

Second Draft

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

Dear Mr. President:

Re: Nuclear Posture Review

As you prepare for your next meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin, we the undersigned representatives of religious organizations 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. This is the desire of numerous religious leaders and religious organizations in the United States and elsewhere. For example, 21 top religious leaders in the United States, joined by 18 military professionals, in June 2000 proclaimed, "**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.**" (Emphasis added; full statement attached.)

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). We have several concerns to call to your attention.

(1) Reductions. We commend the NPR commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500. This is a positive step in the right direction. Yet, we wonder why it should take ten years to accomplish. We ask that standing down of these warheads and their delivery vehicles be completed by 2004.

(2) Warhead reserve and the terrorist threat. The reduction in strategic weapons is compromised by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. If the United States keeps so many warheads in reserve, 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 much 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. This would follow the example of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Ronald Reagan, and START I, signed by your father, President George H.W. Bush, both of which provided for the destruction of the delivery vehicles taken out of service.

The Honorable George W. Bush

Date

Page two.

(3) Mutual assured destruction. 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.

(4) De-alerting. 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. Therefore, we call for zero alert.

(5) Expanded role. 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 NPR 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.

(6) Testing. 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 of Defense will "study alternatives for follow-ons" for nuclear delivery systems. 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

The Honorable George W. Bush

Date

Page three.

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 your attention to 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

Jeanette Holt, Associate Director
Alliance of Baptists

James Matlack, Director
Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

Rev. Ken Sehested, Executive Director,
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

Greg Davidson Laszakovits
Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Tiffany Heath, Legislative Officer
Washington Office, Church Women United

Lonnie Turner, Representative to the
Diplomatic/Business Community
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

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

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

Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action.

Joe Volk, Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Murray Polner, Chair
Jewish Peace Fellowship

Bro. Steven P. O'Neil, SM
Office of Justice & Peace
Marianists, New York Province

Rev. J. Daryl Byler, Director
Washington Office
Mennonite Central Committee, U.S.

Rev. Kathryn J. Johnson, Executive Director
Methodist Federation for Social Action

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

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

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

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

Andrew Greenblatt, Coordinator
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Duane Shank, Issues and Policy Adviser
Sojourners

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

Pat Conover, Legislative Director
United Church of Christ
Justice and Witness Ministries

Meg Riley, Director
Washington Office for Faith in Action
Unitarian Universalist Association

March 5, 2002

Mr. Wade Greene
Room 5600
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112

Dear Mr. Greene:

You once told me that sometimes members of the Rockefeller Family make grants for special purposes between their semi-annual grant-making sessions. With this possibility in mind we request a grant of \$3,000 to retain a consultant to design an interfaith web site, named "www.zeronukes.org".

The web site will be a project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair. Denominational offices will serve as sponsors, and their representatives will form a steering committee. The enclosed description lists the sponsors to date and those pending.

The web site "www.zeronukes.org" has several purposes. It will serve as a repository for statements on nuclear disarmament by religious leaders and religious organizations with linkages to home pages of various religious bodies. It will also provide abstracts and linkages for nuclear disarmament proposals of various civil-sector organizations. With this base established the web site will be a means for reaching out to military leaders, scientists, and other experts for their ideas on how to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons: the zero option.

The latter purpose is the primary motivation for establishing this web site. For decades religious organizations have spoken out on the immorality of nuclear weapons. In June 2000 religious leaders got retired military leaders to join them in a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral (for which you gave financial assistance). These have often been prophetic but have had very little impact on policymakers for two reasons. First, the statements usually offer general principles without specific plans for achieving their goals. Second, they are not followed by public advocacy by a coalition broad enough to influence policymakers.

Following the adage "you can't beat something with nothing", this web site will invite retired generals, admirals, and other experts who want to eliminate nuclear weapons to offer step-by-step plans on how this can be achieved. We

Mr. Wade Greene
March 5, 2002
Page two.

will start in the United States and then reach out to persons in Russia, Europe, and elsewhere who have expertise to share. The web site will provide opportunities for comments on various proposals and for determining whether a consensus can emerge on the best course of action to get to zero nuclear weapons. These concrete ideas will be offered as a countermeasure to the Pentagon's recent Nuclear Posture Review, which envisions nuclear weapons forever.

Having established contacts with military leaders, scientists, and other professionals in this idea development phase, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will then explore possibilities for working together in a broader coalition in the United States and globally to influence policymakers on steps leading to the global elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, joint delegations of bishops, generals, admirals, and scientists could call upon policymakers to advocate their proposals. This could be followed by grassroots mobilization in support of these concrete proposals.

But before we can do this, we need to get the web site established. For this we need to retain a design consultant. Although some of the sponsoring offices will contribute modest sums to help pay the cost of ongoing operations, we need a special grant to get the web site underway. Therefore, we hope that a member of the Rockefeller Family might be responsive to our request. The grant would go to Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, a 501(c)(3) organization.

If you need further information, please call me at 301 896-0013.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Third Draft (3-11-02)

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

Dear Mr. President:

Re: Nuclear Posture Review

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations were encouraged by the meetings you and Russian President Vladimir Putin held last November in Washington and Texas. Together you told the world that the United States and Russia 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). We look forward to your signing a specific agreement on strategic arms reductions when you meet in Moscow in May.

This gives us hope that substantial progress can be made toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. This is the desire of numerous religious leaders and religious organizations in the United States and elsewhere. For example, 21 top religious leaders in the United States, joined by 18 military professionals, in June 2000 proclaimed, "**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.**" (Full statement attached.)

From this perspective we are, however, discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns we would like to share with you.

(1) Reductions. We commend the NPR commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500. This is a positive step in the right direction. Yet, we wonder why it should take ten years to accomplish. We ask that standing down of these warheads and their delivery vehicles be completed by 2004.

(2) Warhead reserve and the terrorist threat. The reduction in strategic weapons is compromised by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. If the United States keeps so many warheads in reserve, 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 much 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. This would follow the example of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Ronald Reagan, and START I, signed by your father, President George H.W. Bush, both of which provided for the destruction of the delivery vehicles taken out of service.

The Honorable George W. Bush

Date

Page two.

(3) Mutual assured destruction. We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. The NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". It indicates that "a contingency involving Russia, while plausible, is not expected." Nevertheless, the approximately 3,500 strategic warheads in active deployment and reserve are of sufficient magnitude to cover hundreds of targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality the MAD doctrine prevails.

(4) De-alerting. 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. Therefore, we call for zero alert.

(5) Expanded role. The Pentagon plan expands 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. This includes immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies involving North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya. The NPR indicates that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack or in retaliation for use of nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons. In contrast, previous U.S. policy specified 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.

(6) Testing. 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 goes 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 of Defense will "study alternatives for follow-ons" for nuclear delivery systems. Preparation to resume testing appears to be 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

The Honorable George W. Bush

Date

Page three.

departure, we call your attention to 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

Signers of Letter to President Bush on Nuclear Posture Review
(as of 3-11-02)

Jeanette Holt, Associate Director, Alliance of Baptists

James Matlack, Director, Washington Office, American Friends Service Committee

Rev. Ken Sehested, Executive Director, Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

Lonnie Turner, Representative to the Diplomatic/Business Community
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

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

Ronald J. Sider, President, Evangelicals for Social Action.

Murray Polner, Chair, Jewish Peace Fellowship

Rev. J. Daryl Byler, Director, Washington Office, Mennonite Central Committee, U.S.

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

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

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

Pat Conover, Legislative Director, United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries

Meg Riley, Director, Washington Office for Faith in Action, Unitarian Universalist Association

PENDING

Church of the Brethren, Washington Office

Church Women United

Friends Committee on National Legislation

Lutheran Office for Governmental Affairs

National Council of Churches

Pax Christi, USA

Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

Sojourners

United Methodist General Board of Church and Society

Immediate release
March 18, 2002

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

RELIGIOUS LEADERS CRITICIZE NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW

The Nuclear Posture Review, the Pentagon plan for the use of nuclear weapons, should go back to the drawing boards for substantial revision. That is the view of representatives of 23 national religious organizations, expressed in a letter to President George W. Bush. They raise six major concerns.

