

**Meeting of the
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
2:00 to 3:30 p.m., Friday, July 11, 2003
Room 1, Methodist Building
100 Maryland Avenue, Washington, D.C.**

AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Legislation
3. Grassroots mobilization
4. Consultation: December 2003
 - Selection of date
 - Location
 - Finance
 - Program content
 - Resource persons
 - Invitations
 - Division of responsibility
5. Advocacy Days: March 2004
 - Program content
 - Resource persons
 - Recruitment
 - Division of responsibility
6. Next meeting

**Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Meeting of June 9, 2002 from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m.
Room 3, Methodist Building
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.**

AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Legislative issues
 - a. New nukes
 - b. Nuclear threat reduction
 - c. Other
3. Proposal for a fall strategy meeting
4. Global interfaith appeal
5. Next meeting

**Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament,
1:30 to 3:00 p.m. Friday, February 21
Conference Room 4, Methodist Building,
100 Maryland Avenue, NE,
Washington, DC.**

Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Nuclear weapons issues of 108th Congress -- David Culp
3. Cooperative threat reduction campaign -- Brian Finlay
4. Urgent Call -- Rich Killmer
5. Deep cuts in strategic weapons -- Howard Hallman
6. Other business

Title	FirstName	LastName	Address1	City	State	PostalCode
--------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------	--------------	-------------------

Budget
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

Activities within Methodism

Personnel -- mostly voluntary

Chair

Treasurer

Editor, Peace Leaf

Board members

Web consultant

\$1,200

Operations

Communications (phone, internet, postage)

Printing, photocopy

Supplies

Peace Leaf

Travel

Annual total

Interfaith Activities for Nuclear Disarmament

Personnel

Hallman (part time) 12 months @ \$3,000/mo.

\$36,000

Fringe benefits 15% of salary

5,400

41,400

Communications (phone, internet, postage)

3,000

Printing, photocopy

2,400

Supplies

600

Travel

2,600

One year total

\$50,000

Two year budget

\$100,000

Request to Ploughshares Fund:

\$25,000/year for a two year total of \$50,000

Dear Dr. Clements and Rev. Noll:

As things get worse in the quest for nuclear disarmament, the global faith community needs to speak more clearly and strongly than ever for the need to eliminate all nuclear weapons. With that in mind I have drafted the attached "An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". It calls upon all possessors of nuclear weapons (1) to unequivocally renounce the use of nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance and (2) to completely eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

Would the Conference of European Churches be willing to participate in further refinement of this Appeal, have your president be an initial signer, help get other signatures, and participate in follow-through activities? I am also approaching the World Council of Churches, National Council of Churches (USA), Canadian Council of Churches, and Pax Christi International initially. We will want to broaden the base as we proceed.

I write you as chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, a U.S.-based advocacy organization of laity and clergy (see our website, www.mupwj.org). I am also chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament (www.zero-nukes.org) whose website has linkage with the Conference of European Churches and your statements on nuclear disarmament at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#cec>. I played a leading role in drafting the statement that Dr. Konrad Raiser and Cardinal Danneels presented to the 1998 NPT PrepCom meeting (see <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#nptactnow>). I participated in the 2000 Brussels Consultation on Nuclear Issues.

The attached Appeal (which is open to further refinement) is divided into three parts:
(1) the basic appeal to be signed by religious leaders from around the globe,
(2) a set of recommendations to possessors of nuclear weapons, to be signed by representatives of religious organizations and to be used by delegations calling on the possessors, and
(3) background material of other statements and proposals by experts on certain aspects of nuclear disarmament.

My thinking is that the following schedule might be followed:

June -- get agreement from initial signers on language

July-August -- get signatures

September-October -- release of appeal and beginning of delegation visits

Although my experience is that the Vatican rarely signs onto joint statements, we could hope that the Holy See might make its own statement in favor of renunciation of nuclear weapons, such as in the annual presentation to the UN First Committee.

Release of the appeal would be followed by religious delegations calling upon the possessor states. This would build upon the experience of the 2000 Brussels Consultation on Nuclear Issues and the opposition to war against Iraq, which had remarkable global mobilization of the faith community.

I look forward to your response to these ideas.

Shalom,

Howard

CHRISTIANS AND WAR IN THE 21ST CENTURY: A Theological Analysis

**The Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy
Washington, D.C.**

Introduction.

The Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy was founded in 1976 to offer informed theological analysis of public policy issues. The Center is broadly ecumenical. Although its Board is not officially elected by religious bodies, its members include women and men who hold or have held positions of leadership in a number of Christian denominations and agencies (Protestant and Roman Catholic). The Center's work is designed to serve thoughtful Christians and their churches as they seek to express their faith in the public arena. Based in Washington, D.C., the Center has generally addressed policy issues facing American government. Nevertheless, it has been cognizant of the worldwide ramifications of many of those issues. The United States exists as a part of an intricately interwoven global community, and its unprecedented military and economic power within that community confer responsibilities that must be addressed with utmost care.

During the 1980s, the Churches' Center gave major attention to the threat of nuclear war, providing the principal analysis underlying the United Methodist Bishops' pastoral letter, *In Defense of Creation*. Other Center studies have focused upon such diverse matters as economic issues, environmental problems, refugee policy, health care, the 1998-99 presidential crisis, welfare policy, and policies on aging. A major current focus of the Center is the continuing danger posed by nuclear proliferation.

The end of the Cold War in the late 1980s provided significant relief from international tensions in a world polarized between the United States and the U.S.S.R. But as the world has moved into the 21st century, new military issues confront American policy and the international community. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 had a searing effect on American public opinion, with a heightened sense of vulnerability. President George W. Bush had wide support for a "war on terrorism." By and large, the rest of the world reacted with warm sympathy for America at this time of tragedy and with outrage at its perpetrators. Credible evidence pointed to the al Qaeda network and its leader, Osama bin Laden, as responsible for the attacks, and to the Taliban rulers of Afghanistan as providing them with sanctuary. Accordingly, there was also widespread national and international support for military action to remove the Taliban from power and to attempt at reconstitution of the government of Afghanistan.

During the spring and summer of 2002, the U.S. administration focused upon Iraq, alleging that its ruler Saddam Hussein had continued to flout a major condition of truce ending the 1991

Gulf War by proceeding with the development of chemical and biological and nuclear weapons of mass destruction. The administration sought to establish linkages between Iraq and the international network of terrorists, raising fears that such weapons might be placed in the hands of terrorists for further, and possibly even more terrible inhumanities. Policy statements by the President and other administration officials announced the readiness of the United States to attack Iraq militarily to pre-empt that country's possible use of weapons of mass destruction. The United States would be prepared to intervene with or without the approval of other nations or the United Nations—although it was argued that the legal basis for intervention already existed through previous UN actions. The President sought and gained a Congressional resolution approving such a unilateral intervention. But faced with substantial international criticism, he agreed to await the results of renewed inspections in Iraq by the United Nations. Meanwhile, there has been increased debate within the United States over the propriety of pre-emptive military actions, especially if conducted unilaterally.

Similar issues have been posed by other conflicted parts of the world. The international community struggled with the inhumanities of genocide and "ethnic cleansing" in Cambodia, the Balkans, and Central Africa. Do such situations warrant military interventions by other nations? Moreover, weapons of mass destruction have been developed successfully by India, Pakistan, and North Korea, each involved in tense international conflict. Could the world community successfully intervene in such areas to pre-empt possible use of such weapons?

Faced with these and other issues, Christians and their churches in the United States have had to focus in new ways on issues of war and peace. The following discussion is intended to help clarify the theological importance of those issues and how they might be resolved by Christians.

Historic Christian Attitudes Toward War

In his classic study of Christian thought on war,¹ Roland Bainton outlines three basic approaches: pacifism (the rejection of all war, often accompanied by withdrawal from public life), the just war (qualified acceptance of war as a sometime necessity, under certain circumstances and with defined constraints), and crusade (war waged against those identified as the enemies of God, with very little constraint). Crusade is easily dismissed theologically, although it has not infrequently expressed absolutist views of what is at stake in war. Pacifism and just war have been the attitudes most characteristic of serious Christian thought. But all three of these attitudes are displayed in the current Christian debates over war. Each has theological basis and ramifications.

Why Serious Christian Thought is "Almost" Pacifist

¹Roland H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960).

In a discussion of war, the great Swiss theologian Karl Barth summarizes his starting point in these words:

"All affirmative answers to the question [of war] are wrong if they do not start with the assumption that the inflexible negative of pacifism has almost infinite arguments in its favour and is almost overpoweringly strong."²

Barth elaborates this view by summarizing the horrors of war, against which the Christian conscience must protest. He writes,

even if the message of the Church cannot be the simple one of pacifism, it should surely have been a light in the dark world, at least to the extent of arousing and keeping alert a sense of the enormity of war at any rate amongst its own members and even beyond, and thus of constituting and interposing a strong restraining factor in this matter.... The primary and supreme task of Christian ethics in this matter is surely to recover and manifest a distinctive horror of war and aloofness from it."³

Barth was not a pacifist. He spoke of war as sometimes preferable to "a worthless peace."⁴ The operative word in his view is "almost." The arguments for pacifism are "almost overpoweringly strong."

Today there are Christians who, in good faith, find they cannot live with the word "almost." For, to them, war is simply and always wrong, always against everything they believe as Christians.

Even those who are not pacifist (undoubtedly a majority of Christians worldwide) should, like Barth, at least be seriously tempted by that "inflexible negative of pacifism." For war, set over-against major themes of Christian theology, is profoundly disturbing.

Christians consider the Bible to be the primary source of theological understanding. But our recognition of the gravity of war is not a simple matter of citing biblical texts. There are, of course, passages that can be cited in both Old and New Testaments that glorify even holy crusades: Such for example are the wars of conquest, wherein ancient Israelites were commanded by God not only to defeat, but to *exterminate*, their enemies—taken thus to be also the enemies of God. Thus, Joshua is depicted as exterminating the entire population of ancient Jericho, saving only the harlot Rahab and her family, who had given refuge to Hebrews, an act of genocide to be followed by a similar extermination of the inhabitants of Ai. (Joshua 6 and 8). Thus also, King Saul was commanded by God, through Samuel, to kill all of the Amalekites and harshly judged when he failed to carry out the entire order. (1 Samuel 15). The New Testament apocalypse of Revelation

²Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, III/4 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1961), 455.

³*Ibid.*, p. 456.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 463.

depicts the final battle of Armageddon in which the enemies of Christ will be destroyed in bloody combat. (Revelation 16) Against such passages there are of course the eloquent words of Isaiah concerning the yearning for peace amidst the follies of war and the teachings of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount concerning love for one's enemies and non-resistance to evil.

Serious Christian thought about war does well to forgo the selective use of particular biblical texts in support of one's views. Christian thought must be grounded in the Bible, but it struggles to discern there the deeper theological insights by which faithful Christians live. In respect to war, there are two particularly promising theological entry points.

The first is the basic biblical conception of the divine-human covenant, whereby human beings are affirmed by God and drawn into mutual love through community. The covenant is expressed biblically as God's steadfast love for humanity. It is the grace of God, expressed through Christ: God's continued love despite human undeserving. To Christians that grace is best revealed in the self-giving love of Christ, including especially his death on the cross. The deeply personal love of God is offered freely, despite human undeserving. Jesus referred to God in different ways, but the most compelling term is *abba*, or Father, a word in that culture expressing the most intimate kind of love. The love of God is what enables human trust at the most basic levels; it is what makes it possible for people to live out their faith in God by love of fellow humanity. On the basis of that faith and that love, we grasp the fundamental reality of our kinship with one another. Our lives intersect with the lives of everybody else on earth, our actions and our prayers have rippling effects far beyond our seeing or our knowing. Love thus understood is not merely sentimental; it is sturdy and dependable. Because of such deep trust in the love of God, it is possible for people to take great risks for the sake of realizing God's intended community of love and justice.

The second theological entry point is the doctrine of creation. The whole cosmos is God's creation. In all of its intricate beauty, creation is what enables the realization of human life and community. From the awestruck words of ancient poets contemplating the beauties of earth and skies to the creative ventures of modern scientists and explorers of outer space, human beings have sought to comprehend the grandeur that stretches beyond full understanding. And yet we know, by faith, that this cosmos is created as our home. We were not created as disembodied spirits; creation provides structure and identity; its wonders and its possibilities challenge us.

These doctrinal entry points, with all of their ramifications, stand in judgment against the harsh realities of war:

- The callous disregard for life, whether destroyed through individual slaughter or wholesale through the detached application of weapons of mass destruction;
- The pain and suffering of the injured, the foreshortening of human potentialities that, apart from war, might flower in the creative works of civilized community;
- The sorrow of families torn apart, of mothers and fathers deprived of their children, of children turned homeless and fatherless and motherless;

- The earth strewn with hidden landmines, promising continued death and injury long after a particular combat has been resolved;
- The seeds of bitterness, yielding hatred from generation to generation, borne by memories of evils suffered, forgetful of evils inflicted, ever the basis of yet new conflicts and new terrorism to be engaged by generations unborn;
- The destruction of God-given resources, inflicting wounds upon the nurturing environment of humankind and the rest of God's creatures;
- The special burdens generally placed upon the poor, often disproportionately placed in harm's way in the military services, often suffering the more severe economic losses;
- The self-righteousness of those caught up in the conflicting absolutes of war, wrong alike in the depiction of one's own goodness and the perceived evil of the enemy;
- Above all, the grief of God, who has created humankind for better than this, whose vineyard, in the words of Isaiah, was intended for grapes but instead has yielded wild grapes.

If we Christians are serious about the love of God, we must be very serious about the evils of war!

War as Response to Sin and as Expression of Sin

But another profound theological problem lurks in the shadows of all Christian talk about war: it is the reality of human sin. The very fact of war illustrates it; so also the persistence of other evils and injustices in our life as people. This, too, is an enduring part of the biblical drama. It is God's steadfast love and grace, to which human kind responds with rebellion. As put in Isaiah's striking metaphor, Israel is a lovely vineyard, planted with choice vines. The Lord "expected it to yield grapes, but it yielded wild grapes.... The vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the people of Judah are his pleasant planting; he expected justice, but saw bloodshed; righteousness, but heard a cry." (Isaiah 5) God's intentions for humankind, through creation and grace, are altogether loving and good. But humankind persistently seeks to find its own good in the ruin of God's intended good. That is the tragic reality of sin. It is exacerbated by *hubris*, the pride and arrogance by which people are led to false confidence in their own wisdom and goodness and to neglect the counsel of others.

The pacifist/anarchist tradition associated with the Russian novelist-philosopher, Leo Tolstoy assumes that human sin is caused by faulty institutions. Were it not for the coercive instruments of state power—the police, the prisons, the military—the innate goodness of human

nature would flower like a garden, with no more violence and evil-doing. Other pacifists, more realistic about sin, still hold that methods of non-violent resistance to evil can be counted upon to change the hearts of evil-doers. Many Christians who are not pacifists gratefully acknowledge the sometimes stunning success of non-violent efforts in societies as diverse as India, America, and South Africa. Gandhi's campaigns of non-violence to achieve India's independence from Great Britain were remarkably effective. Through the method of Satyagraha, thousands of disciplined and committed Indians, under his leadership, were able to effect change while minimizing legacies of bitterness and animosity—not to say, the minimization of actual bloodshed. Martin Luther King, Jr. and other American civil rights leaders achieved similar success in the struggle against racial segregation in this country. In Africa, leaders like Archbishop Desmond Tutu and President Nelson Mandela, using non-violent methods of reconciliation, avoided the huge blood bath that many predicted.

Such leaders were important, not only in action but in thought about its implications. They helped us *understand* why non-violence is effective and how deeply it is rooted in our fundamental values.

Still, some Christians who *are* pacifists are also skeptical that non-violent campaigns can be effective in every instance and in every respect. Dr. King, for instance, while deeply committed to the methods of non-violence was quite willing to go into Federal District Court to secure injunctions requiring the Federal government to provide physical protection for civil rights marches. When the final march from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama occurred in March, 1965, it was led by Dr. King but it was also with protection by highly visible and well-armed troops..

The great Mennonite theologian John Howard Yoder was fully persuaded that sin is deeply rooted in human nature. Yoder was totally committed to non-violence, but he harbored no illusions that it will always win over the perpetrators of injustice. We must, he wrote, trust that in the long run it is the way of God that will prevail. Thus, he held that *any* use of lethal force to be contrary to God's way of love, but without believing that alternatives, such as non-violent resistance, will always be immediately effective.

Many other Christians, who are not pacifists, are more concerned about the immense human consequences of evil in the short run and of our responsibility to deal with it. Police or military force cannot be counted upon to change hearts and minds, but it can sometimes restrain or deter people who are bent upon doing evil things. Twentieth century Christians wondered what the world would have been had there not been forcible resistance to Nazi power, while also pondering the question whether more timely use of power could have spared the lives of six million Jews in the demonic holocaust. More recently, Christians wonder whether a timely international intervention in Central Africa might have spared the lives of hundreds of thousands who were killed in the "ethnic cleansing" there. And whether anything short of military intervention could have "worked" in the Balkans. History does not disclose its alternatives, and yet the human cost of inaction—or of ineffective action—must be weighed alongside the costs of police and military actions taken.

