

## **Religious Statements to 1998 NPT PrepCom**

*The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has provisions for a Review Conference every five years. In each five year period an NPT Preparatory Committee meets several times to prepare for the next Review Conference. For the 1998 session in Geneva, Switzerland two statements laid out the religious case for the elimination of nuclear weapons.*

### **Act Now for Nuclear Abolition**

*The Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, presented the following statement to the 1998 PrepCom delegates. [insert photo of Dr. Raiser and Cardinal Danneels, preferably with NPT PrepCom chair]*

[PDF document]

The time has come to rid planet Earth of nuclear weapons -- all of them, everywhere. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee has a remarkable opportunity at its upcoming meeting to set the course resolutely for the achievement of this goal.

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. This was quite apparent in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The same result would probably occur in any further use, and indeed would be worse because of the increased destructive power of modern nuclear weapons.

*When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt. It loses sight of the inviolable connection between means and end by failing to recognize that just ends cannot be achieved through wrongful means.*

During the past 50 years the production and testing of nuclear weapons has proven grievously harmful to individuals and the environment in the vicinity of mining operations, processing plants, production facilities, and test sites. Numerous locales are burdened with lingering radioactivity and deadly waste products that will take decades to clean up. Some sites may never be restored to safe occupancy.

Psalm 24 teaches, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, the world and those who dwell therein." The First Book of Moses, also known as Genesis, indicates that God made Earth available to humankind to till and keep, that is, to use for mutual benefit and to preserve. Because production and use of nuclear weapons causes grave harm to Earth and its inhabitants, we as good stewards of God's Earth have an obligation to rid the world of this perilous threat.

Numerous religious bodies have condemned nuclear weapons and have called for their abolition. Thus, the Sixth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1983 stated: "We believe that the time has come when the churches must unequivocally declare that the production and deployment as well as the use of nuclear weapons are a crime against humanity and that such activities must be condemned on ethical and theological grounds. Furthermore, we appeal for the institution of a universal covenant to this effect so that nuclear weapons and warfare are delegitimized and condemn as violations of international law."

Speaking for the Holy See before the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 15, 1997, Archbishop Renato Martino stated: "Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition....This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity."

In principle the nations of Earth agree on the need to eliminate nuclear weapons. Indeed, they have made a strong commitment in Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) "to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." After reviewing this article at the request of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice unanimously agreed that "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control."

Now is the time to take this obligation seriously. We call upon the members of the NPT Preparatory Committee to make the 1998 session a notable landmark in the journey toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First, we ask the delegates to call resolutely upon the nuclear weapon states to embark upon a series of steps along the road leading to nuclear abolition. There is broad consensus among study commissions, retired generals and admirals, scientists, and other civilian experts on what these steps should be. They include:

- Declare a policy of no first use amongst themselves and non-use in relation to non-nuclear weapon states.
- Cease all research, development, production, and deployment of new nuclear weapons.
- Refrain from modernizing the existing nuclear arsenal and increasing the number of deployed nuclear weapons.
- Take all nuclear forces off alert and remove warheads from delivery vehicles.
- Achieve faster and deeper bilateral reduction of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia.

It would be appropriate for the NPT Preparatory Committee to require the nuclear weapon states to provide annual progress reports on how they are carrying out such measures.

Second, we ask the delegates to take the lead in commencing the process of developing a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish all nuclear weapons. One appropriate method would be to establish a working group of the NPT Preparatory Committee for this purpose. Although the nuclear weapons states should be part of this process, other nations need not wait until they are willing to become engaged. Rather as stewards of God's Earth, non-nuclear weapon states can begin the task of developing a nuclear weapons convention that specifies a fair and effective program to abolish all nuclear weapons.

We appeal to delegates to the NPT Preparatory Committee to consider what is best for the whole Earth and its inhabitants when they vote on issues of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. Loyalty to all humankind exceeds that of loyalty within political blocs of nations. We urge delegates to act now decisively and courageously for the benefit of all the peoples of Earth.

Godfried Cardinal Danneels, President  
Pax Christi International

Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary  
World Council of Churches

March 1998

### **Co-Signers**

*The following religious leaders co-signed the statement, "Act Now for Nuclear Abolition".*  
[format into two columns]

**Archbishop Michael**  
Metropolitan Bishop  
Greek Orthodox Church in Austria  
President, Ecumenical Council of  
Churches in Austria

**Superintendent Helmut Nausner**  
United Methodist Church in Austria  
Secretary, Ecumenical Council of Churches

**Christine Gleixner**  
Mother Superior of the Order, Sisters of Bethany, and Vice Chair, Ecumenical Council of  
Churches in Austria