In spite of rhetoric to the contrary, the cold war doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) remains intact in the Pentagon plan. The 1,700 to 2,200 strategic warheads that will remain in service beyond 2012, plus thousands held in reserve, will still cover hundreds of targets in Russia, as they do now. Likewise Russia will still have hundreds of strategic warheads in service, covering U.S. targets. This is morally untenable, say the religious leaders.

Instead the religious leaders favor taking missiles off hair-trigger alert, a process advocated by President Bush during the presidential campaign. They note that true friends don't target friends. Although President Bush says that the United States and Russia are now friends, the Pentagon plan makes no provision for de-alerting.

The religious leaders are particularly concerned about how the Pentagon plan expands the role of nuclear weapons to encompass threats against such non-nuclear states as North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya and for retaliation in the event of use of chemical and biological weapons. This reverses a long-term policy of no first use against such states that is part of the U.S. commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

This is tied to the Pentagon's interest in resuming nuclear weapons testing and development of new warheads and delivery systems. The religious leaders find this commitment to nuclear weapons forever to be highly objectionable. Instead they favor movement toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

The religious leaders praise President Bush for his efforts to work out an agreement with Russian President Vladimir Putin to reduce their respective strategic arsenals. This is a step in the right direction. They ask that this commitment be expressed in a binding, verifiable agreement and that the schedule be accelerated to be completed by 2004.

They also insist that warheads and delivery vehicles taken out of service should be dismantled rather than held in reserve as the Pentagon plan contemplates. If the United States keeps a large stock of warheads in reserve, Russia is likely to do the same. The more warheads that Russia has in reserve the greater risk of some of them falling into the hands of terrorists.

The religious leaders, therefore, ask President Bush to have Pentagon planners revise the Nuclear Posture Review to end the MAD doctrine and to incorporate nuclear disarmament objectives. Specifically they suggest a set of practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

-30-

A copy of the letter to President Bush and list of signers is attached. The letter was facilitated by Howard W. Hallman, chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

March 15, 2002

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

Dear Mr. President:

Re: Nuclear Posture Review

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations were encouraged by the meetings you and Russian President Vladimir Putin held last November in Washington and Texas. Together you told the world that the United States and Russia 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). We look forward to your signing a specific agreement on strategic arms reductions when you meet in Moscow in May.

This gives us hope that substantial progress can be made toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. This is the desire of numerous religious leaders and religious organizations in the United States and elsewhere. For example, 21 top religious leaders in the United States, joined by 18 military professionals, in a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000, proclaimed: "**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.**"

From this perspective we are discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns we would like to share with you.

(1) Reductions. We commend the NPR commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500. This is a positive step in the right direction. Yet, we wonder why it should take ten years to accomplish. We ask that standing down of these warheads and their delivery vehicles be completed by 2004.

(2) Warhead reserve and the terrorist threat. The reduction in strategic weapons is compromised by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. If the United States keeps so many warheads in reserve, 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 much 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. This would follow the example of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Ronald Reagan, and START I, signed by your father, President George H.W. Bush, both of which provided for the destruction of the delivery vehicles taken out of service.

The Honorable George W. Bush
March 15, 2002
Page two.

(3) Mutual assured destruction. We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. The NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". It indicates that "a contingency involving Russia, while plausible, is not expected." Nevertheless, the approximately 3,500 strategic warheads in active deployment and reserve are of sufficient magnitude to cover hundreds of targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality the MAD doctrine prevails.

(4) De-alerting. 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. Therefore, we call for zero alert.

(5) Expanded role. The Pentagon plan expands 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. This includes immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies involving North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya. The NPR indicates that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack or in retaliation for use of biological or chemical weapons. In contrast, previous U.S. policy specified 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.

(6) Testing. 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 goes 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 of Defense will "study alternatives for follow-ons" for nuclear delivery systems. Preparation to resume testing appears to be 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

The Honorable George W. Bush
March 15, 2002
Page three.

departure, we call your attention to the practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. 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,

Jeanette Holt, Associate Director
Alliance of Baptists

Joe Volk, Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation

James Matlack, Director
Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

Murray Polner, Chair
Jewish Peace Fellowship

Rev. Ken Sehested, Executive Director,
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

Bro. Steven P. O'Neil, SM
Office of Justice & Peace
Marianists, New York Province

Greg Davidson Laszakovits
Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Rev. J. Daryl Byler, Director
Washington Office
Mennonite Central Committee, U.S.

Tiffany Heath, Legislative Officer
Washington Office, Church Women United

Rev. Kathryn J. Johnson, Executive Director
Methodist Federation for Social Action

Lonnie Turner, Representative to the
Diplomatic/Business Community
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

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

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

Brenda Girton-Mitchell
Director, Washington Office
National Council of the Churches of Christ
in the USA

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

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

Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action.

(more)

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

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

Andrew Greenblatt, Coordinator
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Duane Shank, Issues and Policy Adviser
Sojourners

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

Pat Conover, Legislative Director
United Church of Christ
Justice and Witness Ministries

Meg Riley, Director
Washington Office for Faith in Action
Unitarian Universalist Association

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

*This letter was facilitated by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear
Disarmament, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036 Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: mupj@igc.org*

March 19, 2002

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 23 national religious organizations on the Nuclear Posture Review.

We welcome the friendship that President Bush has established with Russian President Putin. We hope that this will lead to a binding, verifiable strategic arms reduction agreement to demonstrate that the United States and Russia are no longer military rivals.

We are, however, disappointed in the Nuclear Posture Review that Pentagon planners have produced. We have six concerns: (1) that strategic reductions will take too long to complete, (2) that keeping a large supply of warheads and delivery vehicles in reserve will encourage Russia to do likewise, with risk that they could fall into the hand of terrorists, (3) that in actuality the cold war doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) remains in effect, (4) that the Nuclear Posture Review does not provide for taking warheads off hair-trigger alert, as President Bush advocated during the presidential campaign, (5) that the NPR expands the role of nuclear weapons, including the targeting of such non-nuclear states as North Korean, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Libya, and (6) that the NPR reveals plans to develop new warheads and delivery vehicles and prepare for nuclear testing.

For these reasons we have asked President Bush to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing board for revisions that would eliminate the MAD doctrine and encompass nuclear disarmament objectives in keeping with U.S. obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

We would welcome an opportunity for a delegation drawn from the signers of the letter to President Bush to meet with some your top staff to express our concerns and discuss the Nuclear Posture Review in depth.

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

March 15, 2002

To: Mr. Frank Miller, National Security Council
Fax: 202 456-9190
No. of pages: 5
From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Mr. Miller:

I am sending to your attention a letter to President Bush from representatives of 23 religious organizations on the Nuclear Posture Review. We would greatly appreciate your forwarding the letter to the President and sharing it with Dr. Condoleezza Rice and whoever else you think is appropriate.

We look forward to your presentation on the Nuclear Posture Review to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on Friday, March 22 at 1:30 p.m. at the Methodist Building, Conference Room 2, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE. This will give us an opportunity to discuss six concerns we have, as specified in the letter to President Bush.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

March 19, 2002

The Honorable Colin Powell
Secretary of State
U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC 20301

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I would like to share with you a letter to President Bush from representatives of 23 national religious organizations on the Nuclear Posture Review.

We welcome the friendship that President Bush has established with Russian President Putin. We hope that this will lead to a binding, verifiable strategic arms reduction agreement to demonstrate that the United States and Russia are no longer military rivals.

We are, however, disappointed in the Nuclear Posture Review that Pentagon planners have produced. We have six concerns: (1) that strategic reductions will take too long to complete, (2) that keeping a large supply of warheads and delivery vehicles in reserve will encourage Russia to do likewise, with risk that they could fall into the hand of terrorists, (3) that in actuality the cold war doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) remains in effect, (4) that the Nuclear Posture Review does not provide for taking warheads off hair-trigger alert, as President Bush advocated during the presidential campaign, (5) that the NPR expands the role of nuclear weapons, including the targeting of such non-nuclear states as North Korean, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Libya, and (6) that the NPR reveals plans to develop new warheads and delivery vehicles and prepare for nuclear testing.

For these reasons we have asked President Bush to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing board for revisions that would eliminate the MAD doctrine and encompass nuclear disarmament objectives in keeping with U.S. obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

We would welcome an opportunity for a delegation drawn from the signers of the letter to President Bush to meet with some your top staff to express our concerns and discuss the Nuclear Posture Review in depth.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Colleagues,

(1) I am sending as a Word attachment the final version of the letter to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. If you need it as text, please let me know. Thanks to all who signed it. If anyone wants to put the letter on your web site, please do.

