

### ***Global Nuclear Disarmament***

*The elimination of the nuclear weapons stockpile and delivery systems is a major element of the disarmament program contained in the McCloy-Zorin agreement. Relevant, too, is the idea of stages with specified time-limits, balance at each stage, and international control and verification.*

*Our goal should be completion of global disarmament by the year 2000. There are three major tasks to accomplish: strategic disarmament, tactical nuclear disarmament, and preventing proliferation to other nations. Way stations include a halt in nuclear weapons testing and an end to production and deployment of modernized nuclear weapons. In some cases, tactical nuclear disarmament should be associated with conventional disarmament, but in other instances, nuclear disarmament can proceed by itself.*

*Perspectives on a New World Order*

The Persian Gulf War has ended after 43 days of fighting. Kuwait is free again. U.S. and other coalition forces have thoroughly defeated the Iraqi army.

The victory is not surprising. A very large nation defeated a much smaller one. The Superbowl champ beat a Division III team. Note these comparisons (with latest available comparative data):

**National Population, 1988**

Iraq 17 million

United States 246 million

**Military Expenditures, 1988**

Iraq\$ 13 billion

United States \$295 billion

Although Iraq put a much larger percent of its population into the army, it was no match for the technological prowess and the enormous firepower that the United States could assemble. Moreover, the U.S. had military support from seven coalition nations: Great Britain, France, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, and Qatar.

Millions of Americans are elated over the defeat of Saddam Hussein, a man perceived as a tyrant. They are pleased that victory was accomplished so quickly and with little loss of American lives. We, too, are glad that so few Americans died, but we grieve for them and for their families. We also grieve for Kuwaiti citizens killed during the Iraqi invasion, occupation, and retreat from Kuwait. We grieve for military casualties from other coalition armies. We grieve for the tens of thousands of Iraqis killed in the war.

So, euphoria must be tempered with sorrow for the human lives lost. Moreover, we should step back and take a look at the nature of this endeavor. We should ask whether this is the way we want to approach world problems in the 1990s and into the 21st century.

**Rationale for the War**

President Bush provided a number of reasons for U.S. military action against Iraq: repel lawless aggression, restore the independence of Kuwait, protect the oil supply, preserve the American way of life. Other objectives, though not as explicitly stated, were demolition of Iraq's warmaking capacity and, if possible, removal of Saddam Hussein from power. All of these, the president has insisted, is within the framework of establishing a new world order.

The president's most idealistic expression of this concept came in his State of the Union address (January 1991):

a new world order where diverse nations are drawn together in common cause to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind -- peace and security, freedom and the rule of law.

Explaining why the United States had to bear the major burden of the collective effort against Iraq, the

president stated:

Among the nations of the world, only the United States of America has both the moral standing and the means to back it up. We're the only nation on this Earth that could assemble the forces of peace.

### **Deeds Speak Louder than Words**

President Bush's "forces of peace" consist of a formidable war machine. Forsaking nonviolent economic sanctions as the major instrument to force Iraq from Kuwait, the Bush Administration embarked upon a course that matched killing with killing. U.S. forces, with some coalition support, opened the war with a unrelenting air assault on the Iraqi homeland and Iraqi forces based in Kuwait. After nearly 100,000 air sorties in 38 days, the heavily-armed, coalition ground forces moved into Kuwait and southern Iraq. They were victorious in a little over four days. In the process, grave human suffering occurred.

**Human casualties.** Between August 2, 1990 when Iraq invaded Kuwait and February 28, 1991 when the initial ceasefire occurred, the Persian Gulf War was costly in human lives. No full count is available of Iraqi deaths, but estimates run from 80,000 to 100,000 civilians and military personnel. Civil war in Iraq as an aftermath of the war has produced another 5,000 to 10,000 deaths. Predictions are that many children, elderly, and other frail persons will die in coming months from malnutrition, insanitary conditions, and inadequate medical care.

Several thousand Kuwaitis died as a result of the Iraqi invasion. Palestinians residing in Kuwait have been killed in postwar turmoil. During the 43 day war 115 Americans were killed in action, and another 200 Americans died in non-combat accidents during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Thirty-six Britons died in combat and 39 Saudi Arabians. Other coalition participants had smaller numbers of military deaths.

In addition, refugees exceeding one million were displaced by the Iraq occupation of Kuwait and the war that followed. Some died as a result, and most of the others suffered physical hardships. Displaced workers, many with families residing in their homeland and dependent upon their support, endured lost of income.

**Other damage.** Kuwait City, Baghdad, and many other Iraqi cities and towns experienced tremendous loss of property. Replacement cost in Kuwait is estimated to be \$50 to \$100 billion. Most of Kuwait's oil wells were set ablaze by retreating Iraqis and much of its oil production facilities destroyed. Grave environmental damage has occurred.

A UN mission to Iraq in mid-March learned that 9,000 homes were destroyed or damaged beyond repair during the hostilities, displacing 72,000 persons. Virtually all sources of fuel and power are defunct. This adversely affects food delivery and production, hospital operations, and basic public services. Approximately 90 percent of industrial workers have been reduced to inactivity, and thus loss of income. Water supply in Baghdad is drastically reduced, and untreated sewage is now dumped directly into the Tigris River. The sole laboratory producing veterinary vaccines was destroyed and also seed warehouses, thus threatening future agricultural production. Summarizing its findings, the UN mission stated:

The recent conflict has wrought near-apocalyptic results upon the economic infrastructure

of what had been, until January 1991, a rather highly urbanized and mechanized society. Now, most means of modern life support have been destroyed or rendered tenuous. Iraq has, for some time to come, been relegated to a pre-industrial age, but with all the disabilities of post-industrial dependency on an intensive use of energy and technology.

Thus, the United States went far beyond a military campaign in aerial bombardment of Iraq. One of the intentions was to create conditions that would drive Saddam Hussein from office, but he survived as his people suffered.

**Global policeman.** As unfolded in the Persian Gulf, President Bush's new world order looks strangely like the old world order with its heavy reliance on military force. The United States has become a global policeman in the manner of its self-appointed role as policeman of the Western Hemisphere. For decades the United States has intervened militarily in Latin American when and where it chooses: Nicaragua, Grenada, and Panama in the 1980s, many other places previously. And now the world?

It's as if the Monroe Doctrine, warning all foreign powers to keep out of the U.S. domain in this hemisphere, has been given global extension. In this expanded format there may be window dressing of a UN vote and some allied support, but essentially the United States decides what is right and wrong, who shall rule and who shall be displaced. Rather than allowing the international community to work its will on aggressors like Saddam Hussein, the United States will decide when and where to use military force. The philosophy is "might makes right".

#### **A Contrasting Approach**

This approach is in stark contrast to the Social Principles of the United Methodist Church, as adopted by General Conference:

We believe war is incompatible with the teachings and example of Christ. We therefore reject war as an instrument of national foreign policy and insist the first moral duty of all nations is to resolve by peaceful means every dispute that arises between or among them.

United Methodists, in reciting "Our Social Creed", pledge:

We dedicate ourselves to peace throughout the world, to freedom for all peoples, and to the rule of justice and law among nations.

Comparing the United Methodist position with President Bush's description of a new world order, we find a common aspiration for *peace, freedom, and the rule of law*. Divergence occurs as the president stresses *security* while United Methodists place emphasis upon *justice*.

This is a significant difference. The "haves" worry about security while the "have-nots" crave justice. A society can be orderly, secure from enemy attack, but unjust. Slavery was orderly, but iniquitous. Communism created order but not freedom. To be worthy of pursuit and attainment, a new world order must strive not merely for security but also for social and economic justice, fulfillment of basic human rights, and full participation of the people in governance.

#### **Means and End**

A second major difference relates to the means for accomplishing the goals. The United Methodist Church makes peaceful dispute resolution the first moral duty of nations and rejects war as an instrument of foreign policy. United Methodist policy "categorically opposes interventions by more

powerful nations against weaker ones." To deal with aggressors, the United Methodist Church supports multilateral diplomatic efforts, regional and international negotiations, policies designed to isolate and quarantine nations consistently denying fundamental human rights, and complete or partial interruption of economic relations.

When Iraq invaded Kuwait, United Methodist and other church leaders in the United States denounced this aggression and supported sanctions in the form of an economic boycott. Most of them tacitly accepted the deployment of defensive forces to protect Saudi Arabia from invasion. Church leadership was unanimous in wanting the United Nations to play the leading role in finding a diplomatic resolution of Persian Gulf crisis.

But quickly U.S. military deployment moved beyond defensive role to encompass offensive capability. This capacity steadily grew in size and firepower. Rather than allowing the United Nations to lead the international coalition, the United States took the dominant position and maneuvered the UN Security Council to support what the U.S. wanted done. President Bush rejected negotiations. Instead of patiently waiting for sanctions to work, he initiated a military counterattack as the primary method for dealing with Iraq's aggression.

Thus, we find stark contrasts of what kind of world order to seek: Bush's preeminent concern for security, the United Methodist goal of justice. And also how to achieve it: military might versus peaceful means of dispute resolution and nonviolent sanctions.

#### **FOUNDATION STONES**

We reject a world order achieved by the United States policing the globe with military might. Instead, we offer an alternative vision of what a new world order might look like. We begin by describing the foundation on which a world order should be erected.

##### **One God**

God is the world's true foundation. One God for the whole Universe, eternal and present everywhere.

God is a creative force, working through vast periods of time to form galaxies, stars, planets, life in richly varied and evolving forms. God is a living presence, accessible to all here and now. God is love-force, reaching out to everyone, suffering as humans suffer -- for suffering is an inevitable aspect of loving.

A special tragedy in the Middle East is the antagonism prevailing between the three branches of Abraham's family: Jews, Christians, Muslims. All three are monotheistic by affirming One God for the Universe. It is the same God, not three different "one-gods". Eternal God is a reality transcending complete human comprehension, unrestricted by creedal formulation, not circumscribed by ritual.

##### **God's People**

All the people of Earth are God's people. Everyone. As Jesus taught, "God makes the sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous." God may judge, may suffer when some persons are cruel to others, but God never totally forsakes. This steadfast love derives from God's true nature and is not dependent upon human belief, creed, or conduct.

Whom God loves -- and that is everybody -- deserve respect and fair treatment. For God an American life is not more precious than an Iraqi life, or a Russian life, or a Japanese life, or whoever the

current U.S. adversary is. For that reason, a military policy that bombs a city (Hiroshima, Baghdad) in order to "save American lives" is morally wrong.

Moreover, as the Quakers say, there is that of God in everyone. By the very nature of the Universe, the spark of the divine is implanted in every human being. Although sometimes excessive ego, anger, and hatred nearly smothers it, this spark is inextinguishable. When we kill a human being, we kill something of God.

### **One World**

Having one God, we share a common humanity. Within this oneness, humankind is richly varied in physical appearance, language, custom, culture, occupation, intellectual achievement, spiritual attainment, religious belief and practice. But these differences need not destroy our fundamental unity.

Furthermore, we share the same planet, a single biosphere. We exist in an interdependent world economy. Truly, as the United Methodist Social Principles state, "God's world is one world."

This One World perspective attracted a lot of attention during World War II as people looked ahead to the post-war period. Instead of Axis Powers (Germany, Italy, and Japan) warring against the Allies (United States, Great Britain, USSR, and others), could not we achieve global unity? This was the inspiration for establishing the United Nations.

But alas, a new division occurred: the Communist bloc (Soviet Union, its satellites, China) versus the North Atlantic alliance. Instead of one world there were two. And soon it became apparent that a huge portion of humankind was not part of either bloc but occupied a Third World, less developed and in many places in the process of throwing off the yoke of colonialism.

For 45 years the first two worlds -- East and West -- engaged in a Cold War that absorbed vast resources for military preparedness but never fought one another in direct combat. However, the two sides were involved, directly or indirectly, in many of the 136 wars occurring between 1945 and 1990, mostly in Third World countries.

The Cold War is over, though a lot of the military apparatus remains in place. Also persisting is the less-developed Third World, struggling to improve living conditions and suffering from an inadequate share of global resources. Global competition has shifted from East-West to North-South. North symbolizes the wealthier developed nations, especially Europe, North America, and Japan. South consists of the less developed nations of South America, Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia.

Disparities between North and South must be addressed if we are to have truly one World. It is a matter that cannot be resolved by military force. Indeed, waste of resources in military spending by North and South alike interferes with bringing about a just world order.

### **Freedom and Justice**

We Americans, in saluting our flag, pledge our allegiance to "one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." As global citizens, we should also pledge our allegiance to

"one World, under God, indivisible,  
with liberty and justice for all."

Or, we can use "freedom" as a simile for "liberty".

Freedom is essential for a new world order, for it provides a social climate in which people can

develop their potential and can flourish. Freedom permits people to read what they want, to speak their minds even to the extent of criticizing persons in authority, to form associations for a wide variety of purposes, to worship as they choose, to assemble peacefully for their own reasons, to travel where they like.

Freedom places restrictions on government and other institutions, thus protecting the citizenry from arbitrary power and the abuse of authority. Freedom assures that people cannot be arrested and detained capriciously. Freedom respects the privacy of people's homes.

Justice is also essential for a new world order so as to give people a fair opportunity to use the freedom they possess. Justice demands that everyone has adequate food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities of life. Justice requires that all persons have fair access to education, employment, health care, and other kinds of opportunity that provide for human fulfillment.

Justice deplors wide disparities between the richest and the poorest members of a society, especially where the poor are deprived life's necessities. Likewise justice is concerned about inequities between North and South and seeks a fairer distribution of the world's resources.

Without justice, freedom is not truly available to all. Without justice, society is only half-free. And without justice, true peace is not possible. The United Methodist Social Creed, quoted earlier, recognizes this triple linkage by making a commitment to:

- Peace throughout the world,
- Freedom for all peoples, and
- The rule of justice and law among nations.

This is the true foundation for a new world order of God's people living together in One World.

#### LESSONS FROM PERSIAN GULF WAR

We aspire for a peaceful world, but we have just lived through a highly destructive war in the Middle East. A dozen more wars are occurring in different parts of the globe. Elsewhere armies and guerrilla forces are ready to fight. Oppressive regimes are subjugating their own people. Civil unrest is stirring in many countries.

So we must ask: does war have to be a permanent feature of human existence? How do we respond to aggression if not with military force? How do we deal with tyrants and oppressors? How do we cope with forces inclined fight?

Our response is: War is not inevitable. Disputes between and within nations can and should be handled without resort to war.

Certainly war is not "the continuance of politics by other means" -- the aphorism of General Karl von Clausewitz, the 19th century Prussian strategist. It's this thinking that led the Bush administration to push the UN Security Council to authorize "all necessary means" as a euphemism for use of force to drive Iraq from Kuwait.

It would be much truer to state that war occurs because of the failure of politics. Rather than being an extension of the political process, war enters another mode of interaction. War starts after politics falters.

That's the key lesson of the Persian Gulf War. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait came about because of historic political failure, for which many parties are responsible. World response after the invasion

had initial success in preventing further conflict, but then subsequent political failure resulted in further war that cost over 100,000 human lives.

### **Wrong Conclusions**

Unfortunately many are drawing two wrong conclusions from the Persian Gulf War. First, that the United States can lick anybody in the world because of its superior military technology. Second, that, therefore, the United States should maintain a sizable military force to intervene anywhere on Earth to thwart aggressors.

On the first point, Rear Admiral Eugene J. Carroll, Jr. (U.S. Navy, ret.) from the Center for Defense Information points out that it wasn't high-tech but rather enormous explosive power that defeated Iraq. The daily rate of explosive power used during the 43 day Gulf War exceeded the average daily rate for all of World War II, which was fought in the vastly wider European and Pacific theaters of operation. It was this tremendous volume, not technical prowess, that defeated Iraq.

The Pentagon was very selected in videotapes released, showing laser-guided bombs going down ventilation shafts and through bunker doors but not displaying any misses. But after fighting ceased the U.S. Air Force admitted that the so-called "smart bombs" accounted for only seven percent of the explosive tonnage dropped on Iraq and occupied Kuwait. Although these bombs were reported to be 90 percent accurate, the much larger number of unguided bombs hit their targets only 25 percent of the time. Consequently it took many tries to knock out bridges and destroy other targets, with resulting damage to surrounding civilian areas.

Moreover, high-tech satellite reconnaissance didn't reveal that 400 civilians were huddled in a structure that the U.S. judged to be a military command post. U.S. planes bombed the structure and killed the innocents.

Secondly, victory over an overrated lightweight doesn't give the United States either the right or the responsibility to become the world's policeman. We'll return to this point later.

### **Pre-Invasion Failures**

The Persian Gulf War came about because of an accumulation of political failure extending back 70 years. This failure is a complex interaction of forces indigenous to the Middle East and intervening acts by outside powers. At the risk of oversimplification, we highlight some of the main factors that led to war rather than peaceful resolution of conflict. We offer them to explain, not to justify aggressive actions.

(1) **Lingering grievances of colonial decisions.** The Ottoman Turks controlled the Arabian Peninsula from the 17th century until World War I. The British took over under a League of Nations mandate and set national boundaries for the region. Repeatedly Iraq has tried to break out of the British-drawn boundaries. In the 1930s Iraq's king unsuccessfully sought union with Kuwait. The Republic, which replaced the monarchy in 1958, tried again in 1961 after Kuwait gained its independence from the British mandate, even massing troops along the border until countered first by British troops and then an Arab force without a fight. In 1973 Iraq initiated a border skirmish to back a claim to the Kuwaiti islands of Warbah and Bubyhan, but to no avail. Two years after Saddam Hussein became president in 1978, he declared war on Iran to gain Gulf access and other territory. Iraq's invasion of Kuwait on August 2, 1990 was another takeover attempt.



**(2) Economic exploitation.** Foreign oil companies gained immense, virtually unrestricted profits until the 1950s when Arab nationalists demanded and receive a larger share. This led to a disparity between oil-rich and oil-poor states in the region. Some invested significantly in domestic improvements, others did not. Oil prosperity made ruling families extremely rich. Iraq used oil profits to pay for its huge military buildup.

**(3) Unresolved Arab-Jewish rivalry.** When the United Nations partitioned the former British mandate of Palestine in 1948 to create a Jewish state and an Arab state, several Arab nations went to war to prevent the establishment of Israel. The UN ended the fight and admitted Israel in 1949. Since then Israel has felt continuously threatened by hostile Arab states. Six times war has erupted (1956, 1967, 1969, 1973, 1978, and 1982) and numerous skirmishes have occurred. Throughout this period Palestinians have sought self-determination in a homeland of their own and have resented living under Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, which came about in the 1967 war. With this conflict unresolved, Saddam Hussein could appear to champion the Palestinian cause in his effort to gain Arab support against the United States during the Gulf War. (He had more success with the populace than with governments.)

**(4) Intrusion of the Cold War.** Overlaying national rivalries in the Middle East has been the Cold War rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union. The United States has consistently supported Israel and has also supplied arms to most Arab states at one time or another. The Soviet Union has provided military and economic assistance to various Arab nations since 1956, especially Syria and Iraq. Egypt was a Soviet client from the 1950s until 1973 and then switched to the United States. Sometimes American assistance has gone to the same Arab nation that the Soviets are helping, such as to Iraq during the 1980s when Iraq was fighting Iran.

**(5) Unrestricted arms sales.** In addition to the United States and the Soviet Union, other nations and private entrepreneurs have supplied weapons to Middle Eastern nations. France has been a major supplier of Iraq, and so has China. Weapons and technology have also come from Great Britain, Germany, Italy, Brazil, Argentina, South Africa. Profits seem to be the principal motivation.

**(6) Doctrine of "greater enemy".** The United States has often allied itself with dictators and totalitarian regimes in order to oppose tyrants and aggressor nations deemed even worse. With Stalin against Hitler. With a host of right-wing dictators against insurgents pressing for economic reform, oftentimes thought to be Communist. In the 1980s the U.S. government considered Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini to be one of its worst enemies and therefore aided Saddam Hussein by supplying intelligence information, civilian aircraft, and agricultural products. In 1987 when a French-made, Iraqi missile struck the U.S. Frigate Stark in the Persian Gulf and killed 37 sailors, the United States accepted Saddam's apology. When the Iraqi military gassed its own citizens, the Kurds, in 1988, the U.S. government offered no criticism.