**Rev. Ivan Petkin**  
Bulgarian Orthodox Church in Austria

**Rev. Johannes El Baramousy**  
Koptic Orthodox Church in Austria

**Bishop Mag. Herwig Sturm**  
Lutheran Church in Austria

**Bishop Bernhard Heitz**  
Old Catholic Church, Austria

**Bishop Dr. Heinrich Fasching**  
Roman Catholic Church  
President, "Justitia et Pax" in Austria

**Metropolit Archbishop Ireneji**  
Russian Orthodox Church in Austria

**The Most Rev. J. Barry Curtis**  
President, Canadian Council of Churches

**Archbishop Michael G. Peers**  
Primate of the Anglican Church of Canada

**The Rev. Arie G. Van Eek**  
Council of Christian Reformed Churches  
in Canada

**The Rev. Telmor Sartison, Bishop**  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada  
**Marvin Frey**  
Executive Director  
Mennonite Central Committee Canada

**The Rev. John D. Congram**  
Moderator  
The Presbyterian Church in Canada

**Gale Wills**  
Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)  
in Canada

**Commissioner Donald V. Kerr**  
Territorial Commander  
The Salvation Army, Canada

**The Very Rev. Bill Phipps**  
Moderator  
United Church of Canada

**Rev. Dr. Lothar Engel**  
Deputy General, Association of Protestant Churches and Missions in Germany

**Bishop Dr. Walter F. Klaiber**  
United Methodist Church in Germany

**Rev. John Reardon**  
General Secretary  
Council of Churches for Britain and Ireland

**D. Dr. Béla Harmati**  
Bishop of the Lutheran Church  
President, Ecumenical Council  
of Churches in Hungary

**Dr. Zoltán Bóna**

General Secretary, Ecumenical Council  
of Churches in Hungary

**Rev. Domenico Tomasetto**  
President, Federation of Protestant  
Churches in Italy

**Rev. Kenichi Otsu**  
General Secretary,  
National Christian Council in Japan

**Rev. Samuel I. Koshiishi**  
Acting General Secretary  
Nippon Sei Ko Kai  
(Anglican/ Episcopal Church)

**Rev. Junichiro Naito**  
Executive Secretary  
Japan Baptist Convention

**Rev. Masakazu Asami**  
President  
Japan Evangelical Lutheran Church

**Rev. Satoru Gohada**  
President  
Japan Free Methodist Church

**Rev. Sadao Ozawa**  
General Secretary  
United Church of Christ in Japan

**William V. Robinson**  
President, CCANZ (Conference of Churches in Aotearoa New Zealand)

**Rev. Jennifer Dawson**  
President, CCANZ

**Rev. Max Reid**  
President, CCANZ

**Mrs. Jan Cornack**  
General Secretary, CCANZ

**Rev. Billy Taranger**  
President, Christian Council of Norway

**Rev. Ingrid Vad Nilsen**

General Secretary  
Christian Council of Norway

**Bishop Nifon** of Slobozia and Calarasi  
President, Ecumenical Association  
of Churches in Romania

**Bishop Christoph Klein**  
Evangelical AC Church in Romania  
Vice President, Ecumenical Association  
of Churches in Romania

**Bishop Kalman Csiha**  
Reformed Church of Transsylvania  
Member, Administrative Council  
Ecumenical Association of Churches  
in Romania

**Christian Teodoresu**  
General Secretary, Ecumenical Association  
of Churches in Romania

**Rev. Thord-Ove Thordson**  
General Secretary  
Christian Council of Sweden

**Rev. Tord Ström**  
General Secretary  
Free Church of Sweden

**Rev. Krister Andersson**  
President and General Secretary  
Mission Covenant Church of Sweden

### **A Spiritual, Ethical, and Humanitarian Perspective on Nuclear Weapons**

[PDF document]

*As part of a series of presentations to the 1998 PrepCom meeting by non-governmental organizations, the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition developed this statement. Co-chairs of the Working Group were Howard W. Hallman, Methodists United for Peace with Justice; Ibrahim Abdil-Mu'id Ramey, Fellowship of Reconciliation (USA); and Dave Robinson, Pax Christi USA. The final draft was polished and presented on April 28, 1998 by Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, past president of Pax Christi USA.. [insert photo of Bishop Gumbleton]*

Mr. Chairman and delegates to the 1998 session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, we in the community of non-governmental organizations greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and provide information on vital issues that are on your agenda. My role is to offer some ideas developed by the Religious Working Group for Nuclear Abolition.

You meet at a propitious time. With a new millennium rapidly approaching, the people of this planet would like to enter the new century free from the threat of nuclear holocaust. In the next two weeks you delegates here assembled have a great opportunity to take decisive action to set the course for the abolition of all nuclear weapons on Earth.

The moral grounds for nuclear abolition are expressed in a statement by Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, and Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Church, which you have received. They state

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment. ...As an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt.

This view stems from a belief in the sanctity of life, a perspective shared by other world religions: Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism.

