

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

> Sept. 16, 2002

>

> STATEMENT FROM FLORIDA CONFERENCE BISHOP TIMOTHY W. WHITAKER ON
WAR WITH

> IRAQ

>

> Dear Friends in Christ:

>

> Included below is a statement from the Florida Council of Churches* urging
> President George W. Bush not to commit the armed forces of the United
> States to war with Iraq for the purpose of deposing the regime of Saddam
> Hussein. I have joined officials of other Christian communities in signing
> the statement.

>

> I do not wish to offend President Bush personally or politically. I
> respect him as both a person and as our president. Because he is a United
> Methodist Christian, I feel an affection for him and pray for him as he
> seeks to fulfill the burdens of his office.

>

> Nor am I a pacifist. I believe the Spirit of God has called certain
> individuals and communities to make the witness of pacifism against the
> violence that is the result of human sinfulness. Most of us have not
> received that call. We understand that in a world where there are acts of
> lawlessness sometimes nations must use force in order to restrain evil and
> protect innocent people.

>

> Neither do I criticize the administration of President Bush in its attempt
> to destroy the international network of terrorists who attacked the United
> States on Sept. 11, 2001.

>

> Yet, I am opposed to the proposition that the United States should make
> war against Iraq. The reasons for my opposition are stated simply in the
> statement of the Florida Council of Churches. Even war must be waged in
> the context of a moral perspective that provides direction and defines
> boundaries. That moral perspective is usually called the "just war
> theory." As someone who believes the "just war theory" is the best moral
> perspective we possess for deciding whether to wage war and how to wage
> war, I do not believe that a virtually unilateral decision by the United
> States to wage war has sufficient moral justification. Iraq is under the
> censure of the United Nations. Its ability to harm the Kurdish people in
> its northern region or to invade its neighbors is being contained by the
> United States military. It may be necessary to conduct air strikes on
> sites where weapons of mass destruction are manufactured or stored. If
> there is a need to conduct an invasion it should be under the authority of
> the community of nations known as the United Nations since a war on Iraq
> will affect the whole world. The approval of the United Nations is
> especially important if there is a threat posed by Iraq's "nuclear

> capability" since Iraq does not have the ability to attack the United
> States with an intercontinental ballistic missile, but it would have the
> ability to attack other nations in its region.
>
> I do not know what the consequences of a war would be. The reason that war
> should be waged only as a last resort when there are no other plausible
> solutions is because war always has long-term unforeseen consequences. One
> could imagine the deaths of many young Americans and Iraqi civilians in
> the residential areas of Baghdad, the severe disruption of the global
> economy, heightened tensions or new violence in the Middle East, and the
> eventual collapse of governments friendly to our country in the region. A
> virtually unilateral war by the United States would likely diminish the
> moral authority of our country in its leadership in the world for the
> future. A lengthy war would divide the American people. Even a brief
> "successful" war would still have significant consequences that cannot be
> anticipated.
>
> I wanted you to know directly my position. When the Spirit of God called
> me into the episcopal office I made a commitment that I would not speak in
> code. When officials speak in ambiguous and vague language that hides
> their true position they raise the level of anxiety and frustration in the
> communities of which they are a part. I believe the United Methodist
> people in Florida have a right to know my position on controversial and
> emotionally charged subjects. I try to speak clearly to you because I
> trust you. I trust that you are quite capable of assessing the strengths
> and weaknesses of my position and of making up your own mind. I trust that
> you will respect my right to express my conscience even if you think I am
> wrong.
>
> I continue to pray for President Bush, the members of his administration
> and the members of Congress. I pray for the young men and women and their
> leaders in the armed forces. I pray for the people of Iraq. Most of all I
> pray that God's kingdom will come and God's will be done on earth as it is
> in heaven.
>
> Bishop Timothy W. Whitaker
>

<http://www.accessatlanta.com/ajc/opinion/0902/29bookman.html>

The President's Real Goal in Iraq

By JAY BOOKMAN

Bookman is the deputy editorial page editor of The Atlanta Journal-Constitution

The official story on Iraq has never made sense. The connection that the Bush administration has tried to draw between Iraq and al-Qaida has always seemed contrived and artificial. In fact, it was hard to believe that smart people in the Bush administration would start a major war based on such flimsy evidence.

CONTRIBUTORS TO 2000 REPORT

"Rebuilding America's Defenses," a 2000 report by the Project for the New American Century, listed 27 people as having attended meetings or contributed papers in preparation of the report. Among them are six who have since assumed key defense and foreign policy positions in the Bush administration. And the report seems to have become a blueprint for Bush's foreign and defense policy.

Paul Wolfowitz

Political science doctorate from University of Chicago and dean of the international relations program at Johns Hopkins University during the 1990s. Served in the Reagan State Department, moved to the Pentagon during the first Bush administration as undersecretary of defense for policy. Sworn in as deputy defense secretary in March 2001.

John Bolton

Yale Law grad who worked in the Reagan administration as an assistant attorney general. Switched to the State Department in the first Bush administration as assistant secretary for international organization affairs. Sworn in as undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, May 2001.

Eliot Cohen

Harvard doctorate in government who taught at Harvard and at the Naval War College. Now directs strategic studies at Johns Hopkins and is the author of several books on military strategy. Was on the Defense Department's policy planning staff in the first Bush administration and

is now on Donald Rumsfeld's Defense Policy Board.

I. Lewis Libby

Law degree from Columbia (Yale undergrad). Held advisory positions in the Reagan State Department. Was a partner in a Washington law firm in the late '80s before becoming deputy undersecretary of defense for policy in the first Bush administration (under Dick Cheney). Now is the vice president's chief of staff.

Dov Zakheim

Doctorate in economics and politics from Oxford University. Worked on policy issues in the Reagan Defense Department and went into private defense consulting during the 1990s. Was foreign policy adviser to the 2000 Bush campaign. Sworn in as undersecretary of defense (comptroller) and chief financial officer for the Pentagon, May 2001.

Stephen Cambone

Political science doctorate from Claremont Graduate School. Was in charge of strategic defense policy at the Defense Department in the first Bush administration. Now heads the Office of Program, Analysis and Evaluation at the Defense Department.

The pieces just didn't fit. Something else had to be going on; something was missing.

In recent days, those missing pieces have finally begun to fall into place. As it turns out, this is not really about Iraq. It is not about weapons of mass destruction, or terrorism, or Saddam, or U.N. resolutions.

This war, should it come, is intended to mark the official emergence of the United States as a full-fledged global empire, seizing sole responsibility and authority as planetary policeman. It would be the culmination of a plan 10 years or more in the making, carried out by those who believe the United States must seize the opportunity for global domination, even if it means becoming the "American imperialists" that our enemies always claimed we were.

Once that is understood, other mysteries solve themselves. For example, why does the administration seem unconcerned about an exit strategy from Iraq once Saddam is toppled?

Because we won't be leaving. Having conquered Iraq, the United States will create permanent military bases in that country from which to

dominate the Middle East, including neighboring Iran.

In an interview Friday, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld brushed aside that suggestion, noting that the United States does not covet other nations' territory. That may be true, but 57 years after World War II ended, we still have major bases in Germany and Japan. We will do the same in Iraq.

And why has the administration dismissed the option of containing and deterring Iraq, as we had the Soviet Union for 45 years? Because even if it worked, containment and deterrence would not allow the expansion of American power. Besides, they are beneath us as an empire. Rome did not stoop to containment; it conquered. And so should we.

Among the architects of this would-be American Empire are a group of brilliant and powerful people who now hold key positions in the Bush administration: They envision the creation and enforcement of what they call a worldwide "Pax Americana," or American peace. But so far, the American people have not appreciated the true extent of that ambition.

Part of it's laid out in the National Security Strategy, a document in which each administration outlines its approach to defending the country. The Bush administration plan, released Sept. 20, marks a significant departure from previous approaches, a change that it attributes largely to the attacks of Sept. 11.

To address the terrorism threat, the president's report lays out a newly aggressive military and foreign policy, embracing pre-emptive attack against perceived enemies. It speaks in blunt terms of what it calls "American internationalism," of ignoring international opinion if that suits U.S. interests. "The best defense is a good offense," the document asserts.

It dismisses deterrence as a Cold War relic and instead talks of "convincing or compelling states to accept their sovereign responsibilities."

In essence, it lays out a plan for permanent U.S. military and economic domination of every region on the globe, unfettered by international treaty or concern. And to make that plan a reality, it envisions a stark expansion of our global military presence.

"The United States will require bases and stations within and beyond Western Europe and Northeast Asia," the document warns, "as well as

temporary access arrangements for the long-distance deployment of U.S. troops."

The report's repeated references to terrorism are misleading, however, because the approach of the new National Security Strategy was clearly not inspired by the events of Sept. 11. They can be found in much the same language in a report issued in September 2000 by the Project for the New American Century, a group of conservative interventionists outraged by the thought that the United States might be forfeiting its chance at a global empire.

"At no time in history has the international security order been as conducive to American interests and ideals," the report said. stated two years ago. "The challenge of this coming century is to preserve and enhance this 'American peace.' "

Familiar themes

Overall, that 2000 report reads like a blueprint for current Bush defense policy. Most of what it advocates, the Bush administration has tried to accomplish. For example, the project report urged the repudiation of the anti-ballistic missile treaty and a commitment to a global missile defense system. The administration has taken that course.

It recommended that to project sufficient power worldwide to enforce Pax Americana, the United States would have to increase defense spending from 3 percent of gross domestic product to as much as 3.8 percent. For next year, the Bush administration has requested a defense budget of \$379 billion, almost exactly 3.8 percent of GDP.

It advocates the "transformation" of the U.S. military to meet its expanded obligations, including the cancellation of such outmoded defense programs as the Crusader artillery system. That's exactly the message being preached by Rumsfeld and others.

It urges the development of small nuclear warheads "required in targeting the very deep, underground hardened bunkers that are being built by many of our potential adversaries." This year the GOP-led U.S. House gave the Pentagon the green light to develop such a weapon, called the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, while the Senate has so far balked.

That close tracking of recommendation with current policy is hardly surprising, given the current positions of the people who contributed to the 2000 report.

Paul Wolfowitz is now deputy defense secretary. John Bolton is undersecretary of state. Stephen Cambone is head of the Pentagon's Office of Program, Analysis and Evaluation. Eliot Cohen and Devon Cross are members of the Defense Policy Board, which advises Rumsfeld. I. Lewis Libby is chief of staff to Vice President Dick Cheney. Dov Zakheim is comptroller for the Defense Department.

'Constabulary duties'

Because they were still just private citizens in 2000, the authors of the project report could be more frank and less diplomatic than they were in drafting the National Security Strategy. Back in 2000, they clearly identified Iran, Iraq and North Korea as primary short-term targets, well before President Bush tagged them as the Axis of Evil. In their report, they criticize the fact that in war planning against North Korea and Iraq, "past Pentagon wargames have given little or no consideration to the force requirements necessary not only to defeat an attack but to remove these regimes from power."

To preserve the Pax Americana, the report says U.S. forces will be required to perform "constabulary duties" -- the United States acting as policeman of the world -- and says that such actions "demand American political leadership rather than that of the United Nations."

To meet those responsibilities, and to ensure that no country dares to challenge the United States, the report advocates a much larger military presence spread over more of the globe, in addition to the roughly 130 nations in which U.S. troops are already deployed.