(2) We will discuss this letter with Frank Miller of the National Security Council staff when we meet with him from 1:25 to 2:30 p.m., Friday, March 22 in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE. Please plan to stay another 30 minutes until 3:00 so that we can discuss follow through activities. PLEASE RSVP.

(3) Global Security.Org, headed by John Pike, has put excerpts of the classified Nuclear Posture Review on line: <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>

(4) Release of the recommendations of the classified NPR has brought the nuclear issue to the forefront of public discussion. This is both a great opportunity and a sizable challenge to the faith community to respond vigorously. More on this next week.

Shalom,
Howard

March 19, 2002

The Honorable Carl Levin
269 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Levin:

I would like to share with you a letter from representatives of 23 national religious to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review.

We have six concerns about the Nuclear Posture Review that Pentagon planners have produced. (1) that strategic reductions will take too long to complete, (2) that keeping a large supply of warheads and delivery vehicles in reserve will encourage Russia to do likewise, with risk that they could fall into the hand of terrorists, (3) that in actuality the cold war doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) remains in effect, (4) that the Nuclear Posture Review does not provide for taking warheads off hair-trigger alert, as President Bush advocated during the presidential campaign, (5) that the NPR expands the role of nuclear weapons, including the targeting of such non-nuclear states as North Korean, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Libya, and (6) that the NPR reveals plans to develop new warheads and delivery vehicles and prepare for nuclear testing.

For these reasons we have asked President Bush to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing board for revisions that would eliminate the MAD doctrine and encompass nuclear disarmament objectives in keeping with U.S. obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

As the Senate Armed Services Committee examines the U.S. nuclear posture, we urge you to invite top religious leaders to offer the views of the faith community on this important public policy. In the meantime you are welcome to share our letter to President Bush with fellow senators by circulating it or placing it in the Congressional Record.

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

March 19, 2002

To: Madelyn Creedon
Senate Armed Services Committee

Fax: 202 228-1387

No. of pages: 6

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Madelyn:

I am sending you a letter to Senator Levin which transmits to him a letter to President Bush from religious organizations on the Nuclear Posture Review.

If you choose, you may share the letter with other senators by circulating it or placing it in the Congressional Record.

In the letter we encourage Senator Levin to call in top religious leaders for a public hearing on the nuclear posture of the United States. We would be willing to help you line up a bishop or two for such an occasion, or somebody like Bob Edgar, general secretary of the National Council of Churches and a former U.S. representative from Pennsylvania.

Please call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to discuss this further.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman

Dear Ms. Kulinowski:

I am sending you via text below and also by a Word attachment a letter from representatives of 23 national religious to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review. It was developed by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair.

I requested that you share this letter with Representative Markey and others who may be interested. Perhaps Mr. Markey would be willing to put it in the Congressional Record or send it to all members of the House.

We have six concerns about the Nuclear Posture Review that Pentagon planners have produced. (1) that strategic reductions will take too long to complete, (2) that keeping a large supply of warheads and delivery vehicles in reserve will encourage Russia to do likewise, with risk that they could fall into the hand of terrorists, (3) that in actuality the cold war doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) remains in effect, (4) that the Nuclear Posture Review does not provide for taking warheads off hair-trigger alert, as President Bush advocated during the presidential campaign, (5) that the NPR expands the role of nuclear weapons, including the targeting of such non-nuclear states as North Korean, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Libya, and (6) that the NPR reveals plans to develop new warheads and delivery vehicles and prepare for nuclear testing.

For these reasons we have asked President Bush to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing board for revisions that would eliminate the MAD doctrine and encompass nuclear disarmament objectives in keeping with U.S. obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

As the House Armed Services Committee examines the U.S. nuclear posture, we hope that they will invite top religious leaders to offer the views of the faith community on this important public policy. We would be willing to help line up a bishop or two for such an occasion, or somebody like Bob Edgar, general secretary of the National Council of Churches and a former U.S. representative from Pennsylvania.

Please call me at 301 896-0013 if you want to discuss this further.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

###

March 15, 2002

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

Re: Nuclear Posture Review

Dear Mr. President:

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations were encouraged by the meetings you and Russian President Vladimir Putin held last November in Washington and Texas. Together you told the world that the United States and Russia 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). We look forward to your signing a specific agreement on strategic arms reductions when you meet in Moscow in May.

This gives us hope that substantial progress can be made toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. This is the desire of numerous religious leaders and religious organizations in the United States and elsewhere. For example, 21 top religious leaders in the United States, joined by 18 military professionals, in a statement issued at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000, proclaimed: "**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.**"

From this perspective we are discouraged by what Pentagon planners have produced in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). We have several concerns we would like to share with you.

(1) Reductions. We commend the NPR commitment to reduce strategic nuclear weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 warheads along with the Russia commitment to reduce theirs to 1,500. This is a positive step in the right direction. Yet, we wonder why it should take ten years to accomplish. We ask that standing down of these warheads and their delivery vehicles be completed by 2004.

(2) Warhead reserve and the terrorist threat. The reduction in strategic weapons is compromised by the NPR plan to keep an estimated 1,500 warheads in an active reserve with their delivery systems intact for uploading. If the United States keeps so many warheads in reserve, 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 much 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. This would follow the example of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Ronald Reagan, and START I, signed by your father, President George H.W. Bush, both of which provided for the destruction of the delivery vehicles taken out of service.

(3) Mutual assured destruction. We are especially disappointed that the doctrine of mutual assured destruction remains intact in the Pentagon's Nuclear Posture Review. The NPR specifies that "preplanning is essential for immediate and potential contingencies". It indicates that "a contingency involving Russia, while plausible, is not expected." Nevertheless, the approximately 3,500 strategic warheads in active deployment and reserve are of sufficient magnitude to cover hundreds of targets in Russia, as they now do under the single integrated operational plan (SIOP). Thus, in actuality the MAD doctrine prevails.

(4) De-alerting. 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. Therefore, we call for zero alert.

(5) Expanded role. The Pentagon plan expands 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. This includes immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies involving North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya. The NPR indicates that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack or in retaliation for use of biological or chemical weapons. In contrast, previous U.S. policy specified 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.

(6) Testing. 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 goes 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 of Defense will "study alternatives for follow-ons" for nuclear delivery systems. Preparation to resume testing appears to be 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 your attention to the practical steps contained in the Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. 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,

Jeanette Holt, Associate Director
Alliance of Baptists

James Matlack, Director
Washington Office
American Friends Service Committee

Rev. Ken Sehested, Executive Director
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America

Greg Davidson Laszakovits
Church of the Brethren Washington Office

Tiffany Heath, Legislative Officer
Washington Office, Church Women United

Lonnie Turner, Representative to the Diplomatic/Business Community
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship

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

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

Ronald J. Sider, President
Evangelicals for Social Action.

Joe Volk, Executive Secretary
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Murray Polner, Chair
Jewish Peace Fellowship

Bro. Steven P. O'Neil, SM
Office of Justice & Peace
Marianists, New York Province

Rev. J. Daryl Byler, Director
Washington Office
Mennonite Central Committee, U.S.

Rev. Kathryn J. Johnson, Executive Director
Methodist Federation for Social Action

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

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

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

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

Andrew Greenblatt, Coordinator
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities

Duane Shank, Issues and Policy Adviser
Sojourners

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

Pat Conover, Legislative Director
United Church of Christ
Justice and Witness Ministries

Meg Riley, Director
Washington Office for Faith in Action
Unitarian Universalist Association

*This letter was facilitated by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear
Disarmament, 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036 Phone/fax: 301 896-0013
E-mail: 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

March 22, 2002

To: Mr. Frank Miller
National Security Council

Fax: 202 456-9190

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Mr. Miller:

Members of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament look forward to meeting with you today to discuss the Nuclear Posture Review. As you know, the meeting is scheduled for 1:30 p.m. in Conference Room 2, Methodist Building, 200 Maryland Avenue, NE.

