

ACTION PROPOSALS FOR 2005
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
by Howard W. Hallman

(1) Early in 2005 the faith community through its top leadership should issue a call for the restoration of a bipartisan approach to nuclear weapons with the objective of reducing nuclear danger and moving toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. This call can be accompanied by a booklet outlining nuclear disarmament objectives for the next four years (see below).

(2) This should be followed with a concerted grassroots effort to gain support of 20 or so Republican senators and 25 to 30 House Republicans for nuclear reduction policies. (A few recalcitrant Democrats, such as Evan Bayh, can be added.) We worked in this manner in the 1998-99 campaign for CTBT ratification. To a lesser extent we have done so this year in our efforts to block funding for new nuclear weapons. For this to happen there should be a full-time grassroots coordinator who would work closely with denominational offices, peace fellowships, and state ecumenical associations.

(3) To provide a focus, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament (or its successor) should develop a set of nuclear disarmament objectives to be achieved in 2005 to 2008 during the next presidential term. These objectives would relate to (a) steps by the United States and other nuclear weapon states to move toward total nuclear disarmament and (b) nonproliferation measures that (i) prevent states with nuclear ambitions from acquiring such weapons and (ii) keep fissile material and nuclear weapons out the hands of terrorists. These objectives with explanatory material should be published in a 16 page booklet.

Civic sector organizations can help in formulation of objectives and provision of background explanation. They can be referenced in the booklet as sources for further information.

Interfaith groups in key states and congressional districts could use the booklet for opening conversations with senators and representatives to determine which objectives they might support. In Washington representatives of the faith community could use the booklet for conversations with executive officials.

(4) To provide greater specificity action alerts would be provided to grassroots activists on pending legislation and executive decisions as they arise.

(5) In addition there could be background papers on new issues, written by

civic sector experts. State and congressional district coalitions could use these in dialogue with senators and representatives. For example, in July the Bush Administration announced that in negotiations for a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty it would not support verification measures. An organization like the Arms Control Association could provide a briefing on this matter and explain why verification is essential. The chair of a state or congressional district interfaith coalition could send this briefing to senators and representative and ask for their views on the issue, indicating that their response would be shared with members of their interfaith coalition. This might elicit a better response than a letter from a Washington-based organization to senators and representatives.

(6) The faith community could encourage civic sector organizations that operate on a nonpartisan basis to join in the effort to develop bipartisan (Republican) support for nuclear disarmament.

I'll be interested in your response to these ideas.

Shalom,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 301 896-0013; e-mail: hhallman@mupwj.org
Website: www.mupwj.org

Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Meeting of Monday, June 14, 2004

2:00 p.m., Room 300, United Methodist Building

100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.

AGENDA

1. Introductions
2. Legislation
 - a. Current Status
 - b. Tasks for next six weeks
3. Looking toward 2005
 - a. Proposal for four-year goals
 - b. Consultation: January 2005
 - c. Ecumenical Advocacy Days: March 2005
4. Fundraising
5. Committee leadership
6. Next meeting

Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Meeting of Tuesday, September 21, 2004

10:00 a.m. to 12 noon

**Room 3, United Methodist Building
100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, D.C.**

AGENDA

1. Current legislation
2. Future organization and leadership for interfaith activities on nuclear disarmament
3. Issues and tactical focus for 2005
4. Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament, January 12-13, 2005
5. Ecumenical Advocacy Days, March 11-14, 2005
6. Assignment of responsibility
 - a. Serving as chair or convener of ICND or its successor
 - b. Developing strategy and tactics for 2005
 - c. Organizing the Consultation
 - d. Organizing track for Advocacy Days
 - e. Secretariat: arranging for meeting place, meeting notices and notes
 - f. List serve
 - g. Web site (if continued)
 - h. Other
7. Next meeting

January 24, 2004

Ms. Naila A. Bolus, Executive Director
Ploughshares Fund
Fort Mason Center
San Francisco, CA 94123

Dear Naila,

I would like to bring you up to date on the work of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, which I chair, for two reasons.

First, I want to strengthen our relationship with the collaborative planning process of civic sector organizations on peace and security issues that you are coordinating. In this regard the focus of our efforts in the coming months will include:

- Opposing funding for new nuclear weapons
- Opposing the Administration's retrogressive nuclear policies
- Promoting positive steps toward nuclear disarmament
- Emphasizing that the existence of nuclear weapons is inherently a moral issue
- Mobilizing grassroots action within the faith community
- Encouraging education of congregations

In undertaking these activities we are committed to achieving strong linkages with civic sector organizations

Second, being a "long distance runner", I never give up hoping that the work I am doing might merit financial support from the Ploughshares Fund. In providing leadership on these issues within the faith community, my basic approach is to share credit and operate low-key, behind-the-scene. This is effective in coalition building but less so in grant seeking. What I describe below has many contributors, but much of it would not be happening except for my leadership and the connections that I facilitate. What I do strengthens the work of major Ploughshares grantees within the faith community and leverages their contributions.

Consultation. The Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament, which we held on December 3, 2003, was a very successful event. We had more than fifty participants including heads of a number of denominational offices. It was the largest gathering of this kind on this issue within the memory of current activists. We generated renewed enthusiasm and a commitment to

Ms. Naila A. Bolus
January 24, 2004
Page two.

work harder and more cohesively on nuclear disarmament. Attached are the program, a roster of participants, and some of the papers of the presenters.

This was a collaborative effort with particularly strong contributions by Rich Killmer and David Culp. I provided primary leadership by chairing the planning meetings, lining up the presenters (half of whom were women at my insistence), getting information out on the list-serve that I operate, and coordinating recruitment of participants beyond our usual circle. At the Consultation I chaired the afternoon strategy sessions, kept the meeting on schedule, and pushed for commitment of participating organizations for follow up activities.

We decided to (1) focus on Congress to oppose funding for new nuclear weapons, (2) mount opposition to the Administration's retrogressive nuclear weapons policies, (3) coordinate grassroots mobilization, especially in some target states and congressional districts, and (4) strengthen educational activities within congregations.

Focus on Congress. At the January meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament we refined our strategy for dealing with Congress. Working from Culp's presentation to the Consultation, we decided to focus on key senators on floor votes for funding research for new nuclear weapons and on key decision makers within legislative committees. Culp will take the lead on legislative strategies, and Killmer will coordinate grassroots outreach activities. This is spelled out in an attached memo. My job is facilitate connections among the various actors and to assure that denominational offices are fulfilling their commitment to participate.

My catalytic leadership is a crucial ingredient. Since joining the Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy eighteen months ago, Killmer has done a terrific job in reaching out to denominational offices and state ecumenical councils. Although he achieved only three percent of his goal of 100,000 signatures for "An Urgent Call -- Reduce Nuclear Danger", it has been a useful tool for making contact with a wide network. Now is the time to use that network for grassroots mobilization on specific legislative issues. For the past three years I have been looking for someone to coordinate this task, as Marie Reitmann helped accomplish from her base at 20/20 Vision during the CTBT ratification campaign. I urged Killmer to take on this role, and I got the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament to agree to this assignment.

This arrangement will take advantage of FCNL's skills in policy analysis and legislative contacts. They are strong in mobilizing their own base. They are less inclined to coordinate interfaith efforts. However, they welcome the opportunity to relate to denominational offices and religious peace fellowships that I bring together in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. They also make use of the "interfaithnd" list-serve that I operate (see below).

Focus on the President. How we deal with the President and Executive Branch to oppose retrogressive nuclear weapons policy is not as clearly in focus. My own thinking, not yet fully

Ms. Naila A. Bolus
January 24, 2004
Page three.

adopted by Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, is to take several steps: (1) Have top religious leaders in the United States sign *A Moral Appeal for a Safer World without Nuclear Weapons* (see below). (2) When this Appeal is publicly released, simultaneously release a letter to President Bush outlining specific steps that the United States should undertake (an unvetted draft is attached). (3) Start a grassroots educational campaign at Ecumenical Advocacy Days (see below). (4) In April have a call-in day to the White House on the immorality of nuclear weapons and the need to eliminate them. (5) Continue other activities in following months.

Ecumenical Advocacy Days. Last spring Washington-based offices within the faith community began planning for the 2004 version of Ecumenical Advocacy Days, which brings hundreds of grassroots activists to Washington to lobby on specific issues. Under my leadership the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament asked that there be a track on nuclear disarmament. The planning committee agreed. Again I have taken the lead in developing the program, with considerable help from Killmer. I have invited the speakers and pushed denominational offices to promote attendance. Our program for Ecumenical Advocacy Days 2004 is attached and also an e-mail announcement for the Nuclear Disarmament Track. Our intent is to use this occasion to develop educational material that can be used by grassroots activists in their home communities. We wouldn't have had this opportunity if I hadn't pushed for it.

Educating congregations. A number of participants at the December 3 Consultation emphasized the need to strengthen educating congregations on nuclear weapons issues. As a first step, Catherine Gordon of the Presbyterian Washington Office has agreed to provide leadership for an inventory of relevant material available from denominational offices and religious peace fellowships. We will identify important gaps and commission different participants to prepare new material that can be shared with our entire network.

Communications. I facilitate communications within the faith community on nuclear disarmament issues in two ways. First, I am moderator of a list-serve that now has 54 participants and is growing. I use it for meeting announcements and strategy discussion. Others use it to get out information to our network. Second, I am moderator of a website, www.zero-nukes.org, which (a) serves as a repository for statements and other information on nuclear disarmament and (b) provides opportunity for dialogue on how to get zero nuclear weapons. The website is cosponsored twelve denominational offices. (For the website of Methodists United for Peace with Justice go to www.mupwj.org.)

Civic sector linkages. A perusal of the programs for the Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament on December 3, 2003 and Ecumenical Advocacy Days 2004, plus some of the initial signers of *A Moral Appeal*, illustrates some of the ways we are connected with civic sector organizations. This is an essential element of our approach, which we intend to strengthen in the coming months.

Ms. Naila A. Bolus
January 24, 2004
Page four.

A moral issue. Discussion at the December 3 Consultation stressed that the existence of nuclear weapons is inherently a moral issue. This will be the topic of the keynote speech by United Methodist Bishop C. Dale White at the Nuclear Disarmament Track at Ecumenical Advocacy Days. I am also making the moral issue the focus of a global initiative that I have underway.

This builds upon my previous activities as a co-convenor of the Religious Working Group of Abolition 2000 that produced a statement and a presentation from religious leaders to the 1998 NPT PrepCom meeting in Geneva. (See <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#npt>.) In 2000 I renewed my European contacts by participating in A Consultation with Churches on NATO Nuclear Issues, held in Brussels.

Working from my base in Methodists United for Peace with Justice, I am now renewing my global efforts through *A Moral Appeal for a Safer World without Nuclear Weapons* (attached). This Appeal speaks of the inherent immorality of nuclear weapons, calls for no use, and advocates total elimination. In this effort I am partnering with Paul Lansu of Pax Christi International; Rev. Dr. Robert Edgar and Tony Kireopoulos of the National Council of Churches; and Jonathan Granoff representing the World Conference of Religions for Peace (WCRP), who also has strong contacts in the civic sector. Other partners are pending.

The attached Appeal shows our initial signers. (This list will be regularly updated at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/moralappeal.html>.) I am reaching out to the World Council of Churches, regional and national ecumenical councils, and global federations of denominations to obtain other signers. Paul Lansu is obtaining Catholic signers from different continents. Jonathan Granoff will obtain signers from other faiths through WCRP and from Nobel peace laureates. He and I are working together to obtain signatures of leading scientists and physicians to achieve an unusual combination of religion, science, and medicine. We are working toward public release of the Appeal in early March. This will be followed by activities within nations possessing nuclear weapons to promote their elimination.

We will invite heads of religious communions in the United States to sign *A Moral Appeal*. I am suggesting that they also sign a letter to President Bush outlining specific steps that the United States should take to move toward total elimination of its nuclear arsenal.

Conclusion. Naturally I hope that the Ploughshares Fund might look again at the work that I do and find that it merits financial support. But even if you don't, I want to stay in touch with you so that work within the faith community for which I provide leadership can relate to the collaborate planning process of the civic sector that you are coordinating.

With best regards,

Howard W. Hallman
Chair

Dear Colleagues:

At the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament at 2:00 p.m., Monday, June 14 in Room 300, United Methodist Building, I want to continue to looking ahead to 2005. This summer I would like to seek financial support for preparation for our Consultation the second week in January. Therefore, I am seeking a consensus in where we are headed.

Specifically I want to propose two things:

First, develop a set of "Nuclear Disarmament Goals: 2005-2008" that can be achieved during the next presidential term. These goals would be agreed to by organizations participating in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. They would be published in a 16-page booklet and used to guide us in talking with executive officials and members of Congress. Specific annual action objectives would depend upon who is in control of these branches. (See suggested outline pasted below.)

Second, in 2005 build a strong interfaith grassroots network that focuses upon 20 or so "swing" senators (mostly Republican), enough to get a treaty ratified, and 20 to 25 House Republicans, enough to win a majority if the House is divided as it is in 2004. We would encourage grassroots delegations to meet with these senators and representatives, present our 16-page "Goals", and ask them which ones they would support, which ones they might oppose or have trouble with. We would continue to focus on these senators and representatives throughout the session.

If you are not going to attend the meeting on Monday, June 14, I would like your initial reaction to these ideas. You can respond by e-mail or phone me Friday afternoon, June 11 at 301 896-0013.

Shalom,
Howard

####

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT GOALS: 2005-2008 Initial Draft

I. Don't Let Terrorists Acquire Nuclear Weapons

- A. Within four years totally secure all nuclear warheads and fissile material in Russia and elsewhere.
- B. Within four years re-acquire and secure all heavily enriched uranium.
- C. Other measures for achieving this goal (see Harvard report, other sources)
- D. Appropriate sufficient funds for these purposes.

II. Prevent New Nations from Acquiring Nuclear Weapons

- A. End nuclear programs of Iran and North Korea
- B. Strengthen global non-proliferation regime (get specific ideas from Joe Cirincionne, Jonathan Dean, and others)

III. End US-Russian Nuclear Danger

- A. Achieve zero alert within one year.
- B. Within four years reach SORT level of deployed strategic warheads (1,700-2,200).
- C. Dismantle all warheads and delivery vehicles taken out of service.
- D. In year three (2007) commence negotiations for further reductions.

IV. Nuclear Weapon Development by United States

- A. Cease all research and development of new nuclear weapons.
- B. Continue testing moratorium
- C. Ratify Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- D. Cease development of new nuclear weapons facilities.
- E. Begin closing down facilities not needed for testing reliability and for dismantling nuclear warheads

V. Curtail Other Nuclear Weapons States

- A. Support regional nuclear disarmament (such as India and Pakistan)
- B. In year three (2007) commence multilateral negotiations for global elimination of all nuclear weapons.

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT GOALS: 2005-2008

A proposal by Howard W. Hallman

I propose that the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament develop a set of "Nuclear Disarmament Goals: 2005-2008" that can be achieved during the next presidential term. These goals would be agreed upon by participating organizations. They would be published in a 16-page booklet and used to guide us in talking with executive officials and members of Congress. Specific annual action objectives would depend upon who is in control of these branches.

Outline of Goals, First Draft

I. Don't Let Terrorists Acquire Nuclear Weapons

- A. Within four years totally secure all nuclear warheads and fissile material in Russia and elsewhere.
- B. Within four years re-acquire and secure all heavily enriched uranium.
- C. Other measures for achieving this goal (see Harvard report, other sources)
- D. Appropriate sufficient funds for these purposes.

II. Prevent New Nations from Acquiring Nuclear Weapons

- A. End nuclear programs of Iran and North Korea
- B. Strengthen global non-proliferation regime (get specific ideas from Joe Cirincione, Jonathan Dean, and others)

III. End US-Russian Nuclear Danger

- A. Achieve zero alert within one year.
- B. Within four years reach SORT level of deployed strategic warheads (1,700-2,200).
- C. Dismantle all warheads and delivery vehicles taken out of service.
- D. In year three (2007) commence negotiations for further reductions.

IV. Nuclear Weapon Development by United States

- A. Cease all research and development of new nuclear weapons.
- B. Continue testing moratorium
- C. Ratify Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty
- D. Cease development of new nuclear weapons facilities.
- E. Begin closing down facilities not needed for testing reliability and for dismantling nuclear warheads

V. Curtail Other Nuclear Weapons States

- A. Support regional nuclear disarmament (such as India and Pakistan)
- B. In year three (2007) commence multilateral negotiations for global elimination of all nuclear weapons.

Advocacy. To work for achievement of these goals I propose that in 2005 we build a strong interfaith grassroots network that focuses upon 20 or so "swing" senators (mostly Republican), enough to get a treaty ratified, and 20 to 25 House Republicans, enough to win a majority if the House is divided as it is in 2004. We would encourage grassroots delegations to meet with these senators and representatives, present our 16-page "Goals", and ask them which ones they would support, which ones they might oppose or have trouble with. We would continue to focus on these senators and representatives throughout the session.