I believe that most of you today, who come from different faiths, in your heart of hearts, in the deep recesses of your mind, also understand the moral depravity of nuclear weapons. The challenge to you is to let your moral judgment guide your actions.

A statement developed for this meeting by the International Peace Conference, based in Prague, offers a pair of reasons for the total rejection of nuclear weapons: first, the threat to Creation and, second, the contribution to moral degradation.

"Nuclear weapons," says this statement, "fundamentally differ from all other weapons because of their potential to destroy all life on this planet. They are terminal in relation to Nature. They can destroy the divine Creation....They take from God the sole power to end the created order, and thus usurp the divine prerogative....Nuclear weapons stand condemned because they can destroy 'the sacred gift of life' and are thus innately demonic and blasphemous."

Secondly, the statement notes, "The terrible suffering caused by nuclear weapons, their potential for total destruction, and their perversion of the fundamental nature of matter have contributed immeasurably to the moral degradation of humanity in our time." This moral decline has escalated from the mass slaughter of World War I to the Nazi concentration camps to the mass bombing of cities in World War II to the development of nuclear weapons and their use on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the 1945. Since then "the East-West nuclear confrontation with the readiness of states to commit global genocide further hugely contributed to the moral de-sensitization of our age, now so evident in many aspects of contemporary life."

From an ethical perspective, Judge Mohammed Bedjaoui, when he was president of the International Court of Justice, stated: "The nuclear weapon, the ultimate evil, destabilizes humanitarian law which is the law of lesser evil. The existence of nuclear weapons is therefore a challenge to the very existence of humanitarian law, not to mention their long-term effects of damage to the human environment, in respect to which the right to life must be exercised."

Judge Bedjaoui spoke in connection with the 1996 advisory opinion of the International

Court of Justice in which the Court decided unanimously that under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all aspects under strict and effective international control."

Notice the words "good faith", two terms with deep religious meaning. In this context they refer to basic honesty, to abiding by one's commitment. You delegates have it within your goodness to act decisively in behalf of all us: humans, animals, plants, the whole community of life. We have faith that you will show yourself worthy of this trust.

Even if no other nuclear bomb is exploded, the Earth will remain scarred by the nuclear weapons era. Earth and its people have suffered grave harm in the mining of fissionable material, by production of nuclear warheads with the byproduct of radioactive waste, and through nuclear testing in the atmosphere and below the ground.

Beyond harm to people and environmental damage, nuclear weapons have taken an enormous economic toll. Since the 1940s the nuclear weapon states have spent more than \$8 trillion to develop, test, produce, transport, deploy, and safeguard their nuclear arsenal. This vast waste of resources brings to mind the words of U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, himself a former general, words deemed so important that they are engraved beside his tomb in Abilene, Kansas. "Every gun made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed....This is not a way of life at all....Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron."

The great irony is that the nuclear weapon states through these vast expenditures have failed to produce the security they seek. Indeed, it is their own people who are at greatest risk due to their doctrine of mutually assured destruction. Citizens of the allies of nuclear weapon states are themselves vulnerable to nuclear attack because of the military doctrine of the nuclear powers. Any other nation gaining nuclear weapons would join the ranks of the insecure.

Tragically the nuclear weapon states and their allies are victims of a self-imposed and self-destructive addiction to nuclear weapons. Yes, an addiction. Like many other addictions cure can come in two ways.

First, the addicted can exercise self-will, can renounce the addictive substance or orientation, and can through great determination and inner strength free itself from the addiction that is sapping its vitality. In this case, the nuclear weapon states can say individually or join together in a covenant that says, "We renounce the use of nuclear weapons for war-fighting purposes. We renounce nuclear deterrence as an instrument of foreign and military policy." Renunciation would remove the fundamental blockage to carrying out a series of actions that lead to nuclear abolition. Other speakers on this program will describe the steps that can be taken along this road.

Second, friends of the addicted can apply "tough love". They can talk firmly and insist that the addicted take the necessary steps leading out of addiction. In the matter at hand, you delegates from non-nuclear weapon states can exercise tough love by insisting that the nuclear powers embark upon a course of action that moves toward nuclear abolition. You can even

develop a plan in the form of a nuclear weapons convention to outlaw and abolish nuclear weapons. Even if you are part of a political bloc with one or more nuclear weapon states, true friendship requires you to apply tough love by acting independently and supporting measures leading to nuclear abolition. Beyond that, each and every one of you has a higher loyalty to all of humankind, to the well-being of all peoples on Earth.