**(7) Incoherent oil policies.** Factors of world oil policies form a significant background of the Persian Gulf War. First, in the spring of 1990 Iraq accused of other OPEC member states of overproducing oil, thus lowering the price of Iraq's oil. In July Saddam Hussein threatened to use force against Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates to make them stop overproduction. Second, the United States has retained a dependence on Gulf oil by abandoning some promising initiatives of the 1970s for

energy conservation and renewable energy sources. This made the U.S. vulnerable to a cutoff of its Middle East oil supply.

**(8) Absence of international process for dispute resolution.** In July 1990 Iraq began massing troops along Kuwait border to reinforce its demand for (a) curtailed oil production, (b) reimbursement for oil that Iraq alleged Kuwait was taking from the border-straddling Rumalia oil field, and (c) Gulf access, including control of the two islands. At this time OPEC was in disarray. The Arab League could conceivably have mediated the dispute but didn't. The United Nations lacked the machinery for quick-response dispute resolution. Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union attempted a major diplomatic effort to resolve the dispute and prevent outbreak of war.

**(9) Lack of international peacekeeping force.** By July 31, 1990 Iraq had 100,000 troops on the Kuwait border. When a similar, though smaller, Iraqi troop deployment occurred in 1961, Great Britain returned some troops to protect Kuwait and then turned the task over to the Arab League. This time, Kuwait, other Arab League members, and the United States seemed to think that Saddam was bluffing and wouldn't invade. Even if they had taken him seriously, there was no emergency peacekeeping force readily available -- not with the Arab League, the United Nations, nor any other international arrangement. And there was no process for assembling a truly international defensive force rapidly if Kuwait had put out a call for help.

This "what-if" list is lengthy. If negotiated solutions to the persistent issues could have been achieved and if dispute resolution processes and a peacekeeping force had been available, Iraq's invasion of Kuwait probably would not have been prevented. They weren't, and Iraqi troops moved into Kuwait on August 2. War occurred because of accumulated political failure. Such failure could have been avoided but wasn't.

#### **Post-Invasion Successes**

The response of the world community to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait had a number of political successes even though eventually the assembled Coalition rejected a political solution and went to war to force Iraq out of Kuwait.

**(1) Widespread condemnation of Iraq.** On August 2, 1990, the day of Iraq's invasion, the UN Security Council held an emergency session and passed a resolution condemning the invasion and demanding immediate withdrawal. On August 3 the ministerial council of the League of Arab States voted 12 to 9 to condemn the invasion, called for withdrawal, and urged an Arab solution to the crisis. Subsequently the United States and the Soviet Union worked together in a manner unprecedented for the Middle East. Over the following months the UN Security Council passed ten other resolutions related to peaceful settlement of the dispute.

**(2) Rapid deployment of defensive forces.** On August 7 the United States began deploying warplanes and troops into Saudi Arabia and ships to the Persian Gulf to prevent Iraqi forces from moving into Saudi Arabia. The USSR, Great Britain, and France also sent ships into the Gulf. As U.S. church leaders came to grips with the crisis, most accepted defensive deployment under UN authorization, though strict pacifists were bothered by this display of military force. In the ensuing months a consensus emerged among church bodies that the mobilized forces should be used only for defensive purposes and not for offensive action. Many U.S. peace organizations gave tacit acceptance

to this position, but some radical groups saw U.S. intervention as another case of U.S. imperialism.

**(3) Working through the United Nations.** After many years of falling under the shadow of US/Soviet rivalry, the United Nations Security Council came to the forefront during the Gulf crisis. It passed a dozen resolutions, including authorization of economic boycott and use of force. Although the United States was oftentimes the initiator and on the latter exerted lots of pressure to gain votes, at least the U.S. felt that UN support was essential -- something it had not always believed in similar situations (such as Nicaragua, Grenada, Panama).

**(4) Effective use of sanctions.** The economic sanctions against Iraq achieved unprecedented completeness, totally shutting down Iraq's oil export and blocking importation of many vital supplies. Within four months the Iraq gross national product was cut in half, and shortages of many important materials, such as additives for gasoline, had appeared. That's why some important retired military officers and former defense officials testified to Congress that the boycott deserved a much longer application before resorting to offensive military action.

**(5) Israeli restraint.** After US-initiated attacks against Iraq began in January 1991 and in return Iraq launched scud missiles at Israel, the Israeli government decided not to retaliate. This was unusual because Israel has always been quick to respond to such provocation. This restraint kept the war from becoming a major Arab-Jewish conflagration.

#### **Post-Invasion Failures**

In spite of these political successes, all-out war in the Persian Gulf broke out on January 16, 1991. From our perspective, we judge this to be a failure because we believe that the war was not inevitable. We maintain that the objective of forcing Iraq out of Kuwait could have been achieved through longer patience with economic sanctions and with skillful diplomacy. We insist that this course should have been pursued with greater patience and wisdom rather than embarking upon a war that killed more than 100,000 people.

Saying this, we recognize that the Bush administration had two other objectives that went beyond the UN resolutions: to destroy Iraq's military capacity and to remove Saddam Hussein from office. Initially these objectives tended to be stated obliquely, but as the war progressed it was clear that military destruction was a clearcut aim and President Bush became more open about wanting Saddam's ouster.

Because of this different view of objectives, what we see as political failure in stopping war, President Bush and his advisors may perceive as success in war preparation. Nevertheless, we make our judgment related to the peaceful-resolution objective because it helps us better consider what it will take to achieve our vision of a new world order. Accordingly, we suggest the following set of political failures in handling the Gulf crisis.

**(1) Demonization of Saddam Hussein.** From the beginning President Bush has spoken of Saddam Hussein as the epitome of evil, likening him to Adolf Hitler, the archenemy of World War II. Saddam has reciprocated by saying Bush is the embodiment of Satan. This is a technique to bolster a war-fighting mentality, not resolve outstanding issues. In contrast Martin Luther King, Jr., in a sermon "Loving Your Enemies" written while in a Georgia jail, said, "we must recognize that the evil deed of the enemy-neighbor, the thing that hurts, never quite expresses all that he is. An element of

goodness may be found even in our worst enemy."

**(2) Refusal to negotiate.** Constantly throughout the crisis Bush was adamant about not negotiating with Saddam Hussein. He made absolute demands and refused to making any adjustments that would make possible a satisfactory peaceful settlement. This contrasts with the way that President John F. Kennedy handled the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, which was an even graver threat to U.S. security. Averell Harriman counseled that in dealing with Khrushchev, "If we do nothing but get tougher and tougher, we will force him into countermeasures. We must give him an out." This reinforced Kennedy's own inclination, and he told his staff, "We don't want to push him to a precipitous action. I don't want to put him in a corner from which he cannot escape."

**(3) Impatience with sanctions.** As noted earlier, one of the initial political successes was the breadth and depth of economic sanctions against Iraq. U.S. intelligence sources admitted that they were having a strong, deleterious effect on the Iraqi economy. Retired Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr., former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, testified, "If, in fact, the sanctions will work in 12 to 18 months instead of six months, the trade-off of avoiding war with its attendant sacrifices and uncertainties would in my estimate be worth it."

**(4) Offensive military buildup.** In the first month of deployment the United States placed offensive weapons in Saudi Arabia, such as stealth fighter-bombers, attack helicopters, and heavy tanks. In October Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney began talking about sending an additional 100,000 troops to bolster the 200,000 already there. Two days after the fall election President Bush announced deployment of 200,000 more, including strengthening of offensive capability. Shortly thereafter another former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, retired Air Force General David C. Jones, expressed a concern that this action "might cause us to fight, perhaps prematurely and perhaps unnecessarily." The 400,000 troops assigned to the Gulf left too few at home to achieve troop rotation, and therefore pressure built for quick initiation of offensive action.

**(5) Misuse of the United Nations.** Although the United States worked through the UN Security Council, the U.S. absolutely refused to consider placing any of the forces under UN command. The Secretary General was never given broad authority to seek a negotiated settlement even though he visited Iraq in August and January. By November when the Bush administration was clearly committed to initiating offensive action, the United States put tremendous pressure on Security Council members in order to gain their vote. This included weakening criticism of China's human rights violations and promising economic aid to some smaller nations. The determination of the date to begin bombing and to embark upon a ground offensive was essentially left in U.S. hands.

**(6) Pernicious doctrine of strategic bombing.** Since the 1920s, military theorists have propounded the notion of strategic bombing. The idea is to destroy military bases, weapons factories, transportation networks, and the basic industrial base of an enemy and thus undermine warfighting capability. This contrasts with the older approach of defeating enemy forces on the battlefield. At its extreme the doctrine of strategic bombing encompasses wholesale destruction of cities in order to demoralize the enemy. During World War II both sides took it to this degree, such as the prolonged Nazi bombing of London, Allied destruction of many German cities, and U.S. attacks on Japan, culminating in the obliteration of Hiroshima and Nagasaki with atomic bombs.

Intending not merely to drive Iraq out of Kuwait but also to destroy Iraq's war-making capacity, the United States and its coalition partners embarked upon a relentless strategic attack on the Iraqi homeland. Bombs and missiles were directed at airfields, weapon production facilities (including chemical and nuclear), conventional weapons, command and control centers, railroads and bridges, basic urban utilities, such as electricity, water supply, and sewage treatment. While housing wasn't directly targeted, many of the facilities on the hit list were located in populated areas. Because bombs and missiles were not unfailingly accurate, thousands of civilians died in the attack. U.S. military spokesmen shielded this result by referring to unintended "collateral" damage, but real human beings suffered death and injury.

Such is the horrible product of a war brought on by historic political failure and brought to the level of intensive fighting by contemporary political failure to have the patience and skill to settle the dispute in a peaceful fashion.

#### SEARCH FOR ALTERNATIVES

The Bush administration is using its military victory in the Persian Gulf to make the case for a greater supply of high-tech weapons and a sizable interventionist force that can deploy rapidly to any spot on the globe to put down aggressors and protect American interests. But, as we have noted, this is the wrong lesson to draw from this war.

If not the Bush Doctrine of having U.S. military forces available to enforce a Pax Americana, what then do we advocate? How should we respond to aggression? How should we deal with tyrants and oppressors? How should we achieve peaceful resolution of dispute? How do we cope with disorder if not with military force?

#### A Bit of Analysis

To begin we must think smart. We must realize that the world is complex and that no single solution is applicable in all circumstances. Accordingly, it is useful to analyze the nature of recent wars and their causes and then to figure out ways to cope with different types of conflict that are likely to occur in the future.

**Types and causes of war.** Since the end of World War II, political failure has resulted in 136 wars. This is the count provided by William Eckhardt of the Lentz Peace Research Laboratory, who defines war as "armed conflict including one or more governments and causing the deaths of 1,000 or more people per year." These wars have caused 22,166,000 million deaths, 63 percent of them civilians.

Eckhardt classifies war into four principal types, as shown in Table 1. Of the 136 wars from 1945 to 1990, most numerous (95) were civil wars, that is, armed conflict within a nation. Least frequent (3) were imperial wars where a nation invaded another less-powerful country (as Iraq did Kuwait). There have been 22 international wars with fighting between nations possessing about equal strength (such as in Korea and Vietnam). Colonies seeking freedom from imperial control resulted in 16 wars, mostly in the earlier part of the post-World War II period.

Table 1. Wars by Type, 1945 to 1990.

#### Number   Type

3 Imperial (conquest of an inferior power)

22 *International* (armed conflict between nations  
more or less equal in strength)

16 *Colonial* (a conquered colony trying to free  
itself from imperial control)

95 *Civil* (armed conflict within a nation)

136

As to the reasons for going to war, Table 2 shows how Eckhardt classifies the principal causes of the 136 wars occurring between 1945 and 1990.

Table 2. *Causes of Wars, 1945-90.*

Number Cause

36 *Territorial fighting* (including land, labor,  
capital and trade disputes)

18 *Independence* (wars of liberation)

33 *Leftist attack on government*

16 *Rightist attack on government*

19 *Ethnic and religious conflict*

14 *Power struggle relative free of ideology*

136

*Types of political failure.* As we have pointed out, war is a result of political failure. The different causes can be grouped into four kinds of political failure.

- Failure of colonial powers to accept the necessity of decolonization and to effect a peaceful transition.
- Failure to resolve disputes within nations between (a) ethnic and religious groups, (b) ideological contenders ("Left" and "Right"), and (c) other kinds of groups competing for power.
- Failure to protect small countries from invasion by larger ones.
- Failure to resolve disputes between nations with approximately equal power when one or both sides is threatening to go to war.

A new world order must be able to deal with these situations.

In the years ahead the first two are likely to blend together because virtually all of the possibilities for a war of independence occur within federated nations where a component republic wants to be free, such as in the USSR, Yugoslavia, and perhaps in some African nations composed of different tribes. In these circumstances, a war of independence is virtually like a civil war.

Direct military intervention by outsiders in civil wars to support one of the contestants is inappropriate. So is covert military assistance (like U.S. aid to the Nicaraguan contras) and also covert attempts to assassinate disliked rulers. Rather the good offices of an international or regional body could be available to help the sides resolve their dispute. However, if the conflict is a result of egregious human rights violations by the ruling government, some form of international sanctions might be appropriate to put on pressure for reform.

As in the past 45 years so also in the coming years, the second two situations -- invasion of a small nation by a larger one and more complex international wars -- are less likely to occur than civil wars. But they are also larger and more disruptive to global peace. It is these situations that a new world order must be particularly able to handle.

#### INSTRUMENTS FOR PEACE

In place of interventionist military forces, other instruments are needed if we are to have a peaceful and just world order. At the same time we should get rid of the warfighting capacity of nation-states. These two major thrusts must occur simultaneously, for one reinforces the other.

##### ***Curtailement of Warfighting Capacity***

The world is now far too heavily armed for its own good. This makes it possible for aggressive nations to attack their neighbors, or at least to intimidate them. Rather than resolving disputes amicably, nations with warfighting capacity are tempted to settle their differences with military means.

**Halt world arms trade.** Iraq on its own could not have manufactured the weaponry used in its invasion of Iran and Kuwait. Weapons and technology came from many different nations and private entrepreneurs. The same is true with Iran, Syria, Israel, and Egypt, and with other well-armed nations in the Third World. Indeed, this process is continuing. It is a matter of profits for manufacturers and arms traders, and it is part of the habit of thinking that armament provides security.

A commitment to halt the world arms trade should be a major part of the quest for a new world order. It can begin by an embargo on new arms sales and transfers to the Middle East. This can extend to other regions. Governments of the major supplier nations should take the lead by halting their direct sales and transfers and by curtailing private manufacturers and traders who are their nationals.

**Curb proliferation of dangerous weapons.** There is a special need to block the spread of weapons of mass destruction -- chemical, biological, nuclear -- and also the broader availability of ballistic missiles. This has been happening partly with outside assistance, but some nations are developing indigenous capacity to produce these weapons. Therefore, in addition to halting arms trade there is a need for regional and global agreements for nonproliferation.

Such a treaty exists for nuclear weapons, but not every nation subscribes to it, such as, Israel, India, Pakistan, South Africa, France, and China. Universal coverage is needed. Also, the existing nuclear weapon states should make substantial reduction in their nuclear arsenal, for this was part of the agreement when the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was adopted in the late 1960s. In addition, a worldwide, comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons testing should reinforce nonproliferation efforts.

To round out the regime against dangerous weapons, thorough enforcement is needed for the international Biological Weapons Convention of 1972, and completion of negotiations for an international Chemical Weapons Convention and its enforcement should be accomplished.

**Achieve substantial arms reduction.** It is not enough to halt arms trade and curb proliferation. Serious efforts must be made to greatly reduce the existing supply of weaponry and to demobilize large

numbers of military personnel. The United States and the Soviet Union could set a good example by making more rapid headway in the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons, and European-North Atlantic nations could make quicker progress in demilitarizing Europe. This process can then extend around the globe, perhaps proceeding region by region. The Middle East is particularly ripe for arms reduction.

Global disarmament should be a fundamental part of a new world order.

### **Dispute Resolution**

Along with disarmament we should gain greater capability for resolution of disputes that draw nations into war. This is a special need in the Middle East with the long-standing Arab-Jewish rivalry, competition among Arab states and with Iran, and conflict among oil-rich and oil-poor nations. And one can take a tour around the world and find other long-standing conflict: India and Pakistan, in Southeast Asia and Korea, in Africa and Central America.

By and large emphasis should be upon international processes and instruments for dispute resolution rather than unilateral intervention.

**United Nations.** The UN Charter has provisions for conciliation, mediation, and arbitration but lacks procedures for either a disputing party or the UN itself to initiate mediation or arbitration. This process should be strengthened and a trained corps of mediators should be developed and made available to disputants.

**World Court.** Similarly the International Court of Justice (World Court) should be used more extensively in settling disputes that threaten international peace. For this to happen many more nations should accept its general compulsory jurisdiction. For instance, the Soviet Union has never accepted this jurisdiction, the United States withdrew its acceptance in 1985 after being charged with mining Nicaraguan harbors.

**Regional bodies.** In several parts of the world nations have formed regional bodies to deal with common problems: Organization of American States, Organization of African Unity, League of Arab States, and others. They have some experience in handling disputes among their members. Their role can and should be enhanced.

### **Peacekeeping Forces**

Along with dispute mediation and arbitration there is a need for international peacekeeping forces. They can be under auspices of the United Nations and also regional organizations.

The last 45 years have witnessed introduction of peacekeeping forces by UN and regional units into a number of international conflict situations and in some cases into nations with near anarchic conditions. In a study of this experience, Joseph Preston Baratta has offered a set of principles for peacekeeping, including the following:

- Introduction at the request of or with the consent of the governments in the dispute.
- Composition of contingents drawn from national armed forces, sometimes including police and civilians, but not usually the great powers or former colonial powers (except for airlift and supply).
- Non-interference in internal affairs.
- Strict impartiality in maintaining the agreement that brought the peacekeeping operation



into existence.

- Non-use of force, except in self-defense -- and even then with weapons limited to small arms.
- Purpose to stabilize a conflict in order to gain time for diplomacy to negotiate a permanent settlement.

The last two points deserve highlighting. An international peacekeeping force is not a combat unit but rather an impartial defensive unit standing between belligerents. Its influence is more moral than military, bringing enough stability to enable political processes to have more time to work. Being international, it tells the contending parties that other nations stand behind it. To this extent it is a tripwire, suggesting that an attack on the peacekeepers risks involvement of a wider array of nations, including potentially their military force.

Thus, suppose that Kuwait had been able to call in a UN peacekeeping force, armed only with handguns, at the end of July 1990, supported by a vote of the UN Security Council. It seems highly likely that Iraq would have held back its threatened invasion.

In the kind of conflicts we can expect during the 1990s there will be similar opportunities for peacekeeping units to prevent wars. They can also be useful after a ceasefire and during postwar peace negotiations.

### **Nonviolent Responses**

As we have seen in the Middle East in the recent war and in more than 40 years of Arab-Israel conflict, violence begets violence. Experience in many other parts of the globe teaches the same lesson. For that reason, we should make much greater use of nonviolent methods for responding to aggressors and tyrants.

**Economic sanctions.** In an analysis of 115 cases beginning with World War I, Gary C. Hufbauer, Kimberly A. Elliott, and Jeffrey J. Schott found that economic sanctions helped achieved economic foreign policy goals in 34 percent of the episodes. Rarely was the boycott as extensive and comprehensive as the one established against Iraq. This led the authors to predict in early January 1991 that sanctions could succeed against Iraq within one to two years. Acknowledging that a dictator like Saddam might be quite resistant, they cited a statement by the Italian Fascist leader, Benito Mussolini, that Italy would have been forced out of Ethiopia in 1935-36 if the League of Nations had included oil in its sanctions.

After the Gulf War was over, Representative Lee Hamilton, who led the effort in the U.S. House of Representatives to give sanctions more time to work, pointed out that just because aerial bombardment and a short ground war yielded a military victory, this does not mean that the alternative strategy of economic sanctions and diplomatic pressure was wrong. It could have been successful, he and others insist, and without the tremendous cost in human deaths. Furthermore, he noted that every tough issue on the Middle East agenda, except for the occupation of Kuwait, remains unresolved.