More specifically, they argue that we need permanent military bases in the Middle East, in Southeast Europe, in Latin America and in Southeast Asia, where no such bases now exist. That helps to explain another of the mysteries of our post-Sept. 11 reaction, in which the Bush administration rushed to install U.S. troops in Georgia and the Philippines, as well as our eagerness to send military advisers to assist in the civil war in Colombia.

The 2000 report directly acknowledges its debt to a still earlier document, drafted in 1992 by the Defense Department. That document had also envisioned the United States as a colossus astride the world, imposing its will and keeping world peace through military and economic power. When leaked in final draft form, however, the proposal drew so much criticism that it was hastily withdrawn and repudiated by the first

President Bush.

Effect on allies

The defense secretary in 1992 was Richard Cheney; the document was drafted by Wolfowitz, who at the time was defense undersecretary for policy.

The potential implications of a Pax Americana are immense.

One is the effect on our allies. Once we assert the unilateral right to act as the world's policeman, our allies will quickly recede into the background. Eventually, we will be forced to spend American wealth and American blood protecting the peace while other nations redirect their wealth to such things as health care for their citizenry.

Donald Kagan, a professor of classical Greek history at Yale and an influential advocate of a more aggressive foreign policy -- he served as co-chairman of the 2000 New Century project -- acknowledges that likelihood.

"If [our allies] want a free ride, and they probably will, we can't stop that," he says. But he also argues that the United States, given its unique position, has no choice but to act anyway.

"You saw the movie 'High Noon'? he asks. "We're Gary Cooper."

Accepting the Cooper role would be an historic change in who we are as a nation, and in how we operate in the international arena. Candidate Bush certainly did not campaign on such a change. It is not something that he or others have dared to discuss honestly with the American people. To the contrary, in his foreign policy debate with Al Gore, Bush pointedly advocated a more humble foreign policy, a position calculated to appeal to voters leery of military intervention.

For the same reason, Kagan and others shy away from terms such as empire, understanding its connotations. But they also argue that it would be naive and dangerous to reject the role that history has thrust upon us. Kagan, for example, willingly embraces the idea that the United States would establish permanent military bases in a post-war Iraq.

"I think that's highly possible," he says. "We will probably need a major concentration of forces in the Middle East over a long period of time. That will come at a price, but think of the price of not having

it. When we have economic problems, it's been caused by disruptions in our oil supply. If we have a force in Iraq, there will be no disruption in oil supplies."

Costly global commitment

Rumsfeld and Kagan believe that a successful war against Iraq will produce other benefits, such as serving an object lesson for nations such as Iran and Syria. Rumsfeld, as befits his sensitive position, puts it rather gently. If a regime change were to take place in Iraq, other nations pursuing weapons of mass destruction "would get the message that having them . . . is attracting attention that is not favorable and is not helpful," he says.

Kagan is more blunt.

"People worry a lot about how the Arab street is going to react," he notes. "Well, I see that the Arab street has gotten very, very quiet since we started blowing things up."

The cost of such a global commitment would be enormous. In 2000, we spent \$281 billion on our military, which was more than the next 11 nations combined. By 2003, our expenditures will have risen to \$378 billion. In other words, the increase in our defense budget from 1999-2003 will be more than the total amount spent annually by China, our next largest competitor.

The lure of empire is ancient and powerful, and over the millennia it has driven men to commit terrible crimes on its behalf. But with the end of the Cold War and the disappearance of the Soviet Union, a global empire was essentially laid at the feet of the United States. To the chagrin of some, we did not seize it at the time, in large part because the American people have never been comfortable with themselves as a New Rome.

Now, more than a decade later, the events of Sept. 11 have given those advocates of empire a new opportunity to press their case with a new president. So in debating whether to invade Iraq, we are really debating the role that the United States will play in the years and decades to come.

Are peace and security best achieved by seeking strong alliances and international consensus, led by the United States? Or is it necessary to take a more unilateral approach, accepting and enhancing the global

dominance that, according to some, history has thrust upon us?

If we do decide to seize empire, we should make that decision knowingly, as a democracy. The price of maintaining an empire is always high. Kagan and others argue that the price of rejecting it would be higher still.

That's what this is about.

A new section on "Disarming Iraq" on How to Get to Zero Page

It is at the bottom of the page after "Deep Cuts" (which should replace "Reductions Approaching Zero". It is as follows:

(italics in brown box)

Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons

[following in bold, italic, on right margin]

- ***Disarming Iraq without War***
Statements of Religious Organizations *[linkage to below]*
Articles and Reports *[linkage to below]*

[graphic: map of Middle East with Iraq in center and highlighted; identify neighborhood states]

[italics] Nuclear non-proliferation is an important aspect of achieving zero nuclear weapons. One of the contemporary challenges is how to stop Iraq from developing nuclear weapons. There is also a need to contain and eliminate other weapons of mass destruction (WMD) -- chemical and biological -- that Iraq appears to possess.

[begin box]

Statements of Religious Organizations

A variety of religious organizations have spoken in opposition to war against Iraq. We present references to their statements and resolutions.

American Friends Service Committee

Conflict with Iraq: Policy Gone Awry [<http://www.afsc.org/iraq/Default.htm>]

Catholic Church: The Holy See

Vatican Urges U.S. to Seek U.N. Approval on Iraq [<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A5543-2002Sep11.html>]

Church of the Brethren

Iraq: What's a Christian to Do [<http://www.brethren.org/genbd/witness/Iraq.htm>]

Preventing the Second Gulf War [<http://www.brethren.org/genbd/witness/Iraq.htm>]

Churches for Middle East Peace

Letter to President George W. Bush to Reconsider Iraq Invasion, September 12, 2002

[<http://www.cmep.org/iraqletter.htm>] Signed by 48 Protestant Orthodox, Catholic, Evangelical leaders

Episcopal Church

Presiding Bishop Frank T. Griswold's Statement on Military Action Against Iraq, September 6, 2002 [<http://www.episcopalchurch.org/presiding-bishop/>]

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

ELCA President Bishop Mark S. Hanson's Statement on Iraq Situation, August 30, 2002
[<http://www.elca.org/bishop/iraq.html>]

Fellowship of Reconciliation, USA

No War with Iraq! [http://www.forusa.org/News/FOR_Statement_081602.html]

Friends Committee for National Legislation

Letter to Congress: Oppose unilateral, preemptive U.S. military attack against Iraq, September 12, 2002 [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_volk_ltr912-02.htm]

Statements from Quaker meetings on U.S.-Iraq relations
[<http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/iraindx.htm#sta>]

Mennonite Central Committee

Threats of War [<http://www.mcc.org/areaserv/middleeast/iraq/index.html>]

Mennonite Church USA

Letter to President Bush, August 27, 2000
[<http://peace.mennolink.org/resources/iraq5000/schragletter.pdf>]

Pax Christi, USA

Iraq Peace Pledge/Iraq Pledge of Resistance
[http://www.paxchristiusa.org/news_events_more.asp?id=263]

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Church leaders sign statement opposing military action against Iraq
[<http://www.pcusa.org/pcnews/02349.htm>]
Church is preparing material on Iraq [<http://www.pcusa.org/pcnews/index.htm>]

Reformed Church in America

Action Alert: Possible U.S. Military Action Against Iraq, August 2002
[<http://www.rca.org/churchlife/advocate/iraq0802.html>]

United Church of Christ

Oppose War in Iraq, September 4, 2002 [<http://www.ucc.org/justice/action/w090402.htm>]

United Kingdom Statement by Christian Leaders

The Morality and Legality of War against Iraq - A Christian Declaration, August 6, 2002
[<http://www.paxchristi.org.uk/press.HTML>]

United Methodist General Board of Church and Society

Bush Urged to Turn Back from War, August 30, 2002 [<http://www.umc-gbcs.org/gbpr170.htm>]

United Methodist Women's Division

Statement on Iraq, September 4, 2002 [http://gbgm-umc.org/umw/statement_iraq.html]

World Council of Churches

Stop the Rush to War, August 29, 2002. [<http://www.ucc.org/news/r090302.htm>] Signed by 37 Christians leaders from Canada, Great Britain, and the United States.

[end box]

back to top

[new box]

[bold, italics, 14 pt] ***Articles and Reports on Alternatives to War against Iraq***
We list articles and reports that offer ideas on how to deal with Iraq's weapons of mass destruction without going to war. We present them as a contribution to public discussion without necessarily endorsing particular recommendations.

Arms Control Association

Documents, News, and Analysis on the Task of Disarming Iraq

[<http://www.armscontrol.org/country/iraq/>]

Disarming Iraq: Nonmilitary Strategies and Options

[http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_09/cortright_lopez_sept02.asp] by David Cortright and George A. Lopez. September 2002

The Task of Disarming Iraq [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_09/foc_sept02.asp] by Daryl Kimball. September 2002.

The Case for Iraq's Qualitative Disarmament

[http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2000_06/iraqjun.asp] by Scott Ritter. June 2000.

The Lessons and Legacy of UNSCOM. [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/1999_06/rbjun99.asp]

An interview with Ambassador Richard Butler. June 1999.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Non-Proliferation Project

Iraq's WMD Arsenal: Deadly But Limited

[<http://www.ceip.org/files/nonprolif/templates/Publications.asp?p=8&PublicationID=1050>]

Center for Defense Information

Eye on Iraq [<http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/eye-on-iraq.cfm>]

Education for Peace in Iraq Center (EPIC)

About the Crisis in Iraq [<http://epic-usa.org/thecrisis/>]

Fourth Freedom Forum

Sanctions, Inspection, and Containment: Viable Policy Options in Iraq

[<http://www.fourthfreedom.org/php/t-si-index.php?hinc=SecondIraq.hinc>]

Exploring Options for the Nonviolent Resolution of International Conflict

[<http://www.fourthfreedom.org/index.php>]

Friends Committee on National Legislation

U.S.-Iraq Relations [http://www.fcnl.org/hottopics_index.htm#usi]

Intervening in Iraq [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_dan-smith.htm]

Unwrapping Tony Blair. [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_tony-blair.htm]

Institute for Policy Studies

Seven Reasons to Oppose a U.S. Invasion of Iraq [<http://www.fpiif.org/papers/iraq2.html>]

**Monterey Institute of International Studies, Chemical and Biological Weapons
Nonproliferation Program**

[IRAQ:Nuclear, Biological, Chemical, and Missile Capabilities and Programs](http://cns.miis.edu/research/wmdme/iraq.htm)

[<http://cns.miis.edu/research/wmdme/iraq.htm>]

Sojourners

[With Weapons of the Will: How to Topple Saddam Hussein -- nonviolently](http://www.sojo.net/magazine/index.cfm/action/sojourners/issue/soj0209/article/020910.html)

[<http://www.sojo.net/magazine/index.cfm/action/sojourners/issue/soj0209/article/020910.html>]

by Peter Aclerman and Jack DuVall

[end box]

[back to top](#)

Pastoral Letter to ELCA Rostered Leaders on War with Iraq

March 20, 2003

(Released with a [Statement](#) in response to U.S. pre-emptive military strike on Iraq)

Dear Sisters and Brothers in Christ,

Amid the flood of emotions we experience as the tragic realities of war unfold, I write to you out of our shared call to radical discipleship and responsible leadership. This call, heard in Sunday's Gospel, continues to echo throughout the church. "If any want to become my followers, let them deny themselves and take up their cross and follow me. For those who want to save their life will lose it and those who lose their life for my sake and, for the sake of the gospel, will save it" (Mark 8:34-35).