As you prepare to meet the challenges before you during this session of the NPT Preparatory Committee, I invite you to pause and observe one minute of silence. Draw upon the perspective of your personal faith and use this minute to reflect upon the human suffering caused by nuclear weapons in their more than fifty years of existence: the victims at Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the indigenous people and other inhabitants living in the vicinity of test sites in the western United States, Algeria, Russia, Kazakhstan, China, the South Pacific, and Australia; persons far away from test sites but harmed by drifting radioactive fallout; the people who have suffered by the side effects of mining operations and weapon production facilities.

In silence we can remember all who have suffered.. We can share together feelings of regret and contrition. You who are delegates can also use this moment to reflect on what you can accomplish in the next two weeks. You can re-dedicate yourself to working courageously and with imagination to find ways to end the nuclear arms race and rid Earth of this horrible plague on human existence.

May we pause now in silence.                    [One minute of silence.]

In the spirit of renewal and re-dedication, the NGO community this afternoon would like to offer you ideas on steps that can be undertaken to achieve the abolition of nuclear weapons, an achievable goal that humankind longs to accomplish. Although NGOs have various perspectives on the issues presented, we have collaborated in preparing these statements. We hope that our ideas will be useful to you in your deliberations. Throughout your session we will be available to you to elaborate on what we have presented today. We look forward to further exchange of ideas in the period leading up to the year 2000 NPT review conference.

Lastly I want to thank you personally for the privilege of speaking to you.

## Catholic Church

[*Photo of St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome*] The Catholic Church is the largest body of Christians in the world. It has about 1 billion members. The pope, who is the bishop of Rome, serves as the head of the Catholic Church and governs from Vatican City, sometimes referred to as the Holy See. The pope appoints cardinals to be his main advisers. As a group, they form the College of Cardinals and elect a new pope after a reigning pope dies or resigns. The pope also appoints bishops who preside over churches in different countries.

[Side bar: Picture of John Paul II with caption: Pope John Paul II has called for the banishment of all nuclear weapons through "a workable system for negotiation, even of arbitration".]

### Holy See

In recent years policy statements coming from the Holy See on nuclear disarmament are made by Holy See delegation to the United Nations in New York.

#### **"There Has Been Regression"**

[PDF document]

*Address by Monsignor Francis Chullikat, deputy head of a Holy See delegation to the United Nations, to the Preparatory Committee for the 2005 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in New York on April 10, 2002.*

[Possibly a photo of Monsignor Chullikat addressing the NPT PrepCom.]

[Within the body of the text a side bar: "There can be no moral acceptance of military doctrines that embody the permanence of nuclear weapons."]

Mr. Chairman, as the international community begins preparation for the 2005 Review of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, my Delegation notes the deep concern that is widely felt about the state of nuclear disarmament.

At the 2000 Review, it was felt that progress was being made. The Review obtained a clear-cut commitment from the nuclear weapon states that systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI would include: "An unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear weapon states to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament to which all states parties are committed under Article VI."

This commitment was embodied in a list of 13 practical steps the conference unanimously agreed to take. However, the progress made in implementing the 13 steps over the past two years has been indeed discouraging. In fact, the prospects for future implementation are alarming.

As an examination of the 13 steps shows, there has not only been a lack of sufficient progress, there has been regression. Although, thankfully, there has been no nuclear testing in this period, the entry-into-force of the CTBT cannot be seen on the near horizon. The Conference on Disarmament is paralyzed. One of the parties to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty has given

notice of withdrawal. Nuclear weapons are still kept on alert status. The admonition of the International Court of Justice for the completion of negotiations towards elimination is ignored.

Even more serious than the lack of progress is the overt determination of some nuclear weapon states to maintain nuclear weapons in a critical role in their military doctrines. While the international community rightly welcomes the willingness of those with the most nuclear weapons to reduce their stocks of operationally deployed warheads, what is the real effect of such unilateral disarmament when it is not made irreversible, i.e., when such stocks can be remounted again quickly?

My Delegation is deeply concerned about the old posture of nuclear deterrence that is evolving into the possibility of use in new strategies. This must be stoutly resisted. The Holy See has constantly recalled the fact that the strategy of deterrence can be envisaged only as a stage in the process aimed at disarmament, even of a progressive nature. So long as it is taken as an end in itself, deterrence encourages the protagonists to ensure a constant superiority over one another, in ceaseless race of over-arming.

Mr. Chairman, the concern of the Holy See mounts in seeing the non-proliferation regime, with the NPT as its cornerstone, in disarray. The old policies of nuclear deterrence, which prevailed in the Cold War, must lead now to concrete disarmament measures. The rule of law cannot countenance the continuation of doctrines that hold nuclear weapons as essential.

There can be no moral acceptance of military doctrines that embody the permanence of nuclear weapons. That is why Pope John Paul II has called for the banishment of all nuclear weapons through "a workable system for negotiation, even of arbitration." Those nuclear weapon states resisting negotiations should therefore be strongly urged to finally come to the negotiating table.