**Nonviolent defense.** "In recent years," according to the Civilian-Based Defense Association, "oppressed people in many different countries have curbed the power of their governments by means of largely nonviolent public protest, refusal to cooperate, and massive civil disobedience." This experience teaches valuable lessons for designing a new kind of national defense. Noncooperation, strikes,

boycotts, and other forms of nonviolence resistance could be used to thwart invaders and make it impossible for them to govern. Gene Sharp has pulled together many historic cases where nonviolent action prevailed over invasion or a tyrannical government. He lists 198 techniques that have been used and can be replicated by others.

The U.S. Catholic bishops in 1983 and the United Methodist bishops in 1986 recommended further study of this method of alternative defense. Likewise did the Presbyterian General Assembly in 1988 and the World Council of Churches in 1989. Because means are related to ends, a nonviolence response has a surer chance of producing a peaceful result than violence, which seems to beget a never-ending cycle of violence.

### **Justice**

Another significant part of a new world order must be the quest for justice -- economic, social, political. In many lands injustice remains as a legacy of colonialism. Foreign rule has ended, but unjust arrangements set up by the colonial power still exist -- such as boundaries that ignore ethnic groupings and natural geography, racial division, economic control of key resources by a small group. Other cases of injustice around the world feature corrupt and authoritarian regimes, controlled by a narrow elite who disrespect fundamental human rights and oppress their own people.

Another cause of injustice is the maldistribution of resources between rich nations and poor ones, between developed nations and developing ones, globally between North and South. Heavy Third World debt is part of this problem. These are matters that go beyond militarism but are compounded by excessive global military expenditures. The concerns of peace and justice intersect in the necessity of shifting national budget priorities from military to human and community needs.

In the 1990s we must realize that justice is the foundation for peace, that the elimination of injustice in developing nations should be on the working agenda of peacemakers as well as justice advocates. Major shifts in national budget priorities are essential. Needed is a renewed commitment to international assistance, predicated upon self-determination and responsive efforts by recipients.

Unless justice is achieved, true peace is not possible. The prophet Isaiah wrote that when the Spirit is poured upon us from on high,

Then justice will dwell in the wilderness,  
and righteousness abide in the fruitful field.  
And the effect of righteousness will be peace,  
and the result of righteousness, quietness and trust for ever.  
My people will abide in a peaceful habitation,  
in secure dwellings, and in quite resting places.

All the people of Earth will have peaceful habitation when justice prevails, for they are all God's people.

*This issue of **Peace Leaf** was written by Howard W. Hallman, executive director of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.*

### **This Is My Song**

This is my song, O God of all the nations,  
a song of peace for lands afar and mine.  
This is my home, the country where my heart is;  
here are my hopes, my dreams, my holy shrine;  
but other hearts in other lands are beating  
with hopes and dreams as true and high as mine.

My country's skies are bluer than the oceans,  
and sunlight beams on cloverleaf and pine;  
but other lands have sunlight too, and clover,  
and skies are everywhere as blue as mine.  
O hear my song, thou God of all the nations,  
a song of peace for their land and for mine.

-- Lloyd Stone, 1934

### **On Hearing Funeral Bells**

No man is an island,  
entire to itself;  
Every man is a piece of the continent,  
a part of the main.  
If a clod be washed away by the sea,  
Europe is the less.

Any man's death diminishes me,  
because I am involved in mankind.  
And therefore never send to know  
for whom the bell tolls.  
It tolls for thee.

-- John Donne, 1623

### **Means and End**

*The means may be likened to a seed,  
the end to a tree;  
And there is just the same inviolable connection  
between the means and the end  
As there is between the seed and the tree.*

-- Mohandas K. Gandhi, 1909

### *Loving Your Enemies*

*We must not seek to defeat or humiliate the enemy  
but to win his friendship and understanding.*

*At times we are able to humiliate  
our worst enemy.*

*Inevitably, his weak moments come  
and we are able to thrust in his side  
the spear of defeat.*

*But this we must not do.*

*Every word and deed must contribute  
to an understanding with the enemy  
and to release of  
those vast reservoirs of goodwill  
which have been blocked  
by impenetrable walls of hate.*

*-- Martin Luther King, Jr., 1963.*

### *Shalom*

*Shalom is positive peace:*

*harmony, wholeness, health, and  
well-being in all human relationships.*

*It is the natural state of humanity  
as birthed by God.*

*It is harmony between humanity  
and all of God's creation.*

*All of creation is interrelated.*

*Every creature, every element, every force of nature  
creation.*

*If any persons is denied shalom,  
all are thereby diminished.*

*participates in the whole of*

*-- United Methodist Bishops, 1986*

*Prayers for Peace in the Middle East  
(prepared by a Christian, a Jew, a Muslim)*

*Eternal God,  
shepherd of every hope,  
refuge of every bewildered heart,  
and fountain of forgiveness  
for every contrite one,  
hear, we beseech thee, our prayer  
for peace in the Middle East.*

*Save us from weak resignation  
to violence.  
Teach us that restraint  
is the highest expression of power,  
that thoughtfulness and tenderness  
are marks of the strong.*

*Help us to love our enemies,  
not by countenancing their sins,  
but by remembering our own.  
And may we never for a moment forget  
that they are fed by the same food,  
hurt by the same weapons,  
have children for whom they  
have the same high hopes as do we.*

*O God, as Muslims, Jews and Christians  
we acknowledge that thou  
hast made of one blood  
all the nations of the earth.  
Thou dost love all of us  
as if all were but one,  
and dost care for each  
as if thou hadst naught else  
to care for.*

*Remembering such love,  
may we not weary in our efforts  
to fashion out of our failures today*

*some great good  
for all thy people tomorrow.  
And not unto us, O God,  
not unto us,  
but unto thy name  
be the glory.  
AMEN.*

*-- August 1990. U.S. Interreligious Committee for Peace  
in the Middle East, Greene & Westview, 3rd Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19119*

*O God, who makes peace and harmony  
in the heavenly spheres,  
help Your bewildered humanity understand  
the futility of war,  
and hatred and violence.*

*Help us to overcome the rationalizations  
that ultimately end  
in justification of actions  
which inevitably lead  
to bloodshed and suffering.*

*As hundreds of thousands of human beings  
look at their brothers and sisters  
over the barrels of guns,  
cannons and missiles,  
help us to hear Your voice  
which counsels compassion,  
patience and rational discourse.*

*How long, O loving God,  
will we continue to kill in Your name?  
How long will we refuse to register  
the unalterable fact that  
all human creatures on this earth  
are brothers and sisters?*

*Help us to understand  
that the search for peace  
and well-being is not weakness  
nor lack of conviction  
but rather the only way  
to insure continued life  
on this planet upon which  
You have placed us.*

*Grant us the ability  
to find joy and strength  
not in the strident call to arms  
but in stretching out our arms*



*to grasp our fellow creatures  
in the striving for justice and truth.*

*You are Truth.*

*You require justice, mercy,  
compassion and love.*

*You are Love.*

*Help us prove ourselves worthy  
of Your creation,*

*God of all space  
and time and worlds.*

*AMEN*

*O God, Lord of the universe,  
All-merciful and Compassionate,  
have mercy upon us and illumine  
our way, our hearts and our minds  
in this hour of darkness.*

*O God, creator and sustainer of all things,  
Lord of infinite love, kindness and mercy,  
guide us to the way of love  
when hatred and pride appear to be  
the easier and more attractive way.*

*O God, cherisher and sustainer of all beings,  
sovereign Lord over all your creation,  
in your boundless mercy and care,  
teach us wisdom and compassion to face  
this threat of suffering, discord and death.  
Teach us, most holy creator,  
to love mercy and justice  
as you love mercy and justice.*

*O God, Lord of all dominion,  
in whose hand is all good,  
teach our leaders humility, wisdom  
and good judgment.  
Help us all  
to defuse this crisis peacefully  
before it plunges us into a whirlpool  
of senseless suffering, bloodshed and war.*

*O God, we give thanks to you  
for giving us this good earth  
as a sacred trust to enjoy and share  
with all your creatures.  
Help us to keep your trust  
and not destroy it.*

*Save us, our compassionate Lord,  
from our folly by your wisdom,  
from our arrogance by your forgiving love,  
from our greed by your infinite bounty, and*

*from our insecurity by your healing power.*

*O God, guide us to your ways,  
the ways of righteousness and peace.*

*Grant us peace, O Lord of peace.*

*Help us to do your will in our lives,  
in our relations and in our affairs.*

*Forgive us all your creatures in your mercy,  
and save us from our own evil.*

*Yours alone is all praise,  
all dominion and all power  
forever and ever.*

*AMEN*

Yes, I want to join Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

I'm enclosing my membership contribution of:

\$15    \$25    \$35    \$50    \$100    \$250    \$500    Other \$

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_  
Street (Route)      Apt.# (Box)      City      State      Zip

Local Church \_\_\_\_\_ Methodist Conference \_\_\_\_\_

Congressional Representative or District \_\_\_\_\_

Please return to Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
421 Seward Square, SE, Washington, DC 20003

[March 28, 1991]

## *News from Methodists United*

### *Middle East Peace Issues*

The Board of Directors of Methodists United for Peace with Justice held its semi-annual meeting in Washington, D.C. on March 15-16, 1991. In the early part of the meeting the directors reflected on the Persian Gulf War. We had opposed offensive action against Iraq, preferring instead to give nonviolent sanctions more time to pressure Iraq to leave Kuwait. Therefore, directors felt a sense of sorrow that war had occurred. They were especially concerned about the victims: Americans killed in action, other military deaths on both sides, Iraqi and Kuwaiti civilians killed, the plight of refugees from many nations. They noted the enormous physical destruction in Iraq and the need for relief.

**Relief.** From this discussion the Board adopted a resolution on Iraq relief, calling upon the United Methodist General Board of Global Ministries to organize delegations and work teams to visit Iraq with medical and relief supplies, working with Christian churches in Iraq. Local churches could take special offerings to purchase relief supplies, coordinated with the United Methodist Committee on Relief (UMCOR). The Board decided to share this resolution with annual conferences, which could adopt it and organize relief efforts.

**Arab-Israeli conflict.** The Board adopted a second resolution to seek ways for resolving Arab-Israeli conflict. Special attention was given to the need for negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians over legitimate concerns of both. The Board resolution also called for contributions to humanitarian aid to refugees and for opportunities to develop a deeper understanding of the beliefs and cultures of Muslims and Jews.

### *Other Issues*

Methodists United's Board of Directors agreed to continue our work for disarmament, giving particular attention to a comprehensive test ban, nonproliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and curtailment of arms sales and transfer. The Board committed Methodists United to support efforts enhancing the role of the United Nations in dispute resolution and peacekeeping. We will

continue our work on federal budget priorities, seeking more resources for urgent human needs and curtailing military spending. And we will support the United Methodist bishops' drug initiative.

### **Membership**

Readers of *Peace Leaf* who are not members of Methodists United are invited to join. A membership form is on page 11.

**Methodists United for Peace with Justice** is a Pan-Methodist association of laity and clergy engaged in education and advocacy on peace and justice issues.

**NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.** Rev. Dr. Edward W. Bauman, Elinor Bedell, Betty Bumpers, Dr. Gilbert Caldwell, Rev. Motlalepula Chabaku, Rev. Dr. Emmett Cocke, Jr., Bishop Judith Craig, Rev. Robert Edgar, Dr. Arthur Flemming, Dr. Alan Geyer, Grace Halsell, Geraldine Heilman, Edward Helm, Bishop J. Clinton Hoggard, Rev. Dr. Joshua Hutchins, Jr., Ethel R. Johnson, Bishop Leontine Kelly, Rev. Hae Jong Kim, Dr. W. Astor Kirk, Rev. Joseph Lowery, Bishop Felton E. May, Bishop C.P. Minnick, Eloise Folkers Nenon, Eldon Roe, Bishop Roy Sano, Rev. Thomas Starnes, Rev. Peter Sun, Bishop Frederick H. Talbot, Rev. Spencer Turnipseed, Bishop C. Dale White, Bishop Joseph Yeakel.

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS.** **Chair:** Sherman W. Harris; **Vice Chairs:** Doris Akers, Rev. Bruce K. Edwards, Rev. Lovenger Bowden; **Secretary:** Dr. John D. Copenhaver, Jr.; **Assistant Secretary:** Margaret Bryan; **Treasurer:** Howard W. Hallman; **Assistant Treasurer:** Rev. Carroll Chambliss. **Other Members:** Rev. Clifford A. Armour, Jr., Dr. Hilda Arndt, Rev. Joy E. Arthur, Delphinia Bowen, Kathy Brown, Rev. Grainger Browning, Rev. Joseph Davis, Rev. Dr. William Deveaux, Margaret Fertschneider, Edward Helm, Sue Herne, Rev. John M. Mecartney, Betty J. Nelson, Nancy Risch, Rev. William Robinson, Rollin L. Rothhaar, Rev. Cindy Tappan, Rev. Spencer Turnipseed, Rev. Howard Warriner, Rev. James H. Zeisloft. **Executive Director:** Howard W. Hallman.

*METHODISTS UNITED  
for Peace with Justice  
421 Seward Square, SE  
Washington, DC 20003  
2676*

*Nonprofit  
U.S. Postage Paid  
Washington, DC  
Permit No.*

*Peace Leaf  
January-March 1991*

## Policies for Peace and Justice in the 1990s

Not often in history do we get a second chance, but now we do. Suddenly hopes that shone brightly at the end of World War II, only to be extinguished by the Cold War, are being lit again.

After 45 years the promise of free elections in Eastern Europe, made in the Yalta agreement between Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin, is now being fulfilled. The United Nations, originally seen as an important instrument for keeping peace and dealing with aggression but then blocked from full effectiveness by superpower rivalry, is now playing a central role in the response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. Point Four of President Truman's 1949 inaugural address, offering economic and technical assistance to developing nations, can now be carried out for its own sake, not merely as an instrument of Cold War competition.

The 1990s, therefore, offer many opportunities to make significant progress for peace and justice. We will look at some of the possibilities in this and subsequent issues of *Peace Leaf*.

### Biblical Foundation

For Christians peace and justice policies in the 1990s should be built upon a biblical foundation. One of the best references for this task is the 1986 pastoral letter and foundation document of the United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. The following paragraphs extract highlights from the bishops' statement.<sup>1</sup>

#### Old Testament

"At the heart of the Old Testament is the testimony to *shalom*, that marvelous Hebrew word that means peace. But the peace of *shalom* is not negative or one-dimensional. It is much more than the absence of war. *Shalom* is positive peace: harmony, wholeness, health, well-being in all human relationships. It is the natural state of humanity as birthed by God. It is harmony between humanity and all of God's good creation. All of creation is interrelated. Every creature, every element, every force of nature participates in the whole of creation. If any person is denied *shalom*, all are thereby diminished."

"The Old Testament speaks of God's sovereignty in terms of covenant, more particularly the 'covenant of peace' with Israel, which binds that people to God's *shalom* (Isaiah 54:10; Ezekiel 37:26). In the covenant of *shalom*, there is no contradiction between justice and peace or between peace and security or between peace and security or between love and justice (Jeremiah 29:7). In Isaiah's prophecy, when 'the Spirit is poured upon us from on high,' we will know that these laws are one and indivisible:

Then justice will dwell in the wilderness

---

<sup>1</sup> The full statement of the bishop's "Biblical Foundations" is found on pages 23-30 of *In Defense of Creation*. A similar extract is found in the United Methodist General Conference resolution on "Peace with Justice as a Special Program", *The Book of Resolutions*, pp.557-559.



and righteousness abide in the fruitful field.  
And the effect of righteousness will be peace,  
and the result of righteousness, quietness and trust forever.  
My people will abide in a peaceful habitation,  
in secure dwellings, and in quite resting places.  
(Isaiah 32:16-18)

*Shalom*, then, is the sum total of moral and spiritual qualities in a community whose life is harmony with God's good creation."

"The sovereignty of God means that vengeance in human hands is evil. When in the Song of Moses Yahweh proclaims 'vengeance is mine,' the message is not that God is violent but rather that the people of God have no right to usurp God's powers of ultimate judgment (Deuteronomy 32:35)."

"Ezekiel and Isaiah (40-66) reaffirm God's creation and redemption as universal in scope. Narrow nationalism is repudiated. Servanthood is exalted as the hopeful path to *shalom*."

"Swords into plowshares, arms converted to food and death to life, no more wars or training for wars, peaceable kingdoms, joy and peace such that the trees clap their hands, new covenants written on the heart -- these are the radiant images of *shalom* at the visionary heights Old Testament prophecy. With these images we know that the Bible is really one Book. The images forecast the coming of One who will be the Prince of Peace."

#### **New Testament**

"And so he comes. He comes heralded by angels who sing: 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace!' He invokes the most special blessings upon peacemakers. He exalts the humanity of aliens. He commands us to love our enemies; for he knows, even if we do not, that if we hate our enemies, we bind and destroy ourselves. *Shalom*, after all, is the heart of God and the law of creation. It cannot be broken with impunity."

"New Testament faith presupposes a radical break between the follies, or much so-called conventional wisdom about power and security, on the one hand, and the transcendent wisdom of *shalom*, on the other. Ultimately, New Testament faith is a message of hope about God's plan and purpose for human destiny. It is a redemptive vision that refuses to wallow in doom."

"Paul's letters announce that Jesus Christ is 'our peace.' It is Christ who has 'broken down the dividing wall of hostility,' creating one humanity, overcoming enmity, so making peace (Ephesians 2:14-19). It is Christ who ordains a ministry of reconciliation. Repentance prepares us for reconciliation. Then we shall open ourselves to the transforming power of God's grace in Christ. Then we shall know what it means to be 'in Christ.' Then we are to become ambassadors to a new creation, a new Kingdom, a new order of love and justice (2 Corinthians 5:17-20).

"It is Christ who has 'disarmed the principalities and powers and made a public example of them, triumphing over them in him' (Colossians 2:15). To be citizens of this new Kingdom means that Christians are subject to conflicting loyalties -- loyalty to one's nation and its government and a transcending loyalty to the 'Governor of the whole universe' (John Wesley's term), whose law may compel us to challenge our nation and its policies.

"In Jesus Christ we know, when confronted with such conflicting loyalties, how costly the grace of

*God can be....Jesus never resorted to violence in his own defense. Somehow he had the power to forgive even his own killers. The Crucifixion is an eternal testimony to the transcendent power of forgiving love and nonviolence.*

*"The Crucifixion was initially a political event -- and a seeming defeat at that -- but it quickly became transformed into a theological event, the ultimate act of our redemption. Christ is forever 'making peace by the blood of his cross' (Colossians 1:19-20)."*

*"The Catholic bishops' pastoral letter on war and peace declares:*

*The resurrection of Jesus is the sign to the world that God indeed does reign, does give life in death, and that the love of God is stronger even than death (Romans 8:36-39)."*

*"The promise of peace envisioned by Israel's prophets of the Exile at the climax of the Old Testament is celebrated once more at the climax of the New Testament. The Revelation of John, in the darkest night of despair, sings of a new earth, radiant with infinite love and compassion, in which all nations and peoples come together peaceably before the Lord God and in which hunger and hurt and sorrow are no more (Revelation 7)."*

*[September 20, 1990]*

## Policies for Peace and Justice in the 1990s

The 1990s opened with momentous changes underway in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The Cold War was ending. Talk of military cutbacks and a peace dividend was widespread.

This prospect received a severe setback on August 2 when Iraq invaded Kuwait. The international community responded with economic boycott of Iraq under United Nations auspices and a military buildup in the Persian Gulf, at first mostly defensive but then with offensive capability added. As we go to press, a nasty war is a distinct possibility.

But even with this worst scenario, the 1990s still offer many opportunities to make significant progress for peace and justice. In this issue *Peace Leaf* we consider how Cold War militarism can be dismantled. In future issues we will look at peaceful settlement of regional disputes, strengthening international institutions, and achieving greater global justice.