June 14, 2004

Persons on interfaithnd@yahoogroups.com
the list service of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

abaumgarten@episcopalchurch.org
acurtis@networklobby.org
agreenblatt@nccusa.org
andrew@fcnl.org
aweinberg@rac.org
bfinlay@vi.org
bgirtonm@nccusa.org
bGREEN@wesleysem.edu
bhinman@churchworldservice.org
blythe-goodman@comcast.net
bobkinsey@earthlink.net
BPinguel@afsc.org
BWeinstein@urj.org
cfpa@peacecoalition.org
cgordon@ctr.pcusa.org
conoverp@ucc.org
david@fcnl.org
David@NHchurches.org
dickull@aol.com
dshank@sojo.net
Dwight.Lundgren@abc-usa.org
egbertl4pj@yahoo.com
epfnational@ameritech.net
galvinbill@hotmail.com
gpowers@nccbuscc.org
gthunt@mdo.net
guy.quinlan@cliffordchance.com
hnolen@churchworldservice.org
J._Daryl_Byler@mcc.org
jcoode@maryknoll.org
jean@paxchristiusa.org
jhanson@umc-gbcs.org
karen_vagley@elca.org
kathy@fcnl.org
kenanddavida@starpower.net
KILLMERRP@aol.com
l.redden@comcast.net
LenandJudy@syracusenet.net
LWYOLTON@Prodigy.Net
matthew_anderson-stembridge@elca.org
mgetz@episcopalchurch.org
Mharrison@umc-gbcs.org
MHOWARD@SISTERSOFMERCY.ORG
mkoenig@ctr.pcusa.org
mlucey@lcwr.org

mshea@episcopalchurch.org
mupj@igc.org
Murraylou2@cs.com
Powelll@ucc.org
PSRAtlanta@mindspring.com
rkillmer@wesleysem.edu
sallybreen@msn.com
sdeboe@csm.org
shannonpcusa@hotmail.com
ssidorak@aol.com
stiefr@ucc.org
SusanML@MennoniteUSA.org
tiller64@starpower.net
timellen@members.mkl-mmef.org
uuawo@aol.com
washington_office_gb@brethren.org

March 17, 2004

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Re: Mobilizing to stop fund of new nuclear weapons

Dear Colleagues:

Crunch time has arrived. We have four months left to stop funding for new nuclear weapons and preparation for resumption of nuclear testing. This includes funding for:

- * Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (bunker-buster) -- \$27.6 million for FY '05, growing to almost \$500 million over five years (thus, more than research is planned)
- * Advanced Concepts for Nuclear Weapons (mini-nukes, etc.) -- \$9 million for FY '05
- * Test site readiness -- \$18 million for FY '05

David Culp, Rich Killmer, and I have developed the following set of recommendations for action by the faith community. We would like to know what your office or organization will commit to undertake.

HOUSE SCHEDULE

Estimated schedule for action by the House of Representatives is as follows:

Last week in April -- markup by House Armed Services Committee

Mid-May -- markup by Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee

Before Memorial Day -- House vote on defense authorization

Early June -- House vote on appropriations

SENATE SCHEDULE

May -- markup by Senate Armed Services Committee

Before Memorial Day or early June -- Senate vote on defense authorization

Early June -- markup by Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee

Late June or July -- Senate vote on defense appropriations

PRIORITIES FOR ACTION

Our greatest opportunity to block funding for new nukes will come in the appropriations process.

(1) Rep. David L. Hobson (R-Ohio, 7th district), chair of House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, is committed to block funding for the bunker buster, as he did last year. He needs praise and encouragement from his district.

(2) Last year the Senate approved funding for bunker-busters and mini-nuke research by a four-vote margin. We need to change at least that many votes. If your office can do only one thing, work on one or more of the key senators listed below.

(3) If your office wants to send out alerts to your nationwide list, it should come prior to (a) House vote on appropriations in early June (send before Memorial Day) and (2) Senate vote on appropriations in late June or July (send by mid-June). If you can personalize these alerts by district or state, all the better.

(4) FCNL will circulate a sign-on letter (for heads of Washington offices, etc.) which can be used (with appropriate adjustments) with subcommittees, committees, entire House and Senate.

SEQUENCE FOR ALERTS

For target states with key senators we suggest that you send our alerts in this order:

- (i) One page e-mail or regular-mail alert with explanation of issue. David Culp will have a draft available by March 26. This will also be adaptable to alerts prior to floor votes.
- (ii) Postcard alert (or short, second e-mail message). Sample will be available by April 1.
- (iii) Phone bank in key states a week or so ahead of expected votes.

KEY STATES AND SENATORS

We have identified the following states with swing senators (going east to west):

Maine -- Susan Collins (R), Olympia Snowe (R)

Pennsylvania -- Arlen Specter (R)

Georgia -- Zell Miller (D)

Florida -- Bill Nelson (D)

Indiana -- Evan Bayh (D), Richard Lugar (R)

Nebraska -- Ben Nelson (D), Chuck Hagel (R)

Oregon -- Gordon Smith (R)

Key leaders (not necessarily to get votes against but to lessen their advocacy when trade-off time comes)

Virginia -- John Warner (R), chair, Armed Services Committee

Colorado -- Wayne Allard (R), chair, Strategic Forces Subcommittee

New Mexico -- Pete Domenici (R), chair, Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee

YOUR COMMITMENT

(1) Previously some of you have made a commitment to work in specific states. I want to re-affirm this and get more details. Please let me know the following:

(a) Your commitment to focus on which senators in which states.

(b) Which methods you will use for each state to promote communication to senator:

(i) e-mail or regular-mail alert

(ii) postcard alert

(iii) phone bank

(iv) get top religious leader(s) to write senator

(v) promote op-eds

(c) Do you have a key contact in the state who would be willing to work as part of a statewide coalition? If so, please provide name and contact information.

(d) Rich Killmer is getting state ecumenical organizations to take the lead in coalition activities. We will share the names of your contacts with them. We are looking for somebody to take the lead in Florida and Indiana if you have any suggestions.

- (2) Will you get your members in the 7th district of Ohio to support Rep. Hobson?
- (3) Will you send out an alert to your complete list throughout the United States prior to
 - (a) House floor vote on appropriations (alert before Memorial Day)
 - (b) Senate floor vote on appropriations (alert in mid-June)

You can reply to me by e-mail or call me at 301 896-0013. Also, I will be making follow-up calls.

I recognize that many of you and your offices are working on a number of issues. I will greatly appreciate your giving as much time as possible to blocking the funding of new nuclear weapons. By halting this part of the nuclear arms race, we will be altering a significant aspect of the Administration's regressive nuclear weapons policy.

Thanks for your efforts,
Howard

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

A Message from Methodists United for Peace with Justice
Stop New Nuclear Weapons

Dear Friends in Indiana:

Congress will shortly consider funding to develop new nuclear weapons and prepare for resumption of nuclear testing. In its FY2005 budget, the Administration requested \$27.6 million for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) or bunker-buster (a nuclear weapon designed for use against underground bunkers), \$9 million for Advanced Nuclear Weapons Concepts (new ways to develop nuclear weapons such as mini-nukes), and \$30 million for nuclear test site readiness. While small in terms of dollars and immediate impact, the development of new nuclear weapons will undermine international efforts to stop the spread of these weapons and lead to major spending if implemented.

Please contact Senator Evan Bayh and Senator Richard Lugar today to urge them to oppose the funding of new nuclear weapons and test site readiness. Tell them that new nuclear weapons do not provide security. In fact, they will make the world a more dangerous place by encouraging other countries to rely on nuclear weapons for their security.

Due to delays within the Capitol mailing system, it is preferable to reach your senators by phone, fax, or e-mail in Washington or by contacting one of their offices in Indiana.

Senator Evan Bayh

Phone: (202) 224-5623

Fax: (202) 228-1377

E-mail through <http://bayh.senate.gov/LegForm.htm>

District offices are listed at <http://bayh.senate.gov/contact.html>

Senator Richard Lugar

Phone: (202) 224-4814

Fax: (202) 228-0360

E-mail: senator_lugar@lugar.senate.gov

District offices are listed at http://lugar.senate.gov/contact_dick_lugar.html

You can also contact your senators through UMPower, operated by the United Methodist General Board of Church and Society. Go to <http://capwiz.com/gbcs/home/> and click on "Stop New Nuclear Weapons". You will find further background on this issue. You will be able to send e-mail letters to Senator Bayh and Senator Lugar and also to your representative.

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

Methodists United for Peace with Justice is an advocacy organization and is not a part of any official denominational agency. Further information on our organization is available at <http://www.mupwj.org>.

Stop New Nuclear Weapons

Congress will shortly consider funding to develop new nuclear weapons and prepare for resumption of nuclear testing. In its FY2005 budget, the Administration requested \$27.6 million for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) or bunker-buster (a nuclear weapon designed for use against underground bunkers), \$9 million for Advanced Nuclear Weapons Concepts (new ways to develop nuclear weapons such as mini-nukes), and \$30 million for nuclear test site readiness. While small in terms of dollars and immediate impact, the development of new nuclear weapons will undermine international efforts to stop the spread of these weapons and lead to major spending if implemented.

Please contact Senator Evan Bayh and Senator Richard Lugar today to urge them to oppose the funding of new nuclear weapons and test site readiness. You can reach Senator Bayh by phone at (202) 224-5623 or by e-mail at <http://bayh.senate.gov/LegForm.htm>. You can reach Senator Lugar by phone at (202) 224-4814 or by e-mail at senator_lugar@lugar.senate.gov. Because of delays due to security review, mail to their offices in Washington is delayed several weeks. However, you may write to them at their district offices in Indiana. They are listed at <http://bayh.senate.gov/contact.html> and http://lugar.senate.gov/contact_dick_lugar.html

For more information, contact Mark Harrison, United Methodist General Board of Church and Society at mharrison@umc-gbcs.org or 202-488- 5645.

United Methodist Church Position

We condemn the production, possession, or use of nuclear weapons. (“Social Principles,” 2000 Book of Resolutions, p. 63) United Methodists must urge their governments to abolish nuclear weapons. (“Globalization and its Impact on Human Dignity,” 2000 Book of Resolutions, p. 721)

Background

Nuclear “Bunker Busters” – Since the end of the Cold War, some civilian military planners and nuclear scientists have argued for creating a new class of earth-penetrating nuclear weapons. These weapons are sometimes referred to as “bunker busters” because they would be designed to burrow into the ground to destroy underground military facilities that are protected by 100 to 300 feet of concrete or rock. The Energy Department’s budget request for FY 2005 includes \$27.6 million for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP). The RNEP would use an existing nuclear weapon, redesigned for use against underground bunkers. It would have the explosive power of up to 70 times that of the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima.

Advanced Nuclear Weapons Concepts – During much of the Cold War, the three weapons laboratories had teams of scientists and engineers studying advanced weapons concepts. Studies ranged from modification of existing weapons, to improvement for next-generation weapons, to exploration of new weapons technologies and weapons for new missiles. The Administration has requested \$9 million for FY 2005 for this program. This initiative sends a message to the rest of the world that the U.S. is again thinking about nuclear weapons production. Our most talented

scientists should be working on more socially productive things.

Nuclear Testing – The U.S. stopped testing nuclear weapons in 1992.

The Wrong Direction – The U.S. has strongly criticized Iran and North Korea for moving to obtain equipment to produce weapons-grade nuclear materials and the ability to deliver them as bombs. The U.S. has also expressed concerns about continuing nuclear programs in Pakistan and India, as well as growing concern that nuclear materials could fall into the hands of terrorists groups, such as al Qaeda. By building new nuclear weapons, the U.S. will further weaken already struggling international efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. U.S. influence with the international community will erode further if it seeks to upgrade U.S. nuclear weapons while demanding that other countries such as Iran and Libya disarm.

Dear Colleagues:

Conversation is going on between leaders of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and the newly formed Interreligious Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons about future activities of the faith community on this issue. To add to matters under consideration, I would like to offer a proposal of a way to influence U.S. policy on nuclear weapons under President George Bush's successor, the president who will serve from 2009 to early 2113.

SUMMARY & QUERY

Specifically I propose that beginning in early 2006 we initiate contact with persons who seem to be positioning themselves to run for president (perhaps 12 to 15 in total) and seek to educate and influence them to make a commitment to work for global elimination of nuclear weapons. Would you be interested in participating in such an effort?

ANALYSIS

Ever since atomic bombs exploded over Hiroshima and Nagasaki religious leaders have advocated no further use and complete elimination. They have been joined by scientists, others in the civic sector, and some retired military leaders. Reasons are both moral and practical.

Although we have had some successes in restraining the nuclear arms race, in sixty years we haven't succeeded in our ultimate goal of complete abolition. Our lack of success stems from the fact that executive leaders, top military officials, and legislative majorities in the United States and elsewhere believe that nuclear weapons have utility.

To change this I propose that the faith community in the United States embark upon a carefully focused effort to convince the next U.S. president and a majority in Congress to make a commitment to the global elimination of nuclear weapons.

The 2008 presidential campaign is now in the positioning stage. Men and women with presidential ambitions are making soundings within the political community, traveling to Iowa, New Hampshire, and other key primary states, and working out campaign themes. We have an opportunity to influence them before they have formally announced their candidacy and make public commitments on key policy issues.

From now until the primary campaign begins in earnest in the fall of 2007 we can gain greater access to these would-be candidates than during the hectic primary and general election season and certainly than after one of them is elected president. This applies both to access by national religious leaders and by grassroots activists in states where potential candidates are making soundings.

To take advantage of this opportunity I propose that we undertake the following steps.

COMMITMENT TO WORK TOGETHER

We can start by developing a plan of action and getting commitment from key actors in the faith community between now and the end of 2005. This can be done by persons from denominations

and unofficial religious organizations which have been active in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, representatives of state ecumenical agencies who have participated in Ecumenical Advocacy Days, Muslim leaders who Rich Kilmer is in touch with, and initiators of the Interreligious Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

Denominational staff in Washington and at headquarters can sound out heads of communion to determine if they would be supportive of this effort and, as time permits, join in delegations to meet with leading presidential candidates. Those with grassroots networks can decide whether they want to participate in this effort when the time is ripe. We can identify gaps in coverage within the faith community where we need greater involvement as the effort proceeds.

WHAT TO ADVOCATE

During this initial period we can decide what we want the next president to do. For example:

- (1) Reverse the Bush policy of nuclear weapons forever and make a commitment to work with other nations and international organizations to seek the global elimination of nuclear weapons, as required by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, as soon as practicable.
- (2) Carry out a vigorous nonproliferation program to assure that terrorists and aggressive nations don't acquire nuclear weapons material and explosive devices. (We can consult with experts in this field to specify steps that should be undertaken during the next presidential term, with hope that some of them will even be achieved by the end of 2008.)
- (3) In conjunction with other nations undertake a step-by-step program for global elimination of the existing nuclear weapons stockpile and production facilities. This can include such measures as zero alert within one year; a four year program for reduction of deployed nuclear weapons to 100 or less for each possessor, or even to zero; continuation of testing moratorium and ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; dismantlement of all nuclear weapons taken out of service, etc.

We can publish these ideas in, say, "An Interfaith Proposal for the Global Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". This would become the asking of religious leaders in meeting with presidential candidates and would be used by grassroots activists in public forums and private meetings with presidential candidates.

Later we can flesh this out by asking experts in the civic sector to provide background papers that we can provide presidential candidates to show practical ways of achieving our objectives. These can be used in follow-up conversations to answer concerns raised at initial meetings.

A couple of years ago I tried to encourage some U.S. nuclear disarmament experts to work with Russian colleagues to develop a model bilateral executive agreement for de-alerting and a model treaty for strategic nuclear weapons elimination (getting down to not more than 100 on each side}. I was told that each of these could be accomplished in ten pages or less with provisions for more detailed protocol for verification and other technical matters. I didn't succeed, but I believe that this is still a valid idea. If these model treaties were available, we could encourage presidential candidates to respond favorably.

CONTACTING POTENTIAL CANDIDATES

There are already a number of men and women being mentioned as potential presidential candidates, perhaps 12 to 15 in total. Some of the leading Republican potentials are more progressive than President Bush on this issue. None of the leading Democrats could be called a nuclear abolitionist at this moment, but most of them strongly favor nuclear arms control and potentially could be persuaded to go further.

We can ask heads of communion and other prominent religious leaders to be available to meet with presidential candidates to make the case for significant action on nuclear disarmament during the next presidential term. Delegations can include persons from the faith community deeply immersed in the subject for their expertise. These could be unpublicized meetings in order to avoid premature pressure on candidates until they have time to reflect on making such a momentous commitment.

At the same time we can get grassroots groups in key primary states to seek meetings with potential candidates and to appear at public meetings to raise questions. They would have copies of the Interfaith Proposal to present. As candidates hear this issue raised both directly and by grassroots persons over and over, they will begin to realize that this is a matter they must address. They will also see that there is potential public support for embarking on a bold new direction.

Later when the presidential primary season begins grassroots groups can birddog candidates and keep raising the desirability for global elimination of nuclear weapons.

CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES

To the extent that we have the resources we should also give attention to congressional candidates. This could be a trial run in selected districts in 2006 in preparation for broader coverage in 2008.

ORGANIZING

To formulate policy goals and develop this program we might establish a Policy Working Group of interested persons from the faith community. We could ask civic sector experts to advise us, even participate in the Working Group.

We would need to develop a means for coordinating this effort. Tasks include forming delegations, getting appointments with potential presidential candidates, collecting reports, arranging for follow-up, orchestrating grassroots contacts. The latter would need to be coordinated with grassroots lobbying on current legislative issues.

I have raised the question of whether creating a new Interreligious Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons will lead to confusion and possible duplication with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. The latter has been working mainly on current legislative issues, including grassroots mobilization. The Interreligious Network plans to work on longer range issues and to bring in new elements, such as seminaries and local independents who are not part of denominational networks. These are pluses. However, I believe that we would be much stronger by combining the two organizations into one broad effort.