How do we as leaders and members of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America continue to address our differing and sometimes stridently opposing views of the war without losing faith that the deeper unity we share in Christ will not be severed? No matter how grave our differences, let us be united in the affirmation that it is through the gospel that the Holy Spirit calls and gathers people from all nations to worship and witness to the God of peace. As we say in the ELCA social statement, "For Peace in God's World," the most valuable mission for peace for the church "is to keep alive the news of God's resolve for peace, declaring that all are responsible to God for earthly peace and announcing forgiveness, healing, and hope in the name of Jesus Christ."

I am aware of how many members of ELCA congregations, including you, are experiencing war's reality as family members are sent into battle. Please know that we pray for all families so directly impacted. We also pray for the people of Iraq. As a church based in the United States, we bear a special responsibility financially to support humanitarian relief and assistance to the thousands of refugees who will be fleeing the extensive U.S. bombing of Iraq.

Our call to leadership includes proclaiming Christ in Word and sacrament, offering pastoral care to all affected, and exercising our role as public leaders engaged in prophetic speech and moral deliberation. Let us also be attentive to language, both our own and that of our political leaders who speak of peace and war. As people of faith, the language of peace and reconciliation and of liberation and justice must be spoken and heard within the context of the biblical story and our confession of faith, and not the rhetoric of battle. We must reclaim for ourselves any language of faith that has been used to wage war and ensure that it is used for the sake of peace and reconciliation.

I want you to know that I, as Presiding Bishop of this church, today have released the attached public statement expressing my profound concern that the United States has chosen to take the step of a pre-emptive military strike. In the statement I express my understanding that our country, especially because of its wealth and might, has a particular responsibility to pursue policies of cooperation and to seek to resolve conflicts peacefully. I indicate that we cannot limit our response to the specific matter of this war, but need to continue to raise broader questions. I call on all members of our church to pray for peace, for the members of our military, and for all who come in harm's way because of this war.

"The peace of God, which surpasses all understanding, will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 4:7).

In God's grace,

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

<http://www.elca.org/bishop/iraqletter.html>

Statement from Presiding Bishop Mark Hanson in response to U.S. pre-emptive military strike on Iraq

March 20, 2003 (Released with a [Message to Rostered Leaders](#))

In the midst of the anguish of today's events, and aware of the continuing unfolding and unknown consequences of war, we in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America share with all Christians the call to be peacemakers. This call is grounded in the belief that God in Christ reconciles the whole creation and sends us forth in a ministry of peace and reconciliation. In our liturgies we pray "for the peace of the whole world," uniting our faith in the Triune God with our world's suffering and hopes.

The decision of the United States to attack Iraq with a pre-emptive military strike without the support of the United Nations marks a sobering moment for this nation and world. I express my profound concern that the United States has chosen to take this step. Our country, especially because of its wealth and might, has a particular responsibility to pursue policies of cooperation and to seek to resolve conflicts peacefully. In my view, neither has the United States responsibly exercised its leadership role within the United Nations and in related diplomatic efforts to avert war, nor have our national leaders sufficiently made the case that they have pursued all reasonable avenues other than war. I am particularly troubled that this decision has been made without broad consensus and support within the international community.

As a church our task of engaging in moral deliberation about this war, and its wider implications, does not and will not end now that war has begun. We will continue to press the ongoing moral and ethical questions, which include-but are not limited to-the conduct of war or the leadership of Saddam Hussein. We must continue to ask questions about the humanitarian effects of the decision to go to war, especially protection for noncombatants and the scale of military force used. We must be prepared to respond to the needs of displaced persons and refugees, address the regional destabilization which the war will cause, and demonstrate a readiness to assist with rebuilding after the war. We must ensure that the human rights of all, both within and outside of the United States, are respected and protected. Our searching questions include how our nation addresses the poverty and sense of hopelessness that pervade the Middle East.

As citizens of a country of immense power, influence, and wealth, and as members of the ELCA, we are compelled, I believe, to grapple with questions of how to use our power and wealth responsibly to disarm Iraq, to alleviate human suffering in the region, and to exercise leadership within the international community. The ELCA grounds its position on these matters in its social statement, "For Peace in God's World:"

We also affirm that governments should vigorously pursue less coercive measures over more coercive ones: consent over compulsion, nonviolence over violence, diplomacy over military engagement, and deterrence over war.

With its significant economic, political, cultural, and military power, the United States plays a vital leadership role in world affairs. It cannot and should not withdraw or isolate itself from the rest of the world. Neither should it seek to control or police the world. Global challenges cannot be addressed by the United States alone; yet few can be met without the United States' participation. In pursuing their interests, all nations, including the United States, have an obligation to respect the interests of other states and international actors and to comply with international law. Nations should seek their own common good in the context of the global common good. International bodies should work for the welfare of all nations.

In the days and weeks ahead I call on all ELCA members to pray fervently for peace, for the members of our military, and for all who come in harm's way because of this war. I continue to encourage all ELCA members to engage in moral deliberation and to live out their baptismal vocations striving for justice and peace in all the earth.

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

http://wwwtest.elca.org/bishop/iraq_032003.html

SAVE LIVES!

Stop The Rush To War Against Iraq!

Support the Lee Resolution (H. Con. Res. 473)*

There is no credible evidence that Saddam Hussein is about to attack the United States or any of its allies with weapons of mass destruction.

A unilateral, preemptive attack on Iraq would be reckless endangerment of the lives of American service men and woman and the lives of thousands of innocent civilians in Iraq, who are also God's children.

That is why leaders of many denominations and religious bodies in the United States oppose war against Iraq and favor firm diplomacy and international weapons inspections leading to disarmament.

They include: African Methodist Episcopal Church -- Alliance of Baptists -- American Baptists Churches, USA -- Catholic Church -- Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) -- Church of the Brethren -- Episcopal Church -- Evangelical Lutheran Church in America -- International Council of Community Churches -- Mennonite Central Committee -- Mennonite Church USA -- Moravian Church in America, Northern Province -- Moravian Church in America, Southern Province -- National Baptist Convention, USA -- National Council of Churches -- Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) -- Orthodox Church in America -- Reformed Church in America -- Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) -- Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch for the Eastern USA -- Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations -- United Church of Christ -- United Methodist Church

They are joined by the Holy See, Middle East Council of Churches, and World Council of Churches.

* House Concurrent Resolution 473 was introduced by Representative Barbara Lee of California and 26 co-sponsors on September 19, 2002. Its operative language is:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States should work through the United Nations to seek to resolve the matter of ensuring that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction, through mechanisms such as the resumption of weapons inspections, negotiation, enquiry, mediation, regional arrangements, and other peaceful means.

Written by Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice
mupj@igc.org -- 301 896-0013 -- September 22, 2002

A new section on "Disarming Iraq without War" for the How to Get to Zero page.

- (1) Index at top of page:
 - (a) Change "Interim Measures" to "Steps Toward Zero"
 - (b) Change "Reductions Approaching Zero" to "Deep Cuts"
 - (c) Add a new item:
 - * Disarming Iraq without War" [linkage to later section]

- (2). In section of text where "Interim Measures" begins:
 - (a) Change heading to "Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons"
 - (b) In introduction after #2 add:
 3. In the process of promoting non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, it is necessary to eliminate incipient programs for production of weapons of mass destruction. Currently this includes [bold] **disarming Iraq without going war.** [end bold]
 - (c) Change last sentence to read: "*Ideas on de-alerting, deep cuts, and disarming Iraq are presented here.*"

- (3) In next section where "De-alerting" begins:
 - a. Change "Interim Measures" to "Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons"
 - b. Under "De-alerting" put four sub-items, linked to where they appear:
 - * Civil Sector Advocates
 - * Commission Recommendations
 - * Military Leaders' Proposals
 - * Views of Religious Organizations
 - (c) Where each of these sub-items start, change "Interim Measures" to "Steps toward Zero Nuclear Weapons".

- (4) At end of long de-alerting section:
 - a. Change "Reductions Approaching Zero" to "Deep Cuts"

- (5) Then add a new section on "Disarming Iraq without War". It is sent as a separate attachment.

107th CONGRESS
2d Session

H. CON. RES. 473

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEPTEMBER 19, 2002

Ms. LEE (for herself, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATSON of California, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STARK, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. CONYERS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

Whereas on April 6, 1991, during the Persian Gulf War, Iraq accepted the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (April 3, 1991) bringing a formal cease-fire into effect; Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally accepted the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless of `all chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities related thereto', and `all ballistic missiles with a range greater than one hundred and fifty kilometers, and related major parts and repair and production facilities';

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally agreed not to acquire or develop any nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapons-usable material, nuclear-related subsystems or components, or nuclear-related research, development, support, or manufacturing facilities;

Whereas Security Council Resolution 687 calls for the creation of a United Nations special commission to `carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's biological, chemical, and missile capabilities' and to assist and cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency in carrying out the `destruction, removal or rendering harmless' of all nuclear-related items and in developing a plan for the ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance;

Whereas United Nations weapons inspectors (UNSCOM) between 1991 and 1998 successfully uncovered and destroyed large stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and production facilities, nuclear weapons research and development facilities, and Scud missiles, despite the fact that the Government of Iraq sought to obstruct their work in numerous ways;

Whereas in 1998, UNSCOM weapons inspectors were withdrawn from Iraq and have not returned since;

Whereas Iraq is not in compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1154, and additional United Nations resolutions on inspections, and this noncompliance violates international law and Iraq's ceasefire obligations and potentially endangers United States and regional security interests;

Whereas the true extent of Iraq's continued development of weapons of mass destruction and the threat posed by such development to the United States and allies in the region are unknown and cannot be known without inspections;

Whereas the United Nations was established for the purpose of preventing war and resolving disputes between nations through peaceful means, including 'by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional arrangements, or other peaceful means';

Whereas the United Nations remains seized of this matter;

Whereas the President has called upon the United Nations to take responsibility to assure that Iraq fulfills its obligations to the United Nations under existing United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas war with Iraq would place the lives of tens of thousands of people at risk, including members of the United States armed forces, Iraqi civilian non-combatants, and civilian populations in neighboring countries;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may undermine cooperative international efforts to reduce international terrorism and to bring to justice those responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may also undermine United States diplomatic relations with countries throughout the Arab and Muslim world and with many other allies;

Whereas a preemptive unilateral United States first strike could both set a dangerous international precedent and significantly weaken the United Nations as an institution; and

Whereas the short-term and long-term costs of unilateral United States military action against Iraq and subsequent occupation may be significant in terms of United States casualties, the cost to the United States treasury, and harm to United States diplomatic relations with other countries:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States should work through the United Nations to seek to resolve the matter of ensuring that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction, through mechanisms such as the resumption of weapons inspections, negotiation, enquiry, mediation, regional arrangements, and other peaceful means.

Changes and additions on Disarming Iraq, #1

Go to How to Get to Zero

Scroll down to Disarming Iraq in index

Go to Disarming Iraq in text section

In sub-index provide linkage between Statements of Religious Organizations & Articles and Reports to where they are presented below.