So war, undertaken in response to sin, can be perceived by faithful Christians as necessary for the sake preserving something of God's intended human good that might otherwise be lost. But even those who hold this view must also acknowledge that war is often not only a consequence but also an expression of sin. Even when perceived as necessary, war invariably does violence to much that is good. War is always tragedy. Christians, contemplating war or the prospect of war, grieve over what might have been.

The "Just War" Tradition

Christians who cannot accept either the "inflexible negative" of pacifism or the pretensions of "crusade," are likely to identify themselves with the "just war" tradition. That way of viewing the possible moral necessity of war has a very long history. It is possibly anticipated when the apostle Paul voiced approval of the ruler's coercive power, in Romans 13. It appears in the thought of St. Augustine in the fourth and fifth centuries, a.d., in the work of St. Thomas Aquinas nearly a thousand years later, in the Renaissance theologian Francisco Suarez, and in a variety of 20th century thinkers. It has been appealed to consciously or unconsciously by more recent church leaders in response to the challenges of nuclear weaponry in the Cold War and by the dilemmas of more limited conflicts in situations like Vietnam, the Balkans, and the Middle East.

In brief, the "just war" tradition sets forth the conditions that should be met before Christians can, in good faith, approve of or participate in war. The following criteria are usually cited, in one form or another, as necessary conditions justifying resort to war and as guidelines to govern the conduct of war once it has been resorted to: (1) The cause itself must be just—to right a wrong, to defend against acts of aggression, to protect the innocent from injury, etc.⁵ (2) It must be undertaken by a legitimate authority, thus confirming and strengthening responsible political order. (3) It must be a last resort, undertaken only after every reasonable measure short of war has been found inadequate. (4) Its reasonably predictable consequences must be better than the consequences of not going to war. That is, the good attained or the evil resisted must be proportional to the evils of war itself. (5) There must be reasonable expectation of victory. (6) In the actual conduct of war, the belligerents must maintain "right intention," that is, always desiring peace with justice, never seeking unjust gains, not being corrupted by hatred, while remaining open to reconciliation. (7) The means used must be consistent with the just purpose—specifically, there can be no directly intended injury to non-combatants.

These are very exacting moral standards—always relevant but, unfortunately, all too rarely

⁵James F. Childress illustrates this criterion as a requirement that the war is "to protect the innocent from unjust attack, to restore rights wrongfully denied, or to reestablish a just order." He continues: "Because war involves overriding important prima facie obligations not to injure or kill others, it demands the most weighty and significant reasons." See his "Just-War Criteria," in Richard B. Miller, ed., *War in the Twentieth Century* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), p. 358.

observed. Four points must be emphasized whenever these standards are employed.

- First, the whole tradition presupposes the normative importance of Christian love, against which war is always tragic. War, therefore, is never in itself a good thing, never glorious, never beautiful. The positive force of the gospel is always offended by war, even when, because of the reality of sin, war can be considered a lesser evil than inaction. So the word "just" applied to war must not be taken as positive in itself. It may be more faithful to that tradition to speak of a "justified" war.
- Second, the "just war" tradition places the burden of proof against participation in war. The traditional criteria are standards that must be met if war is to be approved. The presumption is against, not for, war. No other presumption can take precedence over this, not even a presumption that one's own country is morally right in undertaking war. A 1983 pastoral letter from the U. S. Catholic Bishops makes the point eloquently: "The moral theory of the 'just-war' or 'limited-war' doctrine begins with the presumption which binds all Christians: we should do no harm to our neighbors; how we treat our enemy is the key test of whether we love our neighbor; and the possibility of taking even one human life is a prospect we should consider in fear and trembling."⁶
- Third, the criteria of "just war" cannot be applied with precision. They are best thought of as guidelines for mature Christian reflection, grounded in love, prayerfully responsive to God.
- Fourth, even when the standards have been met, after mature Christian reflection, those who engage in the awful means of war continue to recognize that their adversaries are also children of God, to be held up in loving prayer, even as their wrong-doing is resisted.

These points do not mean that military action, when truly necessary, should be undertaken half-heartedly. A military or police action can be undertaken vigorously and effectively, even as one grieves over its necessity. It is not necessary to hate those who must be restrained. Hate is contrary to the gospel of love and generally corrupting to the intentions of those who feel they must undertake war.

Good vs. Evil in Human Form

⁶ U.S. Catholic Bishops, "The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response," in Richard B. Miller, ed., *op. cit.*, p. 377.

One of the tragic consequences of war is the tendency to define one's adversaries as evil, without qualification. This absolutizing of evil carries overtones of an early and persistent theological tendency against which the mainstream of Christian thought has had to struggle. In the ancient world this appeared as the Manichaeian doctrine that both good and evil exist as absolute forces in the structure of the universe.⁷ The theological problem is that this tendency severely questions the ultimate power of the goodness of God.

Of course, evil does exist in human form. And, while all are sinners, it is undeniable that some are more evil than others. Nevertheless, when we make a sharp distinction between "good people" and "evil people," we risk exaggerating the goodness of the former and the wickedness of the latter. Nobody is perfectly good, nor is anybody absolutely evil. That is not to deny the urgency of counteracting evil, particularly when it manifests itself as injustice and oppression. But too sharp a distinction between good and evil people risks the conclusion that we can destroy evil by getting rid of evil people.

The biblical story of Noah and the flood illustrates the problem. God, according to the story, was dismayed by the persistence of evil on earth and resolved to get rid of it once and for all by drowning all humanity. Only the good Noah and his family, along with a reproducible pair of all other species, should be saved via the ark. All the bad people were destroyed. But that didn't get rid of evil on earth! Noah, himself, is depicted in the next chapter of Genesis as getting drunk and cursing his grandson. (Genesis 6-9)

An engaging rabbinic interpretation helps set the theological significance of the story for us. God, as the biblical narrative relates, did resolve to kill a humanity except for Noah and his family. But, seeing the immense suffering and death of all those people caused the compassionate God to grieve. And thus God resolved never again to try to deal with evil in that way. Instead, God would grant humanity freedom and seek to influence their behavior through love, not compulsion.

Evil, by any account, cannot be abolished through the destruction of sinful people. It may be necessary to use force to resist evil, but that should never be with the illusion that it can be destroyed—nor with the illusion that those who are doing the resisting are themselves altogether good. Thus, it was too simple for one President of the United States to refer to the former Soviet Union as the "evil empire" or for another President to identify three countries as an "axis of evil." No doubt that USSR and those three countries have embodied much injustice, oppression, and danger to world peace. But no other country, including our own, is altogether pure, and some good things can be said about even the worst of the nations on earth.

Moreover, when the evil of countries is absolutized, it is too easy to forget that large numbers of people in all countries are relatively innocent victims. They can be victims, both of oppression and of the violent actions taken to free them from oppression.

⁷St. Augustine was strongly attracted to Manichaeism early in his life but later concluded that its teaching was basically heretical.

Warlike actions should only be undertaken, therefore, with restraint and care.

Just Cause for War in the 21st Century

According to the just war tradition, warlike force can only be used to counter aggressive violence or oppression, and only when the evils are greater than those of the warlike force itself, and only when less violent means (such as non-violent resistance) would not be successful. Police protection generally meets these standards, provided the police use the least force compatible with the objective of protecting the community and its people. Revolution can meet these standards, provided it is against real tyranny and it is directed toward establishing institutions of justice. International war can meet these standards, provided it is a defense against aggression by other nations. When nations come to the defense of other nations, that, too, can meet these standards—as illustrated, perhaps, by British and French declarations of war against Nazi Germany after the latter invaded Poland in 1939. Historically, these have been commonplace circumstances, sometimes meeting, sometimes not meeting all of the standards posed by just war doctrine. The larger problem presented in the 20th century by the Cold War was whether thermonuclear war—and preparations for such war—could ever meet the exacting tests of just war doctrine. In its analysis of this problem for the United Methodist Bishops, the Churches' Center discussed the very great perils of nuclear war, raising the question whether nuclear war or even a deterrent nuclear capability could be compatible with the deeper meanings of just war doctrine.

That problem has not evaporated with the ending of the Cold War, since several countries have now acquired the capacity to deploy nuclear weapons. But four additional issues must now be considered with great urgency.

Terrorism

The first of these questions is how a people are to respond to terrorism. The attempt to change people's minds by fear of unprovoked acts of violence, striking suddenly without warning, is not altogether new. But in recent decades it has taken on new dimensions. The destruction of the World Trade Center towers (and the attack on the Pentagon) in September 11, 2001, brought a new sense of urgency to the American people. The use of suicide bombings in Israel and elsewhere has proved very difficult to combat. The transmission of deadly Anthrax spores through ordinary envelopes delivered by unsuspecting postal workers to unsuspecting recipients, while not widespread, cast a cloud of anxiety across the whole nation. Two snipers were able to spread fear to a whole region by striking out of the blue with high-powered rifles.

Terrorism thus wages war on whole societies. It is and has been a reality in many parts of

the world, sometimes sanctioned and even implemented by respectable powers.⁸ Even though it cannot strike everywhere, it seems able to strike anywhere, without warning and with deadly effect. Against this threat, massive armaments of powerful societies seems to have little effect. It, more than mobilized forces of a visible adversary, is effective against the highly industrialized and very wealthy "first world" countries of the 21st century.

Use of police and military forces to counter this threat clearly meet the most important tests of the Just War tradition—that is, when such force can be used effectively and proportionately. Given the fears engendered by terrorism, there is always a certain risk that the means used to combat its dangers will erode the mutual respect and trust by which every civilized people must live. For instance, great care must be taken lest basic rights—such as freedom of speech and press and usual judicial rights—not be damaged. The ways in which the struggle against terrorism is pursued can have the ironic effect of leading to more terrorism and to more insecurity, while undermining values central to the community of love and justice which our faith proclaims. Moreover, we all need to be aware that political fanaticism and demagoguery thrive on the fears of an intimidated people. Christians and other people of faith can contribute to a higher level of maturity in a society's response to terrorism.

Still, the dangers are real and must be confronted realistically. That includes effective police work and, in some instances, military action.

But we must bear in mind that terrorism itself is largely motivated by fanaticism. That is clearly true of terrorist actions that are suicidal, like suicide bombers. If the number of people attracted to such fanaticism has increased in recent years perhaps it could diminish in the future. The national image of a great and powerful nation is not irrelevant to the degree to which it provokes hatred, nor is the kindling of hope unrelated to the actions of alienated people. Christians of all people should be at work in those hope-engendering activities that help to remove the fuel from the fires of terrorism. That is not a substitute for effective police and military response, but it is a necessary addition.

Pre-emptive War

Then there is the question whether nations should undertake war in order to prevent *anticipated* acts of aggression. The question is not altogether new, as the consequences of military mobilizations prior to World War I illustrate. It appears in a new form with the assertion by American leadership that it might find it necessary to invade Iraq to force that country to cease production of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, biological, chemical) and to destroy any such

⁸Even the word "terrorism" is clouded by ambiguity. People perceived as "terrorists" by some may be viewed as "freedom fighters" by others! Still, the underlying *methods* of terrorism, seeking to influence the will of people by fear of unprovoked acts of violence, are a disturbing reality of our times.

weapons already on hand. These restraints were a condition of peace concluding the Gulf War of 1991, in which Iraq was thoroughly defeated and in which America and its allies could presumably have continued until the regime of President Saddam Hussein was overthrown. In 2002, prompted in part by increased dangers of global terrorism, the Bush Administration concluded that war alone would succeed in removing the danger of future Iraqi use of weapons of mass destruction.

The just war ethic has historically taken a dim view of pre-emptive war. Some ethicists rule it out categorically, presumably because it is inherently vulnerable to manipulation and fraud, and is resistant to being regulated by moral principle. The concept of pre-emption is rightly seen as a very dangerous commodity because it undercuts the principle of nonintervention. However, some ethicists concede that under immediate and grave threats when waiting to receive the first blow in a battle, a party may strike first as an act of self defense. Even under these circumstances, pre-emption should be seen as a rarely invoked exception, not something to be normalized.

The argument employed by the Bush administration in support of pre-emptive war is embodied in its September 2002 document, "National Security Strategy of the United States." It contains a truly radical position that lacks all moral nuance. In effect the administration upended both international law and the just war ethic by claiming an unrestricted right to attack enemies pre-emptively whenever and wherever it should see fit, without moral or legal restraint. The document asserts that the United States must adapt the concept of imminent threat to the capabilities and objectives of today's adversaries. But it offers no criteria to replace the old imminent threat standard. It asserts that we will pre-emptively strike our enemies under any conditions we dictate. This new doctrine is so radical in its scope that it obliterates the old legal and moral standards that attempt to rein in pre-emption, that is the concept of the necessity of an immediate and grave threat.

This doctrine is not a morally defensible position. If it were to become normalized in the international system, it would lead to significantly more bloodshed around the world. In several conflicted areas, such as South Asia and the Korean peninsula, both sides could make plausible similar arguments. Furthermore, it is hypocritical for one country to claim such a right of intervention for itself, without extending it to all nation states.

In U.S. history there are precedents of pre-emption, such as the Mexican War (hardly an apt illustration of justified war), as well as precedents of effective restraint, such as in the Cuban missile crisis and tensions with the Soviet Union in the early 1950s.

Even where the restraint of imminent threat is still in place, pre-emptive action carries a heavy burden of proof. If it is true that another nation (1) has or likely will have weapons of mass destruction, and (2) has clear intent to use them, then is it not reasonable to act militarily to remove that danger?

In response, we must remember that war itself is destructive. Even the most sophisticated weapons, such as the "smart bombs" and missiles capable of striking selected targets with precision can cause what is euphemistically termed "collateral damage." Non-combatants are killed or wounded who simply are in the wrong place at the wrong time. Bombs strike targets

unintentionally (such as the unintended bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade during the Kosovo conflict). When utilized on the battlefield, anti-personnel bombs spread lethal death and anguish across many acres of land. If the United States possesses overwhelming force, as generally supposed, that translates into the uses of such weapons. Is it permissible under just war doctrine for such force to be used pre-emptively? Bearing the enormity of human suffering in mind, this must bear a correspondingly heavy burden of proof. Nor, in calculating this cost, is it theologically permissible to consider only that deaths and injuries suffered by those who embark on pre-emptive war. Christian love embraces all people, including enemies. Included among those hurt and killed will also be enemy soldiers serving under duress and civilians who fall victim to unintended action.

In meeting this heavy burden of proof, factual evidence is correspondingly important. Does the potential adversary actually have those weapons of mass destruction? Is there credible evidence of further development of such weapons? Is the intention to use such weapons very clear? Are there other ways, short of war, of protecting other countries against this danger?

International Interventions in Oppressive Nations

The existence of oppressive regimes poses more difficult dilemmas for the global community. When is it proper for other countries, alone or in concert, to intervene to "set things right"? There are sound reasons why this should not be a common practice, not least the temptations to substitute one oppression for another. But what about the known instances of genocide (or "ethnic cleansing"), such as we have witnessed in the Balkans and Central Africa? What about situations in which conflicting forces have fought each other to a stand-still, but without resolution as the killing keeps going on, such as the world still sees in Israel/Palestine and has recently pondered in West Africa?

Such painful realities remind us that inaction has consequences. Might hundreds of thousands of murdered people in Rwanda and Burundi still be alive if the global community had bestirred itself to intervene? Might more thousands of people in the Balkans have died if the world had not (finally) intervened there? We cannot know for sure.

And it yet seems apparent that a central question facing the world community in the 21st century will be exactly when such interventions ought to be undertaken. Clearly, it cannot be whenever there is any sign of oppression, for most countries in the world have *some* of that. Whether oppression has become so egregious as to warrant military intervention by outsiders is doubtless a judgment call, but sometimes the call may need to be made.

Here, the traditional just war criteria can also be helpful. For example, the acts of oppression by rulers against their own people (or by one body of people against another) are not dissimilar in moral effect from the attack of one country upon another. Moreover, the just war criterion of last resort can also apply, reminding us that there may be ways short of war to end the oppression. Then, there should be some prospect of success.

But the unwillingness to intervene should not be based upon falsely absolutizing national sovereignty. Behind most objections to interventions by the international community there lies the assumption that self-determination is a fundamental right of all nations. There are problems with this.

In the first place, there is the question *who* speaks and acts for the nation in determining the course of its "self-determination." When a regime is repressive that almost invariably means that some of the nation's people are excluded from the nation's self-determination. If one were to speak of the "self-determination" of Germany during the Nazi period, were Jewish Germans included? Sometimes a majority of people within a nation are oppressing a minority; sometimes it is a small power elite oppressing the vast majority. But almost always, when there is cause for intervention in behalf of human rights, "self-determination" is a mockery of those whose basic rights are being denied.