If anything comes up requiring you to cancel, you can reach me until 12 noon at 301 896-0013. After that I will be available by cell phone at 240 426-0031. Or you can reach the receptionist at the Methodist Building at 202 488-5600.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

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

March 27, 2002

To: Mr. Frank Miller
National Security Council

Fax: 202 456-9190

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Mr. Miller:

Thank you for meeting with persons from the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on March 22. I'm sorry we had such a small attendance. Twice that many came on February 15, the date you couldn't make it at the last minute. It turned out that several people were out of town on the 22nd. Others had meetings on other subjects I didn't know about in advance, for many cover multiple agendas.

Nonetheless, interest in nuclear disarmament remains strong in denominational offices. Several denominations have indicated that they will be writing to President Bush directly on the Nuclear Posture Review.

I hope that we can keep in touch and continue our dialogue.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman

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

April 4, 2002

To: Chris Regner
Institute on Religion and Democracy

Fax: 202 969-8429

No. of pages: 5

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Here is the letter to President Bush from representatives of national religious organizations on the Nuclear Posture Review, which you requested.

April 9, 2002

Mr. Wade Greene
Room 5600
30 Rockefeller Center
New York, NY 10112

Dear Mr. Greene:

We greatly appreciate the \$2,000 contribution from an anonymous member of the Rockefeller Family to assist in the development an interfaith web site, www.zero-nukes.org. Now we can go ahead and retain a site designer.

We hope to have the site operative by early May. I'll let you know when it happens so that you can look at it.

On a related subject I am enclosing a letter from representatives of 25 national religious organizations to President Bush on the Nuclear Posture Review.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Chair

Dear Bishop:

Knowing that the United Methodist Bishops have a deep concern for the abolition of nuclear weapons, I want to share with you two items on the Nuclear Posture Review, which the Pentagon released in January. The first is an article discussing how the Nuclear Posture Review is a flawed proposal. It will appear in the next issue Peace Leaf, the quarterly newsletter of Methodists United for Peace with Justice. The second is a letter on the subject to President Bush from representatives of 25 national religious organizations.

I am sending them as Word attachments. If that doesn't work for you, let me know and I'll paste it in as text of a e-mail message.

I hope that this material will be useful in the forthcoming meeting of the Council of Bishops. I urge you to speak your views on this issue.

Shalom,

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

April 23, 2002

To: Marie Kayser

Fax: 202 833-9177

No. of pages: 1

Marie,

Here is picture of a bomb that you can use as a point of departure for the "no nukes" sign. It should be a caricature, like the cartoon is, but not a exact copy. It should include the dot and overlapping circles that connotes nuclear. Just to be sure that you understand what I mean by the "prohibited" symbol, here is a drawing of it. You can figure out whether the sign should be on a post with one pole or a stand with two, or whatever.

Howard

May 2, 2002

To: Permissions & Copyright Department
Random House

Fax: 212-572-6066

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman

Fax: 301 896-0013

Working through the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we are setting up a new web site, www.zero-nukes.org. It is cosponsored by a number of religious denominations, such as Brethren, Mennonites, Presbyterian, United Methodist, Unitarian Universalist, United Church of Christ, Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Its purpose is to provide information and facilitate discussion regarding the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

One of the pages will carry views of military leaders. In that section we would like to use extracts from an article by Admiral Noel Gayler entitled "A Commander-in-Chief's Perspective on Nuclear Weapons". It is found in *The Nuclear Crisis Reader*, edited by Gwyn Prins, published in 1984 by Vintage Books, a division of Random Books. The book bears the copyright of Chatto & Windus Ltd.

Specifically we are interested in using extracts from pp. 16-18 of this book. May we have your permission? However, if it is necessary for us to obtain permission from Chatto & Windus Ltd., please tell me how to contact them. We will use whatever language you prescribe to indicate your permission.

Thanks for your cooperation,

Howard W. Hallman
Chair

To: Chatto and Windus Ltd
c/o Random House UK Ltd

Working through the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, we are setting up a new web site, www.zero-nukes.org. It is cosponsored by a number of religious denominations, such as Brethren, Mennonites, Presbyterian, United Methodist, Unitarian Universalist, United Church of Christ, Union of American Hebrew Congregations. Its purpose is to provide information and facilitate discussion regarding the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

One of the pages will carry views of military leaders. In that section we would like to use extracts from an article by Admiral Noel Gayler entitled "A Commander-in-Chief's Perspective on Nuclear Weapons". It is found in *The Nuclear Crisis Reader*, edited by Gwyn Prins, published in 1984 by Vintage Books, a division of Random Books. The book bears the copyright of Chatto & Windus Ltd.

Specifically we are interested in using extracts from pp. 16-18 of this book. May we have your permission? We will use whatever language you prescribe to indicate your permission.

Our web site is in its early pages. You may visit our home page at www.zero-nukes.org if you want to see our approach.

Thanks for your cooperation,

Howard W. Hallman

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

June 10, 2002

Marie,

I am sending you a check for \$250 as a progress payment for your work in designing our web site, www.zero-nukes.org.

The site is coming along nicely. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Howard W. Hallman

Marie Kayser
1413 F Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

PROPOSAL. I propose that we have a full-day summit meeting of the faith community to develop a coordinated effort to step up our advocacy for nuclear disarmament.

* The session should seek to draw in not only persons who usually attend meetings of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament but also heads of Washington offices, headquarters staff located elsewhere, and if possible some heads of communion, bishops, ecumenical representatives.

* It should be scheduled far enough in advance to get on appointment calendars, say, in late October.

What do you think of this possibility?

THE CHALLENGE. Going through statements of religious organizations for our new web site, I am struck by how much they are the opposite of the policies of the Bush Administration.

* Although Bush's commitment to take about two-thirds of the strategic arsenal out of service is a positive step, it is compromised by the intent to keep large numbers in reserve. This contrasts with previous arms control agreements that required dismantlement of delivery systems.

* Both Russia and the United States will be allowed to have multi-warhead missiles, which were to be outlawed under now-renounced START II.

* Bush has repudiated his campaign promise to de-alert the deployed force.

* Bush's policy is nuclear weapons forever.

* The cold war doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) continues because the United States and Russia will look at each other's capability to launch at attack with the 1,700 to 2,200 actively deployed warheads.

* The prospective role of nuclear weapons is expanding to possible use against non-nuclear-weapon states and in response to attacks by biological and chemical weapons.

* The Bush Administration wants to develop new nuclear weapons, such as a bunker buster, and to prepare to reopen the nuclear weapons test site.

* Enormous amounts of funds are committed to missile defense while the Bush Administration refuses to fully fund efforts to secure Russian nuclear weapons and fissile material, as recommended by the Baker-Cutler Commission. This increases the risk of terrorist acquisition of nuclear weapons and missile material.

In sum, nuclear policy, which wasn't all that great in the Clinton Administration, has become significantly worse under President Bush from the perspective of the faith community. We are challenged to respond. That's why I am proposing a one-day summit meeting.

PREPARATION. To get the most out of a one-day gathering, we need careful preparation. I suggest three issue papers, to be circulated at least three weeks in advance. Drafts of the paper should be circulated to a key group even earlier. The suggested topics are:

- (1) Defining the issue: the nature of the nuclear arsenal and current flaws in public policy.
- (2) Public policy outcomes that we desire (the web site is a major source for this)
- (3) Plan of action
 - (a) Within faith community
 - (b) Building a broader working coalition, especially with "unusual partners", such as military leaders, scientists; and with linkage to civil-sector initiatives.

RESOURCE PERSONS. With an eye to developing a broader campaign, I suggest that we bring in one or more military leaders and scientists as speakers. We might also have selective participation from civil-sector organizations, such as the New Call initiative, as observers and resource persons.

OUTCOME. The desired outcome of this summit meeting would be a renewed commitment to work together for nuclear disarmament, a renewal of our prophetic call, and a plan of action that both mobilizes the faith community and links it to a much broader coalition.

QUERY. What do you think of this proposal? Would your office or organization participate? What refinements would you suggest? What dates should be avoid in the October-December 2002 period?

I will be on vacation from June 22 to July 6. By the time I return I hope that my e-mail box is full of replies from you.

Shalom,
Howard

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues,

In a separate communication I have proposed some alternative dates for a September meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Here I want to discuss the agenda.

OVERALL

The overall agenda is intended to discuss action strategies to promote a broader and deeper approach to nuclear disarmament to counter the retrogressive policies of the Bush Administration. This is becoming a matter of urgency because of consideration being given to use of nuclear weapons against Iraq and other non-nuclear weapon states.