### Biblical Foundation

For Christians peace and justice policies in the 1990s should be built upon a biblical foundation. For this task we follow the lead of the United Methodist Council of Bishops by extracting some passages from their 1986 foundation document *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*.<sup>1</sup>

#### Old Testament

"At the heart of the Old Testament," wrote the bishops, "is the testimony to *shalom*, that marvelous Hebrew word that means peace. But the peace of *shalom* is not negative or one-dimensional. It is much more than the absence of war. *Shalom* is positive peace: harmony, wholeness, health, well-being in all human relationships."

"The Old Testament speaks of God's sovereignty in terms of covenant...In the covenant of *shalom*, there is no contradiction between justice and peace or between peace and security or between peace and security or between love and justice (Jeremiah 29.7)...Ezekiel and Isaiah (40-66) reaffirm God's creation and redemption as universal in scope. Narrow nationalism is repudiated. Servanthood is exalted as the hopeful path to *shalom*....

When in the Song of Moses Yahweh proclaims 'vengeance is mine,' the message is not that God is violent but rather that the people of God have no right to usurp God's powers of ultimate judgment (Deuteronomy 32:35)."

"Swords into plowshares, arms converted to food and death to life, no more wars or training for wars, peaceable kingdoms, joy and peace such that the trees clap their hands, new covenants written on the heart -- these are the radiant images of *shalom* at the visionary heights Old Testament prophecy."

#### New Testament

The Prince of Peace comes. "He comes heralded by angels who sing: 'Glory to God in the

---

<sup>1</sup> The full statement of the bishop's "Biblical Foundations" is found on pages 23-30 of *In Defense of Creation*.

highest, and on earth peace!' He invokes the most special blessings upon peacemakers. He exalts the humanity of aliens. He commands us to love our enemies; for he knows, even if we do not, that if we hate our enemies, we bind and destroy ourselves. *Shalom*, after all, is the heart of God and the law of creation. It cannot be broken with impunity."

"Paul's letters announce that Jesus Christ is 'our peace.' It is Christ who has 'broken down the dividing wall of hostility,' creating one humanity, overcoming enmity, so making peace (Ephesians 2:14-19). It is Christ who ordains a ministry of reconciliation. Repentance prepares us for reconciliation....Then we are to become ambassadors to a new creation, a new Kingdom, a new order of love and justice (2 Corinthians 5:17-20)."

"In Jesus Christ we know, when confronted with...conflicting loyalties, how costly the grace of God can be....Jesus never resorted to violence in his own defense. Somehow he had the power to forgive even his own killers. The Crucifixion is an eternal testimony to the transcendent power of forgiving love and nonviolence."

"The promise of peace envisioned by Israel's prophets of the Exile at the climax of the Old Testament is celebrated once more at the climax of the New Testament. The Revelation of John, in the darkest night of despair, sings of a new earth, radiant with infinite love and compassion, in which all nations and peoples come together peaceably before the Lord God and in which hunger and hurt and sorrow are no more (Revelation 7)."

[December 18, 1990]

**NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT: THE ZERO OPTION  
NOW IS THE TIME!**

A Statement by the Board of Directors  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice

**Saying "No" to Nuclear Deterrence**

In 1986 the United Methodist Council of Bishops, after nearly two years of prayerful and penitent study, adopted a pastoral letter and foundation document entitled *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. The bishops' statement was deeply rooted in biblical faith. They wrote:

At the heart of the Old Testament is the testimony of *shalom*, that marvelous Hebrew word that means peace. But the peace that is *shalom* is not negative or one-dimensional. It is much more than the absence of war. *Shalom* is positive peace: harmony, wholeness, health, and well-being in all human relationships. It is the natural state of humanity as birthed by God. It is harmony between humanity and all of God's good creation. All of creation is interrelated. Every creature, every element, every force of nature participates in the whole of creation. If any persons is denied *shalom*, all are thereby diminished.<sup>1</sup>

New Testament faith presupposes a radical break between the follies, or much so-called conventional wisdom about power and security, on the one hand, and the transcendent wisdom of *shalom*, on the other. Ultimately, New Testament faith is message of hope about God's plan and purpose for human destiny. It is a redemptive vision that refuses to wallow in doom.<sup>2</sup>

Based upon this faith the bishops in their pastoral letter stated unequivocally that:

we say a clear and unconditional *No* to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing.<sup>3</sup>

The implication is clear. If nuclear weapons cannot be legitimately used for either deterrence or warfighting, no nation should possess them. Accordingly, in the foundation document the bishops indicated:

We support the earliest possible negotiation of phased but rapid reduction of nuclear arsenals, while calling upon all other nuclear-weapon states to agree to parallel arms reductions, to the eventual goal of a mutual and verifiable dismantling of all nuclear armaments.<sup>4</sup>

**The World Today**

---

<sup>1</sup> United Methodist Council of Bishops, *In Defense of Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just Peace*. Nashville: Graded Press, 1986. p. 24.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 28.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 92.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

Since 1986 remarkable events have occurred. The Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union has ended. The Berlin wall has fallen. Eastern Europe is free of Soviet control. Soviet forces are rapidly evacuating Eastern Europe and have already removed all nuclear weapons. The Warsaw Pact has dissolved. Elsewhere around the globe, confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union, and their allies, has ended. The Soviet Union is changing to the Union of Sovereign States (U.S.S.), committed to democracy and a free-market economy, although the transition has many uncertainties and potential instability.

The Cold War was the primary reason that the global nuclear arsenal grew to enormous size. The United States and the Soviet Union developed their fleets of strategic bombers, intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) to hold each other hostage under a doctrine of mutual assured destruction. The first theater nuclear weapons were deployed in Europe because of Cold War confrontation between the two blocs. Great Britain, France, and China became nuclear nations as a byproduct of the Cold War.

**With the Cold War ended, now is the time to exercise the zero option: to eliminate all nuclear weapons throughout the globe.** That means reducing to zero the supply of all types of nuclear weapons held by all possessors. It means a halt to all testing and weapons production. It means preventing all non-possessor nations from acquiring nuclear weapons.

A promising start on the journey has occurred through the initiative taken by U.S. President George Bush on September 21, 1991 and the response of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on October 5. We welcome these initiatives. They constitute a good beginning. But much more should be done promptly. Therefore, we call for further steps of nuclear arms reduction.

#### **Strategic Nuclear Weapons: Zero**

Approximately one half of the global nuclear arsenal is composed of strategic weapons designed to attack the adversary's homeland from afar. They can be launched from land, sea, and air. From the perspective of both the United States and the Union of Sovereign States these strategic weapons are the *only* danger of foreign attack.

- We praise President Bush's initiative (a) to take all U.S. strategic bombers off alert and remove their bombs and missiles and (b) to take 350 Minutemen II ICBMs off alert for rapid firing. This unilateral deactivation of a portion of the strategic arsenal is an important precedent that can be extended further.
- We praise President Gorbachev's commitment (a) to take all U.S.S. heavy strategic bombers off alert and store their nuclear weapons in depots, (b) to remove 503 ICBMs from alert status, and (c) to keep mobile ICBMs in permanent sites rather than moving them about.
- We agree with President Bush that the U.S. programs for MX rail garrison, mobile basing of small ICBMs, and a new nuclear short-range attack missile for strategic bombers should be terminated.
- We support President Gorbachev's decision to stop development of compact mobile ICBMs.

These are excellent initial first steps, but they do not go nearly as far as the global situation requires and as current opportunities make possible. The best response would be to apply President Bush's deactivation approach to the entire strategic arsenal. Accordingly:

- *We recommend that the United States and the Union of Sovereign States immediately and concurrently deactivate their entire land- and sea-based strategic arsenal. They should:*
  - Bring all strategic submarines into port, remove their missiles, and take off the warheads.
  - Open all ICBM silos, take out the missiles, place them on the ground, and remove the warheads.
- *We hope that Great Britain, France, and China will understand the necessity to immediately deactivate their strategic arsenal: land-, air-, and sea-based.*
- *After deactivation is accomplished, the United States and the Union of Sovereign States should work out a schedule for dismantling all strategic nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles and destroying their warheads. Great Britain, France, and China should join this schedule. The process should be implemented in an agreed sequence that is balanced so that at no stage could any nation gain an advantage.*

#### **Tactical Nuclear Weapons: Zero**

*The other half of the global nuclear arsenal is composed of tactical nuclear weapons with relatively short range and intended for combat use on land, at sea, and in the air.*

- *We praise President Bush's decision to eliminate the United States' entire worldwide inventory of nuclear artillery shells and short-range ballistic missile warheads. Based in Europe and South Korea, and perhaps elsewhere, they have no military utility because their use would have devastating effects on the countries they are intended to defend. With the Soviet army leaving Central and Eastern Europe, there is no adversary possessing theater nuclear weapons. Likewise in Korea the U.S. tactical nuclear force is arrayed against an adversary not possessing this type of weapon.*
- *We support the withdrawal of all U.S. tactical nuclear weapons from surface ships and attack submarines and from land-based naval aircraft. We urge that all of the warheads be dismantled and destroyed, not leaving any in storage for future use.*
- *We also call for elimination of all U.S. nuclear bombs and missiles carried on tactical aircraft, a significant omission from President Bush's proposal. In Europe U.S. tactical aircraft have no adversaries to target with nuclear weapons because of the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, the freeing of Eastern Europe, the complete independence of the Baltic states, and the assertion of democracy in Russia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Kazakhstan, and the other sovereign republics. Moreover, there are no legitimate targets for U.S. tactical nuclear bombs and air-launched missiles anywhere else on Earth.*
- *We praise President Gorbachev's commitment to eliminate the entire Soviet inventory of nuclear artillery, nuclear warheads for short-range ballistic missiles, and nuclear land mines. They have no military utility in international warfare, and their elimination will prevent their use in internal conflict within the emerging Union of Sovereign States.*
- *We support the withdrawal of all Soviet tactical nuclear weapons from surface ships and multi-purpose submarines and the removal of all nuclear warheads from anti-aircraft missiles. We urge that all of these missiles and warheads be dismantled and destroyed, not leaving any in storage for future use.*

- *We anticipate that Great Britain, France, and China will choose to eliminate all of their tactical nuclear weapons and that any unadmitted possessors will do likewise.*

#### **Testing and Production: Zero**

*With a commitment to move to global nuclear disarmament -- the zero option, there is no further need to develop, test, and produce new nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles. Therefore:*

- *We call upon all nuclear weapon states immediately to:*
  - *Cease production of nuclear weapons material.*
  - *Halt all testing of nuclear warheads.*
  - *Stop assemblage of new warheads.*
- *We also call upon all nuclear weapon states to discontinue the manufacture of new missiles, bombers, and strategic submarines.*
- *We recommend the closure of all nuclear weapons production facilities, except as they might be used to disassemble nuclear warheads and convert nuclear material to non-weapon use.*
- *We recommend a program to assist workers, companies, and communities engaged in producing nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles to convert to non-military activities.*

#### **Nonproliferation: Universal**

*It is essential that no other nation acquire nuclear weapons and delivery capacity while the current possessors are eliminating their nuclear arsenal. Accordingly:*

- *We call upon all nations to become signatories the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to abide by its provisions.*
- *We call for strengthening provisions of the Non-proliferation Treaty and for vigorous enforcement.*
- *We call for an international system to prevent the development, production, and deployment of ballistic missiles that can be used to attack an adversary's homeland and for the destruction of all such missiles now in existence.*

#### **Strategic Defense: Unnecessary**

*By moving promptly and resolutely to complete strategic disarmament and by achieving a diligent nonproliferation regime to block the spread of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles, no system of strategic defense will be required. The zero option provides necessary homeland security.*

*Therefore:*

- *We call for the United States and the Union of Sovereign States to disband all efforts of develop and deploy a strategic defense system.*
- *We call upon the Union of Sovereign States to dismantle its existing ground-based strategic defense.*

*We believe that the danger of any new nation developing nuclear weapons and ICBM delivery capacity can be handled through an effective international nonproliferation regime. A strategic defense network is not needed for that purpose.*

#### **Conclusion**

*We fervently believe that these recommendations will greatly enhance global security by eliminating the possibility of nuclear war. Furthermore, the resources of human talent, production*



*capacity, and money released can become available to deal with urgent human problems around the globe. The zero option provides great hope for global peace and prosperity.*

*Adopted October 18, 1991 by Board of Directors  
Methodists United for Peace with Justice*

*The nuclear crisis is not primarily a matter of missiles; it is a crisis of human community.  
-- United Methodist Bishops, In Defense of Creation.*

## **Part 1. Dismantling Cold War Militarism**

For 45 years the hope for a new earth has languished. The Cold War rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union has blocked this high aspiration. But now the Cold War is over. Now we can renew our quest for one world united in a commitment to peace and justice

The Cold War has ended in the sense that the Soviet Union is no longer devoted to seeking control and influence over adjacent lands and far-flung domains. It is over because U.S. containment of Soviet expansion has lost its basis and is no longer necessary. No longer can the United States use the communist threat as an alibi for its own imperial ambitions. And to the extent that the Cold War was an ideological battle of capitalism versus communism for the minds of humankind, it is over.

Nevertheless, the military apparatus of the Cold War remains mostly in place. And Cold War military doctrines -- nuclear deterrence, forward-based defense, maintenance of huge standing armies, navies, and air forces -- have scarcely changed. In this sense the Cold War will not be finally ended until the doctrines are abandoned and the military forces disbanded.

### **Discarding Nuclear Deterrence**

Deterrence is a commonplace practice among human beings. It consists of efforts to control behavior by threat of punishment, sometimes sweetened with awards. It is practiced by parents with their children, teachers with students, employers with workers, the highway patrol with drivers, even the church with worshipers, who are offered temporal and eternal awards and punishment for right conduct.

It is no wonder then that the American public so readily accepted the doctrine of nuclear deterrence when it was offered by think-tank theorists and military strategists in the period following World War II. It seemed a simple thing. Unless the Soviet Union behaved correctly, the U.S. would attack with nuclear weapons. The threat of nuclear attack, therefore, would deter Soviet aggression.

All along, though, there have been two things wrong with this doctrine: first, moral objections and second, lack of practicality, derived from empirical analysis. Now we have a third reason for discarding nuclear deterrence: it is no longer required.

### **Moral objections.**

Early in the nuclear age church bodies expressed their doubts about the use of nuclear (first called atomic) weapons. Thus, the **First Assembly of the World Council of Churches**, meeting in Amsterdam in September 1948 stated:

War as a method of settling disputes is incompatible with the teaching and example of our Lord Jesus Christ. The part which war plays in our present international life is a sin against God and a degradation of man....Warfare has greatly changed. War is now total....In these circumstances the tradition of a just war, requiring a just cause and the use of just means, is now challenged. Law may require the sanction of force, but when war breaks out, force is used on a scale which tends to destroy the basis on which law exists.

In 1965 the **Second Vatican Council** indicated:

Every act of war directed to the indiscriminate destruction of whole cities or vast areas with their inhabitants is a crime against God and man, which merits firm and unequivocal

condemnation.

But what about only threatening the use of mass destruction as a deterrent? After the escalation of the nuclear arms race in the early 1980s, the **U.S. Catholic bishops** struggled with this issue. They accepted the position of Pope John Paul II that "In current conditions 'deterrence' based on balance, certainly not as an end in itself but as step on the way toward progressive disarmament, may still be judged morally acceptable." However, the U.S. Catholic bishops insisted:

*No use of nuclear weapons which would violate the principles of discrimination or proportionality may be intended in a strategy of deterrence. The moral demands of Catholic teaching require resolute willingness not to intend or to do moral evil even to save our own lives or the lives of those we love.*

And they took the pope's position in saying:

*Deterrence is not an adequate strategy as a long-term basis for peace; it is a transitional strategy justifiable only in conjunction with resolute determination to pursue arms control and disarmament.*

Four years later the **United Methodist bishops** grappled with the same issues. They concluded that even in the just-war tradition the *actual* use of nuclear weapons could not be justified because it (a) offered no reasonable hope of success in achieving a just peace, (b) would cause indiscriminate harm to noncombatants, and (c) would cause harm far disproportionate to the good it might accomplish. They also realized that nuclear war "threatens to assault not only the whole human family but planet earth itself." On this basis they stated:

*Therefore, we say a clear and unconditional No to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing.*

**Useless for empirical reasons.**

In addition to moral reasons, nuclear deterrence can be discarded because actual experience has proven that nuclear deterrence theory vastly exaggerates its effectiveness. The evidence is clearly found in the numerous grievous events that have occurred during the past 45 years, undeterred by nuclear weapons.

**Wars not deterred.** Since the end of World War II there have been 128 wars that killed 22 million people. Most of these wars have been in the developing world. In many instances, one of the warring parties was allied with the United States and the other with the Soviet Union or China, but the U.S. nuclear arsenal failed to serve as a deterrent. The most notable cases are Korea and Vietnam where neither North Korea nor North Vietnam held back because of U.S. nuclear might.

**Other events not deterred.** Furthermore, the U.S. nuclear arsenal did not deter the Soviet Union from suppressing revolt in East Germany (1953), Hungary (1956), and Czechoslovakia (1968), from invading Afghanistan (1978), from suppressing human rights at home. Nor did U.S. nuclear weapons inhibit Iraq from invading Kuwait in August 1990. And the nuclear deterrent has no effect on hostage takers and terrorists.

**Unusable in warfighting.** When the United States went to war in Korea and Vietnam, U.S.

political and military leaders discovered found that nuclear weapons were not usable in combat because their awesome power was disproportionately too vast for the battlefield and their potential harm to civilians was far excessive. These are the same reasons why religious leaders have rejected nuclear weapons under "just-war" theory.

Thus, empirical evidence disproves the theory of nuclear deterrence. Nuclear weapons are in actual fact useless to deter the brand of war and violence that has characterized the world scene since World War II. Moreover, these weapons are also useless in fighting these wars.

**No longer necessary.**

Nevertheless, for many years advocates of nuclear deterrence have argued that the two principal effects of the doctrine are (1) to keep the Soviet Union from invading Western Europe and (2) to prevent a Soviet attack on the U.S. homeland.

**Defense of Western Europe.** The fear of Soviet invasion of Western Europe was based upon the alleged Soviet superiority in conventional forces in Central Europe that gave the Soviets the capability of mounting a successful military attack. In response the United States and its NATO allies supplemented their own conventional forces with short-range, tactical nuclear weapons to use against Soviet invaders. These were backed by long-range strategic nuclear weapons, mostly U.S. but also British and French, capable of striking the Soviet homeland. Proponents of nuclear deterrence have claimed success in keeping the Soviets out of Western Europe.

In contrast, critics of nuclear deterrence have offered two counterarguments. First, Soviet conventional superiority was been overrated, especially when quality and readiness factors are considered. Second, the Soviets have had no intent to move farther west than the territory they occupied at the end of World War II, regardless of capability. Moreover, for many years these analysts insisted that the Soviet Union had enough problems at home and in keeping control over Eastern Europe without taking on Western Europe.

All of this argument is now moot. The Soviet Union has lost control of Eastern Europe, Soviet troops are going home, and the Warsaw Pact no longer has a cohesive military force to threaten the West. Western military deterrence is no longer needed, neither conventional nor nuclear.

**Protecting U.S. homeland.** As to deterring Soviet attack on the U.S. homeland, this was not a purpose of U.S. nuclear deterrence for the first dozen years of the nuclear weapons era. Not until the late 1950s with the advent of intercontinental ballistic missiles did the Soviet Union have capability for such an attack. Even then most analysts, including many nuclear deterrence advocates, recognized that an out-of-the-blue Soviet attack on the United States was extremely unlikely, unless it was a byproduct of some other war. And all have recognized that the Soviets have had no capacity to invade the U.S. mainland.

So now we are left with U.S. long-range strategic missiles deterring Soviet long-range strategic missiles, and vice versa. Neither side has any self-interest to attack the other with these weapons. In this situation, mutual abandonment of the entire strategic arsenal would be the most logical course purely for reasons of self-interest. Each side would be much safer if the other disarmed than with the present precarious danger of accidental launching that could spark a disastrous, all-out nuclear war.

If we would be honest about it, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is dead for all practical

purposes. Unfortunately the enormous nuclear arsenal is still alive, as shown in the table on page x.