In the second place, it helps to remember that the nation-state system itself is a relatively recent development in world history. The modern system developed essentially within the last thousand years, and in any currently recognizable form only half that length of time. True, even in the absence of nations as we know them, political sovereignty has existed in *some* form from time immemorial—from tribes and city states to various kinds of kingdoms and great empires. Which of these enjoys special status theologically? The answer is, probably none. When the Bible refers to "nation" it is often a pejorative term for peoples in defiance of God, even in the case of the chosen people of Israel in Hebrew scriptures. Most of the nations of the world today were utterly unknown in ancient times.

In the third place, developments over the past century have created global political problems that cannot be handled effectively by traditional models of balance of power in a nation-state system. The point was made by Pope John XXIII in his widely appreciated encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*. While not condemning the nation-state system as such, Pope John questioned its adequacy in coping with newly emergent problems. Referring to the traditional Roman Catholic doctrine of *Subsidiarity*, in accordance with which problems should be dealt with at the most immediate or local level possible, he went on to observe that in our time some urgent problems can only be handled effectively at the global level:

"In the past rulers of states seem to have been able to make sufficient provision for the universal common good through the normal diplomatic channels, or by top-level meetings and discussions, treaties and agreements; by using, that is, the ways and means suggested by the natural law, the law of nations, or international law.

"In our own day, however, mutual relationships between states have undergone a far-reaching change. On the one hand, the universal common good gives rise to problems of the utmost gravity, complexity and urgency—especially as regards the preservation of the security and peace of the whole world. On the other hand, the rulers of individual nations, being all on an equal footing, largely fail in their efforts to achieve this, however much they multiply their meetings and their endeavours to

discover more fitting instruments of justice. And this is no reflection on their sincerity and enterprise. It is merely that their authority is not sufficiently influential.

"We are thus driven to the conclusion that the shape and structure of political life in the modern world, and the influence exercised by public authority in all the nations of the world are unequal to the task of promoting the common good of all peoples."⁹

The preservation of at least some minimum level of human rights would seem to be among those urgent human needs that cannot always be met within the limitations presented by the current nation-state system—at least not when national sovereignty is considered absolute under all circumstances. The existence of terrible oppression and massive genocide are obvious illustrations of situations in which international intervention may be morally required.

But by whom? Under what auspices?

War Initiated Unilaterally

There is thus the further question whether a war, otherwise justified, can be conducted by one nation. Obviously, a people who have been attacked and whose plea for support from the international community has not been heeded can, in accordance with just war doctrine, defend themselves. Such a people are not, however, the initiators. They are responding to an injury inflicted upon them.

War should never be initiated by any nation except for the gravest of reasons. When there appears to be sufficient basis to initiate hostilities, it appears all the more important for this to be done, not by a single country, but by the broader international community.

That is partly because the perspective of every country is bound to be somewhat limited. Even the largest and most powerful of nations can be blind to important aspects of a situation that can be offered by others. Every country's perspective is bounded to some extent by its own history and culture. The wider international community can help correct for this limited vision. When other countries have serious doubts about the wisdom of initiating war, those uncertainties must be weighed carefully.

Moreover, the involvement of the wider international community can help correct for the tendency of nations to seek their own narrow interests through war. If war is ever to be justified theologically, it cannot be for the sake of narrow interests but for the sake of the good of all.

⁹*Pacem in Terris*, in *Proclaiming Justice and Peace: Papal Documents from Rerum Novarum through Centesimus Annus* (Mystic, Conn.: Twenty-Third Publications, 1991), pp. 148-51, paragraphs 133-135.

Furthermore, when nations initiate war unilaterally their capacity to succeed is limited to their own resources and perseverance. The broader the coalition, the greater the prospect of success, and quite possibly the greater the ability to limit the damage inflicted by war.

And also, the wider the international involvement, the more likely it is that the war will be accepted as necessary and, therefore, the easier it will be to contain the residues of hostility and bitterness that always accompany war. If war is ever to be waged, it must be for the sake of a better peace. The positive work of peacemaking can scarcely be done by a single nation, no matter how justified its cause appears to be. The legacies of war are so generally tragic that even the wider international community finds it difficult to bind up the wounds.

Again, even the widest coalition of nations should initiate war only for the gravest of reasons. But the willingness of such a coalition to go to that extreme is an important test of whether those reasons are sufficient.

Toward a New World Order

At the time of the Gulf War, President George H. W. Bush proclaimed as one of its central objectives the establishment of a "new world order." The term was not, in fact, original with him. It had been used by churches in the midst of World War II as they contemplated the basis for peace and justice in the post-war world. The Methodist Bishops launched an ambitious program, The Crusade¹⁰ for a New World Order, mobilizing millions of Methodists in support of global cooperation and collective security.¹¹ Its leadership sought to avoid the tragic post World War I American mistake of not joining the League of Nations. Cooperating with other denominations of the Federal Council of Churches, the Methodists endorsed the "Six Pillars of Peace," a program broadly supporting an international organization, including control of military establishments everywhere and providing for economic cooperation. Broadly speaking, the churches' goals anticipated the organization of the United Nations as an instrument of peace and cooperative programs of various kinds.

It was possible in subsequent decades for the United Nations and related agencies to accomplish a great deal, but until the 1990s its efforts to establish dependable institutions of collective military security were constantly frustrated by the Cold War conflict between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. The end of the Cold War raised anew the possibility that the United Nations might

¹⁰The word "Crusade" was used generically and carried no implication glorifying the Medieval crusading wars against Muslims in the Holy Land. Indeed, the Crusade for a New World Order was specifically opposed to imperialism.

¹¹See Walter G. Muelder, *Methodism and Society in the Twentieth Century* (NY and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1961), pp. 186-195.

be an effective peace-maker at the global level.

Implicit in the project of a New World Order is recognition that national identity is finally a lesser claim upon us than the humanity all peoples have in common. Nations and empires have existed almost throughout recorded history, and yet the contemporary forms are relatively recent. Often, in the past four or five centuries, nations have served the common good of their people. Historically, in such major European countries as Germany, Italy, France, and the United Kingdom, the achievement of national unity helped overcome regional conflicts, feudalistic oppression, and economic inefficiencies. And yet, the rise of nationalism also brought with it murderous wars and new forms of political idolatry.

In recent years, the quest by groups to achieve separate national sovereignty has been the source of further bloody conflict. The fact of such movements is a reminder that the human and civil rights of ethnic minorities are a precondition of social peace. But it is not necessary for every people to achieve national statehood. Indeed, the vision of a New World Order includes recognition that national sovereignty itself can never be absolute. No nation, not even the world's remaining super-power, has an unlimited capacity for self-determination. Nationhood in the present world situation is still a protection against imperialism in all its forms, but the greater task of our time is to forge political institutions at the global level that are capable of protecting the human rights of all people.

The Historical Role of the United States of America

It is not yet clear whether that dream can be fulfilled. Much depends upon the United States of America, the world's one remaining super-power. This country does not have unlimited power, but its military and economic dominance in the world at the beginning of the 21st century can be a great positive force for good for the whole global community, or it can make things much more difficult. It is not yet clear which way America will go.

We are reminded of prophetic words written by the Swedish sociologist Gunnar Myrdal as he concluded the monumental study of American race relations during World War II.

[Americans] stand warmheartedly against oppression in all the world. When they are reluctantly forced into war, they are compelled to justify their participation to their own conscience by insisting that they are fighting against aggression and for liberty and equality. America feels itself to be humanity in miniature.... The main trend of its history is the gradual realization of the American Creed.¹²

Shorn of triumphalistic implications, such a statement is a reminder that America does have a tradition of higher values. Those values have deep, though not exclusive, rootage in Christian

¹²Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma* (NY: Harper and Brothers, 1944), p. 1021.

faith, for they express a commitment to mutual caring, equality, and the value of every person. But never in the history of this country have the higher values gone unchallenged by baser forms of arrogance and selfishness. Myrdal interpreted the "dilemma" in American race relations as the question whether the higher values of the "American Creed" would prevail over the demons of racism. He thought they would, but it would not come automatically.

Do we face a similar "dilemma" today? Will American power serve the yearning of humankind for peace and justice? Or will it yield to the temptation toward newer forms of national dominance? Perhaps the answer to that will also depend upon the faithfulness of people of good will, including Christians.

In the period immediately following September 11, 2001, there was an impressive outpouring of sympathy for this country from all over the world, including the predominantly Muslim lands. That included a measure of support for American efforts to combat terrorism at home and abroad. Even the military actions in Afghanistan enjoyed broad international support.

Much of the support was dissipated through 2002 and 2003 by the U. S. Administration's intervention in Iraq—especially its announced intention to make war pre-emptively and with or without broad international participation. Thoughtful Americans, including many religious leaders, pondered whether we had squandered the moral high ground and the opportunity to lead the world toward a new world order based upon mutual security with increased peace with justice for the whole global community. About the oppressive rule of Saddam Hussein there could be little doubt. The capacity of that regime to use weapons of mass destruction internationally remained unclear; it was even more doubtful that that regime had serious ties to international terrorist organizations, especially al Qaeda. Thoughtful Christians have had grave misgivings about the buildup toward war. The factual truth of claims and counter-claims will become evident through time. There remains a serious question whether there might have been another way to achieve the desired goals short of war.

Americans need to think long thoughts about the decades ahead. Will we slip imperceptibly from the necessary tasks of deterrence—detering the hand of those who would make war against innocent peoples—to a world in which we ourselves will seek to dominate? Will we move from empathy for the sufferings of others to the creation of empire for ourselves? Have we overreached in recent months and years? Will we have invited further instabilities in an already unstable world for the years to come? We pray not; we cannot know for sure. We know that the world will be better the more committed we are to the tasks of positive peace-making and the wise uses of power.

For Christians, and all other persons of good will, the issues and the opportunities remain open. We have the continuing task of reminding our fellow citizens and the national government that war is always a last resort, to be entered into only when it is very clear that the inevitable suffering will be offset by greater good. Our counsel to the nation, and to the nations, must include a sober reminder that God has made us for community, one with another, transcending all of the barriers that human sin can erect. But this admonition is accompanied by the Christian hope: God

is always with us in our efforts to give substance to the intended community of love and justice, taking the small contributions of each of us and weaving them into a tapestry of good that is far beyond our imagining.

Persons to invite to Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament

Signers of letter of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Alliance of Baptists
American Baptist Churches
American Friends Service Committee
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America
Church of the Brethren General Board
Church Women United
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy
Conference of Major Superiors of Men
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship
Disciples Peace Fellowship
Episcopal Church, USA
Episcopal Peace Fellowship
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Evangelicals for Social Action
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Jewish Peace Fellowship
Marianist, New York Province, Office of Justice & Peace
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns
Mennonite Central Committee
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
F. Francis Murphy Justice and Peace Initiative
Muslim Peace Fellowship
National Council of Churches
 Washington Office
NETWORK: A National Social Justice Lobby
Pax Christi USA
Presbyterian Church, USA

Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities
Sisters of Mercy of the Americas
Sister of St. Joseph of Peace
Sojourners
Unitarian Universalist Association
United Church of Christ, Justice & Witness Ministries
United Methodist Council of Bishops
United Methodist General Board of Church & Society
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops *
World Peacemakers
Also
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
Fellowship of Reconciliation
Buddhist Peace Fellowship
Lutheran Peace Fellowship
A Muslim organization

To invite

Rev. Stan Hastey or Jeanette Holt
Dwight Lundgren, Curtis Ramsey-Lucas
Bal Pinguel, Joseph Gerson
Jim Louder
?
?
Rich Killmer, Barbara Green
Stan De Boe (?)

Joel Heim
Martha Gardiner, Maureen Shea
Jackie Lynn
Mark Brown + headquarters staff
Ron Sider
Joe Volk, David Culp
Murray Polner

Marie Dennis (?)
Daryl Byler
Howard Hallman

?
Bob Edgar or Tony Kireopoulos
Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Brian Hinman
Anne Curtis
Dave Robinson, Jean Stokan
Eleanor Giddings Ivory, Catherine Gordon
 + headquarters staff
?
David Saperstein, new intern (?)
Andrew Greenblatt

Duane Shank
Rob Cavanaugh, Larry Egbert
Lois Powell, Pat Conover, Ron Stief (?)

Jim Winkler, Jaydee Hanson
Jerry Powers
Bill Price

Carol Cosby (?)
Ibrahim Ramey

Glen Gersmehl
?

Initial Invitation List for Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament

Alliance of Baptists	Rev. Stan Hastey
American Baptist Churches	Dwight Lundgren, Curtis Ramsey-Lucas
American Friends Service Committee	Mary Lord, Joseph Gerson, Matlack successor
Church of the Brethren, Washington Office	Phil Jones (after August 1)
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)	Chris Hobgood
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy	Rich Killmer, Barbara Green
Episcopal Church, USA	Martha Gardner, Maureen Shea
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America	Mark Brown
Friends Committee on National Legislation	Joe Volk, David Culp
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns	Marie Dennis
Mennonite Central Committee	Daryl Byler
Methodists United for Peace with Justice	Howard Hallman
National Council of Churches Washington Office	Bob Edgar, Tony Kireopoulos
NETWORK: A National Social Justice Lobby	Brenda Girton-Mitchell, Brian Hinman
Pax Christi USA	Kathy Thorton or Anne Curtis
Presbyterian Church, USA	Dave Robinson, Jean Stokan
Reformed Church in America	Elenora Giddings Ivory, Catherine Gordon
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism	Rev. John Paarlberg
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities	David Saperstein, Barbara Weinstein
Sojourners	Andrew Greenblatt
Unitarian Universalist Association	Duane Shank
United Church of Christ, Justice & Witness Ministries	Rob Cavanaugh, Larry Egbert
United Methodist General Board of Church & Society	Lois Powell, Pat Conover, Ron Stief
U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops	Jim Winkler, Jaydee Hanson
	Jerry Powers

Organizations and persons to considered for second round of invitations

State and local ecumenical, interfaith organizations	List to be developed by Rich Killmer
Some headquarters staff from above list	
Church Women United	
Conference of Major Superiors of Men	Stan De Boe
Leadership Conference of Women Religious	
World Conference of Religious for Peace	Arun Elhance
Muslim organizations	
African American denominations	
Baptist Peace Fellowship	Jim Louder
Buddhist Peace Fellowship	
Disciples Peace Fellowship	Joel Heim
Episcopal Peace Fellowship	Jackie Lynn
Evangelicals for Social Action	Ron Sider
Fellowship of Reconciliation	Ibrahim Ramey
Jewish Peace Fellowship	Murray Polner
Lutheran Peace Fellowship	Glen Gersmehl
Muslim Peace Fellowship	
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship	
World Peacemakers	Bill Price

Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament

Nuclear danger. The risk that nuclear weapons might be used is greater now than it was 20 years ago when the Cold War was still at its height. U.S. and Russia missiles remain on a high state of alert. In Russia insufficient effort is being made to protect the large stockpile of nuclear weapons and missile material from acquisition by terrorists organizations. In the United States the Bush Administration wants to develop new nuclear weapons and has adopted policies providing for expanded roles for nuclear weapons. The international non-proliferation regime is in jeopardy. (See section on "The Challenge" for further explanation.)

Call for consultation. To respond to this challenge the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is calling a one day Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament. The **purpose** is to develop legislative, education, and state and local organizing strategies on nuclear weapons issues. The Consultation will be held in Washington, D.C. on Capitol Hill in late November or early December. The Interfaith Committee is a Washington-based coalition of religious organizations working together for nuclear disarmament.

Participants will be 35 to 50 persons from denominations, faith groups, religious peace fellowships, and other religious associations working for nuclear disarmament. They will include heads and other staff of Washington offices, headquarters staff not in D.C, religious staff at the United Nations, and persons from state and local ecumenical and interfaith organizations.

Program. The morning will consist of substantive seminars on key issues with resource persons drawn from civil sector organizations with expertise on the subject. Topics will include

- 1) Quest for new nuclear weapons (mini-nukes, bunker buster, renewed testing)
- 2) Need for far greater U.S.-Russian nuclear disarmament, such as de-alerting and deeper cuts in strategic weapons
- 3) Expansion of nuclear threat reduction program
- 4) Nuclear non-proliferation in the Middle East and Asia

There will be a luncheon speaker from the faith community to challenge and inspire.

The afternoon will be devoted to development of strategy and tactics, including

- a) Analysis of political dynamics, led by a senator or a congressional staff person
- b) Legislative strategy
- c) Education strategy
- d) Grassroots strategy

Finance. The main expenses will be the cost of a meeting place and the luncheon. An effort will be made to cover these expenses by contributions from the main participating organizations. The alternative is to have a registration fee that includes lunch.

