuclear Posture Review.

The NPR proposes a change from a "traditional threat-based approach" to a "capabilities-based approach" which is not country specific. But it also specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies." National security experts who understand the targeting pattern of nuclear weapons indicate that the only possible contingency that can justify 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed nuclear warheads is the desire to maintain an active deterrent to a Russian arsenal of similar size. Furthermore, the estimated 1,500 warheads held in reserve for uploading to their delivery systems would also be available for a massive attack on Russia. The practical result is retention of the Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction.

Contrast this situation to the views that the religious leaders and military professionals expressed in the Cathedral Statement.

We say that a peace based on terror, a peace based upon threats of inflicting annihilation and genocide upon whole populations is a peace that is corrupting, a peace that is unworthy of civilization.

We say that it defies all logic to believe that nuclear weapons can exist forever and never be used.

The opportunity is at hand to do away with this danger, to do away with our capacity for self-destruction.

It is in the self-interest of the United States and Russia to cease threatening one another with total destruction. For this to happen the level of operationally deployed warheads on each side should be lowered until it approaches or reaches zero. As indicated above, the 1,700 level is readily achievable by 2004. The next stage to 100 or fewer could be achieved in another four years. By not providing for reductions of this magnitude the Nuclear Posture Review is missing a significant opportunity.

De-alerting

During the presidential campaign George W. Bush stated that keeping nuclear weapons on high-alert "may create unacceptable risks of accidental or unauthorized launch". He added that the U.S. "should work with other nuclear nations to remove as many weapons as possible from hair-trigger status." Nevertheless, the Nuclear Posture Review has nothing to say about de-alerting.

Though not called de-alerting the placement of 1,500 now-deployed warheads and their delivery vehicles into the "responsive force", as the reserve is called, is a form of de-alerting. But 1,700 to 2,200 nuclear warheads will still be deployed in 2012 according to the NPR. The

majority of them are likely to be on hair-trigger alert as an application of the MAD doctrine. This retreat from President Bush's campaign advocacy of de-alerting is a serious flaw in the Nuclear Posture Review.

Dealing with Terrorism

As noted, the religious and military leaders in their June 2000 statement indicated that "the most commonly postulated threats to our national security are not susceptible to nuclear deterrence." Clearly a threat they didn't postulate -- the terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon -- was not deterred.

Since that tragic event occurred, President Bush has made the campaign against terrorism the primary focus of U.S. military and foreign policy. Nonetheless, the Nuclear Posture Review doesn't deal with the dangers of terrorism and indeed specifies a policy that could substantially increase the risk of terrorists acquiring nuclear weapons.

This occurs in the intention to have "force structure and downloaded warheads preserved for the responsive force." That may amount to 1,500 warheads with their delivery vehicles available for re-deployment. This is in contrast to previous nuclear arms reduction agreements, such as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Ronald Reagan, and START I, signed by President George H.W. Bush, which provided for destruction of delivery vehicles.

If the United States retains such a high number of warheads, Russia is likely to do the same. Yet, nuclear warheads and fissile material in Russia seem to be less than totally secure and could possibly be obtained by terrorist organizations. The United States is helping to reduce this risk through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. The fewer warheads Russia has deployed and in reserve the lower the risk. Therefore, the United States would be better off to forgo a large warhead reserve and instead enter into a binding, verifiable agreement with Russia that requires elimination of both delivery vehicles and nuclear warheads taken out of service.

Testing and New Weapon Development

The Nuclear Posture Review affirms President Bush's commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing and also its opposition to ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). However, the NPR calls for the Department of Energy to reduce the time it would take to resume testing from the current two to three years to one year or so. Comments by the Pentagon spokesperson at a press briefing on the NPR and statements by other officials suggest that the Administration is looking toward the end of the test moratorium within a few years.

The NPR indicates that the current nuclear force is projected to remain until 2020 or longer. Meanwhile the Department of Defense will study alternatives for follow-ons. According to the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Department will begin studies for a new intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) to be operational in 2020, a new SLBM (submarine-launched ballistic missile) and a new SSBN (ballistic missile submarine) in 2030, and a new heavy bomber in 2040 as well as new warheads for all of them.