Under Religious Statements

1. **American Friends Service Committee** [not in italic]

2. **Catholic Church**

a. Move to second line with the citation

Holy See: Vatican Urges US to Seek UN Approval on Iraq [same URL}

b. Add a new line

U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops: Letter to President Bush on Iraq, September 13, 2002
[<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/bush902.htm>]

3. Under **United Church of Christ** add a second item:

Statement of United Church of Christ leaders opposing U.S. war against Iraq, September 13, 2002 [<http://www.ucc.org/justice/iraq1.htm>]

3. What is now **United Kingdom Statement by Christian Leaders**

change to the following with new URL in new alphabetical location

British Christian Leaders' Statement

The Morality and Legality of a War against Iraq: A Christian Declaration, August 6, 2002
[<http://www.paxchristi.org.uk/documents1.htm#declaration>]

3. For the information now under World Council of Churches, change to a new heading and a different URL in a new alphabetical location

Canadian, British, and U.S. Christian Leaders' Statement

Stop the Rush to War, August 29, 2002 [<http://www.nccusa.org/news/02news82.html>]

4. Change the **World Council of Churches** entree to:

WCC cautions Iraq, US, UK, France, Russia and China on threatened military action, September 20, 2002 [<http://www.wfn.org/2002/09/msg00256.html>]

Add in alphabetical order:

Middle East Council of Churches

Statement on recent situation concerning Iraq, August 5, 2002

[<http://www.churchworldservice.org/news/MiddleEast/mecc-iraq-statement.html>]

National Council of Churches

With Prayer and Fasting: Challenging the Rush to War with Iraq

[<http://www.nccusa.org/iraq/iraqlinks.html>]

NETWORK, A Catholic Social Justice Lobby

NETWORK opposes the Administration's Draft Resolution September 20, 2002

[<http://www.networklobby.org/page4.htm#position>]

September 21, 2002

United Methodist Church

General Board of Church and Society, Statement on Iraq, October 12, 2002

<http://www.umc-gbcs.org/gbpr171.htm>

General Board of Global Ministries, Resolution on Concern Over Iraq, October 22, 2002

http://gbgm-umc.org/global_news/full_article.cfm?articleid=1211

I. Additions to Statements of Religious Organizations on Iraq [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#stmtsrelorgs>]

Under Catholic Church, add;

[italic] U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops: *[end italic]* [Statement on Iraq], *[end underline]* _November 13, 2002 [<http://www.usccb.org/bishops/iraq.htm>]

Under Middle East Council of Churches, for URL of August 5 statement, add a final "l" to html. add:

Plea for Diplomacy, Not War, October 29, 2002 [<http://www.nccusa.org/news/02news90.html>]

Under National Council of Churches, add:

[italic] General Assembly: *[end italic]* ["Do All Possible, Without Going to War"], *[end underline]* November 16, 2002 [<http://www.nccusa.org/news/02news97.html>]

Under United Methodist Church, add:

[italic] General Board of Church and Society: *[end italic]* [Statement on Iraq], *[end underline]*, October 12, 2002 [<http://www.umc-gbcs.org/gbpr171.htm>]

[italic] General Board of Global Ministries *[end italic]* [voices concern over Iraq], *[end underline]* October 24, 2002. [http://gbgm-umc.org/global_news/full_article.cfm?articleid=1211]

New entree in alphabetical order:

[bold] **World Methodist Council** *[end bold]*

[italic] Youth Committee, *[end italic]* [Statement on Iraq], *[end underline]*, November 4, 2002 [http://www.worldmethodistyouth.org/new_page_10.htm]

II. Redo section on Articles and Reports [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#articlesandreports>]

A. For sub-index, change title to:

Sources of Articles and Reports

B. Strike the entire subsection on "Articles and Reports" and substitute the following:

[beginning box]

[bold, italic] ***Sources of Articles and Reports on Alternatives to War against Iraq***

[italic] There is a wide variety of information on alternatives to war against Iraq for the purpose of eliminating weapons of mass destruction. The following organizations are excellent sources. *[end italic]*

[all organization names in boldface]

Arms Control Association

www.armscontrol.org

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

Non-Proliferation Project

http://www.ceip.org/files/projects/npp/npp_home.ASP

Center for Defense Information

www.cdi.org

Education for Peace in Iraq Center

<http://epic-usa.org>

Foreign Policy in Focus

<http://www.fpif.org/index.html>

Fourth Freedom Forum

www.fourthfreedomforum.org

Friends Committee on National Legislation

<http://fcn.org>

Monterey Institute of International Studies

Center for Nonproliferation Studies

<http://cns.miis.edu/research/iraq/index.htm>

National Council of Churches

<http://www.nccusa.org/iraq/iraqlinks.html>

Sojourners

<http://www.sojo.net>

[end box]

[back to top](#)

Marie,

Here are some additions to Disarming Iraq without War: Statements of Religious Organizations
<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero3.htm#stmtsrelorgs>

Restructure (new items have URLs)

Catholic Church

The Holy See

[Vatican Urges U.S. to Seek U.N. Approval on Iraq](#), September 11, 2002

Statements by Pope John Paul II, other Vatican Officials, and Catholic conferences from around the world

<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/peace/quotes.htm>

U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

[Letter to President Bush on Iraq](#), September 13, 2002

[Statement on Iraq](#), November 13, 2002

Bishop John H. Ricard, Chairman, Bishops' International Policy Committee, Moral Concerns about War in Iraq: Still "Valid and Useful", February 11, 2003

<http://www.usccb.org/comm/archives/2003/03-032.htm>

Bishop Wilton D. Gregory, President, Statement on Iraq, February 26, 2003

<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/iraqstatement0203.htm>

Additions:

Under **Episcopal Church** add:

Presiding Bishop Frank T. Griswold, The Challenges of Global Citizenship, January 30, 2003

http://www.episcopalchurch.org/presiding-bishop/postings/article_123.asp

Under **United Methodist Church** add:

Council of Bishops: Bishops' president urges Bush to use restraint with Iraq, February 6, 2002

http://gbgm-umc.org/global_news/full_article.cfm?articleid=1410

Council of Bishops: Letter to Methodists around the World from Bishop Sharon A. Brown Christopher, February 6, 2003

http://gbgm-umc.org/global_news/full_article.cfm?articleid=1411

General Board of Global Ministries, What The United Methodist Church Says on War and Peace with Iraq

http://gbgm-umc.org/global_news/full_article.cfm?articleid=1405

New organizations, put in alphabetical order

Conference of European Churches

Letter on Iraq from General Secretary to President Bush, February 19, 2003

<http://www.nccusa.org/iraq/clementsletter.html>

World Conference on Religion and Peace

Statement of Executive Committee, The Crisis in Iraq, February 14, 2003

http://www.religionsforpeace.org/RforP/NEWS_021403.html

Under Source of Information add in alphabetical order

American Friends Service Committee

<http://www.afsc.org/iraq/>

Churches for Middle East Peace

<http://www.cmep.org/sites.htm#LINKS%20TO%20PREVENT%20IRAQ%20WAR>

Iraq Policy Working Group

<http://www.iraqbriefts.org/>

That's all for now.

Thanks,
Howard



Marie,

With the outbreak of war in Iraq, we need to modify the section related to Iraq on zero-nukes.org. Here are changes and additions to make -- as soon as possible because this is a current issue.

Thanks,

Howard

HOME PAGE -- <http://www.zero-nukes.org>

Where it says NEW: DISARMING IRAQ WITHOUT WAR, strike "WITHOUT WAR".

SITE INDEX -- <http://www.zero-nukes.org/siteindex.htm>

Same change.

Change the linkage to: <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero3.htm#disarmingiraq>

Sub-page on Disarming Iraq without War

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero3.htm#disarmingiraq>

(1) In the heading of this sub-page, strike "without War".

(2) Change the introductory paragraph to read as follows (in italic):

Nuclear non-proliferation is an important aspect of achieving zero nuclear weapons. This means preventing non-nuclear states from developing or acquiring nuclear weapons. In 2002 this matter came to forefront with Iraq, which has had nuclear ambitions. A related challenge is the possibility that Iraq possesses chemical and biological weapons. In this sub-page we give particular attention to the views of religious organizations on how to deal with Iraq.

(3) Section on "Statements of Religious Organizations"

<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero3.htm#stmtsrelorgs>

(a) Change the introductory paragraph to read as follows (in italic):

Numerous religious organizations have supported other means than war for eliminating Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. After war broke out, they continued their opposition to war for this purpose. Here we provide references to their statements and resolutions.

(b) Add references as follows (and keep all existing references):

American Baptist Churches

Leaders Call for Prayer in Time of War, March 19, 2003

<http://www.abc-usa.org/news/2003/20030319a.htm>

Support of Relief Efforts in Post-War Iraq Encouraged, March 20, 2003

<http://www.abc-usa.org/news/2003/20030321.htm>

Canadian Council of Churches

[Canadian churches speak out on Iraq](http://www.ccc-cce.ca/english/jp/index.html?Iraq02.htm~main)

<http://www.ccc-cce.ca/english/jp/index.html?Iraq02.htm~main>

Catholic Church

[In what's now there, add after "Bishop Wilton D. Gregory, President" -- U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops]

New:

Bishop Wilton D. Gregory, Statement on War with Iraq, March 19, 2003

<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/peace/stm31903.htm>

Church Statements on Iraq <http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/peace/churchleaders.htm>

Church of the Brethren, General Board

Statement by Judy Mills Reimer, General Secretary, March 20, 2003

<http://www.brethren.org/genbd/newsline/2003/mar2103.htm>

Iraq: Church of the Brethren Resources <http://www.brethren.org/Iraq.html>

Churches for Middle East Peace

Letter to President George W. Bush, February 4, 2003

<http://www.cmep.org/letters/2003Feb4.htm>

Conference of European Churches

If Christ Is Our Peace, We Cannot Believe In War, March 20, 2003

<http://www.cec-kek.org/News/cq0320e.htm>

Episcopal Church

House of Bishops, In The Shadow Of War: A Pastoral Letter, March 18, 2003

<http://www.episcopalchurch.org/ens/2003-061.html>

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Bishop Mark S. Hanson, Statement in response to U.S. pre-emptive military strike on Iraq, March 20, 2003

http://elca.org/bishop/iraq_031903.html

Bishop Mark S. Hanson, Pastoral Letter on War with Iraq, March 20, 2003

<http://www.elca.org/bishop/iraqletter.html>

Fellowship of Reconciliation, U.S.A.