In fact, in clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence, they are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world. In this regard, my Delegation wishes to reaffirm its well-known position: nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century; they cannot be justified. These weapons are instruments of death and destruction. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands unequivocal action towards their elimination. Only when such a noble goal is attained can the international community be assured that nations are acting in "good faith".

Mr. Chairman, my Delegation is confident that the Preparatory Committee will seize this opportunity to develop a sharpened sense of urgency to root out nuclear weapons that are the biggest threat to mankind. To keep developing weapon systems that can jeopardize the natural structure upon which all civilization rests seriously undermines the genuine quest of the family of nations to build a culture of peace for the present and future generations.

### **"Nuclear Weapons Cannot Be Justified and Deserve Condemnation"**

[PDF document]

*Excerpt from a statement by Archbishop Renato Martino, the Holy See's permanent observer at the United Nations, to the United Nations' First Committee, October 15, 1997. After expressing support of the Holy See for the recently developed treaty to eliminate land mines, he stated:*

[Possibly a photo of Archbishop Martino.]

[Somewhere within the body of the text a side bar: "The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by universal authority."]

If biological weapons, chemical weapons and now land-mines can be done away with, so too can nuclear weapons. No weapon so threatens the longed-for peace of the 21<sup>st</sup> century as the nuclear.

Let not the immensity of this task dissuade us from the efforts needed to free humanity from such a scourge. With the valuable admonition offered in the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, the international community can see the legal and moral arguments against nuclear weapons intertwine with the strategic: since nuclear weapons can destroy all life on the planet, they peril all that humanity has ever stood for and indeed humanity itself.

During the acrimonious years of the Cold War with the emphasis on the military doctrine of nuclear deterrence as a constant justification for the nuclear arms build-up, the international community felt powerless to stop the relentless build-up of nuclear weapons. Not now, in the post-Cold War era characterized by new partnerships, the international community cannot shield itself from the assault on life itself that nuclear weapons represent.

The work of this Committee has done in calling for negotiations leading to a Nuclear Weapons Convention must be increased. Those nuclear weapons States resisting such negotiations must be challenged, for, in clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence, they are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world. The gravest consequences for mankind lie ahead if the world is to be ruled by the militarism represented by nuclear weapons rather than the humanitarian law espoused by the International Court of Justice.

Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. They cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to their abolition.

The Holy See has previously stated in this Committee: "The world must move to the abolition of nuclear weapons through a universal, non-discriminatory ban with intensive inspection by universal authority". Today we repeat those words, conscious that there is a gathering momentum of world opinion in support of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. This is a moral challenge, a legal challenge and a political challenge. That multiple-based challenge must be met by the application of our humanity.

### **U.S Conference of Catholic Bishops**

[*Import logo from web site: [www.usccb.org](http://www.usccb.org)*]. The Catholic Church with over 64 million members and more than 20,000 local congregations is the largest religious body in the United States. Oversight is provided by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB),

composed of xxx bishops who are appointed by the pope and serve in the United States and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

### **The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace**

[PDF document]

*In November 1980 the National Conference of Bishops (as it was then known) appointed a committee of bishops, chaired by Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, to draft a pastoral letter on war and peace. The bishops reviewed two drafts and adopted the third and final draft on May 3, 1983. A substantial part of this pastoral letter focuses on nuclear weapons. The summary is presented below. The complete pastoral letter, The Challenge of Peace, is available from....*

[Possibly a photo of Cardinal Bernardin or the drafting committee]

[Two side bars, say at one-third and two-thirds through the text.

"No *use* of nuclear weapons which would violate the principle of discrimination or proportionality may be *intended* in a strategy of deterrence."

"In the words of our Holy Father, we need a 'moral about-face.' The whole world must summon the moral courage and technical means to say no to nuclear conflict; no to weapons of mass destruction; no to an arms race which robs the poor and the vulnerable; and no to the moral danger of a nuclear age which places before humankind indefensible choices of constant terror or surrender."

#### **Summary**

[to be scanned if possible]

### **The Harvest of Justice is Sown in Peace A Reflection of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops on the Tenth Anniversary of The Challenge of Peace**

[PDF document]

*Ten years after issuing The Challenge of Peace the National Conference of Catholic Bishops reviewed the findings of the 1983 pastoral letter and offered their reflections. The Harvest of Justice [<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/harvest.htm>] is available on the web site of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. The section dealing with nuclear disarmament is presented below with permission.*

[Perhaps a photo of a wheat field inserted into the above paragraph.]

[At appropriate locations, two side bars:

"We must continue to say No to the very idea of nuclear war."

"The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal."