Follow up. The sessions on legislative, education and grassroots strategy will provide direction for follow-up activities. A proposal is pending to include nuclear disarmament as a track in **Ecumenical Advocacy Days for Global Peace and Justice**, scheduled for March 5-8, 2004 in the Washington, D.C. area. The four major topics considered in the Consultation would be encompassed with special attention to matters that are on the active agenda of Congress. This would provide an opportunity to bring state and local activists to Washington and to follow through with strengthened grassroots action for nuclear disarmament.

The Challenge

During the past four years there has been more retrogression than progress in the quest for nuclear disarmament. This is an affront to the faith community which strongly favors the elimination of nuclear weapons.

In October 1999 the U.S. Senate rejected ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). During the 2000 presidential campaign George W. Bush expressed his opposition to the CTBT, though he promised to observe the testing moratorium for the time being. He renewed this position after becoming president. In December 2001 President Bush fulfilled another campaign promise by withdrawing from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, which inhibited the development of national missile defense. A strong effort is being to deploy a missile defense system in Alaska by October 2004.

In January 2002 the Pentagon completed its Nuclear Posture Review. While calling for reduction in nuclear strategic weapons, it envisioned keeping large numbers in reserve. It also projected expanded roles for nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states and the possibility of developing new types of nuclear weapons and the resumption of testing.

In May 2002 the United States and Russia agreed to the Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty (also known as the Moscow Treaty) that provides for the reduction of U.S. and Russian strategic weapons to 1,700 to 2,200 each by 2012. However, there was no reduction schedule, no limitation on multi-warhead missiles as found in the previous START II agreement, no procedures for verification, and no provision for dismantlement of warheads and delivery vehicles taken out of service.

In September 2002 the Bush Administration released a National Security Strategy document articulating the doctrine of preemptive attack on "emerging threats before they are fully formed." This was followed in December with a National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction that endorsed unilateral preemption by U.S. military forces and indicated that nuclear weapons might be used against biological and chemical weapons.

In 2003 the Bush Administration has successfully pushed Congress to remove restrictions on research for small nuclear weapons and to authorize funds for bunker-buster warheads. The Bush Administration is also preparing nuclear test site for possible resumption of testing.

Throughout this period one area of success has been the cooperative threat reduction program (sometimes referred to as the Nunn-Lugar program). This effort has provided financial and technical support to Russia to dismantle and destroy nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. Not only does this reduce the danger of nuclear attack by Russia on the United States, but it also makes nuclear warheads and fissile material more secure from falling into the hands of terrorist organizations. However, this program is underfunded in terms of need and potential progress.

The challenge to the faith commitment is to reverse the negative trends and to strengthen the quest for the elimination of nuclear weapons by supporting strong nuclear disarmament measures.

June 30, 2003

For further information contact Howard W. Hallman, chair, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at 301 896-0013 or at hhallman@mupwj.org.

Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament
Wednesday, December 3, 2003
9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.
Place to be announced

Sponsored by
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

9:00 - 9:30 a.m.	Registration Informal conversation, coffee+ available
9:30 - 12 noon	ISSUES SEMINAR
9:30	Quest for New Nuclear Weapons Mini-nukes, bunker buster, pit production, testing
10:05	US-Russian de-alerting, deeper cuts
10:40	Break
10:50	Nuclear Threat Reduction Program
11:25	Nuclear Non-proliferation: Middle East and Asia
12:00 noon	LUNCHEON Featured speaker
1:30 - 5:00 p.m.	DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIES FOR 2004
1:30	Political Dynamics in 2004
2:10	Break
2:20	Legislative strategy
3:00	Break
3:10	Education strategy
3:50	Break
4:00	Grassroots strategy
4:40	Summing up
5:00	Adjournment

Pax Christi International

The International President Patriarch Michel SABBAH (Palestine) presides over the International Council and the Executive Committee, and represents the movement on an international level.

Marie Dennis, VP

Statement by H.E. Archbishop Diamuid Martin, Head of Delegation of the Holy See to 2003 NPT PrepCom meeting
<http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/npt/2003statements/HOLY.pdf>

Conference of European Churches

The General Secretary is the Rev. Dr. Keith Clements. The Associate General Secretary and Director of the Church and Society Commission is the Rev. Rüdiger Noll.

Geneva (General Secretariat)

PO Box 2100,
150, route de Ferney,
CH- 1211 Geneva 2
Tel: +41 22 791 61 11
Fax: +41 22 791 62 27
E-mail: cec@cec-kek.org

Editorial: Listen To The Nuclear Chatter

Larry Seaquist
The Christian Science Monitor
April 3, 2003
(for personal use only)

As we immerse ourselves in the cacophony of military operations in Iraq, let us not forget to keep an ear cocked for the dangerous nuclear wrangling in the background.

Apparently wishing to put a lid on the Korean problem while dealing with Saddam Hussein, the Pentagon last month made a show of flying two dozen nuclear bombers forward to the Pacific island of Guam. The North Koreans responded promptly, shooting an old, nonnuclear missile on a "test flight" into their own coastal waters. They'd done the same two weeks earlier on the news of the US "warning order" telling the bombers to get ready. By twice choosing not to lob a newer weapon over the heads of the Japanese on a trajectory toward the US as they had last year, the North Korean regime seemed to suggest a degree of restraint. This week, they fired yet another missile, perhaps intending a fresh show of defiance.

Another nuclear duel is under way in South Asia. After inching back from last year's near-war mobilization, India and Pakistan reheated that confrontation a few days ago with matching "test missiles."

Welcome to the world of nuclear signaling. Welcome back, that is. The art of keeping the peace by threatening nuclear obliteration fell into happy disuse when the Soviet Union disappeared. At the time, it seemed the "nukes" themselves would become obsolete. Wrong.

So far, the new voices in these "conversations" are few: North Korea, India, Pakistan, Israel - the latter notable for keeping mum. But each lives in a region where local threats pull the great powers into the discussion. The trouble is that none of the members of the nuclear club - including the nuclear Goliath, America - has any experience in today's varieties of atomic tête-à-têtes.

Even among the old hands of the cold war, nuclear signaling was fraught with misunderstanding. Among today's rookie players, one side's nuance could well be gibberish to the other. We have no real understanding of what North Koreans intend with their bluster or how they interpret our gestures. Indeed, we don't know for certain who is in charge in North Korea. We can only be sure that these isolated men, deliberately starving their own people while they parade a huge army, don't think the way we do.

The pattern of nuclear proliferation is shifting, and with it the dynamics of deterrence. Formerly we worried about countries like Iraq and Iran making their weapons from scratch. But in the future, we'll deal also with shadowy networks of terrorists who buy their weapons on the underground market. Where does a superpower fly a squadron of bombers if it wants to grab the attention of a covert terrorist organization like Al Qaeda, with scattered cells all over the globe? At heart, nuclear signaling is much more than just writing diplomatic notes on a warhead. By threatening catastrophe, each party hopes to extract a measure of safety from the mutual standoff. That's the theory. But instead of calming the situation, nuclear threats ricocheting among today's players may lead one of the smaller, inexperienced parties to panic and shoot.

Regardless of who pulls the trigger or why, a nuclear detonation would be a disaster. A mushroom cloud rising over the dead in any city could thrust civilization into an era of unlimited violence just when bio-weapons are creeping into our mass-killing capabilities. Clearly, humankind must steer in the other direction, toward managing disagreements with less deadly methods.

That's long-term. But how ought we handle the real nuclear threats zinging around right now? Piling on more threats isn't the answer. Flying nuclear bombers toward leaders barricaded in a small country may be macho; it's also escalatory and militarily meaningless should they and their warheads be hidden. With the most to lose, Americans might find themselves more deterred by North Korea's handful of nukes than the North Koreans are by America's thousands of nukes. As it is, the bomber gambit probably stiffened the North Koreans. Hearing murmurs from some in Washington that "you're next" after the US invasion of Iraq, the North Koreans may be thinking they need even more warheads to hold off the US.

The new White House language of preemptive strike disregards a bit of cold-war wisdom that still applies: Nothing escalates like the prospect of preemption. The cold-war nuclear confrontation didn't become really stable until intense, detailed negotiations gradually capped each side's escalation fears. Mutual understanding led, in turn, to a smaller, more relaxed nuclear posture for both sides. Now a new generation needs to repeat that experience.

Like it or not, the nukes are here, and nuclear risks are rising. The urgent task is to devalue them. Until we can substitute an entirely different grammar, we need to encourage all the world's nuclear actors and their at-risk neighbors, large and small, old and new, to understand how each thinks as it sends and receives nuclear signals.

Let's start talking about nukes, not with them.

Dear Bob,

I'm hoping to have a telephone conversation with you about my proposal to have religious leaders from around the world sign "An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". I e-mailed the latest draft to you on June 3. Issuance of the Appeal in the fall would be followed by religious delegations calling upon top officials of the nuclear weapon states.

1. I'm asking you (a) to support this project, (b) to agree to the final wording of the Appeal, (c) to sign it, and (d) later to participate in the public release of the Appeal and delegation visits.

(2) I would like language agreed to by the end of June, get signers in July and August, and release the Appeal in September or October.

(3) I'm willing to take on the lead in getting signers with cooperation from major participating organizations. I don't know whether you send such items to heads of NCC member communions. If not, there are several ways I can facilitate this process. Perhaps Dr. Kireopoulos would help us with his contacts in the World Conference on Religion and Peace.

(4) Paul Lansu, executive director of Pax Christi International, is interested and is conducting a consultation of his network. I haven't yet had a reply from Dwain Epps, but I'm hopeful. I worked closely with him in the 1998 statement that Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels of Pax Christi International presented to the 1998 NPT PrepCom meeting. I drafted the statement and got endorsement from a number of national councils of churches and some of their member communions. If you agree to participate, it should help bring in others.

(5) I am doing some background work to set the stage for parallel statements coming from the Pugwash Conference and IPPNW. I've asked Jonathan Granoff whether he could get a new statement from international generals and admirals who signed a statement that Senator Cranston facilitated in 1996. Dr. Helen Caldicott has agreed to write an article on how to get to zero nuclear weapons for our website, www.zero-nukes.org. She wants to work closer with the religious community. Perhaps she might develop a statement for global women to sign. I know a woman in Texas who, at the right time, might get Texas women to sign an appeal to Laura Bush, making the case that her husband shouldn't be the one to authorize the first use of nuclear weapons since Nagasaki.

(6) In sum, I believe that we need a variety of groups to call upon possessors to renounce nuclear weapons and eliminate them. We need to be as audacious in our direction as President Bush is in his push for preemption and new uses for nuclear weapons.

Shalom,
Howard

david@fcnl.org, rkillmer@wesleysem.edu, bfinlay@vi.org, janice@thejusticeproject.org

Dear David, Rich, Janice, and Brian:

At the last meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament David Culp suggested that we organize a one-day meeting within the faith community for October or November to focus on nuclear weapons issues. I welcomed the suggestion because last summer I promoted such summit meeting on nuclear disarmament and went through several months of dialogue with committee members. However, this was sidetracked as the faith community of necessity mobilized to oppose war against Iraq.

Because the four organizations we represent seem to have the most interest in such a meeting, it was decided that we should have e-mail dialogue and bring some ideas to next meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Since then we've all been busy on legislative matters. With voting now complete perhaps we can get back to the idea of a fall meeting

Our discussion last summer was tending toward a one-day meeting involving staff of denominational offices and religious peace fellowships working on nuclear disarmament issues plus heads of Washington offices and headquarters staff located elsewhere involved in peace and justice matters. Prior to the meeting persons active in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament would need to develop a working agenda and develop some background issue papers. Although heads of communion and ecumenical officers would be welcomed at the one day meeting, it was thought that most would be not attend. There was suggestion of a follow-up news conference with heads of communion around some event (not specified), but that idea was not fully developed.

My current thinking is that a one-day meeting in the fall of 2003 should involve working staff, heads of offices in Washington and at headquarters, plus a few resource persons beyond the faith community. I propose that it be under the auspices of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and that our website, www.zero-nukes, be drawn upon and supplemented for background information (including many linkages). There could also be the possibility of co-sponsorship by a few organizations most involved in developing the meeting.

I believe that our focus should combine the visionary and the practical, the prophetic and the nitty-gritty. The faith community needs to reassert its strong position in favor of nuclear disarmament and its opposition to the nuclear posture of the Bush Administration. At the same time we need to mobilize our grassroots base on specific issues, including those that come up annually in defense authorization.

On the prophetic I am exploring with some international contacts the possibility of a strong statement calling upon possessors of nuclear weapons (1) to totally renounce any use of nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance and (2) to move promptly to eliminate all nuclear weapons and safeguard fissile material. Release of this statement would be followed by international religious delegations calling upon heads of states or their representatives to press for action along these lines. This initiative would build upon the experience of a statement offered to the 1998 NPT PrepCom meeting in Geneva by the heads of the World Council of Churches and Pax Christi International, with endorsement by some national councils of churches and national denominations (see <http://www.zero->

nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#nptactnow). It would also draw upon the experience in opposing the war against Iraq by sending delegations of religious leaders to heads of state. If this statement and visitations occurred in the fall, this would coincide with the annual presentation to the United Nations First Committee by a representative of the Holy See, which could make a similar appeal.

I have found some interest in this idea, but it hasn't matured. If this comes off, it could serve as the prophetic element of our proposed fall meeting. If not, we could develop another means for issuing the prophetic challenge. For instance, this could be handled by a keynote speaker.

On the substance of the meeting I suggest the following items:

(1) Pushing the United States to go farther and faster with bilateral actions involving Russia to take missiles off high alert and to make far deeper cuts, including dismantlement of weapons taken out of service. I have been talking with John Rhineland of the Lawyers Alliance for World Security (LAWS) and some others about providing an outline of model treaty (6 to 10 pages) for U.S.-Russian deep cuts to no more than 1,000 on each side and possibly lower. Harold Feiveson of Princeton University (and editor of Brookings' "The Nuclear Turning Point") has agreed to provide a scenario for U.S. and Russia de-alerting for posting on www.zero-nukes.org. These would be useful background sources. Other background material could be developed. This would help us develop demands for action for de-alerting and deep cuts.

(2) Ways to improve and expand nuclear threat reduction activities. This could include full funding of the proposals of the Baker-Cutler report. We could look to the Nuclear Threat Reduction Campaign, the Nuclear Threat Initiative, and RANSAC for background material and presenters.

(3) Strengthening our opposition to development of new nuclear weapons. Undoubtedly this issue will be replayed in the next session of Congress. David Culp and others who have been heavily involved in this year's efforts could take the lead on this subject.

(4) Developing grassroots educational material and mobilization strategies for on all of these issues.

These are my ideas. What do you think of them? What are your proposals? Please reply to all so that we can have a dialogue.

Shalom,
Howard

Proposal for A Fall Strategy Meeting of the Faith Community on Nuclear Disarmament

Sponsor: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament (co-sponsors possible)

Time: one full day in October or November 2003

Location: In Washington D.C. at Wesley Seminary or a Capitol Hill church
or a hotel near Union Station

Participants: from denominations, religious peace fellowships, Catholic orders
Staff working on nuclear disarmament issues
Heads of Washington offices
United Nations staff
Headquarters staff not in D.C. as appropriate
State and local grassroots activists, especially from state coalitions

Resource persons: from civil sector organizations

Schedule

9:00 a.m. Welcome, statement of purpose

9:15 to 10:00 "The Challenge" -- keynote by a head of communion
or "Religious Basis for Nuclear Disarmament" -- an interfaith panel

10:15 to 11:00 Ending MAD: de-alerting, deep cuts

11:15 to 12:00 Nuclear Threat Reduction

12:00 to 1:00 p.m. Lunch (denomination caucuses possible)

1:00 to 2:00 No new nukes

2:15 to 3:15 Legislative strategy

3:30 to 4:30 Grassroots strategy

5:30 to 7:30 Working dinner on grassroots work (for those who wish to stay)

The first three working sessions would deal with subject matter. We would prepare resource material in advance and draw in expert presenters as needed. These topics would then be taken up again in consideration of legislative and grassroots strategy.

June 6, 2003

Dear Friends:

The global faith community did a tremendous job in mobilizing against the war on Iraq. There was lots of cooperation among national and international religious organizations, but also considerable action occurred through parallel efforts directed toward a common goal.

I would like to see similar mobilization of the international faith community for the global elimination of weapons of mass destruction with particular attention to nuclear weapons. I suggest an undertaking as follows:

1. In the fall of 2003 as preparation for delegations calling upon leaders of the nuclear-weapon states, issue an appeal for nuclear disarmament signed by representatives of religious organizations from around the world. Attached is a draft entitled "An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". It incorporates appeals to various combinations of nuclear weapon states.

This appeal is drafted as a strong condemnation of nuclear weapons on moral grounds. It calls upon nuclear-weapon states to unequivocally renounce all use of nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance. (All use, not just first use.) The appeal encompasses opposition to nuclear deterrence. It calls for concrete action to eliminate all nuclear weapons.