We Refuse To Kill The People Of Iraq In The Name Of "Disarmament", March 20, 2003

http://www.forusa.org/Media/FOR_Statement_032103.html

[new]

Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America

Encyclical of the Holy Eparchial Synod on the Commencement of War in Iraq, March 20, 2003

<http://www.goarch.org/en/news/NewsDetail.asp?id=865>

[new]

KAIROS: Canadian Ecumenical Justice Initiatives

Statement Regarding the War against Iraq, March 21, 2003

<http://www.mcc.org/iraq/statements/kairos.html>

Mennonite Central Committee

The War in Iraq, March 21, 2003

<http://www.mcc.org/iraq/statements/binational.html>

[new]

Muslim Peace Fellowship

Statement, March 20, 2003

http://www.forusa.org/Media/MPF_Statement_031903.html

NETWORK: A Catholic Social Justice Lobby

Statement on War with Iraq, March 20, 2003

http://www.networklobby.org/iraq_war_statement.htm

Pax Christi USA

War Against Iraq: A Defeat for Humanity March 2003

http://www.paxchristiusa.org/news_events_more.asp?id=514

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

Church leaders issue pastoral letter on war, March 19, 2003

<http://www.pcusa.org/pcnews/03142.htm>

Reformed Church in America

Action Alert: An Alternative to War for Defeating Saddam Hussein March 2003

<http://www.rca.org/news/archives/20030311.php>

Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)

[italic] Leaders of Friends Organizations in the U.S., [end italic] Regarding the War in Iraq,
March 20, 2003

<http://www.pym.org/worship-and-care/upt-iraqltr.htm>

Sojourners

6-Point Plan to Avoid War, March 17, 2003

http://www.sojo.net/index.cfm?action=news.display_archives&mode=press_release&article=PR_030317

An urgent appeal to the churches: "We must resist this war" March 2003

http://www.sojo.net/index.cfm?action=action.speak_out

Unitarian Universalist Association

Rev. William G. Sinkford, President, Concerning Military Actions of the United States, March 20, 2003

<http://www.uua.org/main.html>

United Church of Christ

Regarding United Church of Christ position statements on Iraq, March 13, 2003

<http://www.globalministries.org/mee/me031303.htm>

Executive Council, A message to the church, March 18, 2003

<http://www.ucc.org/justice/iraq-execcouncil.htm>

Collegium statement, "When we go to war...." March 20, 2003

<http://www.ucc.org/justice/iraq-collegium-war.htm>

United Methodist Church

[italic] General Board of Church and Society, [end italic] A Statement on the Iraq War, March 20, 2003

<http://www.umc-gbcs.org/news/index.php?newsId=266>

United Methodist bishop urges church to pray for peace, March 21, 2003

<http://umns.umc.org/03/mar/166.htm>

[new]

World Alliance of Reformed Churches

War on Iraq Is Simply Wrong, February 21, 2003

<http://www.warc.ch/news/index.html>

WARC Condemns War on Iraq, March 20, 2003

<http://www.warc.ch/news/index.html>

World Council of Churches

Wars cannot be won, only peace can. March 20, 2003

http://www2.wcc-coe.org/PressReleases_en.nsf/index/pr-03-14.html

General Secretary Challenges Bush's Religious Claims, March 21, 2003

http://www2.wcc-coe.org/PressReleases_en.nsf/index/pu-03-11.html

Possible addition to www.zero-nukes.org, web site of the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament

Disarming Iraq without War

[graphic: map of Middle East with Iraq highlighted]

Nuclear non-proliferation is an important aspect of achieving zero nuclear weapons. One of the contemporary challenges is how to stop Iraq from developing nuclear weapons. This relates to the need to contain and eliminate other weapons of mass destruction (WMD) -- chemical and biological -- that Iraq appears to possess.

In this section of our web page we list sources of reports and articles that offer ideas on how to deal with Iraq's WMD arsenal without going to war.

Arms Control Association

Documents, News, and Analysis on the Task of Disarming Iraq

[<http://www.armscontrol.org/country/iraq/>] Includes:

Disarming Iraq: Nonmilitary Strategies and Options

[http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_09/cortright_lopez_sept02.asp] by David Cortright and George A. Lopez. September 2002

The Task of Disarming Iraq [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_09/foc_sept02.asp] by Daryl Kimball. September 2002.

The Case for Iraq's Qualitative Disarmament

[http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2000_06/iraqjun.asp] by Scott Ritter. June 2000.

The Lessons and Legacy of UNSCOM. [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/1999_06/rbjun99.asp]

An interview with Ambassador Richard Butler. June 1999.

Other articles and reports.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Non-Proliferation Project

Iraq's WMD Arsenal: Deadly But Limited,

[<http://www.ceip.org/files/nonprolif/templates/Publications.asp?p=8&PublicationID=1050>]

Proliferation Brief, Volume 5, Number 11, Wednesday, August 28, 2002

Center for Defense Information

Eye on Iraq [<http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/eye-on-iraq.cfm>]

Fourth Freedom Forum

Sanctions, Inspection, and Containment: Viable Policy Options in Iraq, May 2002

[<http://www.fourthfreedom.org/php/t-si-index.php?hinc=SecondIraq.hinc>]

Exploring Options for the Nonviolent Resolution of International Conflict

[<http://www.fourthfreedom.org/index.php>]

Friends Committee on National Legislation

U.S.-Iraq Relations [http://www.fcnl.org/hottopics_index.htm#usi]

Intervening in Iraq [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_dan-smith.htm]

Unwrapping Tony Blair. [http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_tony-blair.htm]

Monterey Institute of International Studies, Chemical and Biological Weapons Nonproliferation Program

IRAQ:Nuclear, Biological, Chemical, and Missile Capabilities and Programs

[<http://cns.miis.edu/research/wmdme/iraq.htm>]

Sojourners

With Weapons of the Will: How to Topple Saddam Hussein -- nonviolently

[<http://www.sojo.net/magazine/index.cfm/action/sojourners/issue/soj0209/article/020910.html>]

by Peter Aclerman and Jack DuVall

Others sources to be added. Could also add a listing of statements on Iraq by religious organizations.

Prepared by Howard W. Hallman, mupj@igc.org, 301-896-0013

I am making additions and substantial revisions to Religious Statements under Disarming Iraq, found at <http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#stmsrelorgs>. To make it understandable I am including the entire listing with indication of what stays the same and what is new.

[new]

American Baptist Churches

Delegation Joins Religious Leaders Action Days on Iraq, September 25, 2002 [<http://www.abc-usa.org/news/2002/20020926.html>]

[move to Religious Society of Friends; strike this entree and substitute a different one, as shown below]

American Friends Service Committee

Conflict with Iraq: Policy Gone Awry

[OK]

British Christian Leaders' Statement

The Morality and Legality of a War against Iraq: A Christian Declaration, August 6, 2002

[OK]

Canadian, British, and U.S. Christian Leaders' Statement

Stop the Rush to War, August 29, 2002

[new]

Canadian Council of Churches

Letter to President Bush, September 25, 2002 [<http://www.nccusa.org/iraq/canadatobush.html>]

[new]

Canadian Religious Leaders

Letter to Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien, September 25, 2002

[<http://www.nccusa.org/iraq/canadatochretien.html>]

[change sub-entrees to italic; add a date for Holy See]

Catholic Church

The Holy See: Vatican Urges U.S. to Seek U.N. Approval on Iraq, September 11, 2002

U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops: Letter to President Bush on Iraq, September 13, 2002

[Add "General Board" to heading; strike three entrees (one is wrong); substitute a new one]

Church of the Brethren

Iraq: What's a Christian to Do

Preventing the Second Gulf War

Statement of United Church of Christ leaders opposing U.S. war against Iraq, September 13, 2002

[revised]

Church of the Brethren General Board

Statement on the Threat of War between the United States and Iraq, October 14, 2002

[<http://www.brethren.org/genbd/GBResolutions/2002Iraq.html>]

[Use 12 pt. type for "Signed by"]

Churches for Middle East Peace

[Letter to President George W. Bush to Reconsider Iraq Invasion, September 12, 2002](#)

Signed by 48 Protestant Orthodox, Catholic, Evangelical leaders

[OK]

Episcopal Church

Presiding Bishop Frank T. Griswold's [Statement on Military Action Against Iraq](#), September 6, 2002

[OK]

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

ELCA President Bishop Mark S. Hanson's [Statement on Iraq Situation](#), August 30, 2002

[OK]

Fellowship of Reconciliation, USA

[No War with Iraq!](#)

[Move to Religious Society of Friends; strike second entree]

Friends Committee for National Legislation

[Letter to Congress: Oppose unilateral, preemptive U.S. military attack against Iraq](#), September 12, 2002

[Statements from Quaker meetings on U.S.-Iraq relations](#)

[OK}

Mennonite Central Committee

[Threats of War](#)

[OK]

Mennonite Church USA

[Letter to President Bush](#), August 27, 2002

[OK}

Middle East Council of Churches

[Statement on recent situation concerning Iraq](#). August 5, 2002

[new; units in italic]

National Council of Churches

Justice for Women Working Group: Potential War on Iraq: A Threat to Women and Children, September 24, 2002 [<http://www.nccusa.org/iraq/women.html>]

Executive Board: [Letter to President Bush, "Move, Even Now, Away from War"](#), October 7, 2002 [<http://www.nccusa.org/news/02news87.html>]

[Put organization in bold, replace entree with a new one]

NETWORK, A Catholic Social Justice Lobby

[strike:]

[NETWORK opposes the Administration's Draft Resolution](#), September 20, 2002

[new]

[Oppose Attack on Iraq](http://www.networklobby.org/page4.htm#iraq), October 7, 2002 [http://www.networklobby.org/page4.htm#iraq]

[OK]

Pax Christi, USA

[Iraq Peace Pledge/Iraq Pledge of Resistance](#)

[Strike two present entrees and replace with the following:]

[General Assembly Council calls for U.S. restraint on Iraq](#), September 28, 2002

[http://www.pcusa.org/pcnews/02375.htm]

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

[Church leaders sign statement opposing military action against Iraq](#)

[Church is preparing material on Iraq](#)

Reformed Church in America

[Action Alert: Possible U.S. Military Action Against Iraq](#), August 2002

[For the Quakers: (a) move AFSC to this location and substitute a new statement, (b) move FCNL to this location and strike second entree, and (c) add a new entree for "five heads". Put organizations in italic.]

Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)

American Friends Service Committee: [Letter to President Bush](#), September 20, 2002

[http://www.nccusa.org/iraq/afsc.html]

Friends Committee on National Legislation: [Letter to Congress -- Oppose unilateral, preemptive U.S. military attack against Iraq](#), September 12, 2002

[http://www.fcnl.org/issues/int/sup/iraq_volk_ltr912-02.htm]

Heads of Five Quaker Organizations: [Joint Statement in Response to Threat of War with Iraq](#), September 24, 2002 [http://www.nccusa.org/iraq/quakers.html]

[new]

Sojourners

[Disarm Iraq without war](#) by Jim Wallis, September 18, 2002

[http://www.sojo.net/news/index.cfm/action/display_archives/mode/current_opinion/article/CO_091802.html]

[new]

Unitarian Universalist Association

[Responding to the Threat of War](#), A Pastoral Letter from the Rev. William G. Sinkford, President, September 20, 2002 [http://www.abc-usa.org/news/2002/20020926.html]

[strike first entree]

United Church of Christ

[Oppose War in Iraq](#), September 4, 2002

[Statement of United Church of Christ leaders opposing U.S. war against Iraq](#), September 13, 2002

[consolidate these two and add a new entree] [at present;}

United Methodist General Board of Church and Society

[Bush Urged to Turn Back from War](#), August 30, 2002

United Methodist Women's Division

[Statement on Iraq](#), September 4, 2002

[new format with addition, units in italic:]

United Methodist Church

General Board of Church and Society: [Bush Urged to Turn Back from War](#), August 30, 2002

[<http://www.umc-gbcs.org/gbpr170.htm>]

Women's Division: [Statement on Iraq](#), September 4, 2002 [http://gbgm-umc.org/umw/statement_iraq.html]

Council of Bishops: [Pastoral Letter on Iraq from Bishop Sharon A. Brown Christopher](#), October 4, 2002 [<http://www.umc.org/headlines/newsflash/letter.htm>]

[new]

U.S. and U.K. Religious Leaders

[Disarm Iraq without War](#), October 11, 2002 [<http://www.sojo.net/action/>]

[New URL on first item; second item is new]

World Council of Churches

[WCC cautions Iraq, US, UK, France, Russia and China on threatened military action](#), September 20, 2002 [http://www2.wcc-coe.org/PressReleases_en.nsf/4d4fc8b8c54ae848c1256b94005f5b5c/b9c77a6b280456afc1256c3a0053fe73?OpenDocument]