#### **1. Unfinished Business: Nuclear Disarmament and Proliferation.**

[change margins to be like above]

Our 1983 pastoral letter focused special attention on the morality of nuclear weapons at a time of widespread fear of nuclear war. Only ten years

later, the threat of global nuclear war may seem more remote than at any time in the nuclear age, but we may be facing a different but still dangerous period in which the use of nuclear weapons remains a significant threat. We cannot address questions of war and peace today, therefore, without acknowledging that the nuclear question remains of vital political and moral significance.

The end of the Cold War has changed the nuclear question in three ways. First, nuclear weapons are still an integral component of U.S. security policies, but they are no longer at the center of these policies or of international relations. In 1983, a dominant concern was the ethics of nuclear weapons. Today, this concern, while still critically important, must be considered in the context of a more fundamental question of the ethical foundations of political order: How do we achieve *Pacem in Terris*' vision of a just and stable political order, so that nations will no longer rely on nuclear weapons for their security? Second, we have new opportunities to take steps toward progressive nuclear disarmament. In 1983, the first task was to stop the growth of already bloated nuclear arsenals; today, the moral task is to proceed with deep cuts and ultimately to abolish these weapons entirely. Third, the threat of global nuclear war has been replaced by a threat of global nuclear proliferation. In addition to the declared nuclear powers, a number of other countries have or could very quickly deploy nuclear weapons, and still other nations, or even terrorist groups, might seek to obtain or develop nuclear weapons. Just as the nuclear powers must prevent nuclear war, so also they, with the rest of the international community, bear a heavy moral responsibility to stop the spread of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons.

a. *The Moral Judgment on Deterrence.* In 1983, we judged that nuclear deterrence may be morally acceptable as long as it is limited to deterring nuclear use by others; sufficiency, not nuclear superiority, is its goal; and it is used as a step on the way toward progressive disarmament.

Some believe that this judgment remains valid, since significant progress has been made in reducing nuclear weapons, including the most destabilizing ones, while at least some of those that remain are still necessary to deter existing nuclear threats. Others point to the end of the Soviet threat and the apparent unwillingness of the nuclear powers to accept the need to eliminate nuclear weapons as reasons for abandoning our strictly conditioned moral acceptance of nuclear deterrence. They also cite the double standard inherent in nonproliferation efforts: What is the moral basis for asking other nations to forego nuclear weapons if we continue to judge our own deterrent to be morally necessary?

We believe our judgment of 1983 that nuclear deterrence is morally acceptable only under certain strict conditions remains a

useful guide for evaluating the continued moral status of nuclear weapons in a post-Cold War world. It is useful because it acknowledges the fundamental moral dilemmas still posed by nuclear weapons, and it reflects the progress toward fulfilling the conditions we elaborated in 1983. At the same time, it highlights the new prospects — and thus the added moral urgency — of making even more dramatic progress in arms control and disarmament as the only basis for the continued moral legitimacy of deterrence.

b.A Post-Cold War Agenda For Nuclear Disarmament. While significant progress has been made in recent years, we believe additional steps are needed if nuclear policies and priorities are to keep up with the dramatic changes in world politics and if our nation is to move away from relying on nuclear deterrence as a basis for its security. Present challenges include the following:

**The Role of Nuclear Weapons:** We must continue to say No to the very idea of nuclear war. A minimal nuclear deterrent may be justified only to deter the use of nuclear weapons. The United States should commit itself never to use nuclear weapons first, should unequivocally reject proposals to use nuclear weapons to deter any nonnuclear threats, and should reinforce the fragile barrier against the use of these weapons. Indeed, we abhor any use of nuclear weapons.

**Arms Control and Disarmament:** Nuclear deterrence may be justified only as a step on the way toward progressive disarmament. The end of the Cold War, according to the Holy See, "challenge[s] the world community to adopt a post-nuclear form of security. That security lies in the abolition of nuclear weapons and the strengthening of international law." A first step toward this goal would be prompt ratification and implementation of the START I and START II treaties. Even once these treaties are fully implemented, there will still be more than 10,000 nuclear weapons in the world, containing explosive power hundreds of thousands times greater than the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Therefore, much deeper cuts are both possible and necessary. The eventual elimination of nuclear weapons is more than a moral ideal; it should be a policy goal.

The negotiation of a verifiable comprehensive test ban treaty would not only demonstrate our commitment to this goal, but also would improve our moral credibility in urging nonnuclear nations to forego the development of nuclear weapons. We, therefore, support a halt to nuclear testing as

our nation pursues an effective global test ban and renewal of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Also, steps must be taken to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism. We must reverse the spread of nuclear technologies and materials. We welcome, therefore, U.S. efforts to achieve a global ban on the production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons. Finally, one should not underestimate the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency as a forum for the discussion of these issues and as a force encouraging nations to take the steps necessary in this area.