I recognize that the Holy See and the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops have not yet condemned nuclear deterrence and therefore would not sign such an appeal. However, they almost never sign joint statements anyway. But through Pax Christi we could obtain signatures of some cardinals and bishops from many different countries, including the United States.

2. Follow this appeal by having delegations representing religious organizations call upon heads of states, or their representatives, of all nations possessing nuclear weapons and demand action for their elimination. This is the heart of this initiative. This approach can draw on previous experience in the use of delegations focusing on NATO's nuclear policy and the war on Iraq.

3. Urge the Holy See in its annual address to the United Nations First Committee to make a strong appeal for global nuclear disarmament. This statement can cover the same grounds as the interfaith appeal except perhaps the matter of nuclear deterrence.

4. Follow through with action within various nations to get their governments to support serious efforts to promptly eliminate nuclear weapons. We would have the greatest strength in the United States, United Kingdom, France, and other NATO states.

5. Of these the United States is the greatest challenge and greatest importance. It is a challenge for which the U.S. faith community should mobilize. The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, is discussing the possibility of convening a meeting in the fall of 2003 to develop strategies for a renewed nuclear disarmament campaign.

As a web resource of information, please visit www.zero-nukes.org, a project of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. Also, I am talking with arms control experts about drafting a model deep cuts treaty between the United States and Russia and a recommended

schedule for de-alerting the nuclear arsenals. These would be referenced in endnotes of the appeal.

What do you think of these ideas? Bob Edgar, is this something the National Council of Churches would support? Dwain Epps and Salpy Eskidjian, what about the World Council of Churches and also the European Conference of Churches? Ernie Regehr, you were involved with the NATO mobilization, what are your views? Doug Roche, what can you advise us about the Holy See?

I start with you to get something underway. Please reply to all to promote an exchange of ideas, including suggested modification and expansion of my initial ideas. If there is interest, we can broaden the discussion. If this is done, who else should be involved, especially to obtain Jewish, Muslim, and Buddhist participation?

Shalom,
Howard

Draft: Not for Circulation

**Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons
An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense**

We the undersigned believe that any use of nuclear weapons is inherently immoral. We recognize that many military experts believe that nuclear weapons have no legitimate utility in war. Therefore, we call for the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

A Matter of Conscience and Common Sense

As a matter of conscience, numerous religious organizations and religious leaders have stated that the use of nuclear weapons is immoral. Many further insist that the possession of nuclear weapons for purpose of deterrence is also immoral. If used, nuclear weapons with their vast destructive power would inevitably kill thousands, possibly millions, of innocent people. They would cause devastating harm to the environment and potentially threaten the existence of life on Earth. That is why religious organizations and religious leaders have long called for the abolition of nuclear weapons.¹

As a matter of common sense, many retired military leaders have indicated that nuclear weapons are not practical instruments for warfare. They point out that that destructive power of nuclear weapons is too vast for most military purposes. They are also concerned by ancillary effects that harm civilians and the environment. These military leaders also recognize the political consequences and moral issues in the use of nuclear weapons. For these reasons they favor the elimination of all nuclear weapons.²

In one instance religious leaders and military professionals have joined together to state: "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." Therefore, they called for "action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons."³

An Appeal to Possessors and Potential Possessors of Nuclear Weapons

Because nuclear weapons are immoral and ultimately impractical, we call upon all who possess nuclear weapons to renounce them and to adopt a policy of no use of nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance.

We call upon all who have ambitions to develop or acquire nuclear weapons to cease this quest.

Progress toward Abolition

We believe that immediate, unequivocal renouncement of nuclear weapons would substantially enhance global security and would not endanger any nation now possessing nuclear weapons. We also recognize that nations may not be ready for such boldness but would rather move in series of steps toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Therefore, we draw upon the

recommendations of military, scientific, and political experts to offer ideas on steps that move toward nuclear abolition. Three approaches are possible.

Sequential Steps. During the past 15 years several knowledgeable and respectable international bodies have developed ideas on a series of steps that would lead to elimination of nuclear weapons. They include the Canberra Commission (1996),⁴ the New Agenda Coalition (1998),⁵ the Tokyo Forum (1999),⁶ and the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.⁷ Although these reports differ in detail, they contain common elements that can serve as an agenda for step-by-step elimination of nuclear weapons, including"

1. De-alerting and standing down deployed nuclear weapons.
2. Comprehensive test ban.
3. Cease development and production of new nuclear weapons.
4. Halt attempts to develop national missile defense.
5. Commitment to no first use of nuclear weapons as an interim measure.
6. Bilateral (U.S. and Russia) nuclear arms reduction.
7. Bring other possessors of nuclear weapons into multilateral reductions.
8. Total dismantlement of nuclear weapons and delivery systems.
9. International system for transparency and verification.
10. International control of fissile materials.

Nuclear Weapons Convention. Another approach would be to negotiate and implement a comprehensive Nuclear Weapons Convention. This would be somewhat analogous to the Chemical Weapons Convention and Biological Weapons Convention that deal with other weapons of mass destruction. The Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy has coordinated ad hoc committee of lawyers, scientists and disarmament experts that has produced such a document.⁸ This Model Nuclear Weapons Convention (1997) has been endorsed by Although it contains steps that lead to nuclear abolition, it is more comprehensive and better integrated than where each step occurs on its own.

¹ A compilation of religious statements on nuclear weapons is available at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements1.html>.

² See Statement by International Generals and Admirals (1996) at <http://www.gsintitute.org/archives/000014.shtml>. Other statements by military leaders are available at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/militaryleaders.html>.

³ "Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement" (2000) at <http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>.

⁴ Canberra Commission on Elimination of Nuclear Weapons at <http://www.gsintitute.org/archives/000007.shtml>

⁵ "Towards a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World: The Need for A New Agenda" at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero2.htm#canberracommission>

⁶ "Facing Nuclear Dangers: An Action Plan for the 21st Century" at [to be added]

⁷ "Final Document: Practical Steps on Article VI" at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero2.htm#npt>

⁸ "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Testing, Production, Stockpiling, Transfer, Use and Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons and on Their Elimination " at <http://www.lcnp.org/mnwc/convention.htm>

Draft: Not for Circulation

An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

The war against Iraq has raised global awareness of the dangers of weapons of mass destruction: nuclear, chemical, and biological. The challenge is to eliminate all such weapons possessed by particular states and to prevent other states and organizations from acquiring them. In this statement we focus on nuclear weapons.

We the undersigned believe that any use of nuclear weapons is inherently immoral. We recognize that many military experts believe that nuclear weapons have no legitimate utility in war. Therefore, we call for the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

The war against Iraq has raised global awareness of the inherent dangers of weapons of mass destruction: nuclear, chemical, and biological. These are weapons that kill indiscriminately and produce lasting effects. Here we address nuclear weapons, the most destructive of the triad.

We the undersigned believe that nuclear weapons are inherently immoral. If used, nuclear weapons would inevitably kill thousands, possibly millions, of innocent people. They would cause devastating harm to the environment. Multiple use would endanger the existence of life on Earth. Threatened use of nuclear weapons in the name of deterrence is morally wrong because it holds innocent people hostage for political and military purposes.

Therefore, as a matter of conscience we call for the global elimination of nuclear weapons.¹

We note that **many military professionals have indicated that nuclear weapons are not practical instruments for warfare.** They point out that the destructive power is too vast for appropriate military purposes. They too are concerned about ancillary effects that harm innocent people and the environment. They recognize the adverse political consequences in the use of nuclear weapons. For these reasons these military leaders favor the elimination of nuclear weapons.²

As a matter of common sense we observe that continued possession of nuclear weapons by a few privileged nations gives them legitimacy and encourages other nations and terrorist organizations to acquire them. It is far past the time for the nuclear weapon states and other possessors to honor their obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970 and achieve complete nuclear disarmament.

An Appeal to Possessors and Potential Possessors of Nuclear Weapons

Because nuclear weapons are immoral and ultimately impractical, **we call upon all who possess nuclear weapons to unequivocally renounce the use of nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance.**

We call upon the possessor nations to eliminate their nuclear arsenals by such steps as:

- Quickly remove all existing nuclear weapons from alert status.
- Cease all further research, testing, development, and production of new nuclear weapons.
- Dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles.
- Safeguard all nuclear weapon components and fissile material.

We call upon all who have ambitions to develop or acquire nuclear weapons to cease this quest.

We call upon the international community to carry out a vigorous and long-lasting nuclear non-proliferation program to prevent any nation or organization from developing or acquiring nuclear weapons.

Ways and Means

Although we do not claim to be experts on the precise methods for eliminating nuclear weapons, we are aware that an international roster of military, scientific, and political experts have offered ideas on how to bring this about.

Nuclear Weapons Convention. The most comprehensive approach would be to negotiate and implement a comprehensive Nuclear Weapons Convention. This would be analogous to the Chemical Weapons Convention and Biological Weapons Convention that deal with other weapons of mass destruction. The Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy has coordinated an international committee of lawyers, scientists and disarmament experts that has produced such a document.³ The Model Nuclear Weapons Convention (1997) was submitted to the United Nations by the government of Costa Rica and has been circulated as a UN document (A/C.1/52/7).

Sequential Steps. Another approach would be to embark upon a series of steps that would lead to elimination of nuclear weapons. During the past ten years several international bodies have pursued this approach. They include the Canberra Commission (1996),⁴ the New Agenda Coalition (1998),⁵ the Tokyo Forum (1999),⁶ and the 2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.⁷ Although these reports differ in detail, they contain common elements that can serve as an agenda for step-by-step elimination of nuclear weapons. Steps include such measures as de-alerting, comprehensive test ban, deep cuts in deployed warheads leading to complete elimination, a system for transparency and verification, and international control of fissile materials.⁸

Action by Sets of Nations and Regions. These steps could be taken by all nuclear weapon states simultaneously. They could also be carried out by pairs of adversary nations and within particular regions. This would provide opportunity to give attention to the broader political context in which nuclear disarmament must occur.

We apply this approach by addressing various nations directly.

To: United States and Russian Federation

The two of you, the United States and the Russian Federation, possess most of the nuclear weapons on Earth. You acquired them during the 40+ years of the Cold War. For whatever use they may have had then for deterrence or otherwise, they no longer have utility. Yet, because each of you judges the capability of the other to attack with a mighty force, you each keep a huge arsenal on a high state of alert. This in effect continues the Cold War doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD).

To get out of this bind, we urge both of you to unequivocally adopt a policy of no use of nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance. Follow this by removing all

strategic nuclear weapons from high alert. Agree to a schedule for standing down your entire nuclear arsenals and dismantling all warheads and delivery vehicles with full transparency and verification. Cease development of new nuclear weapons and close down all research, testing, and production facilities. Carry out measures to assure full security of all fissile materials.

To facilitate your undertaking we refer you to ideas offered by recognized experts on de-alerting,⁹ deep cuts,¹⁰ and security measures for fissile material and nuclear weapon components.¹¹

To: United Kingdom and France

The two of you developed nuclear weapons during the Cold War with a stated purpose of deterring attack by the Soviet Union. That threat is long gone. The possibility of renewed threat by a revived and aggressive Russia is exceedingly remote. Moreover, if that occurred, your nuclear arsenal would make you more vulnerable to pre-emptive attack than the rest of Western Europe. The basing of U.S. nuclear warheads in England adds vulnerability. Therefore, we call upon you to follow the lead of South Africa, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus and unilaterally eliminate your entire nuclear arsenal. We ask the United Kingdom to have the United States remove nuclear weapons based on British soil.

We note that some say that the United Kingdom and France want to retain nuclear weapons to show that they are great powers. But what is national greatness? We believe that your greatness comes from your literature, visual arts, architecture, music, science and from your two languages, English with its enormous adaptability and French, one of the most beautiful languages of the world.

To: NATO

With the Cold War over and the Russian threat extremely remote, NATO has no adequate reason to retain a nuclear option. Therefore, we call upon all NATO states to work for the elimination of NATO's commitment to nuclear weapons. In addition to our requests to the United States, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, and France, we ask the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Greece, and Turkey to withdraw their consent for having U.S. nuclear weapons based upon their soil. We ask all nations in Europe to work for creation of a nuclear weapons free zone as quickly as possible in Europe west of Russia.

To be developed:

To: China

To: North Korea

To: India and Pakistan

To: Israel and Other Middle East States

Including creation of a weapons of mass destruction free zone in the Middle East.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman, May 7, 2003

Notes and References

¹ In calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons we join a host of religious leaders and religious organizations which favor this course of action. A compilation of religious statements on nuclear weapons is available at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements1.html>.

² See Statement by International Generals and Admirals (1996) at <http://www.gsintstitute.org/archives/000014.shtml>. Other statements by military leaders are available at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/militaryleaders.html>. A joint statement of religious and military leaders (2000) is found at <http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>.

³ "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Testing, Production, Stockpiling, Transfer, Use and Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons and on Their Elimination " at <http://www.lcnp.org/mnwc/convention.htm>

⁴ Canberra Commission on Elimination of Nuclear Weapons at <http://www.gsintstitute.org/archives/000007.shtml>

⁵ "Towards a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World: The Need for A New Agenda" at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero2.htm#newagendacoalition>

⁶ "Facing Nuclear Dangers: An Action Plan for the 21st Century" at <http://www.nuclearfiles.org/redocuments/1999/990725facingnucleardangers.html>

⁷ "Final Document: Practical Steps on Article VI" at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero2.htm#npt>

⁸ For a more complete list go to <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero2.htm#commonelements>.

⁹ [Reference to a proposed de-alerting schedule to be added.]

¹⁰ [Reference to a model deep cuts treaty to be added.]

¹¹ [Reference to ideas about the cooperative threat reduction program to be added.]

An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

The war against Iraq has raised global awareness of the inherent dangers of weapons of mass destruction: nuclear, chemical, and biological. These are weapons that kill indiscriminately and produce lasting effects. Here we address nuclear weapons, the most destructive of the triad.

We the undersigned believe that nuclear weapons are inherently immoral. If used, nuclear weapons would inevitably kill thousands, possibly millions, of innocent people. They would cause devastating harm to the environment. Multiple use would endanger the existence of life on Earth. Threatened use of nuclear weapons in the name of deterrence is morally wrong because it holds innocent people hostage for political and military purposes.

Therefore, as a matter of conscience we call for the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

We note that **many military professionals have indicated that nuclear weapons are not practical instruments for warfare.** They point out that the destructive power is too vast for appropriate military purposes. They too are concerned about ancillary effects that harm innocent people and the environment. They recognize the adverse political consequences in the use of nuclear weapons. For these reasons these military leaders favor the elimination of nuclear weapons.

As a matter of common sense we observe that continued possession of nuclear weapons by a few privileged nations gives them legitimacy and encourages other nations and terrorist organizations to acquire them. It is far past the time for the nuclear weapon states and other possessors to honor their obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970 and achieve complete nuclear disarmament.

Because nuclear weapons are immoral and ultimately impractical, **we call upon all who possess nuclear weapons to unequivocally renounce the use of nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance.**

We call upon the possessor nations to eliminate their nuclear arsenals by such steps as:

- Quickly remove all existing nuclear weapons from alert status.
- Cease all further research, testing, development, and production of new nuclear weapons.
- Dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles.
- Safeguard all nuclear weapon components and fissile material.

We call upon all who have ambitions to develop or acquire nuclear weapons to cease this quest.

We call upon the international community to carry out a vigorous and long-lasting nuclear non-proliferation program to prevent any nation or organization from developing or acquiring nuclear weapons.

Signers: Religious leaders from around the globe.

Recommendations to Possessors of Nuclear Weapons

We the undersigned representatives of religious organizations support "An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". To carry out its principles, we offer specific recommendations to states possessing nuclear weapons and to would-be possessors.

We call upon the **United States** and **Russia**, which led the way in the nuclear arms race, to lead the way in the elimination of nuclear weapons. With their huge arsenals each judges the other capable of attacking with a mighty force. Each therefore retains a huge nuclear arsenal on high alert, thus continuing the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD). The way out of this bind is through mutual adoption of a no-use policy followed by prompt de-alerting of all deployed nuclear weapons and complete dismantlement of their nuclear arsenals. This total task should be completed no later than 2012, the time frame established by the Moscow Treaty of 2002.

We call upon the **United Kingdom, France, and China** to follow the example of South Africa, Kazakhstan, Ukraine, and Belarus and unilaterally dismantle their nuclear weapons. We believe that their nuclear arsenals have no legitimate utility and indeed provide targets for pre-emptive attack. Therefore, nuclear disarmament would increase rather than diminish their national security.

We call upon **India** and **Pakistan** to mutually adopt a no-use policy for their nuclear weapons, to eliminate the ones they possess along with production facilities, and to lead the way to a South Asia nuclear weapon free zone.