[Pre-emptive war against Iraq illegal, immoral and unwise](#), October 15, 2002 [http://www2.wcc-coe.org/PressReleases_en.nsf/4d4fc8b8c54ae848c1256b94005f5b5c/f97dd48f2c17717bc1256c5400337a12?OpenDocument]

107th CONGRESS
2d Session
H. CON. RES. 473

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SEPTEMBER 19, 2002

Ms. LEE (for herself, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATSON of California, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STARK, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. CONYERS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

Whereas on April 6, 1991, during the Persian Gulf War, Iraq accepted the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (April 3, 1991) bringing a formal cease-fire into effect;

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally accepted the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless of 'all chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities related thereto', and 'all ballistic missiles with a range greater than one hundred and fifty kilometers, and related major parts and repair and production facilities';

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally agreed not to acquire or develop any nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapons-usable material, nuclear-related subsystems or components, or nuclear-related research, development, support, or manufacturing facilities;

Whereas Security Council Resolution 687 calls for the creation of a United Nations special commission to 'carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's biological, chemical, and missile capabilities' and to assist and cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency in carrying out the 'destruction, removal or rendering harmless' of all nuclear-related items and in developing a plan for the ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance;

Whereas United Nations weapons inspectors (UNSCOM) between 1991 and 1998 successfully uncovered and destroyed large stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and production facilities, nuclear weapons research and development facilities, and Scud missiles, despite the fact that the Government of Iraq sought to obstruct their work in numerous ways;

Whereas in 1998, UNSCOM weapons inspectors were withdrawn from Iraq and have not returned since;

Whereas Iraq is not in compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1154, and additional United Nations resolutions on inspections, and this noncompliance violates international law and Iraq's ceasefire obligations and potentially endangers United States and regional security interests;

Whereas the true extent of Iraq's continued development of weapons of mass destruction and the threat posed by such development to the United States and allies in the region are unknown and cannot be known without inspections;

Whereas the United Nations was established for the purpose of preventing war and resolving disputes between nations through peaceful means, including 'by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional arrangements, or other peaceful means';

Whereas the United Nations remains seized of this matter;

Whereas the President has called upon the United Nations to take responsibility to assure that Iraq fulfills its obligations to the United Nations under existing United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas war with Iraq would place the lives of tens of thousands of people at risk, including members of the United States armed forces, Iraqi civilian non-combatants, and civilian populations in neighboring countries;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may undermine cooperative international efforts to reduce international terrorism and to bring to justice those responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may also undermine United States diplomatic relations with countries throughout the Arab and Muslim world and with many other allies;

Whereas a preemptive unilateral United States first strike could both set a dangerous international precedent and significantly weaken the United Nations as an institution; and

Whereas the short-term and long-term costs of unilateral United States military action against Iraq and subsequent occupation may be significant in terms of United States casualties, the cost to the United States treasury, and harm to United States diplomatic relations with other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States should work through the United Nations to seek to resolve the matter of ensuring that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction, through mechanisms such as the resumption of weapons inspections, negotiation, enquiry, mediation, regional arrangements, and other peaceful means.

--MS_Mac_OE_3115435289_4630258_MIME_Part
Content-type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<TITLE>Text of Lee resolution on Iraq</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY>

FYI

Kathy Campbell-Barton

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council... (Introduced in House)

HCON 473 IH

<P ALIGN=3DCENTER>

107th CONGRESS

2d Session

H. CON. RES. 473

<P>

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

<P ALIGN=3DCENTER>
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<H3>SEPTEMBER 19, 2002

</H3>
<P>

Ms. LEE (for herself, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATSON of California, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STARK, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. CONYERS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

>

<HR ALIGN=3DCENTER SIZE=3D"3" WIDTH=3D"100%">

<P ALIGN=3DCENTER>
CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

<P>

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

Whereas on April 6, 1991, during the Persian Gulf War, Iraq accepted the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (April 3, 1991) bringing a formal cease-fire into effect;

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally accepted the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless of `all chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities related thereto', and `all ballistic missiles with a range greater than one hundred and fifty kilometers, and related major parts and repair and production facilities';

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally agreed not to acquire or develop any nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapons-

-usable material, nuclear-related subsystems or components, or nuclear-related research, development, support, or manufacturing facilities;

Whereas Security Council Resolution 687 calls for the creation of a United Nations special commission to 'carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's biological, chemical, and missile capabilities' and to assist and cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency in carrying out the 'destruction, removal or rendering harmless' of all nuclear-related items and in developing a plan for the ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance;

Whereas United Nations weapons inspectors (UNSCOM) between 1991 and 1998 successfully uncovered and destroyed large stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and production facilities, nuclear weapons research and development facilities, and Scud missiles, despite the fact that the Government of Iraq sought to obstruct their work in numerous ways;

Whereas in 1998, UNSCOM weapons inspectors were withdrawn from Iraq and have not returned since;

Whereas Iraq is not in compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1154, and additional United Nations resolutions on inspections, and this noncompliance violates international law and Iraq's ceasefire obligations and potentially endangers United States and regional security interests;

Whereas the true extent of Iraq's continued development of weapons of mass destruction and the threat posed by such development to the United States and allies in the region are unknown and cannot be known without inspections;

Whereas the United Nations was established for the purpose of preventing war and resolving disputes between nations through peaceful means, including 'by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional arrangements, or other peaceful means';

Whereas the United Nations remains seized of this matter;

Whereas the President has called upon the United Nations to take responsibility to assure that Iraq fulfills its obligations to the United Nations under existing United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas war with Iraq would place the lives of tens of thousands of people at risk, including members of the United States armed forces, Iraqi civilian non-combatants, and civilian populations in neighboring countries;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may undermine cooperative international efforts to reduce international terrorism and to

bring to justice those responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may also undermine United States diplomatic relations with countries throughout the Arab and Muslim world and with many other allies;

Whereas a preemptive unilateral United States first strike could both set a dangerous international precedent and significantly weaken the United Nations as an institution; and

Whereas the short-term and long-term costs of unilateral United States military action against Iraq and subsequent occupation may be significant in terms of United States casualties, the cost to the United States treasury, and harm to United States diplomatic relations with other countries: Now, therefore, be it

<I>Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)</I>, That the United States should work through the United Nations to seek to resolve the matter of ensuring that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction, through mechanisms such as the resumption of weapons inspections, negotiation, enquiry, mediation, regional arrangements, and other peaceful means.

Status: U

Return-Path: <owner-gbcs-pwj@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG>

Received: from umcgroupemail.org ([64.221.242.81])

by bissell.mail.mindspring.net (Earthlink Mail Service) with ESMTP id 17SKtX7b73N13rE0

for <mupj@igc.org>; Sat, 21 Sep 2002 09:39:37 -0400 (EDT)

Received: from UMCom2C02 (10.1.2.12) by umcgroupemail.org (LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.0002E90B@umcgroupemail.org>; Sat, 21 Sep 2002 8:39:36 -0500

Received: from UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG by UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG (LISTSERV-TCP/IP release 1.8d) with spool id 4331 for GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG; Sat, 21 Sep 2002 08:37:35 -0500

Received: from falcon.mail.pas.earthlink.net (207.217.120.74) by umcgroupemail.org (LSMTP for Windows NT v1.1b) with SMTP id <0.0002E90A@umcgroupemail.org>; Sat, 21 Sep 2002 8:37:34 -0500

Received: from sdn-ap-017watacop0094.dialsprint.net ([63.191.232.94]) by falcon.mail.pas.earthlink.net with esmtp (Exim 3.33 #1) id 17skRw-0003ME-00 for GBGS-PWJ@umcgroupemail.org; Sat, 21 Sep 2002 06:37:33 -0700

User-Agent: Microsoft-Outlook-Express-Macintosh-Edition/5.02.2022

Mime-version: 1.0

Content-type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="MS_Mac_OE_3115435289_4630258_MIME_Part"

Message-ID: <B9B1C519.384C%kentkathyb@earthlink.net>

Date: Sat, 21 Sep 2002 06:41:29 -0700

Reply-To: GBGS PWJ <GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG>

Sender: GBGS PWJ <GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG>

From: Kent/Kathy Barton <kentkathyb@EARTHLINK.NET>

Subject: [GBGS-PWJ] Text of Lee resolution on Iraq

To: GBGS-PWJ@UMCGROUPEMAIL.ORG

> This message is in MIME format. Since your mail reader does not understand this format, some or all of this message may not be legible.

--MS_Mac_OE_3115435289_4630258_MIME_Part

Content-type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

FYI

Kathy Campbell-Barton

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council... (Introduced in House)

HCON 473 IH

107th CONGRESS

2d Session

H. CON. RES. 473

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance

with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
SEPTEMBER 19, 2002

Ms. LEE (for herself, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATSON of California, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STARK, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. CONYERS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

Whereas on April 6, 1991, during the Persian Gulf War, Iraq accepted the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (April 3, 1991) bringing a formal cease-fire into effect;

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally accepted the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless of `all chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities related thereto', and `all ballistic missiles with a range greater than one hundred and fifty kilometers, and related major parts and repair and production facilities';

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally agreed not to acquire or develop any nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapons-usable material, nuclear-related subsystems or components, or nuclear-related research, development, support, or manufacturing facilities;

Whereas Security Council Resolution 687 calls for the creation of a United Nations special commission to `carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's biological, chemical, and missile capabilities' and to assist and cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency in carrying out the `destruction, removal or rendering harmless' of all nuclear-related items and in developing a plan for the ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance;

Whereas United Nations weapons inspectors (UNSCOM) between 1991 and 1998

successfully uncovered and destroyed large stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and production facilities, nuclear weapons research and development facilities, and Scud missiles, despite the fact that the Government of Iraq sought to obstruct their work in numerous ways;

Whereas in 1998, UNSCOM weapons inspectors were withdrawn from Iraq and have not returned since;

Whereas Iraq is not in compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1154, and additional United Nations resolutions on inspections, and this noncompliance violates international law and Iraq's ceasefire obligations and potentially endangers United States and regional security interests;

Whereas the true extent of Iraq's continued development of weapons of mass destruction and the threat posed by such development to the United States and allies in the region are unknown and cannot be known without inspections;

Whereas the United Nations was established for the purpose of preventing war and resolving disputes between nations through peaceful means, including 'by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional arrangements, or other peaceful means';

Whereas the United Nations remains seized of this matter;

Whereas the President has called upon the United Nations to take responsibility to assure that Iraq fulfills its obligations to the United Nations under existing United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas war with Iraq would place the lives of tens of thousands of people at risk, including members of the United States armed forces, Iraqi civilian non-combatants, and civilian populations in neighboring countries;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may undermine cooperative international efforts to reduce international terrorism and to bring to justice those responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may also undermine United States diplomatic relations with countries throughout the Arab and Muslim world and with many other allies;

Whereas a preemptive unilateral United States first strike could both set a dangerous international precedent and significantly weaken the United Nations as an institution; and

Whereas the short-term and long-term costs of unilateral United States military action against Iraq and subsequent occupation may be significant in terms of United States casualties, the cost to the United States treasury, and harm to United States diplomatic relations with other countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the United States should work through the United Nations to seek to resolve the

matter of ensuring that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction, through mechanisms such as the resumption of weapons inspections, negotiation, enquiry, mediation, regional arrangements, and other peaceful means.