SUMMIT

On June 18 I sent you a proposal for a "summit meeting" in October that would be an all-day session with wider participation than the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament to develop a broad action strategy. I've talked with a number of you about this and concluded that first we need the kind of strategy meeting that I am calling for September.

I've received a suggestion that we should look for a window of opportunity for national religious leaders, such as heads of communion, to make a public statement calling for specific steps for nuclear disarmament and to seek a meeting with President Bush and/or his top aides. One occasion might be when the Senate ratifies the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT), which is likely to occur some time this fall. The religious leaders could praise President Bush for negotiating the treaty as a first step toward nuclear disarmament and praise the Senate for ratifying it. The religious leaders could then say that much more needs to be done and could lay out an agenda for next steps. In the process they could specifically oppose the use of nuclear weapons in dealing with Iraq and other non-nuclear weapon states.

I tried this out on one person who suggested that because of the uncertainty of when the Senate will ratify SORT and the length of time it takes to set up a meeting with the president and/or his top aides, the two should be handled separately.

This and other possibilities will be considered at our September meeting. Meanwhile, let me and others know what you think.

JOINT STATEMENT

We all know how hard it is to work out a consensus statement in the faith community. Because of the way that the Catholic polity works, it is particularly difficult to gain Catholic endorsement of a joint statement. Also, the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative has in the works a reaffirmation of the statement originally issued at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000.

Therefore, rather than developing another statement, I'm wondering whether we could simply build on the "Statement on New Nuclear Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy", made by the

Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory, President, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops on May 24, 2002. (See <http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/may02fin.htm>) This statement welcomes the new treaty but calls for policies that "move away from reliance on nuclear weapons as a central part of our nation's military doctrine." In discussing issues of particular importance, the statement indicates:

* "Much deeper, more irreversible cuts, in both strategic and tactical weapons, are both possible and necessary."

* "We oppose the continued readiness of the United States to use nuclear weapons, especially against non-nuclear threats, and the potential development of new weapons for this purpose. . . . We abhor any use of nuclear weapons."

* "We urge the President to support the ratification of the comprehensive test ban treaty."

* "More must be done to assist nuclear nations, particularly Russia, in dismantling and safeguarding their weapons and nuclear materials."

If we staged a news conference, other heads of communion could endorse the statement of Bishop Gregory, who we hope would participate. The four items could also serve as an agenda for a meeting with President Bush. They cover essential points, though one of the participants might also raise the matter of de-alerting, which isn't covered in the Catholic statement.

Heads of communion would have the liberty of making available to the press their own policy statements on nuclear disarmament. Press information could reference [www:zero-nukes.org](http://www.zero-nukes.org) for further religious statements.

What do you think of this approach?

GRASSROOTS MOBILIZATION

At our September meeting, we should consider how to mobilize the grassroots constituencies of the faith community for a broader nuclear disarmament agenda. We can build upon our experience working together for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. If we could obtain additional resources, we could consider the experience of Jubilee 2000 and other faith-based campaigns.

URGENT CALL

One piece of a grassroots campaign could be use of a faith-based version of an "Urgent Call to End the Nuclear Danger" that has recently been initiated by David Cortright, Randy Forsberg, and Jonathan Schell. It is modeled on the experience of the Freeze Campaign in the 1980s, though now making much greater use of the Internet. Information is available at www.urgentcall.org.

Richard Killmer, who has taken Wendy Starman's place at the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative, will be communicating to you about the Urgent Call.

We will consider these and other ideas when the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament meets in September. Meanwhile, please share your observations by replying to all.

Shalom,

Howard

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues,

On June 18 I proposed having a full-day "summit meeting" of the faith community, say in late October, on nuclear disarmament advocacy. Participation would encompass a wider group than those active in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

Feedback suggests that before having such a "summit", it would be better for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament to talk through strategy for broadening our work in opposition to the regressive nuclear policies of the Bush Administration. Therefore, I would like to have a meeting in the second or third week in September. As a strategy session I would like it to run from, say, 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, or 1:30 to 4:00 p.m.

As usual, picking a date is difficult. Wednesday, September 11 will be a commemorative day with likely enhanced security on the Hill. Some think the 9th and 10th might likewise have tighter security. The heads of religious offices meet Thursday afternoon, September 12. That morning might be a possibility unless those in the afternoon session don't want two long meetings in the same day. Churches for Middle East Peace meets on September 18. Some individuals have told me of specific times they cannot meet. Please let me know when you can and cannot meet between September 9 and 20.

I am writing a separate e-mail on issues for consideration.

Shalom,
Howard

As I've had feedback from my suggestion of a "summit meeting" of the faith community on nuclear disarmament to counteract the regressive policies of the Bush Administration, I've received the suggestion that those working most closely on this subject should meet first to develop detailed strategy. Therefore, I would like to have a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on

As to the agenda, here are some items to consider. I would like your feedback.

SUMMIT

I've received a suggestion that we should look for a window of opportunity for national religious leaders, such as heads of communion, to make a public statement calling for specific steps for nuclear disarmament and to seek a meeting with President Bush and/or his top aides. One occasion might be when the Senate ratifies the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty, which is likely to occur some time this fall. The religious leaders could praise President Bush for negotiating the treaty as a first step toward nuclear disarmament and praise the Senate for ratifying it. The religious leaders could then say that much more needs to be done and could lay out an agenda for next steps.

I realize the difficulty in working out a consensus statement. Therefore, I'm wondering whether we could simply build on the "Statement on New Nuclear Treaty and U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy", made by the Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory, President, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops on May 24, 2002. (See <http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/may02fin.htm>) This statement welcomes the new treaty but calls for policies that "move away from reliance on nuclear weapons as a central part of our nation's military doctrine." In discussing issues of particular importance, the statement indicates:

* "Much deeper, more irreversible cuts, in both strategic and tactical weapons, are both possible and necessary."

* "We oppose the continued readiness of the United States to use nuclear weapons, especially against non-nuclear threats, and the potential development of new weapons for this purpose. . . . We abhor any use of nuclear weapons."

* "We urge the President to support the ratification of the comprehensive test ban treaty."

* "More must be done to assist nuclear nations, particularly Russia, in dismantling and safeguarding their weapons and nuclear materials."

With Bishop Gregory's participation in a news conference, other heads of communion could add their endorsement to his statement. They could also make available to the press their own policy statements on nuclear disarmament. (And press information could reference www:zero-nukes.org for further religious statements.)

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

I would like to hold a meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament during the first half of September. The purpose would be to develop an action strategy to counter the retrogressive Bush policies on nuclear disarmament. The potential agenda is covered in a separate communication.

We used to meet on Tuesday afternoons. But since the schedule quickly thickens by the second week in September, maybe we should meet soon after Labor Day. Therefore, I suggest three choices, each from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

Friday, September 6

Tuesday, September 10

Tuesday, September 17

Please reply immediately about which of these dates you can and cannot attend.

As to further alternatives, I know about commemoration and heightened security on the Hill on 9/11, heads of offices on the afternoon of Sept. 12, Yom Kippur on the 16th, Churches for Middle East Peace on the 18th, the meeting on trade and investment on the 19th and 20th. Are there other meetings to avoid or specific dates when you cannot attend?

Thanks for our reply,

Howard

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

July 15, 2002

To: Duane Deal
United Methodist Publishing House

Fax: 615 749-6128

No. of pages: 1

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Dear Mr. Deal:

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, has created a web site, www.zero-nukes.org, to promote discussion of nuclear disarmament issues. Among the sponsors is the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society (see home page).

On the web page, www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements, we are posting and providing linkage to policy statements of various denominations. For the United Methodist Church we seek your permission to post the following two items.

(1) "A Pastoral Letter to All United Methodists" in *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. 1986, pp. 91-93.

(2) "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence" in *The Book of Resolutions of the United Methodist Church, 2000*. pp. 782-785.

We will record your permission in whatever form you indicate.

Staff of the General Board of Church and Society are supportive of our request. You can verify this by contacting either Jaydee Hanson, assistant general secretary, 202 488-5650 or Janet Horman, peace with justice program director, 202 488-5647.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman

Dear Admiral Carroll:

When we chatted briefly at Wesley Seminary in May at the lecture-dinner meeting, I mentioned that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is creating a new web site, www.zero-nukes.org. Its purposes are twofold: (1) to be a source for statements by religious organizations, military leaders, civil sector organizations, and international bodies on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons and (2) to encourage dialogue on practical steps for achieving zero nuclear weapons.