More discussion is needed on this aspect. Meanwhile, I would be interested in your comments on my proposal to influence potential presidential candidates in the positioning period that is now underway.

Shalom,
Howard

Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is a coalition of denominational offices, peace fellowships, and other religious associations. Its purposes are to share information on nuclear disarmament issues, to facilitate cooperative advocacy in Washington, D.C, and to encourage coordinated grassroots mobilization. Howard W. Hallman serves as chair. The Interfaith Committee meets at four to six week intervals in a conference room in the United Methodist Building across from the U.S. Capitol in Washington, D.C.

The Committee has its roots in interfaith cooperation in support of Senate ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention in 1997. This evolved into the Interfaith Group for the CTBT to work for Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. After the Senate defeated ratification in 1999 the group changed its name to the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament to work on a broader range of issues. Since then the Committee has opposed deployment of national missile defense, supported de-alerting the global nuclear arsenal, opposed development of new nuclear weapons, and supported the cooperative nuclear threat reduction program. We oppose the Administration's policies that envision new roles for nuclear weapons. Instead we promote nuclear disarmament as required by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

To facilitate communication the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament operates a list-serve for participating organizations. This is used to announce meetings and to share information and action alerts. Other organizations desiring to be part of the list-serve should contact Howard Hallman (see below).

In 2002 the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament created a website, www.zero-nukes.org. It is co-sponsored by 12 denominational offices. The website has two functions: (1) provide a repository for statements and reports on nuclear disarmament by religious organizations, military leaders, international bodies, and civil sector organizations; and (2) serve as a forum for presentation and discussion of ideas on how to achieve zero nuclear weapons. Sign-on letters developed by the Committee are displayed at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements3.html#interfaithcommittee>.

For further information, contact Howard Hallman, chair, at hhallman@mupwj.org.

March 2004

Letter to President Bush on Nuclear Disarmament

Incomplete draft written by Howard Hallman, November 5, 2004

The Honorable George W. Bush
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Congratulations on your re-election as President of the United States. As you stated the day after the election, "A new term is a new opportunity to reach out to the whole nation." As you do so, we would like to offer suggestions for what you can accomplish during your second term regarding nuclear weapons and nuclear disarmament. This is a very vital issue for the peace and security of the United States and the rest of the globe.

For us the possession and possible use of nuclear weapons is a moral issue. Any use would inevitably kill innocent people and cause devastating harm to the environment. Threatened use of nuclear in the name of deterrence is morally wrong because it holds innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, nuclear weapons should be totally eliminated from Earth.

This goal is stated in Title VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which was signed by both President Lyndon Johnson and President Richard Nixon and ratified by the U.S. Senate in 1970 by a bipartisan majority of xx to xx. During the next four years you have the opportunity to lead the United States and the rest of the world in achieving significant progress toward this goal. We offer suggestions in four areas of action.

Keep Nuclear Weapons out of the Hands of Terrorists

There is grave concern that terrorists might acquire and use nuclear weapons. The best safeguard is to assure that they do not have access to nuclear warheads and fissile material. Your Administration can offer this protection by the following measures:

- (1) Increase funding for the Nunn-Lugar Program and related efforts and remove bureaucratic obstacles so that all nuclear weapons and fissile material in Russia will be totally secured by 2008.
- (2) Gather in and safeguard all [name of material] now at nuclear research facilities around the globe by 2008.
- (3) [Something about the recent international initiative.]

Strengthen the Global Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime

During the last four years North Korea and Iran have made substantial progress in developing nuclear weapons. This follows India and Pakistan deploying nuclear weapons. This trend must be halted and reversed. We recommend:

[Concrete proposals to be added, drawn from the Carnegie Endowment and other sources.]

Eliminate the Danger of Mutual Nuclear Destruction by the United States and Russia

Although the Cold War is long over, the United States and Russia still deploy huge arsenals of strategic nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert. There remains a risk that such weapons might be launched accidentally or without authorization. During your second term you have an opportunity to eliminate this grave danger to citizens of the United States. Specifically we recommend the following actions:

- (1) Through mutual executive agreement with Russia remove all nuclear warheads from hair-trigger alert by the end of 2005.
- (2) Accelerate the pace of strategic weapon reduction under the Moscow Treaty of 2002 so that its goals are attained and made permanent by 2008.
- (3) Dismantle all nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles as they are taken out of service.

Cease Development of New Nuclear Weapons

If the United States is to be a respected leader for global nuclear non-proliferation, it must set a strong example. This means halting efforts to develop new nuclear weapons and add them to the already abundant arsenal. Therefore, we ask you to:

- (1) Cease all efforts to develop, produce, and deploy new nuclear weapons.
- (2) Maintain the nuclear testing moratorium that has been in effect since 1992.
- (3) Make no effort to increase the readiness of nuclear weapons testing facilities.
- (4) Ask the U.S. Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Weapons Treaty, an action that will help strengthen the global nuclear non-proliferation regime.

We would welcome an opportunity to discuss these ideas with you and top officials of your Administration.

With best regard,
To be signed by heads of communion and the like.

Letter to editor opposing funds for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (bunker buster)

Dear Editor:

Last year Congress wisely said "no" to a request from the Bush Administration for money to develop a new nuclear weapon. In Pentagon terms it is called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), otherwise known as "bunker buster". Intended to strike deeply buried targets, it would be 70 times more powerful than the bomb that devastated Hiroshima. If used, huge quantities of radioactive debris would fall upon civilians and drift afar with the wind. Beyond this harm Congress recognized that designing this new nuclear weapon was foolish and counterproductive at a time when the United States is trying to prevent North Korea and Iran from developing their own nuclear arsenal. They watch what we do more than what we say. But the Bush Administration won't give up. They've renewed their request for bunker buster funds and are mounting a vigorous campaign to gain congressional approval. I hope that Representative _____ and Senators _____ will have the wisdom to again say, "no new nukes".

Written by Howard W. Hallman
March 31, 2005

Dear Colleagues,

NEW NUKES

As most of you know, the Tauscher amendment to eliminate funding for the Robust Earth Nuclear Penetrator lost by a vote of 204 to 214 when the U.S. House of Representatives considered the defense authorization bill. A year ago a similar amendment failed 199 to 226, so we are gaining ground. We will have another chance when the House takes up the energy and water appropriations bill toward the end of June. In this case Rep. Hobson, the subcommittee chair, may zero out the RENP, so the situation will be different. Meanwhile, the Senate hasn't yet taken up the Feinstein-Kennedy amendment to eliminate RENP funding. This will happen some time in early June.

Thus, we should keep up our hard work to build grassroots opposition to "bunker buster" funding. Utah continues to be a key state because Senate Bennett has a pivotal vote on the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee.

A CONSULTATION IN EARLY 2005

At the May 17 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament we discussed the possibility of having another Interfaith Consultation on Nuclear Disarmament some time between the November election and the presidential inauguration. The purpose would be to decide our strategy for the next presidential term. There was a consensus that this would be desirable. It would be a one-day event with similar participants to our December 3, 2003 consultation. There is a feeling that we should have more time for strategic discussion and spend less time on issues presentation than at the last one. We had preliminary discussion about the purpose and agenda but reached no consensus.

We concluded that the consultation should be held during the week of January 10, 2005 at the United Methodist Building. **REPLY REQUESTED:** Do you know of any other meeting scheduled for that week that would take our potential participants? What day that week would you prefer? What day would not be possible?

ECUMENICAL ADVOCACY DAYS 2005

We also agreed that we would like to participate in Ecumenical Advocacy Days 2005. I suggested that we broaden the agenda, first, by including a concern for landmines and small arms, and second, by adding some other peace issues. For example, (a) "Militarism as a Justice Issue" with particular attention to the military budget, following President Eisenhower's idea that spending on armaments is a theft from the hungry and the homeless; (b) "Internationalism vs Unilateralism" with sessions organized by denominational offices at the United Nations. Each of these would have particular "asks" for lobbying. There was no elaborate discussion on our agenda, but we agreed that we would ask to have a "Peace and Disarmament Track" (final name to be determined) included in Advocacy Ecumenical Days 2005. Later we will work out an agenda.

A PERSONAL NOTE

I am considering that the end of this Congress may be the time for me to step down as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. (1) I'm feeling a little tired (old age I suppose). (2) I have willingly served as a mostly unpaid volunteer but am in a position where I

need to supplement my retirement income. I've not been able to generate financial support for this work. (3) I'm feeling that I don't have the psychic energy needed to push for a bolder, more far-reaching agenda for the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament (which I believe is necessary) when a number of our key members prefer a more cautious, limited agenda.

This came to the surface on May 17 in initial soundings on what we should focus on at the January 2005 Consultation. I suggested that that we should develop a broad agenda for what we want to achieve during the next four-year presidential term. Tactics would vary according to who is elected president, but objectives would be significant. They could include a strong push for de-alerting, much deeper cuts in strategic weapons including dismantlement, ratification of the CTBT and beginning the dismantlement of the labs, full funding of the Baker-Cutler recommendations on global nuclear threat reduction, support for other non-proliferation measures. Our effort could include a vigorous grassroots campaign, focused particularly on a sufficient number of Republican senators to get a treaty ratified with a Democrat in the White House and enough House Republicans to win votes on crucial issues. First reaction in the May 17 discussion was that this approach is unrealistic, even if Senator Kerry is elected president. Perhaps, but I'm not interested in another four years of a minimalist agenda. Therefore, it may be time for some one else to take over the leadership of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament.

I haven't made a final decision, but I want you know my thinking.

Shalom,
Howard

Letters to the Editor on Nuclear Weapons Issues

Writing a letter-to-the editor is a good way to offer your opinion on a public issue and to promote discussion. Here are three samples on current nuclear weapons issues. They are intended to serve as a point of departure. You can rephrase them in your own words. If possible find a local connection or relate a personal experience. If you include the name of member of Congress or a candidate for public office, it is likely that your letter will come to her or his attention.

Always include your name, address, and phone number. For further "TIPS for Writing Letters-to-the-Editor", go to <http://www.fcnl.org/getin/tips.htm> on the website of the Friends Committee for National Legislation.

1.a. Opposing Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (longer version)

Dear Editor,

Congress will soon be taking up a proposal to spend \$27.6 million for research on something called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. Known as a "bunker buster", its purpose is to strike deeply buried facilities protected by rock and concrete. With an explosive power 70 times the atomic bomb that destroyed Hiroshima, it would spread huge amounts of radioactive fallout over the civilian population. Also, the Administration has spoken about the possibility of preemptive strikes against emerging treats. Thus, the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator might be used as a first strike weapon. This would be a sad departure from previous U.S. nuclear policy. The Bush Administration wants to spend almost \$500 million over the next five years for further development of the bunker buster. That's a lot of money in a tight budget for a bad idea. I hope that Representative [Senators] _____ recognizes the foolishness of developing bunker busters and votes to delete these funds from the appropriations bill.

1.b. Opposing Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (shorter version)

Dear Editor,

Congress will soon be taking up a proposal to spend \$27.6 million for research on something called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. Known as a "bunker buster", its purpose is to strike deeply buried facilities protected by rock and concrete. With an explosive power 70 times the atomic bomb that destroyed Hiroshima, it would spread huge amounts of radioactive fallout over the civilian population. This year's appropriation is just a foot in the door because the Administration wants to spend almost \$500 million on this new weapon in the next five years. I hope that Representative [Senators] _____ recognizes the foolishness of developing bunker busters and votes to delete these funds from the appropriations bill.

2. De-alerting nuclear weapons

Dear Editor,

We hear a lot of talk these days about the threat of terrorist attack on the United States. Hidden from public discussion is a much greater risk: a nuclear strike, whether accidental or on purpose, by Russia. Since the Cold War ended, we think that this isn't possible. Yet Russia keeps thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert, aimed for launching on short notice against the United States. At the same time the United States has thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert, ready to launch against Russia on short notice. Numerous retired military officers and other experts advocate de-alerting the entire nuclear arsenal to reduce this danger. During the 2000 presidential campaign George W. Bush promised that if elected he would de-alert at least part of the nuclear arsenal. He hasn't done so. I'd like to know what he intends to do about this danger if re-elected. I'd also like to know Senator Kerry's views on this issue. In [name of state] I'd like to know whether Senators _____ and _____ support de-alerting. I'd like to hear the views of Representatives _____

3. Terrorists and nuclear weapons

Dear Editor,

As we carry out a global campaign against terrorism, it is essential that terrorist organizations do not gain access to nuclear weapons and fissile material to make nuclear bombs. This requires helping Russia and other possessors of nuclear weapons to keep their arsenals and bomb-making material absolutely secure. The United States has made a start with the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. Several years ago a task force chaired by former Republican Senator Howard Baker and former Democratic White House Counsel Lloyd Cutler recommended that funding for these efforts should be increased from \$300 million to \$3 billion a year for an eight to ten year period. The Bush Administration has mostly ignored the Baker-Cutler recommendations. Instead it has pumped up spending for an untested missile defense system to \$10 billion/year. This ignores the much greater danger that terrorists, if they had a nuclear weapon, could smuggle it into the United States on a freighter or a small boat. The way to prevent this is to keep all warheads and fissile material out of their hands. I'd like to know how Senator John Kerry stands on this issue and what President Bush will do if re-elected. I'd also like to know whether Senators _____ and Representatives _____ would support increased funding for this important effort.

Written by Howard W. Hallman
May 27, 2004

Sample Letters to the Editor on Nuclear Weapons Issues

1.a. Opposing Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (longer version)

Dear Editor,

Congress will soon be taking up a proposal to spend \$27.6 million for research on something called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. Known as a "bunker buster", its purpose is to strike deeply buried facilities protected by rock and concrete. With an explosive power 70 times the atomic bomb that destroyed Hiroshima, it would spread huge amounts of radioactive fallout over the civilian population. Also, the Administration has spoken about the possibility of preemptive strikes against emerging treats. Thus, the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator might be used as a first strike weapon. This would be a sad departure from previous U.S. nuclear policy. The Bush Administration wants to spend almost \$500 million over the next five years for further development of the bunker buster. That's a lot of money in a tight budget for a bad idea. I hope that Representative [Senators] _____ recognizes the foolishness of developing bunker busters and votes to delete these funds from the appropriations bill.

1.b. Opposing Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (shorter version)

Dear Editor,

Congress will soon be taking up a proposal to spend \$27.6 million for research on something called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. Known as a "bunker buster", its purpose is to strike deeply buried facilities protected by rock and concrete. With an explosive power 70 times the atomic bomb that destroyed Hiroshima, it would spread huge amounts of radioactive fallout over the civilian population. This year's appropriation is just a foot in the door because the Administration wants to spend almost \$500 million on this new weapon in the next five years. I hope that Representative [Senators] _____ recognizes the foolishness of developing bunker busters and votes to delete these funds from the appropriations bill.

2. De-alerting nuclear weapons

Dear Editor,

We hear a lot of talk these days about the threat of terrorist attack on the United States. Hidden from public discussion is a much greater risk: a nuclear strike, whether accidental or on purpose, by Russia. Since the Cold War ended, we think that this isn't possible. Yet Russia keeps thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert, aimed for launching on short notice against

the United States. At the same time the United States has thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert, ready to launch against Russia on short notice. Numerous retired military officers and other experts advocate de-alerting the entire nuclear arsenal to reduce this danger. During the 2000 presidential campaign George W. Bush promised that if elected he would de-alert at least part of the nuclear arsenal. He hasn't done so. I'd like to know what he intends to do about this danger if re-elected. I'd also like to know Senator Kerry's views on this issue. In [name of state] I'd like to know whether Senators _____ and _____ support de-alerting. I'd like to hear the views of Representatives _____

3. Terrorists and nuclear weapons

Dear Editor,

As we carry out a global campaign against terrorism, it is essential that terrorist organizations do not gain access to nuclear weapons and fissile material to make nuclear bombs. This requires helping Russia and other possessors of nuclear weapons to keep their arsenals and bomb-making material absolutely secure. The United States has made a start with the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. Several years ago a task force chaired by former Republican Senator Howard Baker and former Democratic White House Counsel Lloyd Cutler recommended that funding for these efforts should be increased from \$300 million to \$3 billion a year for an eight to ten year period. The Bush Administration has mostly ignored the Baker-Cutler recommendations. Instead it has pumped up spending for an untested missile defense system to \$10 billion/year. This ignores the much greater danger that terrorists, if they had a nuclear weapon, could smuggle it into the United States on a freighter or a small boat. The way to prevent this is to keep all warheads and fissile material out of their hands. I'd like to know how Senator John Kerry stands on this issue and what President Bush will do if re-elected. I'd also like to know whether Senators _____ and Representatives _____ would support increased funding for this important effort.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman
May 20, 2004

New Nuclear Weapons Development

Congress should abandon programs aimed at developing a new generation of nuclear weapons. Please vote against funding the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator and the Advanced Concepts Initiative when the defense authorization and energy and water appropriations bills reach the floor.

Background

Buried in the Bush Administration's budget request to Congress are provisions that would shift U.S. nuclear weapons policy dramatically in the wrong direction. For more than 50 years, the U.S. has worked to delegitimize the use of nuclear weapons. Instead of following the lead of past administrations by reducing U.S. reliance on these dreadful weapons, this Administration is purposing the development of a new generation of nuclear weapons. The Administration and some members of Congress are now attempting to implement a policy that would raise the profile of nuclear weapons and lower the threshold for their use.