### **Principles for Disarmament**

Idealism says that we should totally eliminate the nuclear arsenal because these weapons lack moral legitimacy. Practicality shows that they are useless for deterrence and have no warfighting utility. A concern for national security should favor abolition because nuclear weapons might be used in error against us or in a situation where minor conflict gets out of hand, or because some undisciplined nation might acquire nuclear capability and make reckless use of nuclear weapons.

With this conjunction of idealism and self-interest, global nuclear disarmament should be achievable during the 1990s. It will need to happen in relationship to substantial reduction in conventional arms. Simultaneously better methods for settling international disputes will need to be put in place.

Fortunately, we have guidance for such a comprehensive approach, provided by an almost-forgotten U.S./ Soviet agreement stemming from 1961. It is known as the **McCloy-Zorin Principles**, named after the main negotiators, John J. McCloy for the United States and V. Zorin for the Soviet Union. These "agreed principles for disarmament negotiations" contain eight major elements.

**(1) Goals.** The goals of the McCloy-Zorin principles are:

- o Disarmament is general and complete.
- o War is no longer an instrument for settling international disputes.
- o Disarmament is accompanied by establishment of reliable procedures for peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

**(2) Minimal armed forces.** States will have only those non-nuclear armaments and forces necessary to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens. Also, States shall provide manpower for a United Nations police force.

**(3) Program for general and complete disarmament.** Necessary provisions with respect to national military establishments are:

- o Disband armed forces. Dismantle military establishments. Cease armament production. Liquidate armaments or convert to civilian use.
- o Eliminate all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological, and other weapons of mass destruction. Cease production of such weapons.
- o Eliminate all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction.
- o Abolish organizations and institutions designed to organize the military effort of states. Cease military training. Close all military training institutions.
- o Discontinue military expenditures.

**(4) Stages.** The disarmament program should be implemented in an agreed sequence, by stages until it is completed, with each measure and stage carried out within specified time limits.

**(5) Balance.** All measures should be balanced so that at no stage could any State or group of States gain military advantage and that security is ensured equally for all.

**(6) International control, verification.** Strict international control to provide firm assurance that all parties are honoring their obligations. Verification requirements to be worked out for each stage.

*Creation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations.*

*(7) International peace force. Necessary measures to maintain international peace and security, including the obligation of States to place at the disposal of the United Nations agreed manpower necessary for an international peace force.*

*(8) Early, initial agreement. States participating in the negotiations should seek to achieve and implement the widest possible agreement at the earliest possible date. Efforts should continue without interruption until agreement upon the total program has been achieved.*

*McCloy and Zorin came to this agreement through three two-week negotiating sessions in June, July, and September 1961. Their main disagreement was over a sentence the United States wanted in paragraph 6:*

*Such verification should ensure that not only agreed limitations or reductions take place but also that retained armed forces and armaments do not exceed agreed levels at any stage. The Soviets balked because in that period they opposed all intrusive verification measures. The United States did not insist on this sentence in the agreement but indicated it would continue to press for such verification. Now, during the past five years, the Soviets have shown much more willingness to accept this degree of verification.*

#### ***Global Nuclear Disarmament***

*The elimination of the nuclear weapons stockpile and delivery systems is a major element of the disarmament program contained in the McCloy-Zorin agreement. Relevant, too, is the idea of stages with specified time-limits, balance at each stage, and international control and verification.*

*Our goal should be completion of global disarmament by the year 2000. There are three major tasks to accomplish: strategic disarmament, tactical nuclear disarmament, and preventing proliferation to other nations. Way stations include a halt in nuclear weapons testing and an end to production and deployment of modernized nuclear weapons. In some cases, tactical nuclear disarmament should be associated with conventional disarmament, but in other instances, nuclear disarmament can proceed by itself.*

*[November 19, 1990]*

## Part 1. Dismantling Cold War Militarism

For 45 years the hope for a new earth has languished. The Cold War rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union has blocked this high aspiration. But now the Cold War is over. Soviet expansionism has ended. U.S. containment has lost its justification. The ideological struggle of capitalism versus communism has receded.

Even so, the military apparatus of the Cold War remains mostly in place. Cold War military doctrines -- nuclear deterrence, forward-based defense, maintenance of huge standing armies, navies, and air forces -- have scarcely changed. In this sense the Cold War will not be finally ended until the doctrines are abandoned and the military forces disbanded.

### Discarding Nuclear Deterrence

We can start by discarding the doctrine of nuclear deterrence. This will require a determined effort because this doctrine is deeply rooted.

After all, deterrence is a commonplace practice among human beings. It consists of efforts to control behavior of others by threat of punishment, sometimes sweetened with awards. It is practiced by parents with their children, teachers with students, employers with workers, the highway patrol with drivers, even the church with worshipers, who are offered temporal and eternal awards for right conduct and punishment for wrongdoing.

It is no wonder then that the American public so readily accepted the doctrine of nuclear deterrence when it was offered by think-tank theorists and military strategists in the period following World War II. It seemed a simple thing. Unless the Soviet Union behaved correctly, the U.S. would attack with nuclear weapons. The threat of nuclear attack, therefore, would deter Soviet aggression.

All along, though, there have been two things wrong with this doctrine: first, moral objections and second, lack of practicality, derived from empirical analysis. Now we have a third reason for discarding nuclear deterrence: it is no longer required.

### Moral objections.

Early in the nuclear age church bodies expressed their doubts about the use of nuclear weapons. Thus, the **First Assembly of the World Council of Churches**, meeting in Amsterdam in September 1948, observed that with the advent of the atomic age, war is now total. This challenges "the tradition of a just war, requiring a just cause and use of just means....Law may require the sanction of force, but when war breaks out, force is used on a scale which tends to destroy the basis on which law exists."

Dealing with the scale of destruction of nuclear war, the **Second Vatican Council** in 1965 indicated: "Every act of war directed to the indiscriminate destruction of whole cities or vast areas with their inhabitants is a crime against God and man, which merits firm and unequivocal condemnation."

In 1982 the **U.S. Catholic bishops** took up the issue of threatening the use of mass destruction as a deterrent. They accepted the position of Pope John Paul II that on balance deterrence can be justified as a transitional strategy, but "only in conjunction with resolute determination to pursue arms control and disarmament." However, they insisted: "No use of nuclear weapons which would violate the principles of discrimination or proportionality may be intended in a strategy of deterrence." In

short, threatening destruction of vast population areas as part of deterrence is unacceptable.

Four years later the **United Methodist bishops** grappled with the same issues. They concluded that even in the just-war tradition the *actual use* of nuclear weapons could not be justified because it (a) offered no reasonable hope of success in achieving a just peace, (b) would cause indiscriminate harm to noncombatants, and (c) would cause harm far disproportional to the good it might accomplish. They also realized that nuclear war "threatens to assault not only the whole human family but planet earth itself." On this basis they stated:

"we say a clear and unconditional *No* to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear weapons. We conclude that nuclear deterrence is a position that cannot receive the church's blessing."

#### **Useless for empirical reasons.**

In addition to moral reasons, nuclear deterrence can be discarded because actual experience has proven that nuclear deterrence theory vastly exaggerates its effectiveness. The evidence is clearly found in the numerous grievous events that have occurred during the past 45 years, undeterred by nuclear weapons.

**Wars not deterred.** Since the end of World War II there have 128 wars that killed 22 million people. Most of these wars have been in the developing world. In many instances, one of the warring parties was allied with the United States and the other with the Soviet Union or China. None of the wars was deterred by a "great power" nuclear arsenal. The most notable cases are Korea and Vietnam where neither North Korea nor North Vietnam were held back because of U.S. nuclear might.

**Other events not deterred.** The U.S. nuclear arsenal did not deter the Soviet Union from suppressing revolt in East Germany (1953), Hungary (1956), and Czechoslovakia (1968), from invading Afghanistan (1978), from suppressing human rights at home. Nor did U.S. nuclear weapons inhibit Iraq from invading Kuwait in August 1990. And the nuclear deterrent has no effect on hostage takers and terrorists.

**Unusable in warfighting.** When the United States went to war in Korea and Vietnam, U.S. political and military leaders discovered that nuclear weapons were not usable in combat because their awesome power was disproportionately too vast for the battlefield and their potential harm to civilians was far excessive. These are the same reasons why religious leaders have rejected nuclear weapons under "just-war" theory.

Thus, empirical evidence disproves the theory of nuclear deterrence. Nuclear weapons are in actual fact useless to deter the brand of war and violence that has characterized the world scene since World War II. Moreover, these weapons are useless in fighting these wars.

#### **No longer necessary.**

Nevertheless, for many years advocates of nuclear deterrence have argued that the two principal effects of the doctrine are (1) to keep the Soviet Union from invading Western Europe and (2) to prevent a Soviet attack on the U.S. homeland.

**Defense of Western Europe.** The fear of Soviet invasion of Western Europe was based upon alleged Soviet superiority in conventional forces in Central Europe that gave the Soviets capability of mounting a successful military attack. In response the United States and its NATO allies supplemented their own conventional forces with short-range, tactical nuclear weapons to use against Soviet invaders.



These were backed by long-range strategic nuclear weapons, mostly U.S. but also British and French, capable of striking the Soviet homeland. Proponents of nuclear deterrence have claimed success in keeping the Soviets out of Western Europe.

In rebuttal, critics of nuclear deterrence in Europe have argued that Soviet conventional superiority was overrated, especially when quality and readiness factors were considered. Furthermore, the Soviets have had no intent to move farther west than the territory they occupied at the end of World War II, regardless of capability. And for many years these analysts insisted that the Soviet Union had enough problems at home and in keeping control over Eastern Europe without taking on Western Europe.

All of this argument is now moot. The Soviet Union has lost control of Eastern Europe, Soviet troops are going home, and the Warsaw Pact no longer has a cohesive military force to threaten the West. **Western military deterrence is no longer needed in Europe, neither conventional nor nuclear.**

**Protecting U.S. homeland.** For the first dozen years of the nuclear weapons era, the Soviet Union had no capability of attacking the U.S. homeland. Even after the Soviets developed intercontinental ballistic missiles, most strategic analysts recognized that an out-of-the-blue Soviet attack on the United States was extremely unlikely, unless it was a byproduct of some other war. And now the prospects for such a war have virtually disappeared.

At a time when the United States is supplying food to the Soviet people, neither side has any self-interest to attack the other with nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, each side maintains its arsenal of long-range strategic missiles whose only function is to deter the other side's long-range strategic missiles. Clearly in this situation, **mutual abandonment of the entire strategic arsenal would be the most logical course purely for reasons of self-interest.** Each side would be much safer if the other disarmed than with the present precarious danger of accidental launching that could spark a disastrous, all-out nuclear war.

If we would be honest about it, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is dead for all practical purposes. Unfortunately the enormous nuclear arsenal is still alive, as shown in the table on page 5.

[December 19, 1990]

## **Principles for Disarmament**

Idealism says that we should totally eliminate the nuclear arsenal because these weapons lack moral legitimacy. Practicality shows that they are useless for deterrence and have no warfighting utility. A concern for national security should favor abolition because nuclear weapons might be used in error against us or in a situation where minor conflict gets out of hand, or because some undisciplined nation might acquire nuclear capability and make reckless use of nuclear weapons.

With this conjunction of idealism and self-interest, global nuclear disarmament should be achievable during the 1990s. It will need to happen in relationship to substantial reduction in conventional arms. Simultaneously better methods for settling international disputes will need to be put in place.

Fortunately, we have guidance for such a comprehensive approach, provided by an almost-forgotten U.S./ Soviet agreement stemming from 1961. It is known as the **McCloy-Zorin Principles**, named after the main negotiators, John J. McCloy for the United States and V. Zorin for the Soviet Union. These "agreed principles for disarmament negotiations" contain eight major elements.

**(1) Goals.** The goals of the McCloy-Zorin principles are:

- o Disarmament is general and complete.
- o War is no longer an instrument for settling international disputes.
- o Disarmament is accompanied by establishment of reliable procedures for peaceful settlement of disputes and effective arrangements for maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

**(2) Minimal armed forces.** States will have only those non-nuclear armaments and forces necessary to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens. Also, States shall provide manpower for a United Nations police force.

**(3) Program for general and complete disarmament.** Necessary provisions with respect to national military establishments are:

- o Disband armed forces. Dismantle military establishments. Cease armament production. Liquidate armaments or convert to civilian use.
- o Eliminate all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological, and other weapons of mass destruction. Cease production of such weapons.
- o Eliminate all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction.
- o Abolish organizations and institutions designed to organize the military effort of states. Cease military training. Close all military training institutions.
- o Discontinue military expenditures.

**(4) Stages.** The disarmament program should be implemented in an agreed sequence, by stages until it is completed, with each measure and stage carried out within specified time limits.

**(5) Balance.** All measures should be balanced so that at no stage could any State or group of States gain military advantage and that security is ensured equally for all.

**(6) International control, verification.** Strict international control to provide firm assurance that all parties are honoring their obligations. Verification requirements to be worked out for each stage. Creation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations.

*(7) International peace force. Necessary measures to maintain international peace and security, including the obligation of States to place at the disposal of the United Nations agreed manpower necessary for an international peace force.*

*(8) Early, initial agreement. States participating in the negotiations should seek to achieve and implement the widest possible agreement at the earliest possible date. Efforts should continue without interruption until agreement upon the total program has been achieved.*

*McCloy and Zorin came to this agreement through three two-week negotiating sessions in June, July, and September 1961. Their main disagreement was over a sentence the United States wanted in paragraph 6:*

*Such verification should ensure that not only agreed limitations or reductions take place but also that retained armed forces and armaments do not exceed agreed levels at any stage. The Soviets balked because in that period they opposed all intrusive verification measures. The United States did not insist on this sentence in the agreement but indicated it would continue to press for such verification. Now, during the past five years, the Soviets have shown much more willingness to accept this degree of verification.*

*[December 19, 1990]*

## **Principles for Disarmament**

Guidance for a comprehensive approach to disarmament is provided by the almost-forgotten U.S./Soviet **McCloy-Zorin Agreement**. Negotiated in 1961 by John J. McCloy for the United States and V. Zorin for the Soviet Union, these "agreed principles for disarmament negotiations" contain eight major elements.

**(1) Goals.** General and complete disarmament, accompanied by procedures for peaceful settlement of disputes and arrangements for maintenance of peace.

**(2) Minimal armed forces.** States will have only those non-nuclear armaments and forces necessary to maintain internal order and protect the citizens.

**(3) Program for general and complete disarmament.** Disband armed forces. Cease armament production. Eliminate all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological, and other weapons of mass destruction. Cease production of such weapons. Eliminate all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction. Cease military training. Close all military training institutions.

**(4) Stages.** Carry out disarmament in an agreed sequence of stages with specified time limits.

**(5) Balance.** At no stage should any State or group of States gain military advantage.

**(6) International control, verification.** Strict international control. Verification for each stage.

**(7) International peace force.** Under United Nations auspices with each State providing necessary manpower.

**(8) Early, initial agreement.** Achievement and implementation of the widest possible agreement at the earliest possible date. Efforts to continue without interruption until the total program has been achieved.

[December 19, 1960]

## *News from Methodists United*

### **New Directors**

The members of Methodists United for Peace with Justice have elected the following persons to the Board of Directors: Betty Benton, Phoenix, Arizona; Rev. Timothy P. Boal, Grand Rapids, Michigan; Tom Burger, Charleston, West Virginia; Rev. Mary Council-Austin, Washington, D.C.; Rev. Alfred Dale, Bellingham, Washington; Inez Ireland Dawes, Des Moines, Iowa; Rev. W. Cecil Findley, Winfield, Kansas; Rev. James R. Hipkins, Sevierville, Tennessee; Diane Stanton-Rich, Lake Junaluska, North Carolina; Betty Taylor, Akron, Ohio; Harold W. Wulke, Long Beach, California. Rev. Spencer Turnipseed of Auburn, Alabama was reelected for another term.

### **Decisions of Board of Directors**

The Board of Directors met on October 18 and 19 in Washington, D.C. They chose officers as indicated below.

The Board adopted the "Zero Option" statement featured in this issue of *Peace Leaf*. Beyond its public release we are sending the statement to the United Methodist Council of Bishops and the Boards of Bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal, AME Zion, and Christian Methodist Episcopal Churches for their consideration. We will also petition the United Methodist General Conference to adopt the statement as church policy.

The Board decided to provide information on election issues to local activists who want to address questions to presidential and congressional candidates during the 1992 election. All material will be nonpartisan. We will work closely with other religious organizations who are preparing and circulating such information.

Board members mapped out ways to enlarge the membership and strengthen the financial base of Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

### **Membership**

Readers of *Peace Leaf* who are not members of Methodists United are invited to join. A membership form is on the preceding page.

*Methodists United for Peace with Justice* is a Pan-Methodist association of laity and clergy engaged in education and advocacy on peace and justice issues. The organization has no official affiliation with any Methodist denomination.

**NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.** Rev. Dr. Edward W. Bauman, Elinor Bedell, Betty Bumpers, Dr. Gilbert Caldwell, Rev. Motlalepula Chabaku, Rev. Dr. Emmett Cocke, Jr., Bishop Judith Craig, Rev. Robert Edgar, Dr. Arthur Flemming, Dr. Alan Geyer, Grace Halsell, Geraldine Heilman, Edward Helm, Bishop J. Clinton Hoggard, Ethel R. Johnson, Bishop Leontine Kelly, Rev. Hae Jong Kim, Dr. W. Astor Kirk, Rev. Joseph Lowery, Bishop Felton E. May, Bishop C.P. Minnick, Eloise Folkers Nenon, Eldon Roe, Bishop Roy Sano, Rev. Thomas Starnes, Rev. Peter Sun, Bishop Frederick H. Talbot, Rev. Spencer Turnipseed, Bishop C. Dale White, Bishop Joseph Yeakel.

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS.** **Chair:** Sherman W. Harris; **Vice Chairs:** Rev. Bruce K. Edwards, Rev. Lovenger Bowden; **Secretary:** Dr. John D. Copenhaver, Jr.; **Treasurer:** Howard W. Hallman; **Assistant Treasurer:** Rev. Carroll Chambliss. **Other Members:** Doris Akers, Rev. Clifford A. Armour, Jr., Dr. Hilda Arndt, Rev. Joy E. Arthur, Betty Benton, Rev. Timothy P. Boal, Kathleen Brown, Rev. Grainger Browning, Margaret Bryan, Tom Burger, Rev. Mary Council-Austin, Rev. Alfred Dale, Rev. Joseph Davis, Inez Ireland Dawes, Rev. Dr. William Deveaux, Margaret Fertschneider, Rev. W. Cecil Findley, Sue Herne, Rev. James R. Hipkins, Rev. John M. Mecartney, Betty J. Nelson, Rev. William Robinson, Rollin L. Rothhaar, Diane Stanton-Rich, Betty Taylor, Rev. Cindy Tappan, Rev. Spencer Turnipseed, Rev. Howard Warriner, Harold W. Wulke. **Executive Director:** Howard W. Hallman.

**METHODISTS UNITED**  
*for Peace with Justice*  
421 Seward Square, SE  
Washington, DC 20003  
2676

Nonprofit  
U.S. Postage Paid  
Washington, DC  
Permit No.

Peace Leaf

October-December 1991

Yes, I want to join Methodists United for Peace with Justice.