As a work in progress, we have opened our home page, www.zero-nukes.org with linkages to Religious Statements and How to Get Zero. We have the beginning of a page on Military Leaders Speak Out at www.zero-nukes.org/draft/militaryleaders. I am contacting you on three aspects of the web site.

First, we have included you on Military Leaders Speak Out, drawing upon excerpts from your address to the Palme Institute and your speech on "Confrontation or Cooperation" given to the World Federalists and elsewhere. We hope that this is a fair presentation of your view. We would also like to draw on your article "The Case for Nuclear Abolition", published by Turtle River Press in January-February, but we don't know whether it is available on electronic format for linkage or excerpts. Can you guide us? Perhaps there are other articles and speeches you would suggest that expand upon your views. Also we would like to have your picture for inclusion on the site.

Second, on the How to Get to Zero page we will have a section for the ideas of military professionals, civil experts, and ordinary citizens on how to achieve this goal. We invite you to contribute your current thinking on the practical steps that should be taken to achieve the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Such a scenario might encompass a sequence for getting rid of different categories of nuclear weapons. It might include some or all of the common elements recommended by the Canberra Commission and other distinguished bodies (see listing on web page). Although we have no prescribed length, the range of 1,000 to 3,000 words might be appropriate, but we would accept longer. We would like submissions to come as Word attachments or similar formats. We reserve the right to edit for length and format. We offer no compensation for such submissions.

Third, I am wondering whether you would help identify other military leaders who might be willing to contribute their ideas on How to Get to Zero. Perhaps you would be willing to help us make contact. I would like to have a conversation by phone or in person about this possibility.

Information about the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is available at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements.html#interfaithcommittee>.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Shalom,
Howard Hallman

September 2002

To: Monday Lobby

Dear Colleagues:

I am pleased to announce that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, has created a new web site, www.zero-nukes.org. I invite you to visit the site, draw on its information, and use it to participate in dialogue on how to get to zero nuclear weapons.

The web site has these major pages:

- * Religious Statements
- * Military Leaders Speak Out
- * Civil Sector Statements
- * Arsenals & Treaties
- * How to Get to Zero
- * Your Feedback

The Civil Sector Statements page, which is still being developed, will provide linkage with many of the organizations participating in the Monday Lobby. Some linkage is now in place for Arsenals & Treaties and a de-alerting section of How to Get to Zero.

How to Get to Zero is intend to provide discussion of scenarios on how to eliminate all nuclear weapons. We invite you to submit your ideas and offer comments on the ideas of others. This process is explained at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/yourfeedback.html>. You can also send your evaluation of zero-nukes.org from the Your Feedback page.

We hope this new web site will strengthen the ties between the religious and civil sector communities in our common quest for eliminating nuclear weapons.

Shalom,
Howard W. Hallman

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

Dear Mr. President:

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations note the release of "National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction." We share the premise of the report that the potential use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) is a grave concern to citizens of the United States, indeed to all people on Earth. We support many of the elements of this National Strategy, but we strongly disagree with several elements.

We favor a strong nonproliferation program as outlined, including active diplomacy, reliance on multilateral regimes, controls on nuclear materials, and cooperative nuclear threat reduction, such as the Nunn-Lugar program. We also believe that it is prudent to prepare to respond to the consequences of the use WMD on our soil.

Our disagreement with the National Strategy relates to its counter-proliferation proposals. In particular we have two major concerns.

First, we are greatly disturbed by the idea of unilateral preemption by U.S. military forces. Many of us have articulated our concern in relationship to Iraq. We believe that unilateral military intervention is a dangerous precedent which could have disastrous effects if pursued by other nations in diverse situations. Rather we favor strict observance of international law and collective security through the United Nations and multilateral regional organizations.

Second, we strongly oppose threatened and actual use of nuclear weapons in dealing with chemical and biological weapons. Such a policy is immoral because it would be disproportionate, would harm innocent civilians, and would have negative environmental effects. Further, this approach extends the role of nuclear weapons at a time when the world should be working for their elimination. It is contrary to previous policy of not threatening first use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states. It adds to the appearance that nuclear weapons are legitimate, thus encouraging other nations to develop their own nuclear arsenals. We note the disastrous effects in South Asia as India and Pakistan have copied the superpowers in believing that nuclear weapons have utility for deterrence and war-fighting.

Therefore, we urge you to reconsider the policies of unilateral preemption and first use of nuclear weapons.

Sincerely yours,

Representatives of religious organizations

An Interfaith Web Site: www.zero-nukes.org

A Project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

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 for their statements and proposals on 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) Offer opportunity to post responses to various nuclear disarmament proposals. The site will feature education and discussion and will not be used for legislative alerts or advocacy of direct action.

Sponsors. Agreed to: Washington offices of Church of the Brethren, Cooperative Baptist Fellowship, Mennonite Central Committee, Presbyterian Church U.S.A., Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Unitarian Universalist Association, United Church of Christ. Pending: Washington offices of American Baptist Churches, Episcopal Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, United Methodist General Board of Church and Society; also, American Friends Service Committee, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Pax Christi USA. Representatives from these offices will serve as a steering committee for the web site.

Moderator: 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.

8. Comments: 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.]

"We've got all options on the table, because we want to make it very clear to nations that you will not threaten the United States or use weapons of mass destruction against us or our allies." President George W. Bush

Nuclear Posture Review A Flawed Proposal

In January 2002 the U.S. Department of Defense sent to Congress a secret report on 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. For the general public the Pentagon released only a bare outline of its recommendations. In March the Los Angeles Times got hold of the classified version and divulged greater details.

The fuller version reveals a set of policies that has some positive features but also contains serious flaws, some quite disturbing. The greatest flaw is the belief that nuclear weapons should remain forever. In contrast, the voices of religion say that possession, threatened use, and actual use of nuclear weapons is immoral and that all nuclear weapons should be eliminated.

Reductions Insufficient

On the positive side 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 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.

Deeper analysis, however, reveals that this reduction is not as significant as first appears. Previous arms control agreements, such as the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Reagan, and START I, signed by President George H.W. Bush, provided for the destruction of delivery vehicles (missiles, bombers) taken out of service. In contrast, the Nuclear Posture Review reveals an intent to preserve the delivery vehicles and warheads for possible redeployment

This goes against the principle of irreversibility that the United States agreed to during the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Also, it will encourage Russia to keep in reserve warheads and delivery vehicles take out of service. Because Russian security of nuclear weapons and fissile material is sometimes lax, this increases the risk that terrorist organizations could gain access.

A much wiser course would be to dismantle all downloaded warheads and their delivery systems. Moreover, reductions should be accomplished at a much faster pace and should go much deeper than now being considered by President Bush and Russian President Putin.

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."

Their words about moving away from MAD are contradicted by the level of the nuclear force to remain deployed and held in reserve. Administration officials explain that nuclear missiles will no longer be aimed at any particular target but will be available for whatever contingency might arise. But experts indicate that all of the contingencies specified in the NPR beyond Russia -- China and five non-nuclear states (see below) -- would require only a few hundred missiles to deal with if worse comes to worse. The only possible targets for the balance are in Russia.

As Secretary of State George Shultz under President Reagan observed, states design policy not on the basis of intention of other states but rather on their capabilities. Because Russia retains the capability of launching a massive attack on the United States, the U.S. must maintain a counter capability. This means that mutual assured destruction remains in effect between two nations now said to be friends.

The only way to end the MAD doctrine is to substantially reduce capability far below the numbers considered in the Nuclear Posture Review, perhaps to fewer than 200 or 100, and eventually to zero.

Expanded Role

As the United States built up its nuclear arsenal after World War II, the primary role for nuclear weapons was the deterrence of nuclear attack by another state possessing nuclear weapons. The second role until the Cold War ended was deterrence of a Soviet attack on Western Europe. Under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the United States made a commitment not to use nuclear weapons against any nation not possessing nuclear weapons or allied with a nuclear weapons state.

The Nuclear Posture Review of the Bush administration changes this. It indicates that nuclear strike capability should be available for various contingencies. It specifies: "North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Libya are among the countries that could be involved in immediate, potential, or unexpected contingencies." The NPR also indicates that nuclear weapons should be used to deter attack by biological and chemical weapons. It adds that nuclear weapons could be employed against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack, such as, deep underground bunkers and bio-weapon facilities.