We call upon **Israel** to eliminate its nuclear arsenal, achieving this objective along with a just peace with the Palestinians and with the creation of a Middle East weapons of mass destruction free zone.

We call upon **North Korea** and **Iran** to follow the example of Brazil, Argentina, South Korea, and Taiwan and cease all efforts to produce nuclear weapons and accept international safeguards.

We call upon **NATO** to cease its commitment to nuclear weapons. We ask the **United Kingdom, Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Greece, and Turkey** to withdraw their consent for having U.S. nuclear weapons based upon their soil. We favor the creation of a European nuclear free zone.

Signed by representatives of religious organizations.

Background Material

As background material for the "Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense" and "Recommendations to Possessors of Nuclear Weapons", we provide the following references.

1. Religious statements. A compilation of previous religious statements on eliminating nuclear weapons is available at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements1.html>.

2. Military leaders views. Ideas of military leaders are offered in a "Statement by International Generals and Admirals" (1996) at <http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000014.shtml>. Other statements by military leaders are available at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/militaryleaders.html>.

3. A joint statement of religious and military leaders (2000) is found at <http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>.

4. Civilian leaders views. A steady stream of scientists, public officials, and other civilian leaders have advocated nuclear disarmament. They include

"Statement by International Civilian Leaders" (1998)

<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000015.shtml>

" Statement By International Mayors, Nuclear Weapons: Threat to Cities" (2001)

<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000021.shtml>

" Final Statement of the Third Global Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates" (2002)

<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000141.shtml>

Reports and Statements by Scientists on Nuclear Weapons

<http://www.pugwash.org/reports/nw/nwlist.htm>

5. Nuclear weapons convention. One way to achieve global nuclear disarmament would be through a Nuclear Weapons Convention, analogous to conventions on biological and chemical weapons. A proposal for a "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Testing, Production, Stockpiling, Transfer, Use and Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons and on Their Elimination " is available at <http://www.lcnp.org/mnwc/convention.htm>

6. Sequential Steps. Another approach would be to embark upon a series of steps that would lead to elimination of nuclear weapons. During the past ten years several international bodies have pursued this approach. They include:

Canberra Commission, 1996

<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000007.shtml>

New Agenda Coalition, 1998

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero2.htm#newagendacoalition>

Tokyo Forum, 1999

<http://www.nuclearfiles.org/redocuments/1999/990725facingnucleardangers.html>

2000 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero2.htm#npt>

7. Proposed de-alerting schedule (to be added).

8. Model deep cuts treaty (to be added).

9. Global nuclear threat reduction program (to be added).

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

March 24, 2003

To: Interfaith Contacts

Dear Friends:

The war against Iraq is the last war of this kind. It is the last preemptive war instigated by today's dominating superpower, the U.S.A. It is the dying gasp of an old order that will be displaced by an effective global system based upon peace and justice.

This will happen if we make it happen.

We have a tremendous base to build on. Strong opposition to going to war has been widespread among religious organizations throughout the world, more vocal and more united on this issue than any in recent memory. Numerous nations opposed the United States desire for preemptive war, including traditional allies and a majority on the UN Security Council. Civil sector opposition was widespread.

We are energized. Let us now convert this opposition to the war against Iraq to a movement for a different way of doing things.

As a point of departure, I would like to pick up an idea offered by Bishop Felton May in a message to United Methodist churches in the Baltimore-Washington Conference. He said, "I can only hope that our talents and capabilities will be used to oppose other, more imminent weapons of mass destruction in our world. We know that 28 million people are starving to death in Africa, many of them children, while millions of others on every continent crumble beneath the weight of hunger, AIDS and other diseases, poverty, illiteracy, addiction and other lethal forces. Their suffering is largely a result of economic inequity, political corruption and inhumane neglect. America's quest for global peace, justice and security will only be won when these weapons of mass destruction are also dismantled."

Thus, we should outline a far-reaching program to dismantle the military weapons of mass destruction and the socio-economic weapons of death and destruction. They include:

1. Nuclear weapons
2. Chemical weapons
3. Biological weapons
4. Small arms (the biggest killer of military weapons)
5. Hunger
6. AIDS
7. Child mortality
8. Global poverty and underlying causes

There is knowledge available for specifying what to do about all of these items. For instance, on www.zero-nukes.org we have compiled proposals for eliminating nuclear weapons. Others have

ideas on what to do about chemical and biological weapons and small arms. In September 2000 member states of the United Nations adopted a set of Millennium Development Goals. In working toward these goals the World Bank estimates that it would cost an additional \$40-60 billion a year for the next 15 years to cut global poverty in half and achieve substantial improvements in health and education in developing countries.

Although this seems like a lot of money, the U.S. Congress seems willing to appropriate \$80 billion for the war against Iraq and its aftermath. Moreover, the World Bank estimate is less than ten percent of the current global military budget. We could pay for achievement of the Millennium Development Goals through cutbacks in and transfer of military spending.

There are other tasks, too, especially the need to strengthen the United Nations and enable the network of international agencies to take the lead in dealing with threats to peace. This would counter the desire of the Bush Administration, and many Democrats, too, for the United States to have global military and political dominance.

We didn't stop the war against Iraq, but we have emerged stronger and more united. Let us use our strength to work for a different kind of world.

Shalom,

Howard Hallman
Chair

Dear Barbara and Rich,

Congratulations for the successful colloquium on pre-emptive war. I know you put in a lot of hard work. It produced some interesting discussion.

I was disappointed, however, by the lack of a presenter to offer the pacifist viewpoint. This was needed to provide a broader perspective. Moreover, I felt that one presenter's accusation that pacifists are immoral was quite inappropriate (really insulting), especially when there was no presenter to offer rebuttal. Accordingly, I urge you to commission an additional paper by a pacifist scholar to go with the set of just-war papers you will be publishing.

Although your background paper mentions pacifism, it tends to be dismissive. It speaks of the "inflexible negative" of pacifism and the "pacifist/anarchist" tradition of Leo Tolstoy. It neglects what I call "positive pacifism" except for mention of the non-violent campaigns of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., which the paper denigrates.

Positive pacifism, based upon love and non-violence, is fully engaged in society. It recognizes that while humankind may be sinful because of "excessive self-regard" (Reinhold Niebuhr's term), people, having "that of God" in them (a Quaker term), are also altruistic. It recognizes that the love ethic expressed in non-violent action can appeal to the best in an adversary and has the potential for achieving reconciliation and personal change. There are numerous case histories.

Positive pacifism focuses on justice as a means of overcoming underlying causes of violence. It favors "anticipatory prevention" and accepts non-violent measures of containment.

Many of us who are pacifists accept democratic government, the rule of law, and legitimate police authority. Thus, it is quite appropriate to use the courts to achieve racial equality and to expect the police to protect non-violent protesters in the name of civil liberty.

We don't necessarily have all the answers to such perplexing issues as how to deal with genocide occurring within a sovereign state, but we offer a perspective that can enlighten discussion of pre-emptive war.

So next time around, please bring in the pacifist perspective and add a paper written by a pacifist to your present set.

Shalom,
Howard

Dear

The website, www.zero-nukes.org, which the cosponsors, is now a year old. In that time we have accomplished three things: (1) posted or provided linkage to a large number of statements on nuclear disarmament by religious organizations, military leaders, international bodies, and civil sector organizations, (2) provided linkage to statements by religious bodies regarding Iraq, and (3) have begun to get scenarios by experts on how to get to zero nuclear weapons. In the coming months we will add new statements as appropriate, but our concentration will be upon dialogue on how to get to zero.

In the initial year the website was supported by a \$5,000 grant from the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society, a \$2,000 contribution from a member of the Rockefeller family, and several smaller contributions from sponsoring organizations with the balance picked up by Methodists United for Peace with Justice. Now that the website is established we are spending approximately \$300 a month for our web consultant to keep it up and post new material.

Although cosponsorship doesn't mandate a payment, it would be helpful if each cosponsor would contribute \$300 a year to help with operating costs. I would greatly appreciate such support. If you so choose, you can send a check payable to "Methodists United for Peace with Justice" to 1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Thanks,
Howard

**Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Meeting of Monday, March 24, 2003
2:00 p.m., Room 2, Methodist Building
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C**

AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. WMD issues of the war against Iraq
3. Issues before Congress
 - a. New nuclear weapons
 - b. Nuclear threat reduction
 - c. Other
4. Broader agenda for elimination of weapons of mass destruction
5. Other business
6. Next meeting

Personnel	
Hallman (part time) 12 months @ \$3,000/mo.	\$36,000
Fringe benefits 15% of salary	<u>5,400</u>
	41,400
Communications (phone, internet, postage)	3,000
Printing, photocopy	2,400
Supplies	600
Travel	<u>2,600</u>
	\$50,000

**Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Meeting of Monday, April 28, 2003
2:00 p.m., Room 3, Methodist Building
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C**

AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. WMD issues of the war against Iraq
3. Issues before Congress
 - a. New nuclear weapons
 - b. Nuclear threat reduction
 - c. Other
4. Urgent Call
5. Other nuclear disarmament matters
6. Next meeting
6. Next meeting

Notes on meeting of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament held on February 21, 2003.

Dear Colleagues:

First, so that you can mark your calendars, the next meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament (ICND) will be on Monday, March 24, 2003 from 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. in Room 2 of the Methodist Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

At the meeting held on February 21 we gave particular attention to nuclear weapons issues of the 108th Congress. Pasted below is an outline provided by David Culp.

Development of New Nuclear Weapons

Two types of new nuclear weapons are being discussed: a robust nuclear earth penetrator or "bunker buster" (which would be considerably larger than the Hiroshima bomb) and a mini-nuke (which would be perhaps one-third the size of the Hiroshima bomb). The FY 2003 budget contains \$15 million to study the possibility of the bunker-buster, and \$15 million more is proposed for FY 2004. Presently there is no funding request for a mini-nuke, and there is a statutory prohibition of design work on such a weapon.

Representative Markey is drafting an amendment to delete funding for the bunker-buster. It would be highly desirable to gain Republican cosponsors. We will prepare a list of 20 to 25 possible Republicans and ask religious organizations participating in ICND to work in particular districts where they have strength to help recruit such co-sponsors.

Some pro-nuke members of Congress may make an effort to eliminate the prohibition on developing a mini-nuke. We will need to watch out for this and work to keep the prohibition.

The Friends Committee on National Legislation will prepare one-page fact sheets on these issues. David Culp will keep our network informed about legislative developments and tell us when we need to send out action alerts.

Nuclear Testing

There may be legislative action to provide for increasing the readiness of the Nevada test site. The best chance to block such action will be through Senator Harry Reid (D-NV), a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee. We will ask participating organizations in ICND to reach out to their members in Nevada to have them contact Senator Reid.

Nuclear Treat Reduction

Funding for nuclear threat reduction (sometimes referred to as Nunn-Lugar, though broader) will be a major issue because of the tight budget. A second issue is the need to provide the president with permanent authority to waive certain provisions. Now annual authorizing legislation is required, causing delays and a break in program continuity.

Timely across-the-board grassroots action will be desirable on funding and waiver authority. Bryan Finlay of the Nuclear Treat Reduction Program will keep us informed.

On this issue Representative Curt Weldon (R-PA) is a key leader. We will seek religious leaders in his district to write him a joint letter laying out several items on the nuclear threat reduction issue. Bryan will help formulate this letter. I'll contact you later with more specifics.

Urgent Call

Rich Killmer reported on progress on An Urgent Call -- End the Nuclear Danger. A considerable number of religious leaders have endorsed the call. Some denominational offices are promoting it, but greater involvement of other offices is needed. Some state ecumenical and interfaith organizations are working on it. Through a Ploughshares grant the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative is giving extra attention to five states.

Deep Cuts

Through Methodists United for Peace with Justice I am working with some experts in the arms control community to develop a model treaty for deep cuts in nuclear weapons that goes far beyond the Moscow Treaty of 2002. At Senate hearings on this treaty and in other forums a variety of experts, including General Eugene Habiger, former commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, have offered practical ideas on what is desirable and possible. I want to encourage putting these in the form of fairly concise treaty in order to have something specific for our advocacy. I'll keep you informed.

Many have said that the United States should dismantle strategic nuclear weapons taken out of service under the Moscow Treaty of 2002. However, the United States now has no active dismantlement capacity. This matter will need to be addressed in the future.

Shalom,
Howard

###

Nuclear Weapons Issues in 2003

Below is a brief outline of the nuclear weapons issues Congress is expected to address this year.

1. Development of New Nuclear Weapons
 - A. Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator or "bunker buster"
 - B. Mini-nuke
2. Nuclear Testing
 - A. Nevada Test Site readiness
 - B. Effort to resume testing after the 2004 election
 - C. Rep. Spratt proposal to require a 12-month notice to Congress before resumption of testing
3. Moscow Treaty (Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty)

4. Nuclear use policy (preemptive strikes)
5. "Nunn-Lugar" and related Energy Department programs
 - A. Increase funding from ~\$1 billion/year to \$3 billion/year (Baker-Culter report recommendation)
 - B. Remove legislative restrictions
 - C. Expand to other countries
6. Purchase of Russian highly-enriched uranium (~\$4 billion)
7. Related issues
 - A. Missile Defense
 - B. North Korea
 - C. Biological Weapons Convention

Provided by David Culp
Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)
E-mail: david@fctl.org

**INTERFAITH
COMMITTEE
FOR
NUCLEAR
DISARMAMENT**

Dear Paul:

As things get worse in the quest for nuclear disarmament, the global faith community needs to speak more clearly and strongly than ever for the need to eliminate all nuclear weapons. With that in mind I have drafted the attached "An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". It calls upon all possessors of nuclear weapons (1) to unequivocally renounce the use of nuclear weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance and (2) to completely eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

This "no use" proposal is intended to be visionary and prophetic to counter the trend of the Bush Administration to develop new nuclear weapons for possible use. Thus, it goes beyond the statement presented by Cardinal Danneels and Dr. Konrad Raiser to the 1998 NPT PrepCom, which spoke only of no first use. (You will recall that through Dave Robinson I worked with you on that statement.) I believe that the times require the vision of total renunciation.

Would Pax Christi International be willing to participate in further refinement of this Appeal, have your president be an initial signer, help get other signatures, and participate in follow-through activities? I am also approaching the World Council of Churches, National Council of Churches (USA), Conference of European Churches, and Canadian Council of Churches initially. We will want to broaden the base as we proceed.

The attached Appeal (which is open to further refinement) is divided into three parts:
(1) the basic appeal to be signed by religious leaders from around the globe,
(2) a set of recommendations to possessors of nuclear weapons, to be signed by representatives of religious organizations and to be used by delegations calling on the possessors, and
(3) background material of other statements and proposals by experts on certain aspects of nuclear disarmament.

My thinking is that the following schedule might be followed:

June -- get agreement from initial signers on language

July-August -- get signatures

September-October -- release of appeal and beginning of delegation visits

I seek your advice on how to get the support of the Holy See for this endeavor. My experience is that the Vatican rarely signs onto joint statements. However, we could hope that the Holy See might make its own statement in favor of renunciation of nuclear weapons, such as in the annual presentation to the UN First Committee.

Release of the appeal would be followed by religious delegations calling upon the possessor states. This would build upon the experience of the 2000 Brussels Consultation on Nuclear Issues and the opposition to war against Iraq, which had remarkable global mobilization of the faith community.

I am sharing this communication with Marie Dennis, your vice president, and David Robinson and Jean Stokan of Pax Christi USA.

For background information on my activities, you can visit www.mupwj.org, the website of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, and www.zero-nukes.org, the website of the Interfaith

Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair. The latter has linkage with your website and your "New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda: A Call and Statement on Nuclear Disarmament" (2000) at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements2.html#paxchristiintl>.

Shalom,
Howard

July 5, 2003

Naila Bolus, Executive Director
Ploughshares Fund
Fort Mason Center
Building B, Suite 330
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Naila:

Within a few days I will be e-mailing you an application for a grant. In the meantime I am sending you copies of IRS determination letters for Methodists United for Peace with Justice and for our 501(c)(3) Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Chair

Email

ploughshares@ploughshares.org

Mail/phone/fax

Ploughshares Fund
Fort Mason Center
Bldg. B, Suite 330
San Francisco, CA 94123

tel: (415) 775-2244
fax: (415) 775-4529

Sally Lilienthal, President
San Francisco, CA
sallyl@ploughshares.org

Deborah Bain
Development Director
dbain@ploughshares.org

Catharine Kalin
Financial Director
ckalin@ploughshares.org

Naila Bolus
Executive Director
nbolus@ploughshares.org

Lorely Bunoan
Office Manager and Executive
Assistant
lorely@ploughshares.org

Paul Carroll
Program Officer
pcarroll@ploughshares.org

Thibault Worth
Communications and Donor
Relations Assistant
thibault@ploughshares.org

How To Apply For a Grant

The Ploughshares Fund supports organizations and individuals working to stop the spread of weapons and build regional security. The Ploughshares Fund can make grants for direct lobbying programs. There are no geographical limitations on grants. Requests for two year grants will be considered. The Ploughshares Fund does not fund the production of films, videotapes or books. It also does not fund the research and writing of academic dissertations.