Nuclear "Bunker-Busters"

Since the end of the Cold War, some civilian military planners and nuclear scientists have argued for creating a new class of earth-penetrating nuclear weapons. These weapons are sometimes referred to as "bunker busters" because they would be designed to burrow into the ground to destroy underground military facilities that are protected by 100 to 300 feet of concrete or rock. The Energy Department's budget request included \$27.6 million for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP). The RNEP would use an existing nuclear weapon, redesigned for use against underground bunkers. It would have the explosive power up to 70 times that of the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima.

RNEP proponents claim that, because the weapon penetrates the earth before detonating, it would be a "clean" nuclear weapon. In reality, this would be an extremely deadly weapon. If detonated in an urban setting, tens of thousands of people could receive a fatal dose of radiation within the first 24 hours. More would be killed or injured by the extreme pressures of the blast and thermal injuries arising from the heat of the explosion. Still more casualties would result from the resulting fires and the collapse of buildings from the seismic shock that the explosion would produce. According to Sen. Jack Reed (RI), "They [RNEPs] are really city breakers, not bunker busters."

Advanced Nuclear Weapons Concepts

During much of the Cold War, the three weapons laboratories had teams of scientists and engineers studying advanced weapons concepts. Studies ranged from modifications of existing weapons, to improvements for next-generation weapons, to exploration of new weapons technologies and weapons for new missions. With the end of the Cold War, the laboratories wound down their advanced concepts programs. The Administration has requested \$9 million for FY 2005 for this program.

The Advanced Concepts Initiative is based on Cold War thinking which should be abandoned. It sends a message to the rest of the world that the U.S. is again thinking about nuclear weapons

production. Our most talented scientists should be working on more socially productive things than building instruments of mass death.

Reportedly, the driving force behind developing new nuclear weapons is not coming from military commanders. The military has other conventional weapons that are equally effective, but that do not have the problems associated with nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons would pose significant dangers to U.S. military personnel operating in the battlefield environment, and would lower the threshold for nuclear war. Overall, U.S. military leaders have concluded that using nuclear weapons is imprudent and unnecessary.

A Step in the Wrong Direction

The U.S. has strongly criticized Iran and North Korea for moving to obtain equipment to produce weapons-grade nuclear materials and the ability to deliver them as nuclear bombs. The U.S. government has also expressed concerns about continuing nuclear programs in Pakistan and India, as well as growing concern that nuclear materials could fall into the hands of terrorist groups, such as al Qaeda. U.S. development of so-called "usable" nuclear weapons undermines U.S. demands that these countries not seek to acquire nuclear weapons.

Why is the Administration abandoning cooperative international arms control efforts and instead seeking to develop new nuclear weapons? If the U.S. will not lay down its nuclear weapons and stop developing new ones, why should anyone else--especially those that feel most threatened by the new U.S. policy of preventive war?

Building new nuclear weapons will further weaken already struggling international efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. U.S. influence with the international community will erode further if it seeks to upgrade U.S. nuclear weapons while demanding that other countries such as Iran and North Korea disarm. Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei, director of the International Atomic Energy Agency, recently said that, instead of developing new nuclear weapons, the U.S. should send a message to potential proliferators that "[e]ven though we have nuclear weapons, we are moving to get rid of them. We are going to develop a system of security that does not depend on nuclear weapons because that's the way we want the world to move."

The Bush Administration is leading the world down the wrong path. Instead of adhering to our obligations under the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) by reducing reliance on the most horrific weapons ever created and working for global disarmament, the Administration is seeking new uses for nuclear weapons. Adopting such a nuclear posture is a step backward, and a virtual invitation for other nations to opt out of their NPT obligations as well.

Friends Committee on National Legislation (Quakers)

March 6, 2004

Curb Nuclear Weapons Excess

May 4, 2004

Dear Senator/Representative:

We are writing to urge you to cut funds for three proposals contained in the President's FY05 defense authorization request. It asks Congress to approve nearly \$28 million for funding continued research on modifying existing types of nuclear weapons designed to destroy deeply buried and hardened targets (the **Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator**, or RNEP, also known as the nuclear bunker buster). It also seeks another \$9 million for unspecified research on new nuclear weapons concepts (**Advanced Concepts Initiative**).

In addition to the fiscal costs, the diplomatic and security costs of developing, testing, and producing new types of nuclear weapons far outweigh any marginal benefits of such arms. As our nation tries to turn back the tide of nuclear proliferation worldwide, we should not take actions that unnecessarily suggest that nuclear weapons can or should be used as any other weapon might be used.

Proponents of such nuclear capabilities contend that by reducing the yield and enhancing earth penetrating capabilities, the weapons' collateral damage can be minimized to the point that they become "usable." However, the notion that a nuclear weapon could be developed to destroy a deeply buried target, yet cause little collateral damage, is highly misleading and dangerous.

A nuclear weapon exploded just beneath the earth's surface would actually create more fallout than one detonated above the target because the former casts more radioactive dirt and particles into the air. To ensure that a five-kiloton nuclear explosion produces no fallout, it would have to be detonated about 350 feet deep--a depth far beyond what existing materials and force capabilities allow.

But even a lower-yield, one-kiloton nuclear warhead (1/13 the size of the Hiroshima bomb) detonated at a depth of 20-50 feet would eject more than one million cubic feet of radioactive debris, forming a crater about the size of ground zero at the World Trade Center. The result would be a highly contaminated zone and atmospheric fallout that would endanger civilians, as well as military personnel who might be ordered into the area.

The Department of Energy has asserted that it does not now have plans to move these weapons beyond the research phase and into design engineering and development. But the budget request makes the Energy Department's intentions quite clear. Its five-year budget plan outlines a schedule and budget for further research and, if Congress allows, development of the RNEP at a cost of \$485 million. Production and deployment of such a weapon would cost billions of dollars more.

New research and development leading to the production of nuclear warheads could lead to resuming U.S. nuclear testing to confirm the performance of new or modified weapons, and a destabilizing round of renewed nuclear testing by other states. Such weapons, whether designed to defeat hardened bunkers or destroy chemical or biological targets, also threaten to break down the long-standing firewall between conventional arms and nuclear weapons and jeopardize what has become an international norm of the non-use of nuclear weapons. Development of new nuclear weapons also undermines the United States' ability to dissuade others from improving or pursuing nuclear weapons capabilities.

The budget also requests approximately \$30 million for FY05 to begin development of a **Modern Pit Facility** to produce the plutonium cores, or "pits," for new or remanufactured nuclear warheads. The facility, estimated to cost \$2-4 billion, would produce 125 to 450 pits per year on a single shift, with operations beginning around 2020. These projections are based on outdated estimates of maintaining a Cold War-sized nuclear arsenal and fail to acknowledge new laboratory studies suggesting plutonium pits last longer than previously believed. This proposed facility is unnecessary and wasteful.

As Congress debates these proposals in committee and, possibly on the floor, we urge you to support any amendments that may be offered that would

- Cut funding for research on new nuclear weapons capabilities, including the nuclear bunker buster, and/or
- Cut funding for the proposed Modern Pit Facility.

In light of our ballooning national debt and the questionable necessity of these projects, we should not be squandering taxpayer dollars on them.

Jim Bridgman, **Alliance for Nuclear Accountability**
Terri S. Lodge, **Arms Control Advocacy Collaborative**
Daryl Kimball, **Arms Control Association**
Ian Davis, **British American Security Information Council**
Beth C. DeGrasse, **Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation**
John Isaacs, **Council for a Livable World**
David Culp, **Friends Committee on National Legislation**
Henry Kelly, **Federation of American Scientists**
Tom Clements, **Greenpeace International**
Kathleen Gwynn, **Steven and Michele Kirsch Foundation**
Christopher Paine, **Natural Resources Defense Council**
Charles Sheehan-Miles, **Nuclear Policy Research Institute**
Kevin Martin, **Peace Action & Peace Action Education Fund**
Martin Butcher, **Physicians for Social Responsibility**
Tom Z. Collina, **20/20 Vision**
Jill Lancelot, **Taxpayers for Common Sense**
Stephen Young, **Union of Concerned Scientists**
Brian Finlay, **Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation**
Marie Rietmann, **Women's Action for New Directions**
Mary Day Kent, **Women's International League for Peace and Freedom**

7. Currently only nine nations are known to possess nuclear weapons: United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan, and North Korea. This number has been contained by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1970 in which non-nuclear states agreed to forgo development of nuclear weapons and the nuclear-weapon states agreed to move toward elimination of their nuclear arsenals. The current administration has backed away from fulfilling its part of the bargain.

Are you willing to speak out against expanded roles for nuclear weapons?

Notes from ICND meeting of September 21, 2004

Participants: Daryl Byler, Pat Conover, David Culp, Larry Egbert, Howard Hallman, and Rich Killmer

On current legislation David indicated that the appropriation for new nuclear weapons won't be considered by the Senate subcommittee until after the election. Senator Bennett (R, UT) remains the key swing vote.

Those present accepted the retirement of Howard Hallman as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament and thanked him for his faithful service. He will still be involved as representative of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

All present agreed that nuclear disarmament remained a very important issue for the faith community even though it doesn't attract a lot of attention. Therefore, we decided to maintain the committee and retain its name. We decided to register it as task force of the Washington Interreligious Staff Community (WISC). To accomplish this Howard will contact J.E. McNeil, chair of the heads of office group, and Martin Rock, staff of the National Council of Churches.

David Culp agreed to serve as convener. He will call and chair meetings. He will take charge of the list serve, which is used for announcements and e-mail interchange among participants.

We decided to sponsor a single event in the early months of 2005. It will be a Nuclear Disarmament Track as part of Ecumenical Advocacy Days, March 11-14. However, we will look for ways to incorporate aspects of the Consultation. Rich Killmer agreed to lead the planning process for this event. He will contact Anna Rhee to indicate our interest, list the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament as a sponsor, and ask for time for a plenary session and two workshops. David agreed to help with the planning. Others will be invited to assist.

We realized that our strategy for 2005 and the substantive focus of Advocacy Days depends upon the outcome of the election. We will have a meeting either on Friday, November 5 or Monday, November 8, depending on the availability of key persons, to begin to determine strategy for the future.

Howard agreed to continue to manage the web site, www.zero-nukes.org, for the time being. We decided to promote stronger linkage with web sites of denominational offices and religious peace organizations.

Rich said that Howard's suggestion of a booklet with our position on key issues and talking points was worthy of further consideration.

We had some discussion about Howard's idea to push for bipartisan support for nuclear disarmament and to promote grassroots action in selected states and congressional districts with potentially supportive Republican senators and representatives. As an example, we discussed how this might be done in Indiana. Pat reminded us that some state ecumenical councils are involved in a process linking them with national offices and that whatever we do should be sensitive to this process. This was an opening discussion without conclusions.

Tools for Opposing New Nuclear Weapons

The Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative of the Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy is urging you to send a letter to the editor or to place an op-ed article in your local newspaper on the development of new nuclear weapons, especially the nuclear bunker buster, that the Bush Administration is urging Congress to fund.

The following letter to the editor and op-ed article are models for your use. They were written for the Churches' Center by Howard Hallman of Methodist United for Peace with Justice.

You are encouraged to put both of them in your own words. An action alert on the nuclear bunker buster follows the op-ed article to help you in your writing. Please send any clippings of letters or op-ed articles to the Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy, 4500 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20016. If you have questions or concerns, please contact Richard Killmer at 207-846-9963 or killmerp@aol.com.

Model Letter to the editor

Dear Editor:

Last year Congress wisely said "no" to a request from the Bush Administration for money to develop new US nuclear weapons. This included one called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), otherwise known as "bunker buster". Intended to strike deeply buried targets, it would be 70 times more powerful than the bomb that devastated Hiroshima.

If used, huge quantities of radioactive debris would fall upon civilians and drift afar with the wind. Beyond this harm, Congress recognized that designing this new nuclear weapon was counterproductive at a time when the United States is trying to prevent North Korea and Iran from developing their own nuclear arsenal. It comes across as hypocritical to the world's nations, which watch what we do more than what we say.

[But the Bush Administration won't give up. They've renewed their request for bunker buster and other new nuclear weapons, and are mounting a vigorous campaign to gain congressional approval.] Wisely the House of Representatives has voted to eliminate funding for new nuclear weapons. However, the defense authorization bill that will be on the Senate floor in September includes funding for the nuclear bunker buster. Sen. Kennedy (MA) intends to offer an amendment to eliminate the funding. I hope that [Representative _____ and] Senators _____ will have the moral wisdom and common sense to say, "no new nuclear weapons" and will support the Kennedy amendment.

Model Op-Ed Article

Say "No" to New Nuclear Weapons

We tell our kids that smoking cigarettes is bad for them, but we smoke. What are they to believe? That smoking is okay. Actions speak louder than words.

These days the United States is telling other nations that developing nuclear weapons is wrong. We are concentrating particularly on North Korea and Iran. North Korea claims to have one or

more nuclear weapons. Iran may have the capacity to produce them. At the same time the United States maintains a huge stockpile of nuclear weapons and wants to develop new versions. What are North Korea, Iran, and others to believe? Naturally they'll think what's okay for us is okay for them.

This foolish, counterproductive scenario is playing out right now. The Bush Administration is asking Congress for funds to develop new US nuclear weapons including one called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), otherwise known as the "bunker buster". Its purpose is to penetrate underground to destroy deeply buried command centers and production facilities. To do this, it would have 70 times the force that devastated Hiroshima. Scientists tell us that the explosion would produce a huge quantity of radioactive fallout, killing civilians living nearby and spreading afar with the wind.

Last year Congress turned down the Administration's request for funds to develop the bunker buster. But the Administration [has come] came back with a new request and [is mounting] has mounted a vigorous campaign to gain approval. Wisely the House of Representatives has voted to eliminate funding for new nuclear weapons. However, the defense authorization bill that will be on the Senate floor in September includes funding for the nuclear bunker buster.

This new weapon is particularly frightening in light of a series of policy documents, released during President Bush's first term in office. In one of them the Administration expressed willingness to make preemptive strikes at "emerging threats". This could include use of nuclear weapons and the bunker buster bomb seems particularly adaptable to this purpose.

As a person of faith, I'm appalled that new weapons are being developed. Surely there must be better ways to stop the spread of nuclear weapons than building new ones.

Actually there are better ways. They can be found in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This 35 year old treaty is based upon a bargain between the five nuclear-weapon states as of 1970 and other nations. The United States, the Soviet Union (now Russia), Great Britain, France, and China agreed to cease the nuclear arms race and to assist other nations develop peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In exchange the non-nuclear states would not develop nuclear weapons.

With 188 signatory nations the NPT has had considerable success, but not a perfect record in halting nuclear proliferation. Three nations that haven't signed the treaty -- Israel, India, and Pakistan -- have developed nuclear weapons. In January 2003 North Korea announced that it was withdrawing from the treaty and has since announced that it now has nuclear weapons. Some people believe that Iran, another signatory, has nuclear ambitions. But without the restraining influence of the NPT other nations with sufficient industrial capacity might have developed nuclear weapons. Moreover, the NPT provides an international mechanism for dealing with North Korea, Iran, and any other nation wanting to develop nuclear weapons.

The non-nuclear nations, however, are getting restless with the slow pace of nuclear weapons reduction, especially by the United States and Russia. [This] Their concern [will be] was expressed at an NPT Review Conference that [meets] met in New York in May.[*] Unfortunately the Bush Administration's commitment to nuclear weapons hampered this international conference from moving forward with its nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation

agenda. [Delegates will note that commitments made by the nuclear weapon states at the last Review Conference in 2000, such as ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (NPT) and other promised steps, have not been fulfilled. They will point out that the Bush Administration's push for a new nuclear weapon, the bunker buster, moves in the opposite direction of the treaty's goal of nuclear disarmament.] Informed observers indicate that the NPT regime is in danger of collapse.

If this happened, the international restraint on other nations developing nuclear weapons would be gone. This runs a grave risk that non-nuclear states with industrial capability might decide to join the nuclear weapons club. The more nations that have nuclear weapons, the greater the risk that terrorist organizations will both obtain one or more nuclear warheads and use them.

The Bush Administration's push for funding the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator is counterproductive. It is harmful both to stopping the spread of nuclear weapons and to keeping nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists.

I hope that Congress has the wisdom and courage to say "no new nuclear weapons" by blocking funds for the bunker buster.

[* This sentence for use in April 2005. In May it can be changed to: " This concern will be expressed at an NPT Review Conference meeting this month in New York." The whole paragraph should be recast after the results of the Review Conference are known.]

Action alert

Say No to New Nuclear Weapons!

Contacting your members of Congress is easy. Many denominations and organizations provide information and electronic means to communicate with Congress. One great resource is the website of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, <http://www.fcnl.org/>. You can call Congressional offices in Washington, DC using phone numbers listed [here](#). You can also fax or email them from the FCNL web site. Start with the latest sample letter posted on FCNL's Legislative Action Center, personalize the language, then send your message directly from the site - click this link to find the latest letter - <http://capwiz.com/fconl/issues/>.

Tools for Opposing New Nuclear Weapons

The Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative of the Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy is urging you to send a letter to the editor or to place an op-ed article in your local newspaper on the development of new nuclear weapons, especially the nuclear bunker buster, that the Bush Administration is urging Congress to fund.