Thus, the Bush Administration assumes that nuclear weapons will be part of U.S. military forces for at least the next 50 years. This is clearly in conflict with the goal of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It is contrary to the recommendation of numerous religious bodies to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

Expansion of the Role of Nuclear Weapons

The Nuclear Posture Review indicates that nuclear planning will be capabilities-based to provide greater flexibility for a range of contingencies. Although these contingencies aren't spelled out, the NPR expresses a concern for the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and ballistic missile delivery systems. In his State of the Union address President Bush spoke of an "axis of evil" consisting of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. Top officials within the Administration are on record as favoring the use of nuclear weapons to deal with such contingencies.

In previous administrations nuclear weapons were seen primarily as a deterrent to prevent (a) a nuclear attack on the United States by Soviet Union (now Russia) and (b) until 1989 the possibility of Soviet invasion of Western Europe. There was a policy of no-first-use against any non-nuclear-weapons state unless it was allied with a nuclear-weapons state. Now the Bush Administration seems willing to initiate first use in a broad range of events.

This expansion of the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy is a matter of great concern. It goes in the opposite direction of limiting the role of nuclear weapons in world affairs and moving toward their elimination. As the religious leaders, generals, and admirals indicated in the Cathedral Statement in speaking of the nuclear predicament, it "is untenable in the face of a faith in the divine and unacceptable in terms of sound military doctrine."

They further stated:

We know that the responsibility for banning nuclear weapons does not lie solely with the government of the United States and its citizens. It is a responsibility shared by all sovereign states and sovereign individuals everywhere.

But as the creator of these weapons and the preeminent military power in the world, the United States and its people bear an obligation and have a unique opportunity to lead way.

This is an opportunity badly missed in the Nuclear Posture Review. People of faith should speak out in opposition to the continuation of the Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction, the expansion of the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. military and foreign policy, and the commitment to nuclear weapons forever. We as a nation can and should do better than that.

February 19, 2002

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

Dear Pat,

Now that you are active again on nuclear disarmament issues, I would like to share with you a proposal for creation of an interfaith web site to promote discussion of ways to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. It has a broader purpose of providing the basis for developing coalitions between religious organizations, retired military leaders, and others from the civil sector who are committed to nuclear disarmament.

My proposal is presented below. I have shared earlier versions with Ron Stief but have never been able to reach him to discuss the idea.

I invite your office to join with other denominational offices to be a sponsor of the site and to be represented on the steering committee. I will serve as moderator/administrator. So far I have commitments from Brethren, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, Mennonite, Presbyterian, United Methodist, and Unitarian offices with decisions pending with Episcopalians, Friends, Lutherans, and Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism. The U.S. Catholic Conference doesn't join such ventures but is willing to have its policy statements posted.

It will take about \$2,000 to get a web site started: \$1,500 for a consultant and \$500 for domain licensing and web space. Thereafter, it will take some one to handle input. This could be a person on the staff of a sponsoring organization or some one paid part time. I might try to do this, if the consultant would show me how, but I would prefer to concentrate on moderator responsibilities and let some one else handle input.

A couple of offices have offered small amounts of funds. Requests for larger amounts are pending with two others. I am going to try a foundation source for \$2,000 in start-up money. I invite your office to make a contribution if possible.

When we have funds in sight, the first task of the steering committee will be to agree upon the domain name. I have suggested www.zeronukes.org as the name. I have picked up "zero" from statements by General Powell and General Horner (see below). It is more succinct and attention-grabbing than "nuclear disarmament" and probably better than "abolition", which puts off some persons. But I am open to other ideas. One suggestion is to incorporate "interfaith" into the title, but I would rather have a name that seems broader in scope in order to attract greater participation of military officers and civil-sector experts.

To repeat: would your office be willing to be a sponsor of the site, be represented on the steering committee, and perhaps contribute some funds?