Please familiarize yourself with Ploughshares' grants list so that you have an understanding of our priorities as well as the typical size of grant that we make.

If you are uncertain whether your project fits into Ploughshares' areas of interest, you are encouraged to write a brief letter describing your project. We will let you know if a full proposal is appropriate.

When to Apply

The Ploughshares Fund Board of Directors meets four times a year. Proposals must be received two months in advance in order to be eligible for consideration at a board meeting. The Ploughshares Fund may also consider requests for emergency funding on a discretionary basis. For more information, please contact our office at 415-775-2244. We accept and encourage proposals submitted by email. Please send inquiries and/or grant proposal submission to proposals@ploughshares.org Please do not send multiple copies.

2003 Proposal Deadlines

- **Summer - April 15, 2003**
- **Fall - July 15, 2003**

To ensure the smooth processing of your application, please include the following information:

Summary Page

Organization name, address telephone number and website
Name, address and email address (if available) of contact person
Contact person, address and telephone number of fiscal sponsor, if applicable
Project title
Amount requested
Total project and organization budgets
Summary description of organization and project

Full Proposal

Proposals should be clear and concise and contain the following information:

Description of organization

Full description of project:

- What are the objectives of the project?
- What are the methods by which the project will be accomplished?

- What audience(s) do you intend to reach?
- How will you evaluate the success of the project?

Information and/or documentation of current or past accomplishments. (It is unnecessary to include large amounts of material; just a few examples will suffice.)

List of Board of Directors

List of key staff and their qualifications

If you are applying to renew a current grant from the Ploughshares Fund, you must include a report (no longer than three pages) on the current status of the grant. This report is NOT a substitute for the final report required in the original grant agreement. Names and telephone numbers of three references

The summary page and full proposal should be limited to 14 pages.

Supplemental information such as published articles and press clippings can be submitted in addition to the full proposal.

Financial Information

Complete budgets for the project and the organization. IRS letter of determination indicating the tax status of the organization. Fiscal sponsor's IRS letter of determination and a letter from the fiscal sponsor agreeing to act in that role (if applicable). Other sources of funding and potential funding. List of current funders. To what other organizations have you applied or will you apply for support?

We recognize that supporting material such as IRS letters of determination, published articles, etc. cannot be submitted via e-mail. If submitting a proposal via e-mail, Ploughshares will allow this material to be submitted separately after the core proposal is received. Please submit any material that cannot be e-mailed to our office within five days of the proposal submission deadline.

Interfaith Activities for Nuclear Disarmament

May 2003

This request for financial assistance is intended to support efforts by Howard W. Hallman, chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, in a leadership role in interfaith activities for nuclear disarmament. This will occur (a) through his service as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and (b) continuation of international activities that began at the 1998 meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee in Geneva. Activities will include (i) a global initiative and (ii) mobilization of religious representatives in the United States.

Organizations

Methodists United for Peace with Justice was organized in 1987 in response to a call from United Methodist bishops in their pastoral letter, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. We have campaigned for nuclear disarmament, opposed the first Gulf War and the recent war against Iraq, supported shifts in federal budget priorities from excessive military spending to human needs, and worked on other justice issues. To help overcome two centuries of racism within American Methodism, we promote cooperative activities between African Methodist Episcopal, African Methodist Episcopal Zion, Christian Methodist, and United Methodist Churches. Our work on these issues is supported by membership dues, contributions from Methodist entities, activity fees, and occasional foundation grants. Further information on Methodists United for Peace with Justice is provided on our website, www.mupwj.org.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is a coalition of denominational offices and religious association. It formed in 2000 as successor to the Interfaith Group for the CTBT. Since then the Interfaith Committee has mounted opposition to national missile defense, opposed development of new nuclear weapons, such as bunker-busters and mini-nukes, disagreed with the orientation of the Nuclear Posture Review, and objected to the potential use of nuclear weapons in dealing with terrorism. The Interfaith Committee sponsors a website, www.zero-nukes.org to (a) present a compilation of statements on nuclear disarmament by religious organizations, military leaders, international commissions and civil sector organizations and (b) provide a means for dialogue on how to get to zero nuclear weapons. A sample of letters on nuclear disarmament issues from organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee to public officials is found at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#interfaithcommittee>.

Global Initiative

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is in the early stage of a global initiative to mobilize religious opinion for the elimination of nuclear weapons. As a starting point the following elements are being discussed with top staff of the World Council of Churches, National Council of Churches (USA), Pax Christi International, and persons who have contact with the Holy See and with Canadian and European churches. Others will be brought in. The plan is subject to revision as it develops.

1. It is proposed that in fall of 2003 representatives of religious organizations from around the world issue "An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". The attached first draft offers a strong condemnation of nuclear weapons on moral grounds. It calls upon nuclear-weapon states to unequivocally renounce all use of nuclear

weapons against any adversary at any time under any circumstance. (All use, not just first use.) The appeal encompasses opposition to nuclear deterrence. It calls for concrete action to eliminate all nuclear weapons. The appeal will build upon experience of a statement made to the 1998 NPT Preparatory Committee meeting by heads of the World Council of Churches and Pax Christi International with a number of co-signers (initiated by Howard Hallman). See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#nptactnow>.

2. This appeal would form the basis for delegations representing religious organizations to call upon heads of states, or their representatives, of all nations possessing nuclear weapons and demand action for their elimination. This is the heart of this initiative. This approach will draw on recent experience of religious delegations making such visits dealing with (a) NATO's nuclear policy and (b) the war on Iraq.

3. The representative of the Holy See to the United Nations will be urged to use his annual address to the UN First Committee to make a strong appeal for global nuclear disarmament. This statement can cover the same grounds as the interfaith appeal.

4. Along with delegation visits we will initiative follow-through activities within various nations to get their governments to support serious efforts to promptly eliminate nuclear weapons. We would have the greatest strength in the United States, United Kingdom, France, and other NATO states.

5. For background information, we will draw upon www.zero-nukes.org and linkages to other organizations. We are talking with arms control experts about drafting a model deep cuts treaty between the United States and Russia and a recommended schedule for de-alerting the nuclear arsenals. These would be referenced in endnotes of the Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense and used in delegation visits.

Mobilization in the United States

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament will be a vehicle to press for changes in U.S. policy along the lines advocated in the Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense. We are in the early stages of planning a fall strategy meeting of religious leaders for this purpose. Participant would include staff of denominational offices and religious peace fellowships working on nuclear disarmament issues plus heads of Washington offices and headquarters staff located elsewhere involved in peace and justice matters. There would also be some resource persons from outside the faith community.

One proposal under consideration is for a focus that combines the visionary and the practical, the prophetic and the nitty-gritty. The prophetic would consist of elements of the Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense, including call for renunciation of nuclear weapons and a no use policy pending their elimination.

The practical might concentrate on the following issues:

(1) Pushing the United States to go farther and faster with bilateral actions involving Russia to take missiles off high alert and to make far deeper cuts in nuclear weapons, including dismantlement of weapons taken out of service. For background information and resource

persons we would draw upon the Arms Control Association, Center for Defense Information, Lawyers Alliance for World Security, and Union of Concerned Scientists.

(2) Ways to improve and expand nuclear threat reduction activities. This could include full funding of the proposals of the Baker-Cutler report. We could look to the Nuclear Threat Reduction Campaign, the Nuclear Threat Initiative, and RANSAC for background material and presenters.

(3) Strengthening our opposition to development of new nuclear weapons. This will continue present efforts to oppose research for mini-nukes and bunker busters and renewed testing of nuclear weapons. Among others the Friends Committee on National Legislation has provided leadership in this effort.

(4) Developing grassroots educational material and mobilization strategies on all of these issues. This will include use of "An Urgent Call -- End the Nuclear Danger", now promoted within the faith community by the Nuclear Reductions/Disarmament Initiative.

These are initial ideas subject to further development by a subcommittee and then the full Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

Personnel

The requested grant would provide modest support to the work of Howard Hallman, who will perform a catalytic leadership role in these endeavors. His background is shown in an attachment (drawn from <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howardhallman.htm>).

Grantee

The grantee for this proposal will be the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, which is a 501(c)(3) entity. The IRA tax-exempt determination letter is attached.

Budget

The total budget for this project is \$50,000, as follows:

Personnel	
Hallman (part time) 12 months @ \$3,000/mo.	\$36,000
Fringe benefits 15% of salary	<u>5,400</u>
	41,400
Communications (phone, internet, postage)	3,000
Printing, photocopy	2,400
Supplies	600
Travel	<u>2,600</u>
	\$50,000

May 24, 2003

Mr. Wade Greene
Room 5600
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10012

Dear Mr. Greene:

A year ago you gave us a \$2,000 contribution from an anonymous donor to assist in developing a website for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. It is now operational as www.zero-nukes.org. It contains statements on nuclear disarmament by religious organizations, military leaders, international commissions, and civil sector organizations. We are also beginning to receive scenarios written by recognized experts on how to get zero nuclear weapons. We will further develop this section of the website.

We are moving on to other initiatives and seek further support from members of the Rockefeller family. One initiative is getting religious leaders from around the world (a) to sign "An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons" and (b) to follow through by sending delegations to heads of nuclear weapon states, requesting them to renounce all use of nuclear weapons and move promptly for their elimination. A second initiative is staging a one day meeting of representative of religious organizations in the United States to develop strategies for pressing these demands on U.S. policy makers, particularly through grassroots mobilization. These initiatives are described more fully in the enclosed project description.

We request a contribution of \$15,000, which would provide partial support for my catalytic leadership in these endeavors through my role as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. The grant would go to the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, a 501(c)(3) entity. More about Methodists United for Peace with Justice is available on our website, www.mupwj.org.

Please let me know if you have any questions about this request.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman Chair

June 7, 2003

Mr. Wade Greene
Room 5600
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10012

Dear Mr. Greene:

I would like to update you on the two initiatives described in my letter of May 24, requesting support from members of the Rockefeller family.

I now have a second draft of "An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". It is enclosed. To garner initial signers and gain cooperation in carrying out this project, I am in touch with persons from the World Council of Churches, European Conference of Churches, Pax Christi International, Canadian Council of Churches, and National Council of Churches (USA). I've worked with all of them in recent years. We'll add other contacts, particularly beyond the Christian community, as the project develops. We are working toward agreement on the language of the Appeal in June, getting signers in July and August, release of the Appeal in September or October, followed by delegations calling on top officials of the states possessing nuclear weapons. This will feedback into action by religious organizations in various countries.

The second initiative is an all day session, to be held in the fall, involving representative of religious organizations in the United States to develop strategies for pressing harder for nuclear disarmament objectives. This will including planning of follow-up activities in Washington and grassroots mobilization. The enclosed proposal will be discussed by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on June 9. I'll let you know the outcome.

We greatly appreciate your consideration of our request for financial support.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman Chair

Samuel Rubin Foundation

Statement of Purpose

The Foundation's general purpose is to carry on the vision of its founder, Samuel Rubin, whose life was dedicated to the pursuit of peace and justice and the search for an equitable reallocation of the world's resources. The Foundation believes that these objectives can be achieved only through the fullest implementation of social, economic, political, civil and cultural rights for all the world's people.

Kindly consider this purpose before submitting an application.

Contact Information

Ms. Lauranne Jones, Grants Administrator

Mailing Address:

Samuel Rubin Foundation
777 United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017-3521

Telephone: 212 697-8945

Fax: 212 682-0886

Email: info@samuelrubinfoundation.org

Application Guidelines

A brief proposal of no more than 5 pages, together with a budget and your IRS tax-exempt determination letter, may be sent to Ms. Lauranne Jones, Grants Administrator, at any time. No application form is provided, and though it is not a requirement, we accept the National Network of Grantmakers common grant application. If you believe your project fits our statement of purpose, we would prefer a full proposal to a letter of inquiry.

There are no geographic limitations, and we accept applications for general operating expenses as well as for specific projects within an organization. No grants are made to individuals or for building funds, endowments, or scholarships. The majority of the Foundation's grants are in the \$5-10,000 range.

Applications forwarded by facsimile transmission or e-mail will not be given consideration, nor will telephone solicitations.

The Board of Directors normally meets three times a year. Application deadlines are the first Friday in January, September, and May.

The Foundation is small, so we are unable to acknowledge receipt of each proposal we receive. Applicants are notified of the Foundation's decision within a week of its meetings, which are generally held at the end of February, June and October of each year.

The Foundation has limited discretionary funds for 'emergency' distribution between Board meetings; therefore, the above application deadlines should be observed wherever possible.

Past year grantees of the foundation may be viewed [here](#).

Samuel Rubin Foundation

Schedule of grants paid for the year ending June 30, 1999

A.J. Muste Memorial Institute (for: International Peace Bureau)
Africa Fund, The
American Academy of Arts and Sciences (for: Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs)
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
Americans for Peace Now
Appalshop, Inc.
Arthur Ashe Institute for Urban Health, Inc.
Bedford-Stuyvesant Volunteer Ambulance Corps.
Boston Reproductive Rights Network Inc.
Boston Women's Fund
Bread for the Journey, Inc. (for: Suada's Bridge Bosnia Project)
Center for Constitutional Rights, Inc.
Center for Documentary Studies (for: DoubleTake Documentary Film Festival)
Center for Ethical Leadership (for: Soul of a Citizen)
Central American and Caribbean Research Council
Cine Qua Non, Inc. (for: The Provider Crisis)
Citizens Fund
City University of New York School of Law
Consortium of Women's Nongovernmental Associations
COPRED
Council on Foundations
DataCenter
Daytona Beach Community College
Dee & Davis Foundation, Inc.
Development of Peoples, The
The Downtown Cluster of Congregations
Downtown Community Television Center
Downwinders, Inc.
EarthAction Alerts Network (for: EarthAction)
Educators for Social Responsibility (for: Resolving Conflict Creatively Program)
Educators for Social Responsibility Metro Area
Feminist Press at CUNY
Filmmakers Collaborative, Inc. (for: The Heart of Land)
Foundation Center, The
Foundation for National Progress (for: MotherJones Magazine)
Fourth Freedom Forum
The Fund for Peace (for: The National Security Archive)

Global Kids
Global Policy Forum
Gun Free South Africa
Hampshire College (for: Five College Program in Peace and Security Studies)
Human Rights Watch
Immigrant Workers Resource Center Independent Documentary Group Films (for: Between Dreams and History)
Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy
Institute for Policy Studies, Inc.
Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility
International Women's Tribune Centre, Inc.
Jane Addams Peace Association (for: Women's International League for Peace and Freedom)
Learning Tree Education Center, Inc.
Lionel Penrose Trust
Long Island Alliance for Peaceful Alternatives
Mercy Corps International
Meretz USA (for: Israeli Civil Rights and Peace)
National Interreligious Service Board/Conscientious Objectors
National Labor Committee Education Fund.
New School University (for: World Policy Institute)
New York City School Volunteer Program
New York Foundation for the Arts (for: Thunder in Guyana: The Life of Janet Jagan)
Organize Training Center
PACS - Institute of Alternative Politics for Southern Cone
Paul Robeson Foundation
Peace Action Education Fund
PeaceWatch Ireland
Population Services International (for: PROSALUD)
Progressive Foundation, Inc. (for: U.S. Campaign to Free Mordechai Vanunu)
Public Media, Inc. (for: Poverty Outlaw/Skylight Pictures)
Rector, Church Wardens & Vestrymen of Grace Church, NYC
(for: Grace Opportunity Project)
Regents of the University of California (for: Emma Goldman Papers Project)
Royal Institute of International Affairs
Shared Interest
Standing for Truth About Radiation, Inc. (STAR)
State of the World Forum
Teachers College Columbia University
The Tides Center (for: Minuteman Media)
Transnational Institute
Trauma Foundation (for: Gun Policy Research)
U.S. Committee for UNDP
United for a Fair Economy
United Methodist Church, Women's Division
United Nations
United States Catholic Conference
(for: Trouble in Paradise/Access Productions)
University of Fort Hare/Tambo Human Rights Centre
University of Maryland Foundation, Inc.
Women's Action for New Directions Education Fund (WAND)
Wespac Foundation, Inc. (for: East Timor Action Network/United States)
Winrock International Associations
Women's Foreign Policy Group
Women's Institute for Housing and Economic Development
World Federalist Movement Institute for Global Policy, Ltd. (for: Hague Appeal for Peace 1999)
Yaroshinskaya Charity Fund

Supporting Interfaith Activities for Nuclear Disarmament

A Proposal to Samuel Rubin Foundation from Methodists United for Peace with Justice

We request a grant of \$10,000 from the Samuel Rubin Foundation to support the leadership role we fulfill in mobilization interfaith action for nuclear disarmament. This occurs as our chair, Howard W. Hallman, serves as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, a coalition of denominational offices and religious associations in the United States.