The following letter to the editor and op-ed article are models for your use. They were written for the Churches' Center by Howard Hallman of Methodist United for Peace with Justice.

You are encouraged to put both of them in your own words. An action alert on the nuclear bunker buster follows the op-ed article to help you in your writing. Please send any clippings of letters or op-ed articles to the Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy, 4500 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20016. If you have questions or concerns, please contact Richard Killmer at 207-846-9963 or killmerp@aol.com.

Model Letter to the editor

Dear Editor:

Last year Congress wisely said "no" to a request from the Bush Administration for money to develop new US nuclear weapons. This included one called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), otherwise known as "bunker buster". Intended to strike deeply buried targets, it would be 70 times more powerful than the bomb that devastated Hiroshima.

If used, huge quantities of radioactive debris would fall upon civilians and drift afar with the wind. Beyond this harm, Congress recognized that designing this new nuclear weapon was counterproductive at a time when the United States is trying to prevent North Korea and Iran from developing their own nuclear arsenal. It comes across as hypocritical to the world's nations, which watch what we do more than what we say.

But the Bush Administration won't give up. They've renewed their request for bunker buster and other new nuclear weapons, and are mounting a vigorous campaign to gain congressional approval. I hope that Representative _____ and Senators _____ will have the moral wisdom and common sense to say, "no new nuclear weapons".

Model Op-Ed Article

Say "No" to New Nuclear Weapons

We tell our kids that smoking cigarettes is bad for them, but we smoke. What are they to believe? That smoking is okay. Actions speak louder than words.

These days the United States is telling other nations that developing nuclear weapons is wrong. We are concentrating particularly on North Korea and Iran. North Korea claims to have one or more nuclear weapons. Iran may have the capacity to produce them. At the same time the United States maintains a huge stockpile of nuclear weapons and wants to develop new versions. What are North Korea, Iran, and others to believe? Naturally they'll think what's okay for us is okay for them.

This foolish, counterproductive scenario is playing out right now. The Bush Administration is asking Congress for funds to develop new US nuclear weapons including one called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), otherwise known as the "bunker buster". Its purpose is to penetrate underground to destroy deeply buried command centers and production facilities. To do this, it would have 70 times the force that devastated Hiroshima. Scientists tell us that the explosion would produce a huge quantity of radioactive fallout, killing civilians living nearby and spreading afar with the wind.

Last year Congress turned down the Administration's request for funds to develop the bunker buster. But the Administration has come back with a new request and is mounting a vigorous campaign to gain approval.

This new weapon is particularly frightening in light of a series of policy documents, released during President Bush's first term in office. In one of them the Administration expressed willingness to make preemptive strikes at "emerging threats". This could include use of nuclear weapons and the bunker buster bomb seems particularly adaptable to this purpose.

As a person of faith, I'm appalled that new weapons are being developed. Surely there must be better ways to stop the spread of nuclear weapons than building new ones.

Actually there are better ways. They can be found in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This 35 year old treaty is based upon a bargain between the five nuclear-weapon states as of 1970 and other nations. The United States, the Soviet Union (now Russia), Great Britain, France, and China agreed to cease the nuclear arms race and to assist other nations develop peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In exchange the non-nuclear states would not develop nuclear weapons.

With 188 signatory nations the NPT has had considerable success, but not a perfect record in halting nuclear proliferation. Three nations that haven't signed the treaty -- Israel, India, and Pakistan -- have developed nuclear weapons. In January 2003 North Korea announced that it was withdrawing from the treaty and has since announced that it now has nuclear weapons. Some people believe that Iran, another signatory, has nuclear ambitions. But without the restraining influence of the NPT other nations with sufficient industrial capacity might have developed nuclear weapons. Moreover, the NPT provides an international mechanism for dealing with North Korea, Iran, and any other nation wanting to develop nuclear weapons.

The non-nuclear nations, however, are getting restless with the slow pace of nuclear weapons reduction, especially by the United States and Russia. This concern will be expressed at an NPT Review Conference that meets in New York in May.* Delegates will note that commitments made by the nuclear weapon states at the last Review Conference in 2000, such as ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (NPT) and other promised steps, have not been fulfilled. They will point out that the Bush Administration's push for a new nuclear weapon, the bunker buster, moves in the opposite direction of the treaty's goal of nuclear disarmament. Informed observers indicate that the NPT regime is in danger of collapse.

If this happened, the international restraint on other nations developing nuclear weapons would be gone. This runs a grave risk that non-nuclear states with industrial capability might decide to

join the nuclear weapons club. The more nations that have nuclear weapons, the greater the risk that terrorist organizations will both obtain one or more nuclear warheads and use them.

The Bush Administration's push for funding the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator is counterproductive. It is harmful both to stopping the spread of nuclear weapons and to keeping nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists.

I hope that Congress has the wisdom and courage to say "no new nuclear weapons" by blocking funds for the bunker buster.

* This sentence for use in April 2005. In May it can be changed to: " This concern will be expressed at an NPT Review Conference meeting this month in New York." The whole paragraph should be recast after the results of the Review Conference are known.

Action alert

Say No to New Nuclear Weapons!

Contacting your members of Congress is easy. Many denominations and organizations provide information and electronic means to communicate with Congress. One great resource is the website of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, <http://www.fcnl.org/>. You can call Congressional offices in Washington, DC using phone numbers listed [here](#). You can also fax or email them from the FCNL web site. Start with the latest sample letter posted on FCNL's Legislative Action Center, personalize the language, then send your message directly from the site - click this link to find the latest letter - <http://capwiz.com/fconl/issues/>.

There is a second challenge. For far too long the United States has told other nations to "do as I say, not as I do." Since the beginning of the Cold War in the late 1940s, nuclear deterrence has been the linchpin of U.S. national security policy for dealing with, first, the Soviet Union and now with Russia. Russia responded by developing its own, huge nuclear arsenal. Great Britain and France felt they needed their own nuclear deterrence. So did China. India felt vulnerable to China and developed nuclear weapons. This led Pakistan to do likewise. Smaller states -- Iraq, Iran, Libya, North Korea -- have tried to follow the example.

During the past four years the Bush Administration has issued policy documents that envision expanded roles for nuclear weapons. They include possible use against non-nuclear states, as a response to biological and chemical weapons, and for preemptive action against emerging threats by states and terrorist groups before they are fully formed. The Administration has also sought funding to develop more "usable" nuclear weapons. In response, other nations will want to develop their own nuclear weapons to reduce their vulnerability. They may also give secret assistance to terrorist organizations which could use nuclear weapons against the United States and not be traced to the country of origin.

In 1970 the United States was part of a grand bargain that produced the Nuclear Non-Proliferation (NPT) Act. Signatory states not possessing nuclear weapons promised that they would not develop them. The five nuclear-weapon states -- U.S., Soviet Union, United Kingdom, France, and China -- promised that they (a) would move toward the elimination of their global arsenal and (b) would assist other states in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy. Since then three non-signers -- Israel, India, and Pakistan -- have developed nuclear weapons. So has North Korea, a signer who withdrew. Although not perfect the NPT has substantially reduced the spread of nuclear weapons.

Dear David, David, and Rich,

I have read the working paper on "Creating an Interfaith Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". I welcome the desire to strengthen grassroots organizing within the religious community on this issue. I am pleased to know that new resources may be available for this effort. I am grateful for those who have taken this initiative. However, I have reservations about creating a complete new structure for this endeavor.

In recent weeks as the 60th anniversary of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings approaches, I have wondered why we have failed for 60 years to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons. That call went forth from church groups, scientists, and others the first year after the bombings. Millions of people throughout the globe have joined this advocacy. Although there have been some successes to contain nuclear weapons, we have completely failed to end the commitment of the nuclear weapons states to the development, deployment, and possible use of nuclear weapons.

I puzzle why. One reason is because our efforts have been fragmented into too many organizations. Sometimes they cooperate, but altogether we have failed to maximize our potential strength.

I bring this mood to the proposal to create a new Interfaith Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons when there is already an active Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. The latter, while not nearly strong as it might be, is already working with many of the grassroots network and denominational offices that the proposed Interfaith Network intends to mobilize. I believe that it would be better to blend the existing and the proposed together in some manner.

Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament formed in 2000 as an outgrowth of efforts of the faith committee in support of ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). I was the initial chair until I stepped down in the summer of 2004. David Culp from the Friends Committee on National Legislation is now convener.

The Interfaith Committee is loosely organized. It has no officers other than the convener/chair. It has no formal membership. It works through consensus. During the past year it has met every six weeks with a focus on (1) legislative issues and (2) a track for Ecumenical Advocacy Days. Participants in these meetings are mainly Washington-based staff from denominational offices and unofficial religious organizations. Others are connected through a list serve of approximately 70 persons, including persons from denominational headquarters outside Washington, religious peace fellowships based elsewhere, and state ecumenical agencies. There is Protestant, peace church, Catholic, and Jewish representation. Through Rich Killmer's efforts Muslim participation is beginning to occur.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has a website, www.zero-nukes.org, that I developed to provide information and promote discussion on how to eliminate nuclear weapons. It contains statements from religious organizations, military leaders, and the civic sector. It presents different proposals on how to get zero nuclear weapons.

For the past two years the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has sponsored a track for Ecumenical Advocacy Days that has reached out to a broader base, including state ecumenical agencies.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has no staff. When I was chair, I served as secretariat. David Culp and FCNL staff now have this role. Rich Killmer of the Churches Center for Theology and Public Policy has also provided program support. His use of An Urgent Call to End the Nuclear Danger has provided a base for grassroots outreach, including an e-mail network, that is supportive of the Interfaith Committee. Initially I tried to obtain foundation support for a grassroots outreach staff, but to no avail.

Programmatically the Interfaith Committee now focuses primarily upon congressional legislation (now bunker buster funding) through cooperative lobbying and grassroots outreach through denominations, peace fellowships, and state ecumenical agencies. A number of these organizations make use of legislative alerts written by FCNL.

When I was chair, I encouraged a concern for longer-range policy goals, but not much was done because the major participants were too absorbed in legislative work. However, through my position as chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice I have worked in the broader arena on broader issues. The latest was "A Moral Appeal for a Safer World without Nuclear Weapons", which is posted at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/moralappeal.html>.

Three Components

From my experience I believe that more complete mobilization of the faith community for the elimination of nuclear weapons should have three linked components: (1) formulation of public policy objectives, both long- and short-range; (2) legislative advocacy; and (3) grassroots mobilization, which would deal with both longer-range policy objectives and specific legislative issues.

Presently legislative advocacy is organized by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament through David Culp's leadership. There is strong grassroots outreach on legislative issues through denominational and peace fellowship networks and connections with state ecumenical agencies. This can be focused on particular states and congressional districts when needed. For the most part this network hasn't worked on a broader agenda for elimination of nuclear weapons, but some of the participating denominations and unofficial organizations have on their own initiative. Many are using the Hiroshima-Nagasaki commemoration as an opportunity to call for nuclear abolition.

There is no common effort on public policy development. Many denominations have strong policy statements with abolitionist orientation (see <http://www.zero-nukes.org/religiousstatements1.html>). From time to time ecumenical and interfaith statements have been issued (see same source). Occasionally sign-on letters with broader focus are sent to the president. But there is no ongoing mechanism for developing and agreeing upon longer-range public policy objectives.

Opportunity

The proposal for a new Interfaith Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons with potential financial resources provides an opportunity to rethink and broaden the faith community's efforts on this issue. This should be done in a manner that strengthens and avoids duplication of competing networks. Therefore, I suggest exploring how to blend what the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has developed with this new initiative.

The easiest to deal with is legislative advocacy. The Interfaith Committee now fulfills this role with involvement of many denominational offices and peace fellowships. Through David Culp and other participants there are linkages with civic sector organizations and with congressional staff.

The Interfaith Committee has achieved grassroots outreach through denominations and peace fellowships, but it has limited capacity for direct grassroots organizing. The proposed Interfaith Network will have this focus and will have some financial resources to call upon. It plans to bring in theological seminaries, which would be a new element. It wants to tie into some e-mail networks. It wants to assemble lists of religious leaders in every state and mobilize them in public policy advocacy. These would all be worthy additions to the movement.

This last task is where the greatest risk of duplication will occur. To succeed grassroots organizing staff will need the cooperation of denominational offices, peace fellowships, and state ecumenical agencies in identifying and contacting state and local religious leaders. These are the same persons and same networks that are already involved with the Interfaith Committee in grassroots legislative advocacy. It would be highly desirable to blend this into a single operation because legislative and longer-range policy advocacy should be well integrated.

Almost nothing now exists for coordinated development of longer-range public policies. The Interfaith Network proposal seems to rely upon civic sector experts for this task. This an excellent resource, but there also should be significant involvement of heads of communion and top denominational policy staff from the very beginning. As Harold Laski said many years ago, if I am expected to live in a house, I should have a role in its design.

Structural Possibilities

This leads me to speculate on how to blend the existing Interfaith Committee and the proposed Interfaith Network.

Because the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has functioned for five years, it is known, has a track record, has a website and an operative list serve, and has an outreach network on legislative issues. It could be the framework but transformed into a broader structure.

There could be three major working groups, linked but each with a measure of autonomy: Legislation, Grassroots Organizing, and Policy.

Legislation would be continuation of what the Interfaith Committee is now doing under David Culp's leadership.

Grassroots Organizing would draw together outreach staff of denominations, peace fellowships and state ecumenical agencies, and other organizations with this orientation, and also representatives of theological seminaries. Many of them are already engaged in outreach on legislative issues. The working group would combine grassroots legislative and longer-range public policy advocacy. Staff support could be housed in either a religious or civic sector organization but be under the direction of the working group.

Public Policy needs a new mechanism, a working group with that name. Heads of communion of major denominations should be asked to appoint representatives, who would participate fully and keep the heads informed. Other knowledgeable persons from the faith community could be added. Experts from the civic sector could also participate. Because of their knowledge and experience, the latter might originate many ideas, but it is essential that all public policy initiatives be understood and fully supported by top religious leaders. It would be useful for the Public Policy Working Group to have staff support. Staff or a consultant could take over the website, www.zero-nukes.org, which I created but haven't been keeping up.

In this transformation the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament could be the name of the overall policy body. It could consist of key religious leaders plus persons from the working groups. Prominent persons could be drawn in for leadership roles, such as Bill Coffin and retired United Methodist Bishop Sharon Brown Christopher. This body could meet quarterly while the working groups would meet more frequently. It might also have an advisory board of scientists and national security luminaries, along the lines of the Interfaith Network proposal.

One could also argue that the name of this operation should incorporate "nuclear abolition" or "elimination of nuclear weapons" or have some other catchy title. I have no major problem with that. However, Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is known. The term was adopted because some denominations were uncomfortable with "nuclear abolition". For me what the organization does is more important than what it is called.

One could also argue that the proposal for a new Interfaith Network for Elimination of Nuclear Weapons should have primacy and the Interfaith Committee should be absorbed by it. Having resigned as chair of the Interfaith Committee, I have no proprietary interest in its continuation.

However, I am concerned that the Interfaith Network proposal has an insufficient role for denominations and heads of communion. Some see them as stumbling bureaucracies. Although they have that element, they have been in the forefront of opposition of war on Iraq, and they have tremendous capacity for grassroots outreach that unofficial religious organizations and civic sector organizations cannot match. For them to be fully involved they need to be in on a new initiative from the beginning.

Many denominations are now well-involved with the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament through both Washington and headquarters staff, including persons with easy access to heads of communion. Rich Killmer's outreach to the Muslim community has the potential for gaining participation from this faith. It would be relatively easy for the Interfaith Committee to combine with the Interfaith Network initiative in a broader agenda with longer-range policy concerns. It would be a blessing to create strong ties with the civic sector leaders involved in the Interfaith Network initiative and work together on a broad agenda for achieving the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Dear David, David, and Rich,

I have read the working paper on "Creating an Interfaith Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons". I haven't seen Bill Coffin's "Appeal to the Religious Communities of America", but I know that he is a prophetic leader who should be listened to. I admire David Cortright's enduring leadership in the quest for elimination of nuclear weapons. The desire to strengthen grassroots organizing within the religious community is a worthy objective. I am pleased to know that new resources may be available for this effort.

However, I have reservations about creating a completely new structure for this endeavor. Accordingly, I would like to offer some ideas on how to build on what now exists in ways to achieve broader interfaith action.

Background

In recent weeks as the 60th anniversary of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings approaches, I have wondered why we have failed for 60 years to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons. That call went forth from church groups, scientists, and others the first year after the bombings. Millions of people throughout the globe have joined this advocacy. Although there have been some successes to contain nuclear weapons, we have completely failed to end the commitment of the nuclear weapons states to the development, deployment, and possible use of nuclear weapons.

I puzzle why. One reason is because our efforts have been fragmented into too many organizations. Sometimes they cooperate, but altogether we have failed to maximize our potential strength.

I bring this mood to the proposal to create a new Interfaith Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons when there is already an active Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. The latter, while not nearly strong as it might be, is already working with many of the grassroots network and denominational offices that the proposed Interfaith Network intends to mobilize. I believe that it would be better to blend the existing and the proposed together in some manner.

Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament formed in 2000 as an outgrowth of efforts of the faith community in support of ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). I was the initial chair until I stepped down in the summer of 2004. David Culp from the Friends Committee on National Legislation is now convener.