When asked about this at a news conference, President Bush explained, "We've got all options on the table." This is a dangerous approach. The expanded role for nuclear weapons suggests greater legitimacy and encourages other nations to respond in kind. Moreover, it is immoral, for all options should not be on the table. Genocide is not a legitimate option. Slaughter of the innocent is not an acceptable option.

Testing and New Weapon Development

The desire to expand the role of nuclear weapons leads the Nuclear Posture Review to give consideration to return to nuclear weapon testing and development of new nuclear weapons. Although the NPT affirms President Bush's commitment to a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing, it 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. This could include 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.

A Faith Response

Because of such concerns, representatives of 25 national religious organizations have urged President Bush to send the Nuclear Posture Review back to the drawing boards. They propose that it should be reconfigured to incorporate nuclear disarmament components and specify a declining role for nuclear weapons in U.S. foreign and military policy.

An excellent disarmament agenda is available from the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). It encompasses a number of practical steps, such as: reduction in operational status of nuclear weapons system; continued moratorium on nuclear-weapon-test explosions; entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; irreversible reductions of strategic offensive weapons and also tactical nuclear weapons; increased transparency; engagement of all nuclear-weapon states in the process of achieving the total elimination of their nuclear weapons.

For some, this may sound too idealistic and impractical. It isn't. Numerous admirals and generals in their retirement have told us that nuclear weapons have no military utility. In June 2000 eighteen of them joined 21 top religious leaders in a statement, issued at the Washington National Cathedral, saying that "the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger in their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They added, "National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide."

This is moral response for a moral nation. This is the correct nuclear posture for the United States.

Religious Peace Fellowships

Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America
LeDayne McLeese Polaski
ledayne@bpfna.org ledayne@bpfna.org
4800 Wedgewood Rd.
Charlotte, NC 28210
Tel: (704) 521-6051
Fax: -6053

Local Director:

Ken Sehested,
Email: ken@bpfna.org (Charlotte office)
alayna@asap-com.com (home office)

President:

Lindsay Penn Matheson
342 Sebestyen
Saskatoon, SA, Canada
S7K6W6

Director:

Paul Hayes
608 North St.
Suffield CT, 06078
Brethren Peace Fellowship
P O Box 455, New Windsor, MD 21776

Editor

Wayne Zunkel
Atlantic NE BPF Newsletter
7 Brookview Circle,
Elizabethtown, PA 17022
Tel: (717) 361-9113
Fax: -9223

Buddhist Peace Fellowship
P O Box 4650, Berkeley, CA 94704
Tel: (510) 525-8596;
(510) 655-6169

Alan Senauke, Director
alans@bpf.org

Lee Lewis, President of Board
Susan Moon, Editor, 'Turning Wheel'
Turningwheel@bpf.org

Catholic Peace Fellowship
Tom Cornell, National Secretary
41 Cemetery Rd. Marlboro, NY 12542

Rev. Bill Ofenloch, Program Coordinator
177 E. 102nd St.

New York, NY 10029
Tel: (212) 369-1590

Church of God Peace Fellowship
Rev. Maurice Caldwell
m-dcaldwell@juno.com
1826 St. James Pl. Anderson, IN 46012-3190

Tel: (765) 643-0049

Rev. Bill Ferguson

4100 16th street NW
Washington, D.C. 20011
Tel: (202) 829-4223

Nmchog@hotmail.com

Steering committee representatives:

Kay and Fred Shively
809 Westgate
Anderson IN 46012

Sara Cook
3565 Nightspring Ct.
Hilliard, OH 43026

Bill Ferguson
7402 Holly Ave.
Takoma Park, MD 20912

Diciples Peace Fellowship
Box 1986 Indianapolis, IN 46206

Tel: (317) 635-3113

Carol Q. Cosby

Tel: (317) 713-2659

ccosby@dhm.diciples.org

Moderator:

Joel Heim
137 Chaffee Rd #205
Oconomowoc WI 53066-5708
Tel: (262) 524-7291

jheim@cc.edu

Vice Moderator:

Linda McKiernan-Allen
4444 N. College Ave.
IN 46205

Tel: (317) 283-8306

lmckiern@juno.com

Episcopal Peace Fellowship
Jacqueline Lynn, EPF

637 South Dearborn
Chicago 60605-1839
epfnational@america.net

Chair:

David Selzer
Church of Good Sheperd
96 Jewett Pky, Buffalo, NY 14214-2322
Tel: (716) 833-1151
Dos403@aol.com

Vice-Chair:

Janet Chisholm
Box 271 Nyack, NY 10960
Tel: (845) 358-4601 ex36
nonviolence@forusa.org

Verna Fausey, EPF Newsletter

PO Box 121154
Nashville 37212-1154
Tel: (615) 292-1798
vfausey@aol.com

Jewish Peace Fellowship
Box 271
Nyack, NY 10960
(845) 358-4601
Jpf@igc.apc.org
www.jewishpeacefellowship.org

Murray Polner, Editor Shalom

50-10 Concord Ave
Great Neck, NY 11020
Tel: (516) 487-3758
Murraylou2@cs.com

Lutheran Peace Fellowship
1710 Eleventh Ave.
Seattle, WA 98122-2420

Glen Gersmehl, Coordinator, LPF Peace Notes,

Kate Reuer, youth
Tel/Fax: (206) 720-0313
lpf@ecunet.org

Methodist Peace Fellowship

Rev. Schuyler J. Rhodes

1622 Fairview Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94703
Tel: (510) 549-1244

Fax: (510) 649-1405

Muslim Peace Fellowship

Rabia Terri Harris, Coordinator/Editor

As-Salamu 'Alaykum,
Box 271, Nyack, NY 10960
Tel: (914) 358-4601
Fax: -4924
mpf@forusa.org

Presbyterian Peace Fellowship

Janet Newman, Office Manager

Box 271, Nyack, NY 10960
Tel: (845) 358-4601
Fax: -4924

Co-Moderators:

Len Bjorkman
PO Box 194 Syracuse, NY 13215-0194
(315) 492-9042 Fax: same
Jlbjorkman@aol.com

Rick Ufford-Chase

924 N 6th Ave Tucson, AZ 85705
(520) 882-8190
rick@borderlinks.org

Briefly Editor:

Marilyn White
820 Third St.
League City, TX 77573
(281) 332-1761

Fax: (281) 554-2851

marwhite@igc.org

Unitarian — Universalist Peace Fellowship

Rev. Dennis M. Davidson,

President/Editor

Unipax,

48365 Prairie Drive, Palm Desert
CA 92260

Tel: (760) 776-0823

uupeace@uua.org

United Church of Christ FOR

John Steitz, Convener, Steering Committee,
Po122 Tannersville PA 18372

jsteitz@ptd.net

Tel: (570) 839-2988

Rev. Todd Hensley-Weir, Editor

269 Mill Street

Poughkeepsie, New York 12601
Tel: (914) 454-4604

Related Groups:

American Friends Service Committee
(AFSC)

1501 Cherry St.

Philadelphia, PA 19102-1479

(215) 241-7000

www.afsc.org

Inter-Religious Foundation For Community
Organization/

Pastors for Peace

402 W. 145th St, New York, NY 10031

Tel: (212) 962-5757

Mennonite Board of Congregational
Ministries,

Peace and Social Justice Concerns

Box 1245 Elkhart, IN

46515-1245

Tel: (219) 777-2528

Fax: (219) 673-0826

New Call to Peacemaking

(Quakers, Mennonites and Brethren)

John Stoner

21 South 12th-P.O. Box 500

Akron, PA 17501-0500,

Tel/Fx (717) 859-1958

Center on Conscience & War (NISBCO)

J. E. McNeil Exec. Dir.

1830 Connecticut Ave,

NW Washington, DC 20009-5732

Tel: (202) 483-2220

Fax: (202) 483-1246

nisbco@nisbco.org

Pax Christi USA

532 West 8th St.

Erie, PA 16502

Tel: (814) 453-4955

Fax: (814) 452-4784

paxchristi@igc.org

SoJourners Peace Ministry

Duane Shank

2401 15th St. NW Box 29272

Wash. DC 20009

Tel: (202) 328-8842

Fax: -8757

www.Sojo.net

World Peacemakers

Bill Price

11427 Scottsbury Terrace

Germantown, MD 20876

Tel: (301) 916-0442

Fax: -5335

War Resisters League

339 Lafayette St.

New York, NY 10012

Tel: (212) 228-0450

Fax: (212) 228-6193

www.warresisters.org

For More Information on Religious Peace
Fellowships, Contact:

Ellen J. Kurtz

Fellowship of Reconciliation

Box 271 Nyack, NY 10960

Tel: (845) 358-4601 x39

A proposed public event

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

I continue to explore ways to gain more public attention to the faith community's concern over the retrogressive nuclear weapons policy of the Bush Administration.