#### Cooperative Security and a Just International Order:

The nuclear powers may justify, and then only temporarily, their nuclear deterrents only if they use their power and resources to lead in the construction of a more just and stable international order. An essential part of this international order must be a collective security framework that reverses the proliferation of nuclear weapons, guarantees the security of nonnuclear states and ultimately seeks to make nuclear weapons and war itself obsolete. The United States and other nations should also make the investments necessary to help ensure the development of stable, democratic governments in nations which have nuclear weapons or might seek to obtain them.

An active commitment by the United States to nuclear disarmament and the strengthening of collective security is the only moral basis for temporarily retaining our deterrent and our insistence that other nations forego these weapons. We advocate disarmament by example: careful but clear steps to reduce and end our dependence on weapons of mass destruction.

In our five-year report on *The Challenge of Peace*, we said: "To contain the nuclear danger of our time is itself an awesome undertaking. To reshape the political fabric of an increasingly interdependent world is an even larger and more complicated challenge." Now, on this tenth anniversary, we must be engaged in the difficult task of envisioning a future rooted in peace, with new institutions for resolving differences between nations, new global structures of mediation and conflict-resolution and a world order that has moved beyond nuclear weapons once and for all. We are committed to join in this struggle, to bring the Gospel message of justice and peace to this vital work.

### **Pax Christi International**

[logo from [www.paxchristi.net](http://www.paxchristi.net)] *Pax Christi International* [[www.paxchristi.net](http://www.paxchristi.net)] is a non-profit, non-governmental Catholic peace movement that began in France at the end of World War II. Today, it is comprised of autonomous national sections, local groups, and affiliated

*organizations spread over 30 countries and 5 continents, with over 60,000 members worldwide. The movement works in all areas of peace but has a specific focus on demilitarization, security and arms trade, development and human rights, and ecology.*

*In 1998 Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, joined with the Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches in a statement entitled **Act Now for Nuclear Abolition** [linkage to the statement elsewhere on this page], presented to Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Conference. Among other things they stated: [Insert photo of Cardinal Danneels]*

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment....When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt.

*In 2000 Pax Christi International published **New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda: A Call and Statement on Nuclear Disarmament**. [Note: this can be accessed as a PDF document but I'm not sure how to reference the URL. HWH). Signed by xxx bishops from xx countries on x continents, the statement calls upon "all states to put urgent negotiation of a nuclear disarmament convention at the top of the international agenda."*

## **Pax Christi USA**

[logo from [www.paxchristiusa.org](http://www.paxchristiusa.org)] **Pax Christi USA** [[www.paxchristiusa.org](http://www.paxchristiusa.org)] *is the national Catholic peace movement of 14,000 members who are committed to the gospel imperative of seeking peace through nonviolence. It is the United States section of Pax Christi International.*

*In 1998 on the 15<sup>th</sup> anniversary of **Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response (the 1983 report of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops)**, xx Catholic bishops affiliated with Pax Christi USA issued a statement on **The Morality of Nuclear Deterrence**. [URL to be obtained]. Speaking for themselves and not the entire National Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Pax Christi bishops indicated:*

For the past fifteen years, and particularly in the context of the Cold War, we, the Catholic bishops of the United States, have reluctantly acknowledge the possibility that nuclear weapons could have some moral legitimacy, but only if the goal was nuclear disarmament. It is our present, prayerful judgment that this legitimacy is now lacking.

*They concluded by saying:*

Nuclear deterrence as a national policy must be condemned as morally abhorrent because it is the excuse and justification for the continued possession and further development of these horrendous weapons. We urge all to join in taking up the challenge to begin the effort to eliminate nuclear weapons now, rather than relying on them indefinitely.

## **Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative (2000)**

[logo of NRDI from [www.nrdi.org](http://www.nrdi.org)] *At a ceremony at the Washington National Cathedral in June 2000 21 religious leaders along with 18 military professionals issued a **Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement** [<http://www.nrdi.org/nuclear/Nuclear02.html>]. This initiative began as an interfaith project led by Washington National Cathedral, with assistance from the late Senator Alan Cranston, his Global Security Institute [[www.gsinitiative.org](http://www.gsinitiative.org)], and the Fourth Freedom Forum [[www.fourthfreedom.org](http://www.fourthfreedom.org)]. After issuance of the statement the Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative [[www.nrdi.org](http://www.nrdi.org)] developed into an educational program and became a part of The Churches' Center for Theology and Public Policy, located at Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington, DC.*

[photo of signers with caption. "Participants in the news conference that released the *Joint Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Statement* included the Very Reverend Nathan D. Baxter, dean of the Washington National Cathedral; Admiral Stansfield Turner, U.S. Navy (Ret.); Bishop William B. Oden, president, Council of Bishops, United Methodist Church; Dr. Muzammi H. Siddiqi, president, The Islamic Society of North America; and General Charles S. Horner, U.S. Air Force (Ret.). Rabbi David Saperstein, director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, also participated in the news conference.