I'm enclosing my membership contribution of:

\$15    \$25    \$35    \$50    \$100    \$250    \$500    Other

\$

Name  Telephone

Address

Street (Route)

Apt.# (Box)

City

State

Zip

Local Church  Methodist Conference

Congressional Representative or District

Please return to Methodists United for Peace with Justice

421 Seward Square, SE, Washington, DC 20003

## *Global Nuclear Disarmament*

*The elimination of the nuclear weapons stockpile and delivery systems is a major element of the disarmament program contained in the McCloy-Zorin agreement. Relevant, too, is the idea of stages with specified time-limits, balance at each stage, and international control and verification.*

*Our goal should be completion of global disarmament by the year 2000. There are three major tasks to accomplish: strategic disarmament, tactical nuclear disarmament, and preventing proliferation to other nations. Way stations include a halt in nuclear weapons testing and an end to production and deployment of modernized nuclear weapons. In some cases, tactical nuclear disarmament should be associated with conventional disarmament, but in other instances, nuclear disarmament can proceed by itself.*

*[January 26, 1990]*



## ***New Occasions Teach New Duties***

*When it comes to views of its members on important issues, the United Methodist Church is a pluralistic institution. Therefore, it is not surprising that five United Methodists who are members of Congress offer different perspectives on the federal budget for the 1991 Fiscal Year, which is now before the Congress. But while they differ on some matters, they agree on others.*

*The two senators and three congressmen agree that the large federal deficit is a problem that must be dealt with. They agree that the United States has accumulated a wide variety of needs which should be addressed. But how best to respond to those needs is a matter of disagreement.*

### ***Military Spending***

*All five agree that changes taking place in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe alter the defense needs of the United States. Senator Dole is cautious about how to respond, preferring to maintain a high level of defense spending until greater stability is achieved. Senator Sasser believes that defense savings are possible as we move into a peacetime economy. Congressman Hamilton shares the desire to attain significant reductions in defense spending but is only moderately optimistic about our ability to do so, at least in the short run.*

*Senators Dole and Sasser and Congressman Goodling all point out that the \$180 billion reduction in Pentagon spending that Secretary Dick Cheney announced is not a true cut but rather is a decrease in planned but never approved expenditures. Knowing that President Bush wants to maintain the current level of defense spending, all five members realize that there will be no "peace dividend" unless the military budget is cut below the president's request. The three Democrats believe that the changing world situation makes this possible while the two Republicans are doubtful that this should be done at this time.*

### ***Domestic Priorities***

*If a peace dividend can be achieved, Senators Dole and Congressman Goodling believe that it should be used primarily for deficit reduction. Congressman Hawkins would make education the top priority. Senator Sasser would combined spending for such concerns as nutrition, education, and earned income tax credits for the poor with deficit reduction. Congressman Hamilton also recognizes that overdue needs of infrastructure investment, education, and pressing human needs should be considered along with deficit reduction.*

*Senator Dole reports that some people advocate raising taxes to fill the deficit gap, but he disagrees and thinks that a majority in both parties concurs with his position. In contrast, Senator Sasser indicates that the trend of the 1980s was to make our tax system more regressive by allowing wealthy persons to reduce their tax payments while moderate-income persons experienced an overall increase in their total tax burden. He states that fairness requires reversing this trend.*

### ***Position of Methodists United***

*As one voice within Methodism, we at Methodists United for Peace with Justice believe that the time has come for significant cuts in military spending and that urgent human needs should receive priority for the peace dividend.*

Last year in "A Call for Shift in Budget Priorities", which we circulated and obtained signers in most United Methodist conferences, including a majority of resident bishops, we advocated that military spending should be reduced by (a) sharply curtailing the Strategic Defense Initiative, (b) placing a two year moratorium on production of more strategic nuclear weapons, and (c) cutting back on excessive funding of other military hardware.

That was before the mostly nonviolent revolution in Eastern Europe set in motion forces which has virtually eliminated the Warsaw Pact as an aggressive military force with capability of invading Western Europe. That possibility no longer exists. As Congressman Hamilton points out, about \$150 billion of the U.S. military budget is spent on the defense of Western Europe. And in reality the main function of strategic nuclear deterrence has been a backup force for Western Europe's defense. Accordingly, the United States could safely cut from the defense budget large amounts for weapons modernization and troop deployment in Europe (see page 8 for a further view on this matter).

In our Call we indicated that "savings from reductions in military spending should be reassigned to programs responding to urgent human needs." That's how the peace dividend of this and following years should be spent.

#### **Taxes**

As to deficit reduction, what we said last spring is worth repeating:

We believe that our generation should pay our own way instead of forcing our children and grandchildren to pay for our extravagances....It seems clear that substantial deficit reduction cannot occur through budget reductions alone....Therefore, revenue increases are essential. This can come about partially through closing tax loopholes, a process started but not completed in the Tax Reform Act of 1986. But there must also be increases in tax rates in order to have sufficient revenue for significant deficit reduction. Justice requires that such tax increases be assigned to persons and corporations who have the greatest ability to pay.

[January 26, 1990]

## Witnessing for Peace and Justice

*Methodists United for Peace with Justice has recently published Witnessing for Peace and Justice: Peacemaker Handbook. This 36 page booklet features practical advice on local peacemaking and contains resource listings of books, films, and national organizations. This article is derived from the Witnessing handbook.*

### A Threefold Approach

The United Methodist bishops' 1986 pastoral letter, *In Defense of Creation*, called for faithful witness and action. The best response follows the threefold approach favored by John Wesley: prayer, study, and action.

**Prayer** is crucial to effective witness because it allows individuals and groups to tap into the Source of our spiritual strength. Prayer grounds all actions appropriately.

**Study** informs as prayer empowers faithful witness and action. Collective study can itself be an action as well as a community building mechanism.

**Action** flows naturally as a consequence of prayer and study. Action can be individual or collective.

### How to Move into Action

Peacemaking does not consist of projects, meetings, demonstrations, and petitions alone. It must include the building of community and be based on prayer.

**Getting started.** Talk with your minister and other leadership, such as your church and society committee. Consider your friends among the congregation. Who has expressed an interest in social issues or nuclear war? Who is concerned about good citizenship? This is the nucleus to start with.

**Call a meeting.** At least two formats are possible for your first gathering:

- o An inspirational meeting with a speaker or film.
- o An organizational and goal setting meeting.

Both formats are essential to the group's life and part of the first few months' agendas.

If you have a core of already committed folks, organization and goal setting may be most appropriate. Where there is not a group of committed people, you need to create interest. Invite speakers or show a film. Fully publicize the event throughout the church to reach persons you might not otherwise invite to attend.

**Preparation.** Resources for use from outside the group -- the speaker, the film -- need to be firmly secured before you publicize the meeting. An organizational meeting requires preparation, too. Be sure you have thought over what subjects you want consider, what questions answered. An agenda can be useful, especially one which has open discussion built into it. Look for ways to involve others in the meeting as greeters, prayer leaders, preparing refreshments.

**Agenda.** An inspirational meeting with a speaker or film might include:

- o Opening prayer.
- o Featured guest or film.

- o Questions and answers or discussion.
- o Set date for next meeting.
- o Closing prayer.

Here are suggestions for an organizational meeting.

- o Opening prayer.
- o Introduction of all participants and opportunity for each to explain motivation for working for peace and justice.
- o Group discussion of goals and organization. Encourage inclusive discussion.
- o Secure commitments. Make sure you know how often people will meet and what responsibilities they will shoulder.
- o Set date and location for next meeting.
- o Closing prayer.

**Brainstorming.** To encourage all members to participate, it will be important to have everyone's ideas about their vision, their understanding of community, and their expectations. List these without comment. These ideas may suggest the first projects and activities to undertake. At a minimum, they will provide insight into the interests of the initial participants.

**Setting goals.** It is useful for the group to establish a clear charter statement to share with the congregation. Its development is often challenging and necessitates peacemaking skills of compromise and persuasion. The brainstormed visions will provide a start. While the charter statement will probably be general in content, initial goals for the group will work best if they are limited and specific. Most groups take on more ambitious tasks and projects as their membership grows and as they acquire some history of cooperation and project completion.

**Don't be discouraged.** Peace work is the sum of each and every step we take forward. Don't expect to accomplish miracles overnight, but don't fail to see the small miracles which arise when diverse individuals work together and build community.

*A copy of **Witnessing for Peace and Justice** is available for \$2.50 from Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 421 Seward Square, SE, Washington, DC 20003. There is a 10 percent discount for orders of ten or more copies.*

## *News from Methodists United*

### *New Board of Directors Elected*

*Eighteen United Methodist clergy and laity from around the nation have taken office as the first elected Board of Directors of Methodists United for Peace with Justice. They were nominated by Methodists United members and elected by a mail ballot. They replace an Interim Board which functioned for two years after Methodists United incorporated in 1987.*

*The new directors are as follows:*

*Doris Akers, Follett, Texas*

*Rev. Clifford A. Armour, Jr., Newark, Delaware Alice Ashton, Raleigh, North Carolina*

*Rev. Craig L. Barbour, Charlottesville, Virginia Ralph L. Clark, Arlington, Virginia*

*John D. Copenhaver, Jr., Stephens City, Virginia Rev. Bruce W. Edwards, Thayer, Missouri*

*Jennifer Garvin-Sanchez, Richmond, Virginia*

*Howard W. Hallman, Bethesda, Maryland*

*Sherman W. Harris, Potomac, Maryland*

*Edward Helm, St. Petersburg, Florida*

*Rev. John M. Mecartney, Detroit, Michigan*

*Betty J. Nelson, Topeka, Kansas*

*Nancy Risch, Gulf Breeze, Florida*

*Bernice Smith, Decatur, Georgia*

*Rev. Spencer Turnipseed, Florala, Alabama*

*Rev. Mark W. Wethington, Durham, North Carolina Rev. James Zeisloft, York, Pennsylvania*

*At an organizational meeting held in Washington, D.C. in October 1989, this new Board of Directors elected the following officers: Chair, Sherman Harris; Vice-chair, Doris Akers, Bruce Edwards, and Mark Wethington; Secretary, Craig Barbour; Treasurer, Howard Hallman; and Assistant Treasurer, Jennifer Garvin-Sanchez. The officers will serve one year terms.*

### **Executive Director Appointed**

*At its October meeting the Board of Directors appointed Howard W. Hallman as its first executive director. This sets the stage for expansion of Methodists United activities on disarmament, improved US/Soviet relations, federal budget priorities, and other peace and justice issues.*

*Hallman has worked as a volunteer with Methodists United for Peace with Justice since it started in 1987. He was a member of the Interim Board has served as issues chair, treasurer, and membership coordinator. He is a graduate of the University of Kansas (his home state). Much of his career has focused on housing, employment opportunities, urban problems, neighborhood action, and citizen participation. From 1969 to 1983 he was president of the Civic Action Institute. In recent years his work has concentrated on nuclear disarmament and improving US/Soviet relations.*

### **Religious Leaders Write Bush and Gorbachev**

*In a letter to President Bush and President Gorbachev, 120 U.S. religious leaders asked the two leaders to adopt "Swords into Plowshares" as the theme for the 1990s. This would be implemented by achieving general disarmament, global nuclear disarmament, and economic conversion. This letter was drafted, circulated, and dispatched by Methodists United for Peace with Justice in November prior to the Malta summit meeting.*

*In addressing the European situation, the religious leaders proposed that all armed forces based in foreign territory should totally withdraw by May 8, 1995 -- the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe. These forces of the Soviet Union, United States, Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Canada would be demobilized in their homelands. During this same period national forces in every European country should be reduced to a level sufficient only for border defense with no offensive capability, the religious leaders stated.*

*The letter to the two presidents also laid out a course to achieve global nuclear disarmament in the 1990s. And the religious leaders offered ideas on converting resources now wasted on the arms race to constructive, peaceful uses. A copy of this letter is available from Methodists United at 421*

*Seward Square, SE, Washington, DC 20003.*

*METHODISTS UNITED  
for Peace with Justice  
421 Seward Square, SE  
Washington, DC 20003*

*Bulk Rate  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Washington, DC 20003  
Permit No. 2676*

*Peace Leaf  
January-March 1990*

December 13, 1989

Ms. Kathy Ormiston  
Office of the Republican Leader  
Room S234, U.S. Capitol  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Ms. Ormiston:

As I indicated on the phone, we want the January-March 1990 issue of our newsletter, *Peace Leaf*, to focus on the federal budget. Therefore, we are asking four United Methodist members of Congress to write short articles offering their perspective on the budget issues coming before Congress in the coming session. We would like to have Senator Dole offer his views.

Our own interests are reflected in the enclosed *Peace Leaf* we published a year ago on the same subject. The same issues will be before Congress in the coming year: what to do about the deficit, how to achieve a balance between military and domestic spending, whether tax increases are needed.

Probably the greatest difference this year is the apparent lessening of the Soviet threat in Europe, which has implications for the military budget. From this there is now debate over whether there will be a peace dividend, and if so, how it should spent. And of course the deficit-reduction requirements of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings are even more onerous this year.

We are looking for a one-page article. That amounts to about 700 words, or 100 lines with 56 characters/line (leaving room for title and identification of the author). We are also requesting articles from Senator Sasser, Representative Hamilton, and a yet to be selected House Republican. We would like to have these articles no later than January 10, 1990.



*Peace Leaf* goes to all the United Methodist bishops, leaders in the 72 United Methodist conference, our membership in all parts of the country, and others. We also send it to United Methodist conference newspapers and other contacts in the religious press.

We hope that this works out. If you have any questions, please call me at 897-3668 on Monday, Wednesday, or Friday and at (301) 795-7677 (long distance) on Tuesday and Thursday.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman  
Executive Director

December 13, 1989

Dr. Sam Marullo  
Office of Congressman Lee Hamilton  
2187 Rayburn Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Sam:

As I indicated on the phone, we want the January-March 1990 issue of our newsletter, *Peace Leaf*, to focus on the federal budget. Therefore, we are asking four United Methodist members of Congress to write short articles offering their perspective on the budget issues coming before Congress in the coming session. We would like to have Congressman Hamilton offer his views.

Our own interests are reflected in the enclosed *Peace Leaf* we published a year ago on the same subject. The same issues will be before Congress in the coming year: what to do about the deficit, how to achieve a balance between military and domestic spending, whether tax increases are needed. Probably the greatest difference this year is the apparent lessening of the Soviet threat in Europe, which has implications for the military budget. From this there is now debate over whether there will be a peace dividend, and if so, how it should spent. And of course the deficit-reduction requirements of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings are even more onerous this year. Congressman Hamilton has a special perspective on these issues because of his leadership roles on the Joint Economic Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

We are looking for a one-page article. That amounts to about 700 words,

or 100 lines with 56 characters/line (leaving room for title and identification of the author). We are also requesting articles from Senator Sasser, Senator Dole, and a yet to be selected House Republican. We would like to have these articles no later than January 10, 1990.

*Peace Leaf* goes to all the United Methodist bishops, leaders in the 72 United Methodist conference, our membership in all parts of the country, and others. We also send it to United Methodist conference newspapers and other contacts in the religious press.

We hope that this works out. If you have any questions, please call me at 897-3668 on Monday, Wednesday, or Friday and at (301) 795-7677 (long distance) on Tuesday and Thursday.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman  
Executive Director

December 19, 1989

Mr. Peter Woolfolk  
House Committee on Education and Labor  
2181 Rayburn Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Woolfolk:

As I indicated on the phone, we want the January-March 1990 issue of our newsletter, *Peace Leaf*, to focus on the federal budget. Therefore, we are asking five United Methodist members of Congress to write short articles offering their perspective on the budget issues coming before Congress in the coming session. We would like to have Congressman Hawkins offer his views.

Our own interests are reflected in the enclosed *Peace Leaf* we published a year ago on the same subject. The same issues will be before Congress in the coming year: what to do about the deficit, how to achieve a balance between military and domestic spending, whether tax increases are needed.

Probably the greatest difference this year is the apparent lessening of the Soviet threat in Europe, which has implications for the military budget.

From this there is now debate over whether there will be a peace dividend, and if so, how it should spent. And of course the deficit-reduction

requirements of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings are even more onerous this year.

Congressman Hawkins has a special perspective on these issues because of his leadership roles on Education and Labor Committee and in the Congressional Black Caucus.

We are looking for a one-page article. That amounts to about 700 words, or 100 lines with 56 characters/line (leaving room for title and identification

of the author). We are also requesting articles from Representatives Hamilton and Goodling and Senators Sasser and Dole. We would like to have these articles no later than January 10, 1990.

*Peace Leaf* goes to all the United Methodist bishops, leaders in the 72 United Methodist conference, our membership in all parts of the country, and others. We also send it to United Methodist conference newspapers and other contacts in the religious press.

We hope that this works out. If you have any questions, please call me at 897-3668 on Monday, Wednesday, or Friday and at (301) 795-7677 (long distance) on Tuesday and Thursday.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman  
Executive Director

January 2, 1990

Ms. Linda Cooper  
Office of Senator Jim Sasser  
363 Russell Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20100

Dear Ms. Cooper:

As I indicated on the phone, we want the January-March 1990 issue of our newsletter, *Peace Leaf*, to focus on the federal budget. Therefore, we are asking five United Methodist members of Congress to write short articles offering their perspective on the budget issues coming before Congress in the coming session. We would like to have Senator Sasser offer his views.

Our own interests are reflected in the enclosed *Peace Leaf* we published a year ago on the same subject. The same issues will be before Congress in the coming year: what to do about the deficit, how to achieve a balance between military and domestic spending, whether tax increases are needed. Probably the greatest difference this year is the apparent lessening of the Soviet threat in Europe, which has implications for the military budget. From this there is now debate over whether there will be a peace dividend, and if so, how it should spent. And of course the deficit-reduction requirements of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings are even more onerous this year. Senator Sasser is in an excellent position to provide his perspective as chair of the Senate Budget Committee.

We are looking for a one-page article. That amounts to about 700 words, or 100 lines with 56 characters/line (leaving room for title and identification of the author). We have also requested articles from Senator Dole and

*Representatives Hamilton, Hawkins, and Goodling. We would like to have these articles no later than January 10, 1990. (Sorry for the short deadline; I tried unsuccessfully to make contact with an appropriate person in your office before Christmas.)*

*Peace Leaf goes to all the United Methodist bishops, leaders in the 72 United Methodist conference, our membership in all parts of the country, and others. We also send it to United Methodist conference newspapers and other contacts in the religious press.*

*We hope that this works out. If you have any questions, please call me at 897-3668.*

*Sincerely yours,*

*Howard W. Hallman  
Executive Director*

**In This Issue**

*After the Cold War: Views of Three Members of Congress*

Senator Dale Bumpers.....1

Senator Sam Nunn.....2

Congressman Ronald V. Dellums.....4

*Editorial: From Arms Control to Disarmament*.....6

*Witnessing for Peace and Justice*.....7

*News from Methodists United*.....8

[June 29, 1990]



## **A New Epoch Begins**

*by Senator Dale Bumpers*

*The changes we see taking place in the world today are as startling as they are profound. I believe that one has to go back nearly a century and a half, to 1848, to find a point in European history that even remotely compares to what is now occurring. I personally believe the potential for lasting political change, and for a durable peace, are the greatest in history.*

*Future generations will look back and see this period as the beginning of a new history, a new historical epoch. While it is no time to be careless, we must be aware of the risks of inaction as well as the risks of action.*

*What an invigorating, exciting time to be alive. In the events of the last few years, and especially of the last 12 months, we are hearing the gears of history in motion. The protests and triumphs of the people of Eastern Europe, and the spirited attempts at reform by the leaders of the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries, are a mighty affirmation of the desire of nations for freedom and democracy. They are sick, as one East Berliner, said, "of being cooped up."*

*For those of us who believe so deeply in the democratic process, these are truly momentous times. As the leader of the free world, we are witnessing the culmination of decades of national effort. America has paid dearly in terms of treasure, and, sadly, lives, in order for freedom and democracy to be the rallying cry heard around the world.*

### **A Watershed Year**

*The year 1989 will be recorded as a watershed year. The demand for freedom rose first in the east in Tiananmen Square, leaving permanent fissures in a rigid, despotic government; a regime that is living proof that absolute power corrupts absolutely, and has forgotten why revolutions happen in the first place, a mere 40 years after fighting and dying for their own.*

*Freedom then moved west on a fault line to Eastern Europe: to reverberate through Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and all the rest. And as these deserving nations received a long-awaited dose of freedom, so in many senses did we. The year that revolutionized the Eastern bloc also served to revolutionize our thinking, and our prospects for peace. At long last we received a measure of freedom. We received freedom from being wedded to the policies of the past, to years of nuclear nightmare diplomacy, and decades of uneasy sleep.*

*Yet at this time of approaching triumph, where is the United States? At a time when we face opportunities that visionary postwar leaders like Dwight Eisenhower and Jack Kennedy could only dream of, we too often hear only words of caution from the administration. Timidity has replaced leadership and boldness. We seem to be sleepwalking through one of the most momentous chapters in human history.*

### **Nuclear Weapons Remain**

*Amidst all our happiness over recent events in Eastern Europe, let us not forget that the Soviet Union and the United States still have enough nuclear firepower pointed at each other to reduce the fruits of thousands of years of civilization to a funeral pyre for the 5 billion men, women, and children*

of this planet. It makes no sense for both sides to keep piling more and more nuclear weapons upon each other when we are not far away from agreeing upon major cuts.