After further conversations I doubt that a "summit" involving many top denominational leaders is possible. Two hot-button issues are deservedly drawing more attention: Israel/Palestine conflict and the possibility of war with Iraq. Nuclear weapons policy, though exceedingly important, is on the back burner. An interfaith news conference on nuclear policy would likely draw little press attention. They tend to ignore us.

As another approach I would like to offer the idea of having a well-publicized Interfaith Hearing on Nuclear Weapons. The hearing panel would be interfaith. The witnesses would be military leaders, scientists, other civilian experts, and some international visitors. They would be asked to advise the faith community on practical steps for moving away from the MAD doctrine (see separate memo) and achieving nuclear abolition. If we held such a hearing when Congress is not in session, we might get coverage on one or more cable television networks. The attraction would be the combination of religion, military, and science and perhaps the focus of "MAD no longer".

This idea is elaborated below. I invite your comments.

PREMISE:

- (1) Numerous faith organizations favor the global elimination of nuclear weapons.
- (2) The Bush Administration's Nuclear Posture Review commits the United States to nuclear weapons forever, envisions expanded uses, and favors development of new kinds of nuclear weapons.
- (3) Russia is also locked into nuclear weapons forever.
- (4) Both retain the Cold War doctrine of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD).
- (5) Faith groups want the advice of military and civilian experts on alternative public policies and practical steps for abandoning the MAD doctrine and eliminating nuclear weapons.

WHEN: a day in late November, such as Monday, November 25 (3 days before Thanksgiving)

WHERE: a D.C. church, such as Capitol Hill United Methodist Church, which has a basement hall that would make a good hearing room

HEARING PANEL, such as:

Bishop John Ricard, the incoming chair of the International Policy Committee, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, or another Catholic bishop.

The Rev. Dr. Robert Edgar, general secretary, National Council of Churches, who is very knowledgeable about nuclear weapons issues.

United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White (who knows more about nuclear weapons than any other bishop in the country) or a prelate of another denomination.

A Jewish representative, such as Rabbi David Saperstein.

A peace church representative

Possibly a Muslim, an Orthodox Christian

WITNESSES, divided into three two-or-three-person panels, each to be on for 50 minutes.

MILITARY, such as choosing among General Lee Butler, General Charles Horner, Admiral Stansfield Turner, Admiral Eugene Carroll, Admiral John J. Shanahan, etc.

CIVIL SECTOR, such as Bruce Blair, a scientist (through FAS or UCS), a physician (through PSR or IPPNW)

INTERNATIONAL, such as a Russian and Canadian Douglas Roche

COVERAGE: seek C-SPAN, CNN, MSNBC, etc.; live radio; press; videotaped by CDI for later program; get on NewsHour with Jim Lehrer, other news shows; transcript for posting on www.zero-nukes.org; live broadcast on a web site; etc.

VISUALS to be used by witnesses, such as charts showing scenarios for nuclear disarmament

LEAD-UP: U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops and the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches meet the second week in November; American Baptist, ELCA, and United Methodist leadership bodies also meet in November; Episcopal and Orthodox in October. Get fresh resolutions or statements adopted. Dialogue on How to Get to Zero page of www.zero-nukes.org will be going on for a couple of months

FOLLOW-UP: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament draw up a consensus agenda coming out of hearing and web site dialogue; transmit to faith networks, Congress; use of CDI videotape, transcript.

I would appreciate e-feedback on this idea, its pluses and minuses, further development. We can discuss it in person at the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, scheduled for Tuesday afternoon, September 17.

Shalom,
Howard



The Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy
4500 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20016-5690
Tel: 202/885-8648
Fax: 202/885-8559
www.nrdi.org

**A REAFFIRMATION: Concerning Terrorism and U.S. Nuclear
Policy**

**By the Nuclear Reduction/
Disarmament Initiative**

We, military professionals and religious leaders, reaffirm our common conviction, first proclaimed on June 21, 2000, that a "long-term reliance on nuclear weapons" is "morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable," because "a peace based on terror . . . is a peace that is corrupting, a peace that is unworthy of civilization."

Another kind of terror viciously assaulted the United States on September 11, 2001 resulting in thousands of deaths, many injuries, shattered institutions, a traumatized American public, and worldwide apprehensions about the nature of U.S. military responses.

Nuclear weapons are weapons of indiscriminate effect and terror. The threat of their use represents an abhorrent condition we seek to eliminate cooperatively. Nuclear weapons "constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, [and] a danger to the whole human family." We believe that verifiable arms control and non-proliferation efforts must become a top priority in order to safeguard nuclear facilities everywhere, to prevent the export of related materials and technologies, to persuade states to turn away from nuclear weapons, and to prevent terrorists from obtaining them.

Accordingly, we should not seize upon the events of September 11 as a justification for use of nuclear weapons. Domestic and international security cannot be obtained by answering terror with even greater terror. Strengthening international cooperation in bringing unlawful conduct to justice, in addressing the root causes of terrorism, and working through the rule of law to eliminate nuclear

weapons is a path toward greater security consistent with international requirements and our basic American values.

The Reverend Bob Edgar, *General Secretary, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA*

Rabbi Jerome Epstein, *The United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism*

Bishop Elias Galvan, President, *Council of Bishops, The United Methodist Church*

The Reverend Wesley Granberg-Michaelson, *General Secretary, Reformed Church in America*

The Most Reverend Frank T. Griswold, *Presiding Bishop and Primate, Episcopal Church in the USA*

Rabbi Reuven Hammer, *President, The Rabbinical Assembly*

The Rev. Mark S. Hanson, *Presiding Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America*

The Reverend R. Burke Johnson, *President, Moravian Church in America*

The Reverend Clifton Kirkpatrick, *Stated Clerk of the General Assembly, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)*

Bishop Othal H. Lakey, *Secretary, College of Bishops, Christian Methodist Episcopal Church*

The Reverend A. Roy Medley, *General Secretary, American Baptist Churches USA*

The Rev. Judy Mills Reimer, *General Secretary, Church of the Brethren, Church of the Brethren General Board*

Rabbi David Saperstein, *Director and Counsel, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism*

The Reverend Dr. Robert E. Sawyer, *President, Provincial Elders' Conference, Moravian Church in America, Southern Province*

The Rev. William G. Sinkford, *President, Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations*

Bishop Walter F. Sullivan, *Catholic Diocese of Richmond, President, Board of Directors, The Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy*

Dr. Sayyid M. Syeed, *Secretary General, The Islamic Society of North America*

His Beatitude Metropolitan Theodosius, *Archbishop of Washington, Metropolitan of All America and Canada, Primate of the Orthodox Church in America*

The Reverend John H. Thomas, *President, United Church of Christ*

The Rev. Jim Wallis, *Editor-in-Chief, SOJOURNERS*

Rabbi Martin S. Weiner, *President, Central Conference of American Rabbis*

Brigadier General Dallas Brown, Jr., *USA (Ret.)*

Rear Admiral Eugene J. Carroll, Jr., *USN (Ret.)*

Lt. Gen. John H. Cushman, *USA (Ret.)*

Lt. General Robert G. Gard, *USA (Ret.)*

Admiral Noel Gayler, *USN (Ret.)*

General Charles A. Horner, *USAF (Ret.)*

Rear Admiral Robert G. James, *USN (Ret.)*

Chaplain (Major General) Kermit D. Johnson, *USA (Ret.)*

Major General Jack Kidd, USAF (Ret.)

Rear Admiral Eugene LaRocque, USN (Ret.)

Vice Admiral John J. Shanahan, USN (Ret.)

Admiral Stansfield Turner, USN (Ret.)

Vice Admiral James B. Wilson, USN (Ret.)