The Interfaith Committee is loosely organized. It has no officers other than the convener/chair. It has no formal membership. It works through consensus. During the past year it has met every six weeks, focusing on (1) legislative issues and (2) a track for Ecumenical Advocacy Days. Participants in these meetings are mainly Washington-based staff from denominational offices and unofficial religious organizations. Others are connected through a list serve of approximately 70 persons, including persons from denominational headquarters outside Washington, religious peace fellowships based elsewhere, and state ecumenical agencies. There

is Protestant, peace church, Catholic, Jewish, and Unitarian representation. Through Rich Killmer's efforts Muslim participation is beginning to occur.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has a website, www.zero-nukes.org, that I developed to provide information and promote discussion on how to eliminate nuclear weapons. It contains statements from religious organizations, military leaders, and the civic sector. It presents different proposals on how to get zero nuclear weapons.

For the past two years the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has sponsored a track for Ecumenical Advocacy Days that has reached out to a broader base, including state ecumenical agencies.

The Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has no staff. When I was chair, I served as secretariat. David Culp and FCNL staff now have this role. Rich Killmer of the Churches Center for Theology and Public Policy has also provided program support. His use of "An Urgent Call to End the Nuclear Danger" has provided a base for grassroots outreach, including an e-mail network, that is supportive of the Interfaith Committee. Initially I tried to obtain foundation support for a grassroots outreach staff, but to no avail.

Programmatically the Interfaith Committee now concentrates primarily on congressional legislation (currently bunker buster funding) through cooperative lobbying and grassroots outreach through denominations, peace fellowships, and state ecumenical agencies. A number of these organizations make use of legislative alerts written by FCNL.

When I was chair, I encouraged a concern for longer-range policy goals, but not much was done because the major participants were too absorbed in legislative work. However, through my position as chair of Methodists United for Peace with Justice I have worked in the wider arena on broader issues. The latest was "A Moral Appeal for a Safer World without Nuclear Weapons", which is posted at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/moralappeal.html>.

Three Components

From my experience I believe that more complete mobilization of the faith community for the elimination of nuclear weapons should have three linked components: (1) formulation of public policy objectives, both long- and short-range; (2) legislative advocacy; and (3) grassroots mobilization, dealing with both longer-range policy objectives and specific legislative issues.

Presently legislative advocacy is organized by the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament through David Culp's leadership. There is strong grassroots outreach on legislative issues through denominational and peace fellowship networks and connections with state ecumenical agencies. This can be focused on particular states and congressional districts when needed. For the most part this network hasn't worked on a broader agenda for elimination of nuclear weapons, but some of the participating denominations and unofficial organizations have on their own initiative. Many are using the Hiroshima-Nagasaki commemoration as an opportunity to call for nuclear abolition.

There is no common effort on public policy development. Many denominations have strong policy statements with abolitionist orientation (see <http://www.zero->

nukes.org/religiousstatements1.html). From time to time ecumenical and interfaith statements have been issued (see same source). Occasionally sign-on letters with broader focus are sent to the president. But there is no ongoing mechanism for developing and agreeing upon longer-range public policy objectives.

Opportunity

The proposal for a new Interfaith Network for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons with potential financial resources provides an opportunity to rethink and broaden the faith community's efforts on this issue. This should be done in a manner that strengthens and avoids duplication of competing networks. Therefore, I suggest exploring how to blend what the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has developed with this new initiative.

Legislative. The easiest to deal with is legislative advocacy. The Interfaith Committee now fulfills this role with involvement of many denominational offices and peace fellowships. Through David Culp and other participants there are linkages with civic sector organizations and with congressional staff. If there was a new, blended organization, this effort could become the Legislative Working Group.

Grassroots. The Interfaith Committee has achieved grassroots outreach through denominations and peace fellowships with focus on grassroots lobbying on current legislative issues, but it has limited capacity for direct grassroots organizing. The proposed Interfaith Network will have more of an organizing orientation and will have some financial resources to call upon. It plans to bring in theological seminaries, which would be a new element. It wants to tie into large e-mail networks. It wants to assemble lists of religious leaders in every state and mobilize them in public policy advocacy. These would all be worthy additions to the movement.

This last task is where the greatest risk of duplication will occur. To succeed grassroots organizing staff will need the cooperation of denominational offices, peace fellowships, and state ecumenical agencies in identifying and contacting state and local religious leaders. These are the same persons and same networks that are already involved with the Interfaith Committee in grassroots legislative advocacy. It would be confusing to grassroots leaders to be simultaneously approached by the Interfaith Committee and the Interfaith Network.

Therefore, it would be highly desirable to have a combined Grassroots Working Group. It would consist of practitioners from denominations, unofficial religious organizations, state ecumenical councils, seminaries, civic sector organizations working in partnership, and related persons. Staff support for this effort could be housed in either a religious or civic sector organization but be under the guidance of the Working Group.

Public policy. Almost nothing now exists within the interfaith community for coordinated development of longer-range public policies for eliminating nuclear weapons. The website I have developed provides background information, but it doesn't tie into any policy-making process. The Interfaith Network proposal relies mainly on civic sector experts for this task. Their input is useful, but there also should be significant involvement of heads of communion and top denominational policy staff from the very beginning. As Harold Laski said many years ago, if I am expected to live in a house, I should have a role in its design.

A new Public Policy Working Group is needed. Heads of communion of major denominations should be asked to appoint representatives, who would participate fully and keep the heads informed. Other knowledgeable persons from the faith community could be added. Experts from the civic sector could also participate. Because of their knowledge and experience, the latter might originate many ideas, but it is essential that all public policy initiatives be understood and fully supported by top religious leaders. It would be useful for the Public Policy Working Group to have staff support.

The website, www.zero-nukes.org, which I created, could be available as a tool of the Public Policy Working Group for background information and for presentation of ideas on How to Get to Zero (see <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html>). I haven't been keeping up on this site, so staff housed somewhere or a consultant would need to take on this task.

Structure

These three working groups should be brought together in a common structure with a policy board to set overall direction. Presently the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament is run informally by persons from denominational offices and unofficial religious organizations who attend its meeting. The Interfaith Network proposal calls for "a prestigious advisory council", "a board of directors of those willing to commit time, resources, and money", and "a smaller executive committee". There would be "co-chairs (male and female) to serve as spokespersons and oversee staff." The proposal offers no names but doesn't seem to seek much denominational involvement. (I realize that some see denominations as stumbling bureaucracies. Although they have that element, they have been in the forefront of opposition of war on Iraq, and they have tremendous capacity for grassroots outreach that unofficial religious organizations and civic sector organizations cannot match.)

To combine these two approaches I suggest that a blended board should consist of persons recommended by heads of communion (or co-opted if designation isn't easy to obtain) and other prominent religious leaders (such as Bill Coffin, Jim Wallis, etc.). There could be two co-chairs: Bill Coffin and someone like retired United Methodist Bishop Sharon Brown Christopher, who as president of the United Methodist Council of Bishops spoke out against the Iraq war and who would have easy access to heads of communion. There might be a smaller executive committee. There could be an advisory board of scientists and national security luminaries, along the lines of the Interfaith Network proposal.

The working groups would relate to this board and provide the bulk of the agenda. Their chairs could be on the executive committee. It would be useful for the board to have staff support for administrative functions, which could be housed in a cooperating organization, such as the Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy. As a cooperative endeavor, there wouldn't have to be a high-powered executive director.

Because the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament has functioned for five years, is known, has a track record, has a website and an operative list serve, has an outreach network on legislative issues, and has strong ties with denominations, it could be the framework but be transformed into a broader structure. This would avoid the confusion of having both an Interfaith Committee and an Interfaith Network as structures working for elimination of nuclear weapons.

The name could be open for discussion. We settled on Nuclear Disarmament because some denominations were uncomfortable with the term "nuclear abolition", including some Jewish representatives who don't want to challenge Israel to eliminate its nuclear arsenal when surrounded by hostile Arab nations. "Elimination of nuclear weapons" comes out better than "nuclear abolition" in focus groups, but is wordy. We called it a "committee" because of its informal operation and a stated desire of many not to incorporate. Whether a broadened structure should incorporate is a matter to be discussed. If agreement was reached on a different name, the website -- www.zero-nukes.org -- could remain the same.

I will be interested in your response to these suggestions.

Dear David, David, and Rich,

In another message I offered some ideas on how the existing Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament can blend with the proposed Interfaith Network for Elimination of Nuclear Weapons into a single entity. My proposal included three principal working groups: Legislative, Grassroots, and Public Policy. Here I would like to elaborate on the latter.

I suggested that the Public Policy Working Group consist of persons designated by heads of communion and other faith organizations and that it obtain active counsel from civic sector experts. Its role would be to define a common set of public policies leading toward the elimination that denominations, unofficial religious organizations, and grassroots religious groups will support.

The assignment would reflect President Eisenhower's admonition: "I like to believe that people, in the long run, are going to do more to promote peace than our governments. Indeed, I think that people want peace so much that one of these days governments and better get out of the way and let them have it."

With advice from civic sector experts the Public Policy Working Group could define two sets of policies to advocate: (1) policies to work for during the remaining years of the Bush Administration and (2) policies we want the next president to carry out. The Working Group could address these questions to different segments of the civic sector, such as (a) David Cortright, Jonathan Schell, Randy Forsberg, and those associated with Abolition 2000; (b) Washington-based arm control experts like Jonathan Dean, James Goodby, Darrell Kimball, Bruce Blair, etc; and (c) academic experts from Harvard, Stanford, and elsewhere.

I made an attempt to write some goals for 2005-2008, which are appended below. Their wasn't a lot of interest by persons then active in the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament because of competing time pressures and because there were too many, too complicated goals.

I'm thinking of something simpler, perhaps no more than 5 main points (or 7 at the most). The points should go beyond current legislative focus (such as bunker buster) into longer-range but achievable objectives, such as de-alerting, early completion of SORT, strong nonproliferation measures. The 2009-2012 should lay out what we want the next president to do during his term in office.

This would provide a rallying point for advocacy, including meetings with congressional and presidential candidates. For instance, asking Do you support the interfaith five point action program for nuclear disarmament? If elected president, will you pursue the interfaith roadmap for nuclear disarmament during your four year term?

To with this I would like to see some experts draft (1) a model executive order for de-alerting that the U.S. and Russian presidents (plus other possessors) could adopt an implement through executive action and (2) a model strategic reduction treaty that would achieve quick, verifiable

Questions for Congressional Candidates on Nuclear Weapons Issues

The following questions on nuclear weapons issues are written for grassroots activists to use with congressional candidates. You can use them as questions from the floor at candidates' forums and at personal appearances of individual candidates. You can also use them when candidates are on a radio and television call-in shows. You can also address the questions to official representatives of the candidates. If you choose, you can address the questions in writing to candidates.

The questions are considered as points of departure. You may want to rephrase them in your own words. Also, look for a local angle or draw on a personal experience. Keep your question brief. And always be courteous and respectful of the candidates

1. (a) Numerous religious denominations favor the global elimination of nuclear weapons.
or
(b) I am a [United Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Lutheran, American Baptist, Unitarian, member of the United Church of Christ, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ, etc.). My denomination favors the global elimination of nuclear weapons.
If elected (or re-elected), what will you do to work for the achievement of this goal?
2. The current administration wants to develop new nuclear weapons. This doesn't make sense to me because the U.S. already has more than 6,000 in its stockpile, far too many. Also, it sets a bad example that other nations might copy. Do you support developing new nuclear weapons? If not, what will you do to oppose their development?
3. Since 1992 there has been a moratorium on testing nuclear weapons. Do you support continuation of this moratorium? [For senatorial candidates:] Would you support ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) by the U.S. Senate?
4. [For senatorial candidates:] If the President negotiates a treaty with Russian for deeper reductions in nuclear weapons, say to 1,000 or fewer on each side as many experts recommend, would you support treaty ratification?
5. The United States and Russia each maintains several thousand nuclear warheads on hair-trigger alert, ready to be launched against the other side on short notice. Many retired military officers and other experts are on record in support of taking these weapons off high alert. Would you encourage the President to work with Russia to remove all nuclear warheads from hair-trigger alert?
6. In the global campaign against terrorism, it is important to be certain that terrorist organizations do not gain access to nuclear weapons. What will you do to achieve tight security for all nuclear warheads everywhere? For example, do you favor expansion of the Nunn-Lugar program and other efforts to achieve enhanced security for nuclear warheads and fissile material in Russia and elsewhere?

7. For many years U.S. policy has relied on nuclear weapons primarily as a deterrent of nuclear attack by other states possessing nuclear weapons. The current administration has issued policy documents that envision expanded roles for nuclear weapons, such as use against non-nuclear states, in response to biological and chemical weapons, and for preemptive action against emerging threats by states and terrorist groups before they are fully formed. This is contrary to the intention of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1970 which the United States signed. As a member of Congress, will you use your power and influence to promote nuclear disarmament and oppose new roles for nuclear weapons?

Written by Howard W. Hallman
May 27, 2004

<http://www.afsc.org/vote/questions.htm>

Questions for Candidates and Yourself

Let the candidates know what you think!

Go to political events or send letters to ask polite, but pointed questions that show the candidates the people are thinking about issues of peace and justice.

Some Sample Questions: (from AFSC)

Instead of making us more safe, policies of nuclear weapons superiority, developing and deploying new nuclear weapons, and first strike attacks takes us back to the hostility of the Cold War and violates the Non-Proliferation Treaty. What would you do to move our country toward non-proliferation, multi-lateral arms control and the elimination of nuclear weapons?

The U.S. military budget is now about \$400 billion a year, more than the world's next thirty biggest military spenders combined - that amount does not even include the billion dollars a day to occupy Iraq. Meanwhile, people here are losing medical coverage, educational opportunities, pensions, and can't find affordable housing. What would you do to balance federal spending priorities and give us real security?

The policy of pre-emptive war creates a dangerous precedent for regional conflicts in the Middle East, South Asia, Russia, and across Africa - we do not want endless war. What would you do to promote nonviolent resolution of international conflicts?

As you know, there is a cultural war being waged against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people and families who are vulnerable to legalized discrimination and violations of their civil rights. There are now campaigns, promoted largely in the name of religion, to permanently encode the principle of inequality in state and federal constitutions.

Yet there are also thousands of congregations in many different faith traditions and Christian denominations who support full equality for LGBT people, including equal civil marriage rights, and who recognize and honor marriages between people of the same sex.

Will you take a strong stand for religious pluralism by opposing efforts to pass constitutional amendments that treat lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people as unequal?

[The Friends Committee on National Legislation](http://www.fcnl.org/pdfs/candidate_questions.pdf) offers the following questions: http://www.fcnl.org/pdfs/candidate_questions.pdf

- [Advancing Budget Priorities for Human Security](#)
- [Promoting Arms Control and Disarmament](#)
- [Promoting Peaceful Alternatives to the War on Terror](#)
- [Protecting Civil Liberties and Human Rights](#)
- [Removing Oil as a Source of Conflict](#)

This is a nonpartisan effort. AFSC does not endorse any one candidate or political party.

Responses of Faith Community to Nuclear Weapons Danger

Structures

Denominations	Ecumenical, Interfaith
Headquarters	National
Washington offices	State
At United Nations	Local
Regional	
Unofficial associations	

Major statements of the 1980s

World Council of Churches, *Gathered for Life*, Vancouver, 1983
U.S Catholic Bishops, *The Challenge of Peace*, 1983
Union of American Hebrew Congregations, *Preventing the Nuclear Holocaust*, 1983
United Methodist Bishops, *In Defense of Creation*, 1986
Other denominational statements

Arrangements for cooperation

Interfaith Impact, Washington Interreligious Staff Council (WISC)
Monday Lobby
Abolition 2000; Religious Working Group
Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament
Website: www.zero-nukes.org

Campaigns of last ten years

Chemical Weapons Convention	Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative
Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)	Urgent Call to Reduce Nuclear Danger
Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator	Back from the Brink
NPT Review Conference	Nuclear Threat Reduction Initiative

Methods used (illustrative, not exhaustive)

Organization
Coordinating arrangements for faith community
Religious-civic sector cooperation
Denominational, interfaith statements
Direct lobbying in Washington, D.C.
Regular contact with congressional staff, Executive Branch personnel
Lobby days: delegation visits to members of Congress, top Executive Branch officials
Sign-on letters, public statements, news conferences, hearings, newspaper ads
Action alerts, call-in days, material for grassroots education
Ceremonies, rallies, picketing, civil disobedience
Grassroots lobbying
Organizing, training workshops
Education, information dissemination
Calls, e-mail, faxes, petitions to members of Congress, Executive Branch
Delegation visits, attend public events of members of Congress
Statements, news conferences, newspaper and radio ads, call-in shows, sermons
Ceremonies, rallies, picketing, civil disobedience

April 8, 2004

From: David Culp
Friends Committee on National Legislation

Sample Letter on New Nuclear Weapons

[Start with the first sentence. Then write your own letter using one or two of the points below. Personalized letters always have more impact with congressional offices.]

Dear Representative/Senator,

I urge you to vote to remove all funds for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) from the defense authorization bill and the energy and water appropriations bill.

* The development of a Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator would have disastrous consequences for the international arms control regime. At the same time the Administration is criticizing others for having weapons, it is upgrading its own weapons complex. This "do what I say, not what I do" policy is evident to all. If nuclear weapons are unacceptable for Iran and North Korea, they are unacceptable for the U.S.