--MS_Mac_OE_3115435289_4630258_MIME_Part

Content-type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII"

Content-transfer-encoding: quoted-printable

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<TITLE>Text of Lee resolution on Iraq</TITLE>

</HEAD>

<BODY>

FYI

Kathy Campbell-Barton

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council... (Introduced in House)

HCON 473 IH

<P ALIGN=3DCENTER>

107th CONGRESS

2d Session

H. CON. RES. 473

<P>

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

<P ALIGN=3DCENTER>

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<H3>SEPTEMBER 19, 2002

</H3>

<P>

Ms. LEE (for herself, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATSON of California, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. STARK, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. CONYERS) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on International Relations

>

<HR ALIGN=3DCENTER SIZE=3D"3" WIDTH=3D"100%">

<P ALIGN=3DCENTER>

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

<P>

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the importance of the United States working through the United Nations to assure Iraq's compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions and advance peace and security in the Persian Gulf region.

Whereas on April 6, 1991, during the Persian Gulf War, Iraq accepted the provisions of United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 (April 3, 1991) bringing a formal cease-fire into effect;

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally accepted the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless of 'all chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities related thereto', and 'all ballistic missiles with a range greater than one hundred and fifty kilometers, and related major parts and repair and production facilities';

Whereas, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 687, Iraq unconditionally agreed not to acquire or develop any nuclear weapons, nuclear-weapon-usable material, nuclear-related subsystems or components, or nuclear-related research, development, support, or manufacturing facilities;

Whereas Security Council Resolution 687 calls for the creation of a United Nations special commission to 'carry out immediate on-site inspection of Iraq's biological, chemical, and missile capabilities' and to assist and cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency in carrying out the 'destruction, removal or rendering harmless' of all nuclear-related items and in developing a plan for the ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance;

Whereas United Nations weapons inspectors (UNSCOM) between 1991 and 1998 successfully uncovered and destroyed large stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and production facilities, nuclear weapons research and development facilities, and Scud missiles, despite the fact that the Government of Iraq sought to obstruct their work in numerous ways;

Whereas in 1998, UNSCOM weapons inspectors were withdrawn from Iraq and have not returned since;

Whereas Iraq is not in compliance with United Nations Security Council Resolution 687, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1154, and additional United Nations resolutions on inspections, and this noncompliance violates international law and Iraq's ceasefire obligations and potentially endangers United States and regional security interests;

Whereas the true extent of Iraq's continued development of weapons of mass destruction and the threat posed by such development to the United States and allies in the region are unknown and cannot be known without inspections;

Whereas the United Nations was established for the purpose of preventing war and resolving disputes between nations through peaceful means, including '=

by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional arrangements, or other peaceful means';

Whereas the United Nations remains seized of this matter;

Whereas the President has called upon the United Nations to take responsibility to assure that Iraq fulfills its obligations to the United Nations under existing United Nations Security Council resolutions;

Whereas war with Iraq would place the lives of tens of thousands of people at risk, including members of the United States armed forces, Iraqi civilian non-combatants, and civilian populations in neighboring countries;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may undermine cooperative international efforts to reduce international terrorism and to bring to justice those responsible for the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas unilateral United States military action against Iraq may also undermine United States diplomatic relations with countries throughout the Arab and Muslim world and with many other allies;

Whereas a preemptive unilateral United States first strike could both set a dangerous international precedent and significantly weaken the United Nations as an institution; and

Whereas the short-term and long-term costs of unilateral United States military action against Iraq and subsequent occupation may be significant in terms of United States casualties, the cost to the United States treasury, and harm to United States diplomatic relations with other countries: Now, therefore, be it

<I>Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)</I>, That the United States should work through the United Nations to seek to resolve the matter of ensuring that Iraq is not developing weapons of mass destruction, through mechanisms such as the resumption of weapons inspections, negotiation, enquiry, mediation, regional arrangements, and other peaceful means.

</BODY>

</HTML>

--MS_Mac_OE_3115435289_4630258_MIME_Part--

To Unsubscribe from this Group:

If you wish to remove yourself from this Group, please go to UMCom.org, login to your account, click on the My Resources link and select Leave from the list(s) from which you wish to unsubscribe. If you have problems, or any further questions, email us at: websupport@umcom.org.

Powered by United Methodist Communications <http://www.UMCom.org>

Bob and Brenda,

Here are some suggested additions to the NCC web site on Iraq. Would you like to give me the name of the person who handles this process for you so that I can add her/his name to my communications for suggested additions?

Links to Related Sites. I suggest adding FCNL because they have a flow of good, original material.

Friends Committee on National Legislation: <http://fcn1.org>

Add to Index to Ecumenical and Denominational Statements

September 13: [U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops Letter to President Bush on Iraq](http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/bush902.htm)

[<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/bush902.htm>]

September 13: [Statement of United Church of Christ leaders opposing U.S. war against Iraq](http://www.ucc.org/justice/iraq1.htm)

[<http://www.ucc.org/justice/iraq1.htm>]

September 6: [Episcopal Presiding Bishop Frank T. Griswold's Statement on Military Action](http://www.episcopalchurch.org/presiding-bishop/)

[Against Iraq](http://www.episcopalchurch.org/presiding-bishop/) [<http://www.episcopalchurch.org/presiding-bishop/>]

September 4. [United Methodist Women's Division Statement on Iraq](http://gbgm-umc.org/umw/statement_iraq.html) [[http://gbgm-](http://gbgm-umc.org/umw/statement_iraq.html)

[umc.org/umw/statement_iraq.html](http://gbgm-umc.org/umw/statement_iraq.html)]

August 30: [United Methodist General Board of Church and Society: Bush Urged to Turn Back](http://www.umc-gbcs.org/gbpr170.htm)

[from War](http://www.umc-gbcs.org/gbpr170.htm) [<http://www.umc-gbcs.org/gbpr170.htm>]

Shalom,

Howard

Council of Bishops
The United Methodist Church
Sharon A. Brown Christopher
President of the Council
October 4, 2002

Dear United Methodist Sisters and Brothers in Faith:

As the president of Council of Bishops, I write to you with a sense of urgency about the present perilous state of our world. I do so because 1) the Gospel of peace needs to be heard; 2) our United Methodist Social Principles offer guidance, and 3) our General Conference expects the Council of Bishops to "speak to the Church and from the Church to the world."

Nothing could be clearer than that the Gospel of Christ is a Gospel of peace. Jesus rejects the violent response to evil. "He who takes the sword will perish by the sword." Jesus, speaking to us about a new way of living, proclaims that peacemakers are blessed and that "they will be called children of God." He moves the standard even higher by urging us to love our enemies and "pray for those who persecute you." Paul tells us that we are not to return evil for evil, but are to "overcome evil with good."

Our General Conference, on the basis of these Gospel teachings, declares:
"Some nations possess more military and economic power than do others. Upon the powerful rests responsibility to exercise their wealth and influence with restraint.... We believe war is incompatible with the teachings and example of Christ. We therefore reject war as a usual instrument of national foreign policy and insist that the first moral duty of all nations is to resolve by peaceful means every dispute that arises between or among them."

Without question, Saddam Hussein is in gross violation of numerous United Nations resolutions, and President Bush is to be commended for calling the United Nations to accountability on this score. The United States and the United Nations should take the steps necessary to ensure compliance.

But a preemptive war by the United States against a nation like Iraq goes against the very grain of our understanding of the Gospel, our church's teachings, and our conscience. Preemptive strike does not reflect restraint and does not allow for the adequate pursuit of peaceful means for resolving conflict. To be silent in the face of such a prospect is not an option for followers of Christ.

There is no question that President Hussein's demonstrated behavior leaves any thoughtful person horrified by his treatment of his own citizens and the citizen's of Iraq's neighboring countries. However, ours has been historically a church seeking peace, justice, and reconciliation. Even as we acknowledge the need for military action as a means of self-defense demanded by highly unusual circumstances, our primary allegiance is to what we understand the basics of the Gospel of Jesus Christ require of us— grace, mercy, peace, justice, and love.

So, I call all of us to prayer. Pray for the leaders of the nations, many of whom bear the name of Christ, that they may truly be led by the spirit of Christ as crucial decisions are made. Write and phone them, letting them know of your deep concern. Especially lift your prayers for United Methodists President Bush and Vice-President Cheney, that they may truly seek the will of God in Christ as they make awesome decisions of life and death, war and peace.

In Christ,
Sharon A. Brown Christopher

Council of Bishops
The United Methodist Church

Sharon A. Brown Christopher
President of the Council
October 4, 2002

Dear United Methodist Sisters and Brothers in Faith:

As the president of Council of Bishops, I write to you with a sense of urgency about the present perilous state of our world. I do so because 1) the Gospel of peace needs to be heard; 2) our United Methodist Social Principles offer guidance, and 3) our General Conference expects the Council of Bishops to "speak to the Church and from the Church to the world."

Nothing could be clearer than that the Gospel of Christ is a Gospel of peace. Jesus rejects the violent response to evil. "He who takes the sword will perish by the sword." Jesus, speaking to us about a new way of living, proclaims that peacemakers are blessed and that "they will be called children of God." He moves the standard even higher by urging us to love our enemies and "pray for those who persecute you." Paul tells us that we are not to return evil for evil, but are to "overcome evil with good."

Our General Conference, on the basis of these Gospel teachings, declares:

"Some nations possess more military and economic power than do others. Upon the powerful rests responsibility to exercise their wealth and influence with restraint.... We believe war is incompatible with the teachings and example of Christ. We therefore reject war as a usual instrument of national foreign policy and insist that the first moral duty of all nations is to resolve by peaceful means every dispute that arises between or among them."

Without question, Saddam Hussein is in gross violation of numerous United Nations resolutions, and President Bush is to be commended for calling the United Nations to accountability on this score. The United States and the United Nations should take the steps necessary to ensure compliance.

But a preemptive war by the United States against a nation like Iraq goes against the very grain of our understanding of the Gospel, our church's teachings, and our conscience. Preemptive strike does not reflect restraint and does not allow for the adequate pursuit of peaceful means for resolving conflict. To be silent in the face of such a prospect is not an option for followers of Christ.

There is no question that President Hussein's demonstrated behavior leaves any thoughtful person horrified by his treatment of his own citizens and the citizen's of Iraq's neighboring countries. However, ours has been historically a church seeking peace, justice, and reconciliation. Even as we acknowledge the need for military action as a means of self-defense demanded by highly unusual circumstances, our primary allegiance is to what we understand the basics of the Gospel of Jesus Christ require of us— grace, mercy, peace, justice, and love.

So, I call all of us to prayer. Pray for the leaders of the nations, many of whom bear the name of Christ, that they may truly be led by the spirit of Christ as crucial decisions are made. Write and phone them, letting them know of your deep concern. Especially lift your prayers for United Methodists President Bush and Vice-President Cheney, that they may truly seek the will of God in Christ as they make awesome decisions of life and death, war and peace.

In Christ,

Sharon A. Brown Christopher

Statement on War with Iraq

*Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory
President
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops*

March 19, 2003

Our nation is on the brink of war. We worked and prayed and hoped that war would be avoided. The task now is to work and pray and hope that war's deadly consequences will be limited, that civilian life will be protected, that weapons of mass destruction will be eliminated, and that the people of Iraq soon will enjoy a peace with freedom and justice.