As an immediate step, I call upon both sides to "cap" their nuclear arsenals at approximately current levels until a new START agreement goes into effect. This need not halt current modernization programs, but it would at least ensure that for every new weapon deployed, an existing would be dismantled. Not only would this cap the arms race, it would be a response to the change that is taking place in Eastern Europe. And it would also save some money on both sides as well, which we both desperately need.

#### **Harvest of Peace**

As freedom grows around the world, Americans should prepare to reap the Harvest of Peace.<sup>ii</sup> Democrats and Republicans must join together as we plot a different course for these different times. We must turn our attention to problems that have been neglected during the decades that we spent trying to place first in the arms race.

The strength of this Nation is not totally measured in tanks, planes, and guns. Our Nation is first and foremost about people. During the coming years, we will be able to direct our resources to those things that truly make us secure: health care, adequate housing, education, a safe food supply, and a clean environment.

---

i. Senator Dale Bumpers is now in his third term as Democratic Senator from Arkansas. He is a member of the \_\_\_\_\_ United Methodist Church in \_\_\_\_\_, Arkansas.

ii. This term comes from a Senate resolution introduced by Senator Mark Hatfield, Senator Bumpers, and others.

[June 1, 1990]

## **A New Military Strategy**

*by Senator Sam Nunn<sup>i</sup>*

*In his eloquent address to a Joint Session of Congress in February 1990, Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel perceptively observed that events in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union have moved so rapidly that "we have literally no time even to be astonished."*

### **Changed Military Threats**

*The principal conclusions I have reached concerning recent changes in the world scene and their implications for the threat environment of the 1990s are as follows:*

*First, the threat of a large-scale Warsaw Pact attack against Western Europe has virtually been eliminated, and the chances of any Soviet "go-in-alone" attack across Eastern Europe against the West are very remote. Since over half of our defense budget has traditionally been spent on forces deployed in Europe, these developments have enormous consequences for the size of defense budgets and our conventional force structure.*

*Second, any Soviet effort to re-establish a credible threat of a large-scale conventional attack on NATO would be very difficult and would require a vast and extended mobilization, thereby giving NATO many months of warning time. Even if one deems it necessary to hedge against the possibility of a re-established Soviet invasion threat, it does not necessarily follow that the appropriate precaution is to maintain huge standing armies on guard in Europe.*

*Third, the positive trends we have witnessed at the conventional level are not matched by developments at the strategic nuclear level. Soviet strategic nuclear forces remain the paramount military threat to U.S. national security.*

*Fourth, the longstanding danger of unauthorized or accidental use of nuclear weapons has been heightened by the turmoil and tension in the Soviet Union.*

*Fifth, possible contingencies in and around the Persian Gulf, on the Arabian Peninsula, and in Southwest Asia continue to pose serious risks to U.S. security interests. Even though the Soviet Union is not likely to pose a credible threat to seize Persian Gulf oil resources, other threats to Western access to oil resources in the region could emerge.*

*Sixth, North Korea continues to pose an invasion threat against our ally, South Korea.*

*Seventh, the United States faces serious risks, some of which are growing, in other regions and other areas: proliferation of long-range weapons of mass destruction in the Third World; risk of war between India and Pakistan; possibility of another Arab-Israeli war; potential instability in China and the Pacific region, Latin America, and Africa; the threat posed by international narcotics trafficking. In each of these cases, the problem is one of managing risks which, if not contained, could develop into direct threats to our national security interests.*

### **Other Treats to National Security**

Another critical dimension of the threats to our national security is the economic component. This threat assumes many forms. There is the genuine threat that if we do not get our fiscal house in order, we may well be paying such a bill on our staggering national debt that we will simply not have sufficient funds remaining to provide for the common defense and our non-defense needs. And due to our fiscal woes, we are simply failing to respond with an appropriate level of assistance to the newly-restored democracies in Eastern Europe and Central America.

As we look to the year 2000, we can envision a range of other global factors which will bear on our national security and well-being. These include threats to the world's environment, Third World Debt, overpopulation, poverty, and despair, the particular threats posed by radical Moslem fundamentalism, and the growing competitiveness of other industrialized nations.

To improve U.S. competitiveness against the new economic superpowers, such as Japan and Germany, will require major investments at home -- in our decaying infrastructure; in the education of tomorrow's workers, especially in math and the sciences; and in arresting the decline of savings and investments in industrial productivity and in reducing the high cost of capital to U.S. business.

### **Key Military Missions**

With an eye both to recent changes in the world and future defense budgets, I would suggest the following key tasks which we should ask and expect our military forces to accomplish:

- o Deter any attack on the American homeland;
- o Deter the use of nuclear weapons by the Soviet Union or any other nuclear-armed adversary against our homeland, against our allies, or against our military forces deployed in any region of the world;
- o Join with our allies to deter Soviet conventional aggression in Europe -- at lower levels of forces as the threat decreases, and with the capability to rebuild to higher levels in time, should the Soviets attempt to re-establish a credible invasion threat;
- o Help defend our friends and allies in Korea, the Far East, the Middle East, Southwest Asia, and Latin America with U.S. military capabilities tailored to complement -- but not substitute for or duplicate -- their own military capabilities;
- o Be prepared to conduct forcible entry in small- or medium-scale contingencies;
- o Ensure that the sea lines of communications remain open;
- o Counter drug trafficking, terrorism, and other unconventional military threats; and
- o Provide accurate, timely and responsive intelligence in conjunction with other elements of the intelligence community concerning changes in the global threat environment.

### **Elements of a New Military Strategy**

If we are to design a new military strategy that effectively relates our means to the ends outlined above, I believe we should be guided by five essential elements:

First, although nuclear deterrence will provide the critical underpinning of our military strategy for now and for the foreseeable future, it should be achievable at significantly lower levels of weaponry and with a much higher degree of stability, that is, with reduced incentives for either side to strike first with strategic nuclear weapons.

Second, our forward deployed forces should be reduced consistent with the changes in the threat while placing much greater emphasis on increased specialization among allied nations and much greater reliance on reinforcement deployable U.S. combat forces to support our allies.

Third, more of our forces should be put in the reserves, specifically structured for a reinforcement mission.

Fourth, we should employ a concept of flexible readiness -- for certain forces and adjustable readiness for others.

Fifth, our defense management and resource strategy should be guided by the phrase suggested by former Ambassador David Abshire: "think smart, not richer." Under this approach I would include greater emphasis on flying before buying; reduced costs of procuring and maintaining weapons, including improving existing platforms and reducing new starts; innovative research to preserve our technological superiority; and preserving a viable defense industrial base.

#### **Budgetary Implications**

Implementation of this new strategy, I believe, will permit a budgetary reduction of \$25-27 billion in fiscal year 1991, with associated outlay reductions of \$9-10 billion.<sup>ii</sup> Over a five year period, the savings would reach approximately \$225-255 billion in budget authority and \$180-190 billion in outlays.

#### **Prospective Budgetary Savings**

According to Senator Nunn, in the first element of the new military strategy -- nuclear deterrence -- we could save \$3.0-3.5 billion in Fiscal Year 1991 and between \$20 and \$30 billion over the next five years. This includes redirecting the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) into a coherent and rational research program; slowing procurement of the rail garrison MX basing system and looking to deploy the new Midgetman in existing silos rather than mobile launchers; adequately testing the B-2 bomber before we make a commitment to increase the production rate; halting the development of a new short-range, land-based missile for European deployment; not producing new nuclear artillery rounds; reviewing whether we should continue to buy a new Trident submarine each year, especially since the warhead production facilities are now shut down for repairs and safety modifications.

Reducing the number of U.S. troops stationed in Europe to a level of 75,000-100,000 over the next five years could save between \$10 and \$15 billion in that period. Other changes in conventional forces to reflect a new military strategy would yield other savings.

#### **Measured Cooperation**

As we look ahead to further international change, we can expect to see, in the most optimistic case, "two steps forward, one step back." As this occurs, the central concept of our policy should be

"measured cooperation." Cooperation would be calibrated so that our preparedness to cooperate with the Soviet Union and other countries is in rough proportion to their commitment to human rights, democracy and a market economy.

I hope that developments within the USSR and other Communist regimes will allow "measured cooperation" to supersede containment on a broad scale. We must give more attention to fostering a cooperative world order and to managing potential risks before they escalate into direct threats. As this occurs, we will need to keep our national security strategy and our military strategy under continuous review.

---

i. Senator Sam Nunn, a Democrat from Georgia, is chairman the Senate Armed Forces Committee. He is a member of the \_\_\_ United Methodist Church in \_\_\_\_\_, Georgia. This is article is based upon Senate speeches he gave on March 29 and April 19 and 20, 1990.

ii. Budget authority is what Congress actually authorizes and appropriates in a given fiscal year. It is essentially permission to spend money, often over a period of several years. Outlays are the actual dollars spent in a given fiscal year and are based on current and prior year appropriations.

[June 1, 1990]

## *New Priorities for the Real World*

*by Congressman Ronald V. Dellums <sup>1</sup>*

*The establishment of our national budget is perhaps the most important business that Congress can engage in. How our nation spends its money is a statement about its priorities, and its priorities in turn are a significant statement about its values.*

*The world is changing. In some basic and profound ways the world has already changed so that it gives us an opportunity to engage in the shaping of a new consensus. Therefore, it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I speak of the Congressional Black Caucus's "Quality of Life Alternative Budget" for Fiscal Year 1991. It is a budget that embraces a new vision for American in three ways.*

*First, we wrote a budget that expanded, continued to support present social program initiatives, and even new programs to address the human misery that is the reality of America. Second, we established a defense policy, a foreign policy, an international affairs budget that speaks to an emerging new reality in the world, not a foreign policy rooted in the obsolete ideas of the cold war. Finally, we wrote a budget that embraced our fiduciary and statutory responsibilities to address the budget deficit by responsible utilization of taxpayers dollars, and by equitably changing the nature of America's tax structure.*

### *The Real World Today*

*With respect to fashioning a new foreign/military policy, not rooted in the obsolete ideas of the cold war, but rather the emerging new realities, the Congressional Black Caucus budget has the courage to address the real world. The real world, the Berlin Wall no longer exists. The real world, Communist governments crumbled in Eastern Europe. The real world, East Germany and West Germany are uniting. The real world, Warsaw Pact impotence, if not nonexistent as a military entity.*

*In the real world, all these things happened not because of B-2 bombers and MX missiles and Trident submarines and the Midgetman missile, but happened because of the power of ideas, people's commitment to take charge of their destiny, people's desire to move beyond tyranny that had nothing to do with this madness. That is the real world. In the real world, American people want peace, want nuclear disarmament.*

*But also in the real world, hundreds of our children are dying in every major metropolitan city in this country because of drugs and violence related to it. In the real world, we are not fighting drugs.*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Congressman Dellums is from the 8th District in California. He chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus and is the fourth ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee. This article is derived from remarks he made on the floor of the House of Representatives on May 1, 1990 during the debate on the federal budget for Fiscal Year 1991.*

In the real world, 13 million live in poverty. What does it say about a nation that is more committed to building smart nuclear bombs than evolving an intellectual, smart generation of young people? What does it say in the real world about a nation that is not committed to providing our young children resources from the fragile stage of the beginnings of life?

### **People Living in Pain**

In the real world, there are 10 million black Americans living in poverty, millions of white persons living in poverty, millions of brown Americans, red Americans living in poverty. In the real world, there are millions of people living on the streets in America. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. The wealthiest nation where we spend \$300 billion a year on the military, we can ride home and see people eating out of garbage cans. I cry every time I see it because in the real world I feel pain.

Yes, in the real world there is pain. There is a need for change in the real world. We have a few moments. Maybe that little 5, 10, or 15 minutes that Andy Warhol said that we "have on center stage." This Congress has that few moments when we can redirect priorities of this nation. I think the American people do want Members of Congress to engaged in new priorities. They want their children educated, want affordable housing. But we are busy marching off, building B-2 bombers. There is something wrong in our society when we can find money to house the MX missile but cannot find money to house children, to house people in America.

Our responsibility is to the future. I am concerned about a world I will never see, the world of the children, the world of the future, the world of the tomorrows. I am concerned about turning over the world to my children and my children's children. That is the world I want to see. That is the world that is included in the Quality of Life Alternative Budget.

### **Military Budget**

The budget proposed by Congressional Black Caucus is no flaming extreme budget. We looked at the military budget in an emerging new world. We said we are presently spending at the rate of \$306 billion a year. President Bush wants to spend \$303 billion. We said we can live with \$279.4 billion, so we reduced the President's request by \$23.7 billion net. We had really cut \$3.2 billion more, but we took this much back and put it into economic conversion and into clean up of toxic waste from nuclear weapons production facilities.

When I first came to Congress nearly 20 years ago, the 1971 military budget was \$73 billion. Then, years later, the last year of the Carter administration, the military budget had doubled to \$143 billion. Ten years later the military budget is in excess of \$300 billion. So in the short span of 19-plus years, we have seen our military budget go from \$73 billion to over \$300 billion, an incredible amount of money.

### **Where's the Enemy?**

If anyone thinks cutting \$23.7 billion is suddenly going to create war in Europe, my question is this: Who is the enemy? We are spending \$160 billion per year to maintain America's role in NATO. Where is the enemy?

At best, the Warsaw Pact has been rendered impotent as a military entity. What do the West Germans have to fear from the East Germans? They are talking about unification. If we are



spending \$160 billion to maintain our role in NATO and the world has changed, the Berlin Wall has collapsed, Communist governments have collapsed, what makes us think we cannot find some money to save? Our military budget ought to reflect the realities of the world, not some abstract idea

Congress looks at the military budget and builds it on the basis of worst case scenario, where the probability of war breaking out is 1,000 to 1. But let us look at the worst case scenario in terms of poverty in America, homelessness, hunger, illiteracy, excessive school dropout rates, drug problems that are crippling the nation. Faced with this real world at home, \$23.7 billion is not much money to cut from the military budget.

Anyone who thinks that a \$279 billion military budget in some way is a surrender of America is living in an absurd world. I do not see the Soviet Union running across the central path of Europe. I do not see them coming to the United States because they know what we know. We are all crazy enough to put these triggers under certain circumstances that would annihilate human life on this planet.

### **A Compassionate Budget**

To summarize, we have developed a budget based on competence, based on compassion and based on integrity. We have written a budget that focuses a new vision for American by expanding existing social programs and engaging in new initiatives, by developing a military budget not rooted in the obsolete idea of the cold war but rather of an emerging new reality.

Our future does not lie in technology and nuclear weapon capability but in our commitment to peace and in our commitment to human beings.

### **Alternative Military Budget**

Reflecting the view of the world expressed by Congressman Dellums, the alternative budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) applied the following principles to military spending:

- o Reduce the threat of nuclear war through arms control negotiations and restrictions on new nuclear weapons funding; this instead of the Reagan emphasis on developing first-strike and nuclear war-fighting capability.
- o Reduce the one-half to two-thirds of the military budget directed at preparing to fight protracted World War II-style land wars in Europe.
- o Reduce active force levels by 10 percent this year (this includes withdrawals from Europe).
- o Redefine the U.S. relationship with the Third World and move away from the present emphasis on intervention and intimidation.
- o Eliminate overlapping and unnecessary weapons and procurement inefficiencies, and abuse.
- o Fully support military personnel and their families; and
- o Establish programs for economic conversion and military toxic waste clean-up.

In carrying out these principles, the CBC budget would eliminate the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) except for some basic research, both the MX and Midgetman missiles, B-2 bomber procurement, the 19th Trident submarine, Trident II submarine-launched missiles, short-range air-attack missiles (SRAAM), and the follow-on-to-Lance (FOTL) short-range, land-based missile intended for use on Europe. The CBC also proposes reducing active force levels by 200,000 troops, including withdrawals from Europe. This would be accomplished by deactivating two European Army divisions, one carrier task force, two U.S.-based Army divisions, and two U.S.-based Air Force air wings.

[June 1, 1990]

**Editorial**  
**From Arms Control to Disarmament**

The Cold War is rapidly ebbing. Soviet expansionism has ended. Soviet withdrawal from Eastern Europe has begun. The containment approach of the United States has lost its reason for being. The justification for the United States government to spend \$160 billion a year to defend Western Europe is gone.

Even so, the most frightening aspect of the Cold War persists: the enormously powerful nuclear arsenal that mutually threatens to destroy the U.S. and Soviet homelands. The upcoming Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) will place some modest constraints on the number of long-range missiles and bombers, but a plentiful supply of warheads will remain poised for attack -- enough to cause a nuclear holocaust.

**New Thinking Needed**

We will not be able to eliminate this danger unless we alter the frame of reference of our thinking. Specifically we should shift our approach **from arms control to disarmament**.

*Arms control* seeks to limit the number and type of nuclear weapons. In contrast, *disarmament* aims at reducing and eventually eliminating the supply. In *arms control negotiations*, each side seeks an advantage over the other in the quality and quantity of nuclear weapons permitted. *Disarmament*, carried out in stages, is concerned that neither side is at a disadvantage nor feels threatened at each stage of the reduction process. Under *arms control* the two sides are permitted to modernize their nuclear arsenal in order to make their missiles and bombers more effective. The *disarmament* approach, in comparison, halts research, development, testing, production, and further deployment as unnecessary and wasteful. Why modernize weapons which are to be dismantled?

**Strategic Disarmament**

The pending START agreement illustrates the approach of arms control. The agreement now nearing completion will reduce the Soviet arsenal about 30 percent and the U.S. arsenal only 10 percent. Although some issues are unresolved, it appears that the agreement will allow each side to build and deploy all the new weapons now in the pipeline. This includes modernized silo-based and land-based mobile missiles for the Soviet Union and land-based mobile missiles and the new, long-range B-2 bomber for the United States.

Of course, the modest reduction is helpful, especially since it reverses the upward trend and installs useful verification procedures. But if it were viewed more as a first stage along the route toward total abolition, it would be even more significant. Then all the expensive modernization could be scrapped. A step-by-step plan to dismantle and destroy the entire strategic arsenal would be worked out, looking to total abolition by the year 2000.

**Arms Control in Europe**

A framework of disarmament instead of arms control also offers a better perspective for dealing with European security, especially the future of unified Germany. The arms control approach is centered in Negotiations on Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE), aimed at reducing the level of troops, tanks, and aircraft deployed by the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe and the forces of the United States

and its allies in Western Europe. This approach envisions the continued basing of U.S. forces in Germany and elsewhere in Western Europe, maintenance of a sizable German army, and continued presence of Soviet troops in Eastern Europe. This is a Cold War scheme, designed to contain armed confrontation but not eliminate it.

Events, however, are outpacing the arms control negotiators. Political change in Eastern Europe has in effect eliminated the Warsaw Pact as a cohesive military alliance. Soviet forces are on their way out of Czechoslovakia and Hungary, and their long-term presence in Poland and what is now East German territory is questionable. As this occurs, the principal reason for the United States to base armed forces in Europe -- countering Soviet forces -- is vanishing.

#### **Disarmament: A Better Course**

Looking at these trends differently, the disarmament perspective insists that the maintenance of large standing armies and air forces in Europe is obsolete from the viewpoint of everyone's self-interest (except the arms manufacturers and the officer corps). Complete and general European disarmament is a much better course. Under this arrangement, the Soviet Union would withdraw all its forces, demobilize them, and destroy all of their fighting equipment. This would alleviate a concern about Soviet resurgence. Simultaneously the Germany army and air force would be abolished except for a small remnant to guard the border but with no offensive capability. This would ease the greatest fear of German unification. Other European armies would be substantially reduced. The United States would bring its forces home, demobilize them, and destroy their fighting equipment.

A CFE agreement, as the first stage of this process, could be useful by establishing verification procedures and establishing the principle that withdrawn weapons should be destroyed. But quickly other stages of European disarmament should follow. NATO, as a no longer needed military alliance, would follow the Warsaw Pact into oblivion. The 35-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), to which the United States and Canada belong, could emerge as the vehicle to maintain lasting peace and prevent rearming.