* The RNEP would have a yield up to 70 times that of the bomb detonated over Hiroshima. If detonated in an urban setting, tens of thousands of people could receive a fatal dose of radiation within the first 24 hours. More would be killed or injured by the extreme pressures of the blast and thermal injuries arising from the heat of the explosion. Still more casualties would result from the resulting fires and the collapse of buildings from the seismic shock that the explosion would produce.

* Developing new types of nuclear weapons for battlefield use blurs the distinction between conventional and nuclear arms.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Your Name
Your Address

Say "No" to New Nuclear Weapons

We tell our kids that smoking cigarettes is bad for them, but we smoke. What are they to believe? That smoking is okay. Actions speak louder than words.

These days the United States is telling other nations that developing nuclear weapons is wrong. We are concentrating particularly on North Korea and Iran. North Korea claims to have one or more nuclear weapon. Iran may have the capacity to produce them. At the same time the United States maintains a huge stockpile of nuclear weapons and wants to develop new versions. What are North Korea, Iran, and others to believe? Naturally they'll think what's okay for us is okay for them.

This foolish, counterproductive scenario is in playing out right now. The Bush Administration is asking Congress for funds to develop something called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP). That's the Pentagon's fancy title. The popular name is "bunker buster". Its purpose is to penetrate underground to destroy deeply buried command centers and production facilities. To do this it would have 70 times the destructive force that devastated Hiroshima. Scientists tell us that the explosion would produce a huge quantity of radioactive fallout, killing civilians living nearby and spreading afar with the wind.

Last year Congress turned down the Administration's request for funds to develop the bunker buster. But the Administration has come back with a new request and is mounting a vigorous campaign to gain approval.

That's not all. In a series of policy documents released during President Bush's first term in office, the Administration has expressed willingness to make preemptive strikes at "emerging threats". This could include use of nuclear weapons. If this were done, it would reverse a long-standing policy of no first use against non-nuclear states. The bunker buster bomb seems particularly adaptable to this purpose.

As a person of faith (I'm a [name of denomination]), I'm appalled at this new policy. It's bad enough to have a nuclear arsenal for deterrence. To develop and deploy weapons that are considered more usable goes beyond the bounds of acceptable morality. Surely there must be better ways to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

Actually there are. They come to focus in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). This 35 year old treaty is based upon a bargain between the five nuclear-weapon states as of 1970 and other nations. The United States, the Soviet Union (now Russia), Great Britain, France, and China agreed to cease the nuclear arms race and to assist other nations develop peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In exchange the non-nuclear states would not develop nuclear weapons.

With 188 signatory nations the NPT has had considerable success but not a perfect record in halting nuclear proliferation. Three states that haven't signed the treaty -- Israel, India, and Pakistan -- have developed nuclear weapons. In January 2003 North Korea announced that it was withdrawing from the treaty and has since announced that it now has nuclear weapons. Some persons believe that Iran, another signatory, has nuclear ambitions. But without the

restraining influence of the NPT other nations with sufficient industrial capacity might have developed nuclear weapons. Moreover, the NPT provides an international mechanism for dealing with North Korea, Iran, and any other nation wanting to develop nuclear weapons.

The non-nuclear states, however, are getting restless with the slow pace of nuclear weapons reduction, especially by the "big boys", the United States and Russia. This concern will be expressed at an NPT Review Conference that meets in New York in May.* Delegates will note that commitments made by the nuclear weapon states at the last Review Conference in 2000, such as ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (NPT) and other promised steps, have not been fulfilled. They will point out that the Bush Administration's push for a new nuclear weapon, the bunker buster, moves in the opposite direction of the treaty's goal of nuclear disarmament. Informed observers indicate that the NPT regime is in danger of collapse.

If this happened, the international restraint on other nations developing nuclear weapons would be gone. This runs a grave risk that non-nuclear states with industrial capability might decide to join the nuclear weapons club. The more states that have nuclear weapons the greater the possibility that terrorist organizations will obtain one or more nuclear warheads and use them.

Thus, in a bizarre way the Bush Administration's push for funding the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator is counterproductive. It is harmful both to stopping the spread of nuclear weapons and to keeping nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists.

I hope that Congress has the wisdom and courage to say "no new nuclear weapons" by blocking funds for the bunker buster.

* This sentence for use in April 2005. In May it can be changed to " This concern will be expressed at an NPT Review Conference meeting this month in New York." The whole paragraph should be recast after the results of the Review Conference are known.

Written by Howard W. Hallman
March 31, 2005

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

April 14, 2004

To: Robert Sharp
Southern Indiana UM Conference

Fax: 812 336-0216

No. of pages: 6

From: Howard W. Hallman, Chair

Re: New Nuclear Weapons

Dear Rev. Sharp:

I am sending you an Action Alert on New Nuclear Weapons from the Friends Committee on National Legislation and a sample letter to members of Congress. They lay out the issue.

This is part of an effort to stop funding for the development of new nuclear weapons. Senators Bayh and Lugar are considered swing votes on this issue. Therefore, we urge you to encourage United Methodists in Southern Indiana to get in touch with them and urge them to vote against such funding.

This is consistent with Resolution 315 "Saying No to Nuclear Deterrence" in The United Methodist Book of Resolutions, 2000. The UM General Board of Church and Society has made this a top issue for this session of Congress. They have an Action Alert on their website at <http://capwiz.com/gbcs/issues/alert/?alertid=5425146&type=CO>. A copy is attached.

If you want to know who we are, please visit our website: www.mupwj.org.

I will be interested in learning what your Board of Church and Society decides to do about this issue.

Shalom,

Howard W. Hallman, Chair

January 13, 2004

To: Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Dear Colleagues:

At the meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament on January 12, 2004 we decide, among other things, to focus attention on funding for new nuclear weapons. Committee votes are expected in May, floor votes in May and June. We will focus particularly on twelve senators in nine states and one representative.

David Culp is taking the lead on legislative contacts in Washington and providing timely information. Rich Killmer has agreed to coordinate grassroots outreach efforts.

To succeed it is essential that many participating organizations reach out to their grassroots activists. Therefore, please let me know what your office is willing able to do among the tasks enumerated below. Send a copy of your reply to Rich Killmer at rkillmer@wesleysem.org.

I. KEY SENATORS ON FLOOR VOTES

In 2003 47 senators voted against funding for new nuclear weapons. We need four more to defeat funding in 2004. We want to concentrate on the following nine senators (from six states) who voted for funding in 2003 and persuade them to vote "no" this year.

Susan Collins - Maine
Olympia Snowe -- Maine
Arlen Specter -- Pennsylvania
Bill Nelson -- Florida
Evan Bayh -- Indiana
Richard Lugar -- Indiana
Ben Nelson -- Nebraska
Chuck Hagel -- Nebraska
Gordon Smith -- Ohio

In each state we want to achieve the following, beginning in March:

- * 500 individual letters to each key senator
- * Sign-on letter from statewide religious leaders to the key senators
- * Religious leaders meetings with key senators

In which of these states do you have contacts that you can mobilize?

For each state:

- How many letters will you generate from your members?
- Will you encourage leaders from your denomination to sign a religious leaders' letter?
- Will you encourage them to participate in meetings with the key senators?

Is there a particular state where you could help take the lead in mobilizing interfaith action?

II. KEY DECISION MAKERS

A. We also want to focus attention on three senators who hold key positions in the appropriations process.

Sen. Pete Domenici (NM), chair, Senate Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee

Sen. Wayne Allard (CO), chair, Senate Armed Services Strategic Subcommittee

Sen. John Warner (VA), chair, Senate Armed Services Committee

We would like them to receive a flow of letters from their constituents opposing funding for new nuclear weapons. How many letters will you generate in each state?

B. In the House Rep. David Hobson (OH-7), chair, House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee, blocked funding for new nuclear weapons. (The Senate restored half of it.) He is likely to block funding again this year. He needs to hear praise from his constituents for his action. How many letters can you generate in his district?

As soon as possible, please let me and Rich know what you are willing to do.

Thanks for your participation,
Howard

Howard W. Hallman, Chair
Methodists United for Peace with Justice
1500 16th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 301 896-0013; e-mail: hhallman@mupwj.org
Website: www.mupwj.org

Strategy Ideas

modified in e-mail to ICND

Dear Colleagues,

I have opposed nuclear weapons since their first use in 1945 and have been working for their total elimination since 1984. As I retire as chair of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, I would like to offer some strategy suggestions for those of you who will be continuing to work on this important issue. My main idea is to make nuclear disarmament a bipartisan issue by a concerted effort to generate Republican support.

This and other strategic ideas will be on the agenda of the September 21 meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament. To promote dialogue, please reply to all.

REPORT CARD

In the last 20 years there has been some success, such as elimination of intermediate nuclear force in Europe, reduction of strategic nuclear weapons under START I, withdrawal of tactical nuclear weapons by President Bush senior and President Gorbachev in 1991, moratorium on nuclear weapons testing. The peace movement can take credit for public pressure that made these steps possible. However, in spite of all our efforts the cold war doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD) remains in place in U.S. and Russian policy. The unwillingness of the nuclear weapon states to honor Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) by moving toward total nuclear disarmament has inhibited efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation by other states.

I have been involved in a variety of activities during this period: grassroots action as part of the Freeze Campaign; three times producing calls for global nuclear disarmament by religious leaders from around the world; getting resolutions adopted by the United Methodist General Conference; involvement with NGOs at meetings of NPT conferences; lobbying in the United States; grassroots education; helping to mobilize the religious community. In the last twelve years these kind of efforts by the peace movement have yielded minimal results. We failed to get the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) ratified by the U.S. Senate. We have fallen back to rearguard action, such as prevention of research on new nuclear weapons, rather than pro-active efforts to remove nuclear weapons from hair-trigger alert and achieve their elimination.

Our biggest obstacle is the continued commitment by U.S. policymakers, Republican and Democrat alike, to the idea that nuclear weapons have utility for the United States. To be sure, on some issues, such as development of new nuclear weapons, Democrats are more sympathetic to our point of view. John Kerry as president would do more to reduce the role of nuclear weapons, but neither he nor Democratic leaders in Congress are committed abolitionists.

NEED FOR BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

In face of this situation, the religious community should continue its insistence that the existence of nuclear weapons is a moral issue and that total elimination is the goal to seek. At the same

time we should strengthen our efforts to achieve intermediate steps, such as de-alerting, deep cuts in strategic weapons with dismantlement of warheads and delivery vehicles taken out of service, CTBT ratification, curtailment of all research on new nuclear weapons, global nonproliferation measures.

Achievement of these objectives in the United States requires bipartisan support. Even if Kerry is elected president and Democrats take control of Congress, Republican votes will be needed for treaty ratification. If George W. Bush is re-elected and Republicans retain control of Congress, Republican votes will be required to block development of new nuclear weapons and other negative actions.

Therefore, the faith community should embark upon a serious effort to generate bipartisan support for nuclear disarmament. In the 1960s and '70s there was strong bipartisan support for major arms control agreements, which passed the Senate with only 10 to 15 negative votes by a few Southern Democrats and conservative Republicans. Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush signed arms control agreements that Democratic-controlled Congresses ratified. Since then Congress has become more ideologically divided. This has spilled over into Republican opposition to Democrat-initiated nuclear arms reduction efforts. The current Bush Administration, controlled by nuclear hawks, has steadfastly insisted on Republican support for its nuclear policies.

But this is beginning to change. Led by Congressman Hobson, the House of Representative has voted to eliminate funding for research on new nuclear weapons. It is reported that younger members of the House Armed Services Committee are uncomfortable with some of the Administration's nuclear policies. The Republican National Convention in prime time featured such moderates as John McCain, Rudy Guiliani, Arnold Schwarzenegger, and George Pataki (Zell Miller was an exception). An analyst observed that they shone much brighter than such conservatives as Rick Santorum, Sam Brownback, Bill Frist, Dennis Hastert who spoke before the national networks picked up the Convention. Some believe that if Bush is re-elected some of the right-wing ideologues will be replaced by more moderate persons. Therefore, there are opportunities for gaining support of centrist Republicans for nuclear disarmament.

ACTION PROPOSALS

(1) Early in 2005 the faith community through its top leadership should issue a call for the restoration of a bipartisan approach to nuclear weapons with the objective of reducing nuclear danger and moving toward the global elimination of nuclear weapons. This call can be accompanied by a booklet outlining nuclear disarmament objectives for the next four years (see below).

(2) This should be followed with a concerted grassroots effort to gain support of 20 or so Republican senators and 25 to 30 House Republicans for nuclear reduction policies. (A few recalcitrant Democrats, such as Evan Bayh, can be added.) We worked in this manner in the 1998-99 campaign for CTBT ratification. To a lesser extent we have done so this year in our efforts to block funding for new nuclear weapons. For this to happen there should be a full-time grassroots coordinator who would work closely with denominational offices, peace fellowships, and state ecumenical associations.

(3) To provide a focus, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament (or its successor) should develop a set of nuclear disarmament objectives to be achieved in 2005 to 2008 during the next presidential term. These objectives would relate to (a) steps by the United States and other nuclear weapon states to move toward total nuclear disarmament and (b) nonproliferation measures that (i) prevent states with nuclear ambitions from acquiring such weapons and (ii) keep fissile material and nuclear weapons out the hands of terrorists. These objectives with explanatory material should be published in a 16 page booklet.

Civic sector organizations can help in formulation of objectives and provision of background explanation. They can be referenced in the booklet as sources for further information.

Interfaith groups in key states and congressional districts could use the booklet for opening conversations with senators and representatives to determine which objectives they might support. In Washington representatives of the faith community could use the booklet for conversations with executive officials.

(4) To provide greater specificity action alerts would be provided to grassroots activists on pending legislation and executive decisions as they arise.

(5) In addition there could be background papers on new issues, written by civic sector experts. State and congressional district coalitions could use these in dialogue with senators and representatives. For example, in July the Bush Administration announced that in negotiations for a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty it would not support verification measures. An organization like the Arms Control Association could provide a briefing on this matter and explain why verification is essential. The chair of a state or congressional district could send this briefing to senators and representative and ask for their views on this issue, indicating that their response would be shared with members of their interfaith coalition. This might elicit a better response than a letter from a Washington-based organization.

(6) The faith community could encourage civic sector organizations that operate on a nonpartisan basis to join in the effort to develop bipartisan (Republican) support for nuclear disarmament.

I'll be interested in your response to these ideas.

Shalom,
Howard

Terrorists and the Nuclear Danger

September 11, 2001 is a date permanently etched in the minds all living Americans. The unthinkable occurred. Terrorists hijacked commercial airlines and used them as deadly missiles against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

Sadly to say, an even more horrible event could occur. Terrorists could acquire or manufacture a nuclear bomb, sneak it into the United States, and explode in the heart of a major city. Once unimaginable, this could really happen. But it can also be prevented.

I write as a/an (name of denomination). Our denomination favors the global elimination of nuclear weapons. Until that is accomplished, we should do all we can to keep nuclear warheads and fissile material out of the hands of terrorists.

The largest quantity of nuclear-weapon material not fully secure is in Russia. The breakup of the Soviet Union and ensuing economic and political instability left Russia without sufficient resources to protect its widely scattered nuclear weapons complex. The United States recognized this difficulty in 1991 with establishment of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, often referred to as Nunn-Lugar after the two U.S. Senators who sponsored the legislation.

When this effort started, there were 600 tons of potentially vulnerable material in Russia. By the end of the 2003 fiscal year, comprehensive security and accounting upgrade had been completed for only 22 percent of this material. Initial rapid upgrades, such as bricking over windows and installing detectors at doors, had occurred for 43 percent. In the two years following the 9/11 attack the amount of material made secure was less than during the two preceding years. At the current rate of progress it will take another 13 years to complete the job in Russia.

Other nations have lesser quantities of fissile material not fully secured. Throughout the globe 20 tons of highly enriched uranium, enough to make hundreds of nuclear weapons, exist as fuel at more than 130 civilian research reactors in more than 40 countries. Many of them are lightly guard. In response Congress is considering more funds for global clean-up of this material. The U.S. Department of Energy has established a Global Threat Reduction Initiative.

These are steps in the right direction, but we can do much better. This is the conclusion of an in-depth study by experts from Harvard University. Entitled *Security the Bomb: An Agenda for Action*, this report indicates that the task of fully securing all of Russia's fissile material could be completed in four years. Global cleanout to remove other weapons-usable material from the most vulnerable sites, especially civilian research reactors, could also be accomplished in four years.

Why is this not being done? Matthew Bunn and Anthony Wier, the Harvard report's co-authors, indicate that a lack of a sense of urgency and effective leadership in the United States and Russia are major shortcomings. Bureaucratic obstacles have stalled funded programs. The report proposes that President Bush issue a directive making this effort a top priority, set an aggressive timetable, and appoint a senior official to lead the initiative. The Harvard experts also

recommend that President Bush and Russian President Putin take several other initiatives, including mutually securing nuclear warheads taken out of service and dismantling them with proper verification.

To go with a heightened sense of urgency, substantially more funds are needed for the task. In 2001 a Department of Energy task force, co-chaired by former Republican Senator Howard Baker and former Democratic White House Counsel Lloyd Cutler, recommended that funding for nuclear threat reduction should be increased from \$300 million to \$3 billion a year for an eight to ten year period. This has not occurred. Instead the Bush Administration has pumped up spending for an untested missile defense system to \$10 billion a year to deal with a threat that is much more remote than the danger of terrorists acquiring and using nuclear weapons inside the United States.