Applicant Organization

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is the applicant organization. Organized in 1987 in response to a call from United Methodist bishops in their pastoral letter, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*, we have campaigned for nuclear disarmament, opposed the first Gulf War and the recent war against Iraq, supported shifts in federal budget priorities from excessive military spending to human needs, and worked on other justice issues. To help overcome two centuries of racism within American Methodism, we promote cooperative activities between African Methodist Episcopal, African Methodist Episcopal Zion, Christian Methodist, and United Methodist Churches. Our work on these issues is supported by membership dues, contributions from Methodist entities, activity fees, and occasional foundation grants. Further information on Methodists United for Peace with Justice is provided on our website, www.mupwj.org

Going beyond our work within Methodism, we are oriented toward coalition building within the faith community on nuclear disarmament issues, particularly through the work of our chair, Howard W. Hallman. Long a participant in the Monday Lobby of peace and disarmament organizations, in 1997 he convened an informal group of religious organizations supporting ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. As issues changed, this evolved into the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, which he chaired. Subsequently this entity changed into the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament with a broader agenda, also with Hallman as chair (see below).

On the international scene from 1996 to 1998 Hallman was co-convenor of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, affiliated with Abolition 2000. In this role he developed a statement for presentation to the 1998 session of NPT Preparatory Committee and helped organize a reception for delegates. In 2000 he attended a Consultation with Churches on Nuclear Issues in Brussels, Belgium, cosponsored by the World Council of Churches, Conference of European Churches, Canadian Council of Churches, and National Council of Churches (USA) to deal with NATO's nuclear policy.

Our proposal seeks financial support for our leadership role in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and for continuation of international outreach to the global faith community.

Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament (ICND) is a coalition of denominational offices and religious association. It formed in 2000 as successor to the Interfaith Group for the CTBT. Since then the Interfaith Committee has mounted opposition to national missile defense, opposed development of new nuclear weapons, such as bunker-busters and mini-nukes, disagreed with the orientation of the Nuclear Posture Review, and objected to the potential use of nuclear weapons in dealing with terrorism.

Organized as a working coalition, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has approximately 40 organizations participating in meetings and on its list serve. The range of participants is revealed in the list of signers of letters to public officials as posted at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#interfaithcommittee>. In addition to those signers, the Interfaith Committee maintains a working relationship with the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, which usually doesn't sign such group letters.

On the pro-active side the Interfaith Committee promotes positive approaches to the elimination of nuclear weapons. For that purpose it has created a website, www.zero-nukes.org, financed by some of the participating organizations. This website contains a compilation of statements on nuclear disarmament by religious organizations, military leaders, international commissions, and civil sector organizations. It has a section on "How to Get Zero" with sub-sections on de-alerting, deep cuts, and scenarios for getting to zero offered by leading experts (just started with more to come). In the buildup to the war against Iraq a subsection on "Disarming Iraq without War" was added to the website.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament meets monthly in Washington, D.C. The agenda focuses primarily on issues currently before Congress and the Executive Branch and considers how grassroots networks can be mobilized. As a cooperative venture, various participants take the lead on specific issues and use the list-serve to share information. Currently David Culp of the Friends Committee for Legislation provides guidance on proposals for new nuclear weapons and what we can do to oppose them. Brian Finlay and Janice Ryan of the Nuclear Threat Reduction Campaign keep us informed on the Nunn-Lugar Program and related activities. Rich Killmer of the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative provides linkages with the Urgent Call - Reduce Nuclear Danger campaign.

As chair, Howard Hallman serves as catalyst to bring faith-based organizations together and to facilitate linkages with civil sector organizations. He sets up meetings with representatives of the Bush Administration and congressional staff. He serves as moderator of the list-serve and the website.

Future Activities

One purpose of this grant request is to provide some modest financial support so that Howard Hallman can maintain his leadership role with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. This will consist of continuation of catalytic work on specific issues. This will include opposition to new nuclear weapons, expansion of the role of nuclear weapons as envisioned in the Nuclear Posture Review, and missile defense. It will also encompass support

for arms control treaties, the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, and other non-proliferation activities.

In addition, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has started discussion for planning of a major conference in the fall of 2003 to bring together 100 or so representatives from various religious organizations to consider how to stop the expansion of nuclear weapons and to promote measures that will lead to the global elimination of nuclear weapons. The intent is to provide for further mobilization of the interfaith community in 2004 and subsequent years.

A second purpose of the requested grant is to provide support for Hallman's international work in helping to mobilize global faith community, specifically to assert stronger demands on the possessors of nuclear weapons to eliminate them and other weapons of mass destruction. This will build on recent experience with the remarkably widespread opposition by religious organizations throughout the globe to war against Iraq. For instance, religious delegations called upon top leaders in Baghdad, Moscow, Berlin, Paris, London, and Washington. Representatives of the Holy See made appearances in Baghdad and at the White House. Earlier experience along these lines occurred following the 2000 Brussels Consultation when similar delegations called upon governmental leaders in NATO states to propose changes in NATO's nuclear policy.

After the end of the war against Iraq, ostensibly aimed at elimination of weapons of mass destruction, we will seek to bring about similar mobilization to demand serious efforts to achieve global elimination of weapons of mass destruction. This would consist of (a) laying out an agenda with the help of international civil sector experts, (b) organizing religious leaders to call upon heads of states, (c) encouraging grassroots mobilization of the faith community in various countries, and (d) relating this to similar civil sector efforts. Hallman will work on this task, using early contacts developed at the 1998 NPT PrepCom meeting and the 2000 Brussels Consultation and contacts made in developing the section on "Religious Statements" in the Interfaith Committee's website (see <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements1.html>).

Qualifications of Howard W. Hallman

Activities supported by this grant will be carried out by Howard W. Hallman. He has been a peace activist since his days at the University of Kansas in the years following World War II. He was a conscientious objector during the Korean War and performed alternative civilian service. In subsequent years his peace activities have been mostly as a volunteer through local churches and the Fellowship of Reconciliation (chair of the Philadelphia chapter for two years in the 1950s). He actively opposed the Vietnam War. He has also been continuously involved in civil rights activities.

In 1984 Hallman felt a call to work for nuclear disarmament. In 1986 he obtained many signers for a "Citizens' Declaration for Worldwide Nuclear Disarmament". At the grassroots level he was unpaid coordinator of the Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign in Montgomery County, Maryland at the time of merger with SANE (predecessor to Peace Action). He was also chair of the Montgomery County Interfaith Forum on Peace and Justice. In 1987 he was a founding member of Methodists United for Peace with Justice and has subsequently served as issues chair, treasurer, executive director, and now as chair. He represents MUPWJ in the Monday Lobby of arms control and disarmament organizations. From 1996 to 1998 Hallman was co-convenor of the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition, affiliated with Abolition 2000. In the

United States he has served as chair successively of an informal group of religious organizations supporting ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Interfaith Group for the CTBT, and now the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

In his professional career Hallman has worked in urban improvement programs in Philadelphia and New Haven. He was associated with the War on Poverty in the 1960s. During the 1970s into the 1980s he headed the Civic Action Institute which provided training and technical assistance to city officials and neighborhood leaders on citizen participation practices and neighborhood self-help activities. In 1973 he was elected to the National Academy of Public Administration. In 1976 he was the principal founder of Neighborhoods, USA, a national association of neighborhood leaders and local officials, now in its 27th year. He has conducted studies and made presentations in Sweden, Canada, Puerto Rico, Yugoslavia, Israel, Japan, and Turkey. He is author of more than 250 publications including nine books, such as *Small and Large Together: Governing the Metropolis* and *Neighborhoods: Their Place in Urban Life*.

Grantee

The grantee for this proposal will be the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, which is a 501(c)(3) entity. The IRA tax-exempt determination letter is attached.

Budget

The total budget for this project is \$50,000, as follows:

Personnel	
Hallman (part time) 12 months @ \$3,000/mo.	\$36,000
Fringe benefits 15% of salary	<u>5,400</u>
	41,400
Communications (phone, internet, postage)	3,000
Printing, photocopy	2,400
Supplies	600
Travel	<u>2,600</u>
	\$50,000

We request a grant of \$10,000 from the Samuel Rubin Foundation in partial support of this budget. We are seeking further support from other foundations and individual donors.

References

We will provide a list of references upon request.

April 29, 2003

April 29, 2003

Ms. Lauranne Jones, Grants Administrator
Samuel Rubin Foundation
777 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017-3521

Dear Ms. Jones:

We are submitting a proposal for a grant of \$10,000 for "Supporting Interfaith Activities for Nuclear Disarmament". Although the applicant is Methodists United for Peace with Justice, project activities will be undertaken through the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is a coalition of 40 denominational offices and religious associations in the United States. It functions as a cooperative endeavor, first, to coordinate activities of the faith community on nuclear disarmament issues that come to focus in Congress and with the Executive Branch, and second, to facilitate grassroots mobilization within the faith community. This grant will partially support my catalytic leadership role as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

In addition, the grant will help support outreach to the global faith community for the purpose of mobilizing faith leaders and organizations in efforts to put pressure on nuclear weapons states to embark upon significant nuclear disarmament activities. This will build upon my previous experience with the Religious Working Group of Abolition 2000 and participation in a 2000 Brussels Consultation of church groups on NATO's nuclear policy.

The grant recipient will be the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, a 501(c)(3) entity. The IRS determination letter is attached. Budget information is contained in the grant proposal.

Please let me know if you would like some references or other material. I am willing to travel to New York if you or your colleagues would like to confer with me directly about our request.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Organizations represented in sign-on letters of Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Alliance of Baptists
American Baptist Churches, National Ministries
American Friends Service Committee
Baptist Peace Fellowship of North America
Church of the Brethren General Board
Church Women United
Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy
Conference of Major Superiors of Men
Cooperative Baptist Fellowship
Disciples Peace Fellowship
Episcopal Church, USA
Episcopal Peace Fellowship
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Evangelicals for Social Action
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Marianist, New York Province, Office of Justice and Peace
Mennonite Central Committee
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
F. Francis Murphy Justice and Peace Initiative
Muslim Peace Fellowship
National Council of Churches
NETWORK: A National Social Justice Lobby
Pax Christi USA
Presbyterian Church, USA
Presbyterian Peace Fellowship
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism
Religious Leaders for Sensible Priorities
Sisters of Mercy of the Americas
Sister of St. Joseph of Peace
Sojourners
Unitarian Universalist Association
United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries
United Methodist Council of Bishops
United Methodist General Board of Church and Society
World Peacemakers

Dear Ms. Shelton:

I would like to inquire whether the Town Creek Foundation would consider a proposal from Methodists United for Peace with Justice for a grant in support of our work in mobilizing the interfaith community on issues of nuclear disarmament. This is done through the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is a coalition of denominational offices and religious association. It has evolved from an informal group working for ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. It became the Interfaith Group for the CTBT and mounted an extensive grassroots campaign for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. After defeat of the treaty in the Senate, we re-formed in 2000 as the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

Since then we have mounted opposition to national missile defense, opposed development of new nuclear weapons, such as bunker-busters and mini-nukes, disagreed with the orientation of the Nuclear Posture Review, and objected to the potential use of nuclear weapons in dealing with terrorism. Sign-on letters on these subjects and more information about the Committee are presented at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#interfaithcommittee>.

Organized as a working coalition, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament does not have formal membership, but about 40 organizations participate in its list-serve. The range of participants is revealed in the list of signers to these letters. In addition, we maintain a working relationship with the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, which usually doesn't sign such group letters.

On the pro-active side we are promoting positive approaches to the elimination of nuclear weapons. For that reason we have created a website, www.zero-nukes.org, financed by some of the participating organizations. This website contains a compilation of statements on nuclear disarmament by religious organizations, military leaders, international commissions, and civil sector organizations. It has a section on "How to Get Zero" with sub-sections on de-alerting, deep cuts, and scenarios for getting to zero offered by leading experts (just started with more to come). In the buildup to the war against Iraq we added a subsection on "Disarming Iraq without War".

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament meets monthly in Washington, D.C. The agenda focuses primarily on issues currently before Congress and the Executive Branch and considers how grassroots networks can be mobilized. As a cooperative venture, various participants take the lead on specific issues and use the list-serve to share information. Currently David Culp of the Friends Committee for Legislation provides guidance on proposals for new nuclear weapons and what we can do to oppose them. Brian Finlay and Janice Ryan of the Nuclear Threat Reduction Campaign keep us informed on the Nunn-Lugar Program and related activities. Rich Kilmer of the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative provides linkages with the Urgent Call - Reduce Nuclear Danger campaign.

As chair, I serve as catalyst to bring faith-based organizations together and to facilitate linkages with civil sector organizations. I set up meetings with representatives of the Bush Administration and congressional staff. I serve as moderator of the list-serve and the website.

In addition, working from my base as chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice, I reach out to the international ecumenical and peace community. In 1998 I helped develop a presentation by faith leaders to the meeting of the NPT Preparatory Committee meeting in Geneva (see <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#npt>) and organized a reception for delegates. In 2000 I attended a Consultation with Churches on Nuclear Issues in Brussels, Belgium, cosponsored by the World Council of Churches, Conference of European Churches, Canadian Council of Churches, and National Council of Churches (USA). I link these connections back to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

If you want to receive our proposal, our grant request will be for a portion of an annual budget of \$50,000 to continue and expand my work with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. This will consist of two elements. First, to maintain what we are doing to coordinate the work of the faith community in the United States on nuclear issues, including grassroots mobilization. Second, to tie this to global mobilization of the religious community to assert stronger demands on the possessors of nuclear weapons to eliminate them and other weapons of mass destruction.

On the latter it is important to note the remarkably widespread opposition by religious organizations throughout the globe to war against Iraq. Religious delegations called upon top leaders in Baghdad, Moscow, Berlin, Paris, London, and Washington. Representatives of the Holy See made appearances in Baghdad and at the White House. Earlier following the 2000 Brussels Consultation similar delegations called upon governmental leaders in NATO states to propose changes in NATO's nuclear policy.

It would be desirable after the end of the war against Iraq, ostensibly aimed at elimination of weapons of mass destruction, to bring about similar mobilization to demand serious efforts to achieve global elimination of weapons of mass destruction. This would consist of (a) laying out an agenda with the help of international civil sector experts, (b) organizing religious leaders to call upon heads of states, (c) encouraging grassroots mobilization of the faith community in various countries, and (d) relating this to similar civil sector efforts. I propose to contribute to such an endeavor, building upon my experience with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and past efforts in the international faith community. As a catalyst I will be satisfied if others more prominent than myself step up to public leadership of such an initiative.

The grantee for this proposal would be the Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund, a 501-c-3 entity. Funds would be spent only for interfaith activities. For its own activities Methodists United for Peace with Justice has its own budget, drawn from membership dues, church contribution, occasional grants, and activity fees. Further information about the organization is available at www.mupwj.org. My vita is pasted below. Some of my ideas are offered at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements2.html#methodistsunitedforpeace>.

Please let me know if you would like to receive a full proposal.

With best regards,
Howard W. Hallman

Dear Dwain and Salpy,

I've developed a second draft for "An Appeal to Conscience and Common Sense for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". It is attached. This one is divided into three parts:

- (1) the basic appeal to be signed by religious leaders from around the globe,
- (2) a set of recommendations to possessors of nuclear weapons, to be signed by representatives of religious organizations and to be used by delegations calling on the possessors, and
- (3) background material of other statements and proposals by experts on certain aspects of nuclear disarmament.

My thinking is that the following schedule might be followed:

June -- get agreement from initial signers on language

July-August -- get signatures

September-October -- release of appeal and beginning of delegation visits

Would Dr. Raiser be willing to sign the Appeal and Recommendations? By and large the Appeal covers many of the same points made in the statement he and Cardinal Danneels addressed to the 1998 NPT PrepCom except that it calls for renunciation (no use) of nuclear weapons rather than merely no first use, as the 1998 statement did. My thought is that we need to be prophetic and take the opposite position of the Bush administration, which wants to develop new nuclear weapons for possible use. Anyway no first use implies that second use in retaliation might be acceptable, which it isn't.

If Dr. Raiser is a potential signer, I would like your input on the wording and strategy for release of the Appeal.

Would you help reach out to members of the World Council of Churches to get other signers?

Would you help develop a plan for the release of the Appeal? Release might occur when the United Nations General Assembly convenes in September or when the First Committee starts its work on nuclear disarmament issues in October.

Would you participate in forming delegations to visit possessor nations?

As part of this global initiative, I am going to approach Pugwash and International Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War to see whether there might be parallel statements by scientists and physicians advocating renunciation of nuclear weapons. If that is possible, we can coordinate release of these statements.

I hope that we can work together in this endeavor. As a refresher, you can see previous statements at www.zero-nukes.org.

Shalom,
Howard