**It is time to seek disarmament, not merely arms control.**

-- Howard W. Hallman, Executive Director, Methodists United for Peace with Justice

[June 29, 1990]

## Witnessing for Peace and Justice

### General Agenda

In our booklet, *Witnessing for Peace and Justice: Peacemaker Handbook*, we suggest that local peace and justice groups pursue the following general agenda:

- (a) **Prayer.** Each meeting of the group will be enhanced by periods of in-depth reflection on spiritual issues.
- (b) **Personal sharing.** A group is more than just a few people meeting together. It is an opportunity to build the personal contact and support that can sustain us in our day-to-day efforts for just peace.
- (c) **Study.** Learning more about the issues and questions of the day is important for personal and community growth and credibility. Study may be issue-directed or spiritually-directed.
- (d) **Action.** Community is the heart of Christian life and teaching. If all men and women are brothers and sisters, then the world is a community. One of the greatest challenges facing those who would be peacemakers is building vital, active sustaining communities. It helps to have goals that give direction and a plan of action that shows who is responsible for various components.

### Action Ideas

There is an abundance of ways you can engage in action for peacemaking.

#### In Worship

- o Start "passing the peace" as part of your worship service.
- o Put one-liners in your service bulletins.
- o Get the choir to sing anthems of peace.
- o Have liturgies in worship service on themes of peace and social justice.
- o Have a peace sing-in in your church where the songs and hymns have themes about peace and justice. In preparation discuss what you like or dislike about different songs.

#### Personal Lifestyle

- o Collect and display toys that promote caring, sharing, and learning. Contrast these with toys that seem to encourage violence.
- o Encourage children and parents to watch selected television programs. Write to stations either in support of the programs or to express concerns about programs that foster racial or class stereotypes or violence.
- o Urge members of your church to have a family devotional time after the evening meal, using Bible passages that describe *shalom*.

#### Education

- o Select and openly debate an issue that is causing conflict in your community.
- o Have a bulletin board for posters, different sayings or quotes and programs of peace.
- o Write articles in your church newsletter.
- o Have different groups make posters or mobiles symbolizing their ideas of peace. Put these up in the church.

- o To create interest and discussion, play the game called "War Bag". Use a large brown shopping bag. Have each person select pictures and newspaper articles, or write their own thoughts, about things that contribute to the world of war. Once collected, have each person discuss her or his contributions. Then tie up the bag and throw it away. The dialogue will give the group new insights into war-making. At a subsequent meeting, hold a discussion of things that contribute to peacemaking. Again, each person can select pictures and newspaper articles, or write their thoughts, and present them in group discussion.
- o Make a peace calendar. If your church has a monthly or yearly calendar, make sure the peace events are noted.

#### **The Media**

- o Write letters to the editor.
- o Encourage newspapers, television and radio stations to keep people informed on certain issues.
- o When you know of a good peace and justice program or project, encourage various media to cover it. Call them and send a news release. Public television and radio stations are particularly open to suggestions regarding public service programming.

#### **Other Peace with Justice Resources**

*Peace with Justice Newsletter*, containing worship aids, issue information, and action ideas. Four issues a year for \$6.00. Published by the Peace with Justice Program, United Methodist General Board of Church and Society (100 Maryland Avenue, NE, Washington, DC 20002).

"Peace with Justice Resource Package" that includes the *Peace with Justice Newsletter*; one year subscription to *Christian Social Action* (the Board's monthly magazine); a handbook, *Peace with Justice in the Local Church*; one set of Peace with Justice Week materials; and monthly mailing on events, issues, and action models. Cost is \$35. Order from Peace with Justice Program (address above).

The handbook, *Peace with Justice in the Local Church*, is available separately for \$4.50 from United Methodist Discipleship Resources, P.O. Box 189, Nashville, TN 37202.

---

i. A copy of this 36-page booklet is available for \$2.50 from Methodists United for Peace with Justice, 421 Seward Square, NE, Washington, DC 20003. There is a 10 percent discount for orders of ten or more.

[June 29, 1990]

## News from Methodists United

### Decisions of Board of Directors

The Board of Directors of Methodists United for Peace with Justice held its semi-annual meeting on March 30-31, 1990 in Washington, D.C. The Board made a number of decisions to guide the work of our organization.

**Continue current issue focus on disarmament and federal budget priorities.** We will continue our work for disarmament by supporting current US/Soviet negotiations and multilateral negotiations and resulting treaties but will advocate a more rapid pace of arms reduction with much larger cutbacks. On budget priorities we will support (a) deep cuts in military spending, (b) increase spending for human and community needs, and (c) progressive tax increases for deficit reduction.

**Establish stronger Pan-Methodist connections.** The founders of Methodists United for Peace with Justice came from the United Methodist Church, but from the beginning we had a commitment to relate to other Methodist denominations. That's why our name is *Methodists United*. As a step in this direction, the Board voted to add to Board membership three persons each from the African Methodist Episcopal (AME), AME Zion, and Christian Methodist Episcopal (CME) Churches. Persons from these three denominations will also be invited to serve on the National Advisory Committee. We are now working with AME, AME Zion, and CME leaders to bring this about.

The Board also agreed to invite several caucuses within the United Methodist Church to appoint representatives to our Board of Directors. As of this date, new Board members are Rev. William Robinson of Little Rock, Arkansas and Rev. Cindy Tappan of Cleveland Heights, Ohio, representing Black Methodists for Church Renewal, and Sue Herne of Hogsburg, New York, representing Native American International Caucus. In addition, Rev. Yolanda Pupo Ortiz will serve as liaison with Metodistas Asociados Representando la Causa de los Hispanos-Americanos (MARCHA). We have also invited the National Federation of Asian American United Methodists to appoint a representative.

Several of our present Board are also active in the Methodist Federation for Social Action. We recognize that we have distinct roles, such as our emphasis upon lobbying from a base in Washington, D.C., but we want to have a cooperative relationship with the Federation. Therefore, the Board has invited George McClain, executive director of the Federation, to our next Board meeting. In reciprocity our executive director, Howard Hallman, was invited to the Federation's National Executive Committee meeting in May and made a presentation about our work. Meanwhile, we continue to work closely with the official United Methodist advocacy agency, the General Board of Church and Society.

**Expand outreach with *Peace/Justice Alerts*.** One of our major missions is to provide timely information about federal legislation to grassroots peace and justice activists. To do this we provide background information in *Peace Leaf*, and we send out *Peace/Justice Alerts* on specific legislative issues. The Board wants to continue this practice and to expand the circulation of these two publications. With this in mind, we are starting to work with our contacts in the 72 United Methodist conferences to find ways of getting *Peace/Justice Alerts* to more people in local churches. In the future we will do the same within the AME, AME Zion, and CME denominations.

We also want to provide a regular flow of information to the 64 United Methodist conference newspapers about contemporary peace and justice issues, and to publications of the other three Methodist denominations.

#### **Tax-exempt Fund Created**

At its previous meeting in October 1989, the Board of Directors passed a resolution to establish the *Methodists United Peace/Justice Education Fund*, which would be able to receive tax-deductible contributions under provisions of section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Since then, we have applied to the Internal Revenue Service for "(c)(3)" tax-exemption for this Fund. We expect approval by mid-summer.

In the meantime, we have made arrangements with another 501(c)(3) organization, the Civic Action Institute, to serve as a channel for tax-deductible contributions to Methodists United. For that purpose, the Institute's Board of Directors has created a special "Methodists United Project." Therefore, anyone who wants to make a tax-deductible gift to Methodists United can send us a check made out to *Civic Action Institute* with the notation "for Methodists United Project."

#### **METHODISTS UNITED**

*for Peace with Justice*

*421 Seward Square, SE*

*Washington, DC 20003*

*Peace Leaf*

*April-June 1990*

*Bulk Rate*

*U.S. Postage Paid*

*Washington, DC 20003*

*Permit N. 2676*

*[June 29, 1990]*



March 10, 1990

Mr. Scott Williams  
Office of Senator Nunn  
303 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Williams:

As I discussed with over the telephone, Methodists United for Peace with Justice likes to offer views of prominent Methodists in our quarterly newsletter, *Peace Leaf*. We did this earlier this year with an issue on the federal budget (enclosed), featuring the perspectives of five members of Congress.

In our forthcoming issue, we want to focus on national security needs of the 1990s in light of changes occurring in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the apparent winding down of the Cold War. Matters we want to consider are (1) the likely primary threats to U.S. national security during the next ten years, (2) how the United States should respond to these threats, and (3) what this means regarding the kind of military force required and the level of military expenditures.

We would like to have Senator Nunn's views on these issues. You indicated that his current series of Senate speeches focus on this matter and that you could supply us with copies. We could then extract portions that relate to these issues. That arrangement is satisfactory to us. Please send us the speeches. We will adapt them to an article of 1,000 to 1,200 words and then send this draft back to you for review to be certain that our editing is fair to Senator Nunn's viewpoint.

*We will have similar articles derived from recent speeches and statements by Senator Dale Bumpers and Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr. We are also asking Bob Edgar, a former United Methodist minister and a former member of Congress, to write a brief analysis of these presentations, especially with reference to the United Methodist bishops pastoral letter, *In Defense of Creation*.*

*I want to start working on these articles by April 20, so I will appreciate getting copies of Senator Nunn's speeches as soon as possible.*

*Sincerely yours,*

*Howard W. Hallman  
Executive Director*

March 10, 1990

Ms Melissa Scoffield  
Office of Senator Bumpers  
229 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Ms. Scoffield:

As I discussed with over the telephone, Methodists United for Peace with Justice likes to offer views of prominent Methodists in our quarterly newsletter, *Peace Leaf*. We did this earlier this year with an issue on the federal budget (enclosed), featuring the perspectives of five members of Congress.

In our forthcoming issue, we want to focus on national security needs of the 1990s in light of changes occurring in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the apparent winding down of the Cold War. Matters we want to consider are (1) the likely primary threats to U.S. national security during the next ten years, (2) how the United States should respond to these threats, and (3) what this means regarding the kind of military force required and the level of military expenditures.

We would like to have Senator Bumpers' views on these issues. You indicated that he has recently give several speeches related to the topic and that you could supply us with copies. We could then extract portions that relate to our focus. That arrangement is satisfactory to us. Please send us the speeches. We will adapt them to an article of 1,000 to 1,200 words and then send this draft back to you for review to be certain that our editing is fair to Senator Bumpers' viewpoint.

*We will have similar articles derived from recent speeches and statements by Senator Sam Nunn and Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr. We are also asking Bob Edgar, a former United Methodist minister and a former member of Congress, to write a brief analysis of these presentations, especially with reference to the United Methodist bishops pastoral letter, *In Defense of Creation*.*

*I want to start working on these articles by April 20, so I will appreciate getting copies of Senator Bumpers' speeches as soon as possible.*

*Sincerely yours,*

*Howard W. Hallman  
Executive Director*

March 10, 1990

Ms. Brooke Jaffe

Office of Adm. William J. Crowe, Jr.

1800 K Street, NW, Suite 400

Washington, DC 20006

Dear Ms. Jaffe:

As I discussed with over the telephone, Methodists United for Peace with Justice likes to offer views of prominent Methodists in our quarterly newsletter, *Peace Leaf*. We did this earlier this year with an issue on the federal budget (enclosed), featuring the perspectives of five members of Congress.

In our forthcoming issue, we want to focus on national security needs of the 1990s in light of changes occurring in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the apparent winding down of the Cold War. Matters we want to consider are (1) the likely primary threats to U.S. national security during the next ten years, (2) how the United States should respond to these threats, and (3) what this means regarding the kind of military force required and the level of military expenditures.

We would like to have Admiral Crowe's views on these issues from the perspective of his long military career and his recent visits to the Soviet Union. In our discussion you indicated that he does not have time to write an article at this time, but that it might be possible for us extract portions of recent speeches and congressional testimony on this topic. We would like to proceed on that basis, so we request you to send us copies of such speeches and testimony. We will adapt them to an article of 1,000 to 1,200 words

*and then send this draft back to you for you and Admiral Crowe to review to be certain that our editing is fair to his viewpoint.*

*We will have similar articles derived from recent speeches and statements by Senators Sam Nunn and Dale Bumpers. We are also asking Bob Edgar, a former United Methodist minister and a former member of Congress, to write a brief analysis of these presentations, especially with reference to the United Methodist bishops pastoral letter, *In Defense of Creation*.*

*I want to start working on these articles by April 20, so I will appreciate getting copies of Admiral Crowe's speeches as soon as possible.*

*Sincerely yours,*

*Howard W. Hallman*

March 10, 1990

Mr. Bob Edgar, Executive Director  
Committee on National Security  
1601 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 301  
Washington, DC 20009

Dear Bob:

In our January-March issue of *Peace Leaf*, as you may have noticed, we offered views of five United Methodist members of Congress on the federal budget. For the April-June issue we will focus on national security needs of the 1990s in light of changes occurring in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the apparent winding down of the Cold War. We plan to have three articles based upon speeches and statements of Senators Sam Nunn and Dale Bumpers and Admiral Crowe, all United Methodists.

To go with these articles we want a one-page, comparative analysis of what these three persons have stated, how they agree and disagree, with special reference to the United Methodist bishops' pastoral letter, *In Defense of Creation*. Would you be willing to receive the Nunn, Bumpers, and Crowe articles and write such an analysis? It could be similar to page 6 of the January-March *Peace Leaf*, except that your article would be signed by you. In our format this is about 700-750 words.

If you are willing, the other three articles (1,000-1,200 words each) should be ready to give you by April 25. We would hope that we might be able to get your analysis within a week to ten days. I'll call you within a few days to find out if you have the time and inclination to help us in this manner.

*Sincerely yours,*

*Howard W. Hallman*  
*Executive Director*



June 1, 1990

Mr. Scott Williams  
Office of Senator Nunn  
303 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Mr. Williams:

After a little delay, I have drawn on the floor speeches of Senator Nunn related to the changed threat environment and the need for a new military strategy and have produced the enclosed draft of an article for *Peace Leaf*, our newsletter. In taking excerpts here and there, I have tried to offer the sweep of Senator Nunn's views and to preserve the integrity of his presentation.

Please review this draft, let me know if it is all right, or offer suggestion for changes. I am willing to following your advise for modification, but I would like to keep the article at approximately its present length.

Since we are reaching mostly Methodists with our newsletter, I would like to mention the church to which Senator Nunn belongs. If that is acceptable, please supply me with this information.

This edition of *Peace Leaf* will also contain an article by Senator Bumpers, derived from several of his floor speeches, and an article by Representative Dellums, based upon his opening and closing arguments on the floor in behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget.

*Thanks for your assistance.*

*Sincerely yours,*

*Howard W. Hallman  
Executive Director*

June 1, 1990

Mr. George Withers  
Office of Congressman Dellums  
2136 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear George:

After a little delay, I have drawn on Congressman Dellums' opening and closing arguments on the floor in behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget and have combined them into the enclosed draft of an article for *Peace Leaf*, our newsletter. You will note that I have been creative in moving paragraphs around, but I believe that I have kept the integrity of Congressman's Dellums ideas.

Please review this draft, let me know if it is all right, or offer suggestion for changes. On page 3, I have marked one sentence taken from the *Congressional Record*, that doesn't make sense to me. You might want edit it. And if you wish to make other modifications beyond the texts of the May 1st speeches, such as to reflect the Bush-Gorbachev summit, please feel free to do so. I would, though, like to keep the article at approximately its present length.

This edition of *Peace Leaf* will also contain an article by Senator Nunn, based upon the floor speeches he made on military policy, and an article by Senator Bumpers, derived from several floor speeches.

You can reach me by phone at 897-3668. Thanks for your assistance.

*Sincerely yours,*

*Howard W. Hallman*  
*Executive Director*

July 14, 1990

The Honorable Sam Nunn  
303 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Nunn:

We have now published our newsletter, *Peace Leaf*, containing your article "A New Military Strategy", which we derived from your Senate speeches on this subject in March and April. Several copies are enclosed. We thank you for this article, and we appreciate the assistance of Scott Williams in reviewing our condensation of your speeches.

This issue of *Peace Leaf* also contains articles dealing with approaches to national security "After the Cold War" by Senator Dale Bumpers and Representative Ronald Dellums.

In addition, there is an editorial, which I wrote, calling for a switch in emphasis from arms control to disarmament. The difference is that arms control deals with limitations on the arms race but keeps the United States and the Soviet heavily armed, especially with strategic weapons, while disarmament envisions a step-by-step reduction toward the eventual goal of total abolition of nuclear weapons, perhaps by the year 2000. Another example in the editorial is to go beyond the current arms control objective of conventional force reduction in Europe to the goal of complete and general disarmament in Europe.

We believe that the ending of the Cold War and the changes occurring in the

*Soviet Union and Eastern Europe make these more ambitious goals achievable in the 1990s. What do you think of this viewpoint?*

*Sincerely yours,*

*Howard W. Hallman  
Executive Director*

July 14, 1990

The Honorable Dale Bumpers  
229 Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Bumpers:

We have now published our newsletter, *Peace Leaf*, containing your article "A New Epoch Begins", derived from several Senate speeches of yours. Several copies are enclosed. We thank you for this article, and we appreciate the assistance of Melissa Skolfield in preparing the article for publication.

This issue of *Peace Leaf* also contains articles dealing with approaches to national security "After the Cold War" by Senator Sam Nunn and Representative Ronald Dellums.

In addition, there is an editorial, which I wrote, calling for a switch in emphasis from arms control to disarmament. The difference is that arms control deals with limitations on the arms race but keeps the United States and the Soviet heavily armed, especially with strategic weapons, while disarmament envisions a step-by-step reduction toward the eventual goal of total abolition of nuclear weapons, perhaps by the year 2000. Another example in the editorial is to go beyond the current arms control objective of conventional force reduction in Europe to the goal of complete and general disarmament in Europe.

We believe that the ending of the Cold War and the changes occurring in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe make these more ambitious goals achievable

*in the 1990s. What do you think of this viewpoint?*

*Sincerely yours,*

*Howard W. Hallman  
Executive Director*



July 14, 1990

The Honorable Ronald V. Dellums  
2136 Rayburn Hoouse Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Dellums:

We have now published our newsletter, *Peace Leaf*, containing your article "New Priorities for the Real World", based upon your floor speeches on May 1 in presenting the Quality of Life Alternative Budget. Several copies are enclosed. We thank you for this article, and we appreciate the assistance of George Withers, Julie Hadnot, and Bob Brauer in preparing the article for publication.

This issue of *Peace Leaf* also contains articles dealing with the approaches to national security "After the Cold War" by Senators Sam Nunn and Dale Bumpers.

In addition, there is an editorial, which I wrote, calling for a switch in emphasis from arms control to disarmament. The difference is that arms control deals with limitations on the arms race but keeps the United States and the Soviet heavily armed, especially with strategic weapons, while disarmament envisions a step-by-step reduction toward the eventual goal of total abolition of nuclear weapons, perhaps by the year 2000. Another example in the editorial is to go beyond the current arms control objective of conventional force reduction in Europe to the goal of complete and general disarmament in Europe.

*We believe that the ending of the Cold War and the changes occurring in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe make these more ambitious goals achievable in the 1990s. What do you think of this viewpoint?*

*Sincerely yours,*

*Howard W. Hallman  
Executive Director*

July 14, 1990

Ms. Brooke Jaffe  
Office of Adm. William J. Crowe, Jr.  
1800 K Street, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Ms. Jaffe:

Several months ago I was in touch with you about a possible article from Admiral Crowe for our newsletter, *Peace Leaf*. He didn't have time to write such an article, and his testimony on Capitol Hill, which might have been adapted for this purpose, was not yet published. You sent me some alternative material, but this didn't quite fit in with the other articles we were publishing.

The ultimate outcome is the enclosed issue of *Peace Leaf*, which contains articles offering approaches to national security "After the Cold War" by three members of Congress and my editorial on the subject.

Even though it didn't work out with Admiral Crowe this time, I greatly appreciate your help. Perhaps there will be another occasion when we will seek some writing of the Admiral.

Sincerely yours,

Howard W. Hallman