A related effort is the G8 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons of Mass Destruction. This is an initiative of the Group of Eight Nations (United States, United Kingdom, Japan, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and Canada) taken at a summit meeting in June 2002. They pledged \$20 billion over the next ten years to reduce the risk that unsecured weapons of mass destruction throughout the globe might fall into the hands of terrorists. Since then some projects have started but the program is moving slowly. The speed and scope has not reflected the urgency of the challenge to block terrorists from obtaining nuclear weapons and fissile material.

While we are arguing over whether 9/11 could have been prevented, let us move vigorously ahead with what is truly preventable: keeping terrorists from acquiring and using nuclear weapons.

Written by Howard W. Hallman
May 27, 2004

Terrorists and the Nuclear Danger

September 11, 2001 is a date permanently etched in the minds all living Americans. The unthinkable occurred. Terrorists hijacked commercial airlines and used them as deadly missiles against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

Sadly to say, an even more horrible event could occur. Terrorists could acquire or manufacture a nuclear bomb, sneak it into the United States, and explode in the heart of a major city. Once unimaginable, this could really happen. But it can also be prevented.

The theory of nuclear bomb making is well known and knowledge of the technicalities is widely available. But it isn't easy to accomplish. First and foremost a sizable quantity of fissile material is required. Because it isn't found in nature, it has to be produced. This is a complicated process. It's not something that can be done in a cave in a remote mountain. However, the process can be shortcut by surreptitiously acquiring fissile material, or even a nuclear warhead, from the stockpile of a nuclear weapon state. To assure that this doesn't happen, it is necessary to make certain that every ounce of fissile material, every nuclear warhead, is secure throughout the world.

The largest quantity of nuclear-weapon material not fully secure is in Russia. The breakup of the Soviet Union and ensuing economic and political instability left Russia without sufficient resources to protect its widely scattered nuclear weapons complex. The United States recognized this difficulty in 1991 with establishment of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, often referred to as Nunn-Lugar after the two U.S. Senators who sponsored the legislation.

When this effort started, there were 600 tons of potentially vulnerable material in Russia. By the end of the 2003 fiscal year, comprehensive security and accounting upgrade had been completed for only 22 percent of this material. Initial rapid upgrades, such as bricking over windows and installing detectors at doors, had occurred for 43 percent. In the two years following the 9/11 attack the amount of material made secure was less than during the two preceding years. At the current rate of progress it will take another 13 years to complete the job in Russia.

Other nations have lesser quantities of fissile material not fully secured. Throughout the globe 20 tons of highly enriched uranium, enough to make hundreds of nuclear weapons, exist as fuel at more than 130 civilian research reactors in more than 40 countries. Many of them are lightly guard. Terrorists organizations are continuously seeking weaknesses in the security systems.

We can do much better. This is the conclusion of an in-depth study by experts from Harvard University. Entitled *Security the Bomb: An Agenda for Action*, this report indicates that the task of fully securing all of Russia's fissile material could be completed in four years. A global cleanout to remove other weapons-usable material from the most vulnerable sites, especially civilian research reactors, could also be accomplished in four years.

Why is this not being done? The Harvard report indicates that a lack of a sense of urgency and effective leadership in the United States and Russia are major shortcomings. Bureaucratic obstacles have stalled funded programs. The report proposes that President Bush issue a directive making this effort a top priority, set an aggressive timetable, and appoint a senior official to lead the initiative. The Harvard experts also recommend that President Bush and Russian President Putin take several other initiatives, including mutually securing nuclear warheads taken out of service and dismantling them with proper verification.

A second problem is the lack of sufficient funds for this task. In 2001 a Department of Energy task force, co-chaired by former Republican Senator Howard Baker and former Democratic White House Counsel Lloyd Cutler, recommended that funding for nuclear threat reduction should be increased from \$300 million to \$3 billion a year for an eight to ten year period. This has not occurred. Instead the Bush Administration has pumped up spending for an untested missile defense system to \$10 billion a year to deal with a threat that is much more remote than the danger of terrorists acquiring and using nuclear weapons inside the U.S. homeland.

A related effort is the G8 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons of Mass Destruction. This is an initiative of the Group of Eight Nations (United States, United Kingdom, Japan, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and Canada) taken at a summit meeting in June 2002. They pledged \$20 billion over the next ten years to reduce the risk that unsecured weapons of mass destruction throughout the globe might fall into the hands of terrorists. Since then some projects have started but the program is moving slowly. The speed and scope has not reflected the urgency of the challenge to block terrorists from obtaining nuclear weapons and fissile material.

While we are arguing over whether 9/11 could have been prevented, let us move vigorously ahead with what is truly preventable: keeping terrorists from acquiring and using nuclear weapons.

Drafted by Howard W. Hallman
May 25, 2004
832 words

Dear Colleagues:

At yesterday's meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament David Culp added two more Republican senators to our list of swing votes on opposition to the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP): Senator Bob Bennett of Utah and Senator Lisa Murkowski of Alaska. As we reach out to our members in Utah, we can ask them also to contact Senator Orrin Hatch.

If you are willing to reach out to your grassroots constituents in Utah and/or Alaska, please reply to this e-mail.

Contact information is as follows. A fax on an organization's letterhead or with home address listed is the best method of communication. Delivery of letters to D.C. offices is too delayed to be effective. Letters and faxes can go to offices in their states.

Senator Bob Bennett (R-UT)
431 Dirksen Building
Washington, DC 20510-4403
Phone: (202) 224-5444
Fax: (202) 228-1168
E-mail form available at http://bennett.senate.gov/contact/email_comment.html
State offices listed at <http://bennett.senate.gov/contact/contact.html>

Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT)
104 Hart Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
Tel: (202) 224-5251
Fax: (202) 224-6331
E-mail form and state offices listed at
<http://hatch.senate.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=Offices.Home>

Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK)
322 Hart Senate Building
Washington D.C., 20510
202-224-6665
Fax 202-224-5301
E-mail form and state offices available at <http://murkowski.senate.gov/contact.html>
Alaska residents may call the Anchorage office toll free at 1-877-829-6030.

Thanks for adding these senators to your list.

Howard

Dear Colleagues:

At yesterday's meeting of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament David Culp added two more Republican senators to our list of swing votes on opposition to the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP): Senator Bob Bennett of Utah and Senator Lisa Murkowski of Alaska. As we reach out to our members in Utah, we can ask them also to contact Senator Orrin Hatch.

If you are willing to reach out to your grassroots constituents in Utah and/or Alaska, please reply to this e-mail.

Contact information is as follows. A fax on an organization's letterhead or with home address listed is the best method of communication. Delivery of letters to D.C. offices is too delayed to be effective. Letters and faxes can go to offices in their states.

Senator Bob Bennett (R-UT)

431 Dirksen Building

Washington, DC 20510-4403

Phone: (202) 224-5444

Fax: (202) 228-1168

E-mail form available at http://bennett.senate.gov/contact/email_comment.html

State offices listed at <http://bennett.senate.gov/contact/contact.html>

Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT)

104 Hart Office Building

Washington, DC 20510

Tel: (202) 224-5251

Fax: (202) 224-6331

E-mail form and state offices listed at

<http://hatch.senate.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=Offices.Home>

Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK)

322 Hart Senate Building

Washington D.C., 20510

202-224-6665

Fax 202-224-5301

E-mail form and state offices available at <http://murkowski.senate.gov/contact.html>

Alaska residents may call the Anchorage office toll free at 1-877-829-6030.

Thanks for adding these senators to your list.

Howard

April 2003

Supporters of nuclear "bunker busters" suggest that these weapons would allow the destruction of deeply buried targets without causing massive collateral damage. This fact sheet summarizes the results of recent scientific studies, laying out the technical realities of how effective a nuclear bunker buster might be and what sort of nuclear fallout would result.

Key facts:

- Since weapons cannot penetrate very deeply into the ground, destroying deep, hardened targets requires powerful, high-yield nuclear warheads.
- Even a small, low-yield earth-penetrating nuclear weapon will create enormous fallout. The explosion cannot be contained underground. The radioactive debris thrown into the air can drift for miles on the wind.
- There is no guarantee that a nuclear blast will successfully destroy chemical or biological weapons.
- A nuclear attack on a bunker that contains chemical or biological weapons could easily lead to the release and spread of those agents.
- There are current conventional alternatives to the use of nuclear bunker busters.

Q: Why do some advocate the use of nuclear bunker busters?

A: Advocates argue that nuclear weapons are needed to destroy stores of chemical or biological weapons and deeply buried bunkers. But the use of these weapons would lead to severe collateral damage. And, as discussed below, they would not ensure the destruction of chemical and biological agents. Moreover, destroying deep, hardened targets requires very large nuclear weapons that would cause enormous amounts of fallout. Current precision-guided conventional weapons can instead be used to cut off a bunker's communications, power, and air, effectively keeping the enemy weapons underground and unusable until US forces secure them.¹

Q: How far can a nuclear bunker buster penetrate? Is this deep enough to contain nuclear fallout?

A: Experiments show that a steel rod hitting the ground at high speed can penetrate at most about four times its length through concrete (e.g., a 10-foot bomb could theoretically go through about 40 feet). However, in order to protect its sensitive components, a nuclear warhead might have to hit the ground at significantly slower speeds, reducing its penetrating capability. The Pentagon's current nuclear bunker buster, the B61-11 bomb, can penetrate only about 20 feet of frozen soil. Because even a one-kiloton nuclear warhead (less than 1/10th the size of the Hiroshima bomb's yield) must be buried at least 200-300 feet to contain its radioactive fallout, there is no way to avoid serious fallout from a nuclear bunker buster.²

Q: Would this explosion cause radioactive fallout?

A: Yes. Shallow nuclear explosions produce especially severe radioactive fallout. The fireball breaks through the surface of the earth, carrying into the air large amounts of dirt and debris, which then fall back to the ground. Even a one-kiloton nuclear warhead that explodes 20 feet underground would eject about one million cubic feet of radioactive debris from a crater the size of ground zero at the World Trade Center.³

Q: Can the radiation or heat of a nuclear blast destroy chemical and biological agents?

A: A nuclear explosion can destroy these agents if they are sufficiently close to the nuclear blast. However, given the difficulty in obtaining data about the precise location and size of underground bunkers, it is difficult to target the agents accurately, or to know how soil or other material might reduce the effect of heat and radiation on the agents. Thus, there is no guarantee that the radiation or heat would destroy all or even most of the chemical or biological agents. Based on that knowledge, the only way to increase the likelihood of destroying the agents is to increase the yield of the attacking nuclear warhead, with a corresponding increase in fallout.⁴

Q: Could a bunker-busting nuclear explosion spread chemical or biological agents?

A: Yes. There are two scenarios in which a leak of agents could occur. First, a nuclear weapon exploding near a bunker would disperse chemical or biological agents that were not destroyed, spreading them into the resulting crater and surrounding air. Second, a nuclear weapon exploding farther from an underground storage facility could damage the bunker and the agents' storage containers. The explosion would also create fractures leading to the surface, through which surviving chemical and biological agents could leak into the atmosphere. Because of the difficulties in using a nuclear explosion to neutralize all of the agents reliably, either scenario could result in chemical or biological weapons spreading into the surrounding environment. A recent study predicts that anthrax spread in this fashion would cause even more casualties than the resulting nuclear fallout, which would also be severe.⁵

Nuclear bunker buster funding in the FY2004 budget:

The National Nuclear Security Agency (NNSA) is seeking \$15 million in additional funding to study the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), the Pentagon's current nuclear bunker buster project. Work will soon begin with the FY2003 funding already provided.

Notes

1. See M. Levi, "Fire in the Hole: Nuclear and Non-nuclear Options for Counterproliferation" (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace) at

<http://www.ceip.org/files/Publications/wp31.asp>

2. See D. Wright and L. Gronlund, "Earth-penetrating Weapons" (Union of Concerned Scientists) at http://www.ucsusa.org/global_security/nuclear_weapons/page.cfm?pageID=777

3. See R. Nelson, "Low-Yield Earth-Penetrating Weapons" (Science & Global Security) at

http://www.princeton.edu/~globsec/publications/pdf/10_1Nelson.pdf

and S. Drell, R. Jeanloz, and B. Peurifoy, "A Strategic Choice: New Bunker Busters Versus Nonproliferation" (Arms Control Today) at

http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2003_03/drelletal_mar03.asp

4. See M. May and Z. Haldeman, "Effectiveness of Nuclear Weapons against Buried Biological Agents Targets" (Center for Security and International Cooperation) at

<http://cisac.stanford.edu/research/inprogress/mayhaldeman.html>

5. *Ibid.*

For more information, contact:

Stephen Young, Senior Analyst at (202) 223-6133, ext. 112

United Methodist Peace with Justice Coordinators

Colorado

Roger Wolsey 11837 Blacktail Mountain, Littleton, CO 80127 Rocky Mountain Conference
Phone: (w) 303 979-8374, (h) 303 753-1492 brotherrog@hotmail.com

Florida

Anna Peacock-Preston 4819 S. Apopka Vineland Road, Orlando, FL 32819 Florida Conf.
Phone: (w) 407 876-4991, x. 254, (h) 407 947-1577 apeacockpreston@st.lukes.org

Nebraska

Carol Windrum 3735 N. 39th Street, Omaha, NE 68111-2621 Nebraska Conference
Phone: (w) 402 455-4281, (h) 402 981-9733 cawindrum@yahoo.com

Ohio

Rich Aronson 28002 W. Oakland Road, Bay Village, OH 44140 East Ohio Conference
Phone: (w) 440 871-7381, (h) 440 871-3835 pwjpb@juno.com

Oregon

Kathy Campbell-Barton 1535 Aerial Way, SE, Salem, OR 97302 Oregon-Idaho Conference
Phone: 503 399-1584 kentkathyb@earthlink.net

Pennsylvania

James Behrens 21 Casey Drive, Williamsport, PA 17701 Central Pennsylvania Conference
Phone: (w) 570 322-7613, (h) 570 323-7484 Fax: 570 326-2260 revjim@pa.net

Dave Goss 208 E. 1st Street, Wind Gap, PA 18901 Eastern Pennsylvania Conference
Phone: (w) 610 588-1793, (h) 610 863-4246 dlgoss@enter.net or kirkridge@fast.net

Robert Walden 826 Tioga Avenue, Bethlehem, PA 18018-3320 Eastern Pennsylvania Conf.
Phone: (w) 610 712-3352, (h) 610 861-0653 rwaldenpa@entermail.net

E. Philip Wilson, 8 Foster Square, Pittsburgh, PA 15212 Western Pennsylvania Conference
Phone: 412 322-4244 Fax: 412 323-9996 RevPhilWilson@webtv.net

Virginia

Jessie Askew 10476 Colonial Highway, Evinston, VA 24550 Virginia Conference
Phone: 434 821-0520 Fax: 866 451-7694 JessieA1@att.net

Jim Hudson 6413 Maryview Street, Alexandria, VA 22310 Virginia Conference
Phone: 703 313-8733 Fax: 703 313-8733 jch1928@aol.com

April 2, 2004

TIPS for Writing Letters-to-the-Editor

When you are finished looking through the TIPS, [click here](#) and enter your ZIP code or search by state to identify contact information for print, radio, and television media in your region. National contacts are included as well. Sample letters on specific issues are available on this page, as well as the ability to immediately email or fax your letter to the media outlet you select.

The "Letters-to-the-Editor" (LTE) page is a popular and widely-read part of any daily newspaper. From the newspaper's point of view, LTEs help the editors decide which topics to cover in future news stories or editorials. Even more important, elected officials carefully monitor this section along with the editorial page to gauge local opinion. Before submitting a letter, check with your local newspaper for its guidelines, then follow these general **TIPS**:

TIP: Use your own words. We include here several sample letters for you to freely plagiarize, but try to write LTEs that reflect your own style.

TIP: Submitting your LTE to the paper in whose readership area you live gives you the best chance of publication. Working a local reference into your letter also helps. Here is an example: **Mayor John Hawley confirms that the war in Iraq has already cost Redwood City \$1 million in lost contracts.**

TIP: You also increase your chance of getting your letter published if you open with a specific reference to a recent news story, editorial, or previous letter. Here are two examples: **George Forbush's letter of Jan. 22 ("On to the Primary") claimed that Sen. Edwards was well-received by the crowd that day, or, The Tribune's article on Gov. Dean ("Dean Strikes Back," Feb. 10) barely mentioned his criticism of the Homeland Security Act.**

TIP: "Recent" news story, editorial, etc., means no older than a few days. For the very biggest papers (*LA Times*, *San Diego Union-Tribune*) no further back than 48 hours!

TIP: When writing a LTE, keep in mind that most newspapers publish letters up to 250 words. (Anything longer would be considered an op-ed.)

TIP: Keep your LTE concise by sticking to a single issue. With 250 words, you can present one argument. State your point in the first paragraph. Support it with facts, quotes, and numbers in the second. Use the last paragraph to restate your point and make your recommendation. Keeping it to the point greatly increases your odds of being published!

TIP: If you know that your opinion also represents that of others be sure to mention that fact. Here is an example: **Over 600 California supporters of the Friends Committee on National Legislation have signed a petition to the president to re-open peace talks on the Middle East.**

TIP: If you want to submit a LTE signed from representatives of more than one group, be aware that most newspapers limit signatures to two or three names.

TIP: Be sure that your letter is typed and signed, with your address and phone number. Mail, fax, or email it in accordance with the newspaper's requirements. (Most newspapers prefer emailed LTEs.)