A time for prayer and solidarity. In time of war, our first obligation is prayer and solidarity. We pray for all those most directly affected by this war: the men and women who risk their lives in the service of our nation, their families and loved ones who face such fear and anxiety at this time, and the chaplains who serve them; the long-suffering people of Iraq, and those who labor to provide for their humanitarian needs. All of us should do what we can to reach out in solidarity to all those who will suffer as a result of this war.

Iraq's obligation to disarm. Since the Gulf War, we have been clear in calling on the Iraqi leadership to abandon efforts to develop weapons of mass destruction and to meet its obligations to destroy such weapons. We have also been clear that the international community must ensure that Iraq complies with its obligations under UN resolutions. As the Holy Father said last Sunday, "the political leaders in Baghdad have an urgent duty to cooperate fully with the international community, to eliminate any motive for armed intervention."

Deep regret that war was not averted. Our nation's leaders have made the momentous decision to go to war to address the failure of the Iraqi government to comply completely with its obligations. We deeply regret that war was not averted. We stand by the statement of the full body of bishops last November. Our conference's moral concerns and questions, as well as the call of the Holy Father to find alternatives to war, are well known and reflect our prudential judgments about the application of traditional Catholic teaching on the use of force in this case. We have been particularly concerned about the precedents that could be set and the possible consequences of a major war of this type in perhaps the most volatile region of the world. Echoing the Holy Father's admonition that war "is always a defeat for humanity," we have prayed and urged that peaceful means be pursued to disarm Iraq under UN auspices.

The decisions being made about Iraq and the war on terrorism could have historic implications for the use of force, the legitimacy of international institutions, and the role of the United States in the world. The moral significance of these issues must continue to

be assessed given their importance in shaping a more just and peaceful world.

The role of conscience. While we have warned of the potential moral dangers of embarking on this war, we have also been clear that there are no easy answers. War has serious consequences, so could the failure to act. People of good will may and do disagree on how to interpret just war teaching and how to apply just war norms to the controverted facts of this case. We understand and respect the difficult moral choices that must be made by our President and others who bear the responsibility of making these grave decisions involving our nation's and the world's security (*Catechism #2309*).

We affirm the words of the Catechism: "[t]hose who are sworn to serve their country in the armed forces are servants of the security and freedom of nations. If they carry out their duty honorably, they truly contribute to the common good of the nation and the maintenance of peace" (#2310). We also affirm that "[p]ublic authorities should make equitable provision for those who for reasons of conscience refuse to bear arms" (#2311). We support those who have accepted the call to serve their country in a conscientious way in the armed services and we reiterate our long-standing support for those who pursue conscientious objection and selective conscientious objection.

The moral conduct of war. Once the decision to use military force is taken, the moral and legal constraints on the conduct of war must be observed. The United States and its allies are at war with a regime that has shown, and we fear will continue to show, a disregard for civilian lives and traditional norms governing the use of force. All the more reason that our nation upholds and reinforces these values by its own actions. While we recognize and welcome the improved capability and commitment to avoid civilian casualties, every effort must be made to ensure that efforts to reduce the risk to U.S. forces are limited by careful judgments of military necessity and the duty to respect the lives and dignity of Iraqi civilians, who have suffered so much already from war, repression, and a debilitating embargo.

Any decision to defend against Iraq's weapons of mass destruction by using our own weapons of mass destruction would be clearly unjustified. The use of anti-personnel landmines, cluster bombs and other weapons that cannot distinguish between soldiers and civilians, or between times of war and times of peace, ought to be avoided. In all our actions in war, including assessments of whether "collateral damage" is proportionate, we must value the lives and livelihood of Iraqi civilians as we would the lives and livelihood of our own families and our own citizens.

Humanitarian concerns and post-war obligations. An already vulnerable Iraqi population could face terrible new burdens during this war, and a region already full of conflict and refugees could see more conflict and many more displaced persons with nowhere to go. Even amidst the chaos of war, every effort must be made to prevent internal strife and to protect vulnerable groups. We are deeply concerned that adequate resources and effective plans be put in place to address the humanitarian crisis in Iraq, which, at least in the short term, will be worsened by war. The United States, working with the United Nations, private relief organizations, and all interested parties, bears a

heavy burden, during and after the war, of providing for POWs and the civilian population, especially refugees and displaced persons. Catholic relief agencies will continue to do all that they can to respond to the needs of the Iraqi people.

The United States also must accept the long-term responsibility to help Iraqis build a just and enduring peace in their country, while also addressing the many serious unresolved issues in the Middle East, especially the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. War and reconstruction in Iraq must not result in an abandonment of our nation's responsibilities to the poor at home and abroad, or a diversion of essential resources from other humanitarian emergencies around the world.

At times like these, we turn to God and ask for wisdom and perseverance, courage and compassion, faith and hope. We Christians are called to be "sentinels of peace," the Holy Father reminds us. We join with him in urging Catholics to dedicate this Lenten season to reflection, prayer and fasting that the trials and tragedy of war will soon be replaced by a just and lasting peace.

Office of Social Development & World Peace
United States Conference of Catholic Bishops
3211 4th Street, N.E., Washington, DC 20017-1194 (202) 541-3000

March 19, 2003 Copyright © by United States Conference of Catholic Bishops

<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/peace/stm31903.htm>

War Is Still Not the Answer

A Statement by Friends Committee on National Legislation

March 20, 2003

War is still not the answer to Saddam Hussein, terrorism, or the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Yet now the bombs are falling, and the U.S.-led military invasion of Iraq will begin soon.

As members of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), we are called to witness to God's love for every human being; to respect the human dignity of each person; to promote equality and justice; to oppose violence and war; and to work for a peaceful world. We call upon the President and Congress to halt this inhumane, unjust, unnecessary, provocative war. We pray for the peoples of Iraq, now suffering from both Saddam Hussein's oppressive rule and the unjustified U.S.-led military attack. We pray for the men and women in the U.S. armed forces, needlessly sent into harm's way and for their families. We pray that our government leaders will come to recognize the arrogance of power that is reflected in their policies and actions and that they will seek instead peaceful alternatives to war based on international cooperation and law. We pray for President Bush and Saddam Hussein, that their hearts may be turned from war to peacemaking. We pray that our country will recognize its historic complicity in creating the circumstances we now face.

Over the past year, increasing millions of people across this country have labored with Congress and the Administration to prevent this war and to promote peaceful alternatives. Strong majorities of like-minded citizens and governments around the world united in this call for peace with justice.

Yet, the voices of the people have been ignored. Instead, we have watched in anguish as our government squandered the international good will for the U.S. that followed the attacks of September 11, 2001. We have seen the rhetoric of "security" used to justify the erosion of civil liberties and human rights and the rejection of the United Nations and international law. We have watched as federal budget priorities were shifted further away from addressing unmet human needs toward building global military dominance and pursuing an ever-expanding "war on terror."

By launching a preemptive war against Iraq, the U.S. government is needlessly putting at risk the lives of U.S. military personnel and the Iraqi people, spreading the seeds of hatred, and increasing the chance that violence will spread far beyond the bounds of the current conflict. The community of nations is being torn apart. International law, the UN Charter, and the principles of cooperation for peace and security are being undermined. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is accelerating in North Korea and elsewhere in the fear that, following the war in Iraq, the U.S. will attack other countries or that others will follow the U.S. example by launching preemptive wars of their own to resolve historic disputes.

True security arises not from the exertion of military power and control, but from respect for international law and the lifting up of our common hopes, aspirations, and humanity. We join with all those who seek to build a society that respects the dignity of each person, resolves conflicts peacefully, promotes freedom, justice, and democracy, and preserves the natural environment. We call upon the President, Congress, Friends and all people of good will to help end this war now, to heal the deep wounds from this conflict, to prevent further bloodshed, and to build a world in which all people may enjoy true security, free of war and the threat of war.

Friends Committee on National Legislation

245 Second Street, NE

Washington, DC 20002

(202) 547-6000

www.fcnl.org

Remarks of Jim Winkler

General Secretary of the United Methodist General Board of Church & Society

The prevailing assumption in the United States government is that war with Iraq is inevitable. As a Christian, I find such sentiment to be unacceptable. Many of us continue to work fervently for a peaceful resolution to this crisis and have been involved in numerous prayer and worship services, marches and rallies, peace conferences, and meetings with government officials intended to avert war. I am grateful these sisters and brothers from Europe have come to stand in solidarity with us today against war.

Two weeks ago, I met with Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder of Germany to support his efforts to prevent war. I have helped coordinate efforts to seek a meeting of religious leaders with President Bush. Through the National Council of Churches, several of us have been involved in efforts to arrange meetings between U.S. church leaders and government officials and church leaders in Iraq, Great Britain, Germany, Russia, France, and Italy. The only government that refuses to speak with church leaders is our own.

Nothing I understand about Jesus Christ leads me to believe that support of war and violence are necessary or tolerable actions for Christian people. Someday, Christians will have to face up to the choice between their faith in God and the Prince of Peace, and their willingness to participate in war. Why not today? War is an immoral choice. That doesn't mean I do not pray for those who have volunteered to serve in the armed services. I work for peace so they will not have to kill or, possibly, be killed.

The proposed National Security Strategy of the United States represents a dark vision of eternal war. The new doctrine of preemptive war is immoral and in violation of international law. We who follow Jesus Christ simply cannot support this course of action.

The notion that the United States can re-make Iraq and, indeed, the entire region into a democratic, pro-Western zone through a military invasion is a fantasy. I am concerned how few Americans have a sense of Middle East and Islamic history and culture. No matter how contemptible Saddam Hussein is, the people of Iraq do not want a U.S. Army General as their new dictator, viceroy or proconsul. Further, the nearly complete lack of willingness on the part of our government to address the root causes of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict does not bode well for an absolutely necessary region-wide settlement.

Imagine if the most powerful nations in the world concluded that the United States government had to be overthrown by force and replaced with outside rule because we produced and possessed vast quantities of weapons of mass destruction, had an unelected leader, were the greatest destroyers of the global environment, consumed far more of the world's resources than was our due, engaged in covert actions resulting in the overthrow and destabilization of sovereign nations, carried out capital punishment against minors, aggressively redistributed our wealth to the rich at the expense of the poor, and was a violent, racist society. Even if all this were true and an invasion was justified so as to

head off an imminent threat to world peace, it would seriously distort our society and lead our population to conclude we are unable to address our own problems. I do not doubt such an invasion would produce despair, anger, and violent responses from our people.

Further, I am deeply concerned about the impact of an invasion on the people of Iraq. Half the Iraqi population are children. Think about that. The United Nations has determined that 1.26 million Iraqi children are at risk in the event of war. Our military is planning to use hundreds of cruise missiles in the first days of the invasion. One military spokesperson has been quoted as saying there will not be a safe place in Baghdad during the missile attacks. We are intending to unleash hell on Iraq and all of its people, not just Saddam Hussein. I have worshiped with Iraqi Christians and walked the streets of Baghdad. The people of Iraq are not our enemies.

The people who carried out the horrible attacks of September 11 were seriously misguided. Fundamentalism in all religions is a dangerous force around the world. We do need to bring to justice the organizations and leaders who support terrorism. That kind of intelligence and police work should be supported. I am eager to see the Al Qaeda network dismantled.

My opposition to war is deeply rooted in my faith. I cannot profess Christ as my Savior and simultaneously support preemptive war. I can deny Jesus and support war but I will not. My faith in God, denied by some as unscientific, is real and practical to me. My opposition to war is not an idealistic pipedream, but a faithful response. We here today believe Jesus has shown us a better way.