Please call me at 301 896-0013 if you would like to discuss it.

Shalom,
Howard

###

A Proposal for an Interfaith Web Site on Nuclear Disarmament

Proposed name: www.zeronukes.org

Purposes. Provide a forum for presentation and discussion of practical steps for the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Specifically: (a) Serve as a repository for statements and proposals by religious organizations and religious leaders on nuclear disarmament. (b) Provide linkages with civil-sector organizations working for nuclear disarmament. (c) Serve as a means for reaching out to military leaders, scientists, physicians, lawyers, national security experts, and others for their ideas on how to reach zero nuclear weapons. (d) Through a bulletin board provide for open discussion of nuclear disarmament proposals. The site will feature education and discussion and will not be used for legislative alerts or other advocacy of direct action.

Sponsors. Denominational offices. Representatives from these offices will serve as a steering committee for the web site.

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

Site Map

A. Home page

Statement of purpose

Introduction (see Attachment 1)

Sponsors (underscored for web linkage)

Moderator with e-mail address

Menu

B. Sections

1. Basic data on the global nuclear arsenal (primarily through linkages)
2. Statements of religious bodies and religious leaders on nuclear disarmament; linkages.
3. Civil-sector reports on nuclear disarmament: abstracts and linkages.
4. Proposals for how to get to zero nuclear weapon, to offered by military leaders, scientists, physicians, lawyers, national security experts, and other professionals. Open for proposals from members of Congress and interested citizens. Start with U.S. experts and extend globally, including proposals from Russia, NATO countries, and elsewhere.
5. Proposals for achieving zero alert (as a major step toward total elimination).
6. Proposals for approaching zero nuclear weapons from those who do not advocate going all the way to zero.
7. Nuclear Posture Review: summary (with linkage to government site) and comments.

C. Bulletin Board

An opportunity for anyone to comment on the proposals and respond to other persons' comments. To be organized by major topics, such as steps toward zero nuclear weapons, de-alerting, dismantlement, transparency and verification, security of fissile material, Nuclear Posture Review, philosophy of nuclear deterrence and its application.

Attachment 1. Introduction (for home page).

"The nuclear weapon is obsolete. I want to get rid of them all....I want to go to zero." General Charles Horner, July 15, 1994, at the time Commander of the U.S. Space Command.

"I declare my hope and declare it from the bottom of my heart that we will eventually see the time when the number of nuclear weapons is down to zero and the world is a much better place." General Colin Powell, June 10, 1993, at the time Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Other military leaders have reached similar conclusions. For instance, Admiral Noel Gayler, while serving as commander-in-chief of all U.S. forces in the Pacific from 1972 to 1976, became convinced that "there is no sensible military use for nuclear weapons." During the period from 1991 to 1994 when General Lee Butler was commander-in-chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, he began what he later described as "the long and arduous intellectual journey from staunch advocate of nuclear deterrence to public proponent of nuclear abolition."

Numerous religious organizations and religious leaders are on record as favoring the total elimination of nuclear weapons. They include Pope John Paul II, National Conference of Catholic Bishops (United States), World Council of Churches, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., many Protestant denominations, Jewish organizations, Muslim organizations, the Dalai Lama, and others. (For specifics, go to [religious statements.](#))

The crucial question: How do we achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons from Earth -- the zero option?

We in the faith community strongly oppose nuclear weapons on moral grounds, but we lack technical expertise on the detailed steps for reaching zero. In this web site we turn to those who do. Therefore, we invite military leaders, scientists, civilian national security experts, and others to offer their proposals for practical steps and sequence of events that can lead to zero nuclear weapons. We also ask for ideas on how to bring about verification of the results and how to assure the secure storage of fissile material remaining after nuclear warheads are dismantled.

Some may want to address some aspects, such as achieving zero alert for nuclear weapons without necessarily dismantling all of them at this time; or going almost to zero but leaving a residual on each side; or special issues, such as verification. Such ideas will be welcomed.

[To be written: how to submit ideas.]