*Highlights of the statement include:*

We deeply believe that the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the nuclear powers, and the ever-present danger of their acquisition by others, is morally untenable and militarily unjustifiable. They constitute a threat to the security of our nation, a peril to world peace, a danger to the whole human family.

Historically, military and religious leaders have not always been in agreement on these issues, but now a consensus is emerging. National security imperatives and ethical demands have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and prohibiting nuclear weapons worldwide.

We also believe that reliance on a nuclear deterrent in the long run calls into question our stewardship of God's creation.

And so it is that we now come together to bear witness anew: it is past time for a great national and international discussion and examination of the true and full implications of reliance on nuclear weapons, to be followed by action leading to the international prohibition of these weapons.

Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

All treaties and agreements sorted by date of signature

<http://www.nuclearfiles.org/docs/treaties-all.html>

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

<http://www.wagingpeace.org/sitemap.htm>

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

« Previous | Main Archives | Next »

A Moral Call to Eliminate the Threat of Nuclear Weapons  
A Statement by Religious Leaders and People Of Faith Presented as a Gift to Humanity  
to the Parliament of the World's Religions  
Cape Town, South Africa  
December 1-8, 1999

Our common humanity brings us together to eliminate a threat to us all. Our diversity will strengthen our efforts. As people of faith, we accept our responsibility to provide moral and ethical clarity and leadership for the common good of all life on the Earth.

The threat posed to humanity and all other forms of life by the sheer destructiveness of nuclear weapons presents an unacceptable risk for this and future generations. This unacceptable risk presents a moral imperative for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

We cannot hold life sacred and at the same time seek security by placing its entirety at risk.

Security concerns and spiritual concerns often seem at odds with each other. Here, that is not the case. The imperatives of global security and the demands of spirituality have converged to bring us to the necessity of outlawing and eliminating nuclear weapons worldwide.\*

It is immoral for states to place all life at risk in their own perceived self-interest. The creation is a gift and an immeasurable and beautiful mystery; the state is a human construction. We join together in humility to serve and protect the majesty of the mystery of life.

The belief held by the nuclear weapons states that the alleged security benefits of nuclear weapons should be reserved for them and denied to all others violates the most basic principles of fairness. The solution is simple: States should treat other states as they wish to be treated.

Nuclear weapons are more hazardous than any problem they seek to solve. Their possession and threatened use by any nation provide an impetus for their proliferation by others.

Effective leadership in opposing the growing threat of nuclear proliferation will be credible only if nuclear powers demonstrate a commitment to the universal outlawing of these weapons. Continued reliance on nuclear deterrence puts at risk our moral integrity.

The proposition that nuclear weapons can be retained in perpetuity and never be used — accidentally or by decision — defies credibility.

The unprecedented and immeasurable destructive potential of nuclear weapons

threatens the genetic pool. The production and possession of nuclear weapons is an unacceptable threat to the health of the environment.

The threat and use of nuclear weapons is incompatible with civilized norms, standards of morality and humanitarian law which prohibit the use of inhumane weapons and those with indiscriminate effects. The trillions of dollars spent in this irrational pursuit of a false security constitutes a theft from those who are hungry and a waste of the gift of intelligence.

We say that a peace based on terror, a peace based upon threats of inflicting annihilation and genocide upon whole populations, is a peace that is morally corrupting.

We refuse to accept living under an unworthy peace which might make us the Earth's last generation.

The responsibility for banning nuclear weapons does not lie solely with governments of nuclear weapons states and their citizens. It is a responsibility shared by every sovereign state and each precious and sacred individual.

Generals and admirals from many nations have addressed this still-urgent matter of nuclear weapons from a military perspective and advocate that nuclear weapons be taken off hair-trigger alert, that swift and deep reductions in nuclear arsenals be made, and that these steps be taken within the framework of an unequivocal commitment to the achievement of their universal, verifiable, enforceable prohibition and elimination.\*\* We agree.

We pledge to work together in our homes, communities, temples, mosques, and churches, transcending differences of religion, race and nationality to rid the world of this universal threat.

As people of faith and moral conviction, we believe it is our duty to address this global evil, for no person is removed from its effect. The magnitude of this threat requires that we learn to live in greater cooperation and harmony or we shall all perish together. It is time to move the world from the irrational love of power to the wise power of love. We call upon our faith communities and all concerned citizens to mobilize, to pray and to act in support of this noble cause.

For these and other reasons of conscience and wisdom we pledge to:

1. Include the moral imperative of the abolition of nuclear weapons in our studies and teachings and to encourage our families, friends, congregations and institutions to do likewise.
2. Make efforts to persuade the governments of the nuclear weapons states to pledge never to use nuclear weapons first, remove all nuclear weapons from hair trigger alert status, dramatically reduce nuclear arsenals, and commence multi-lateral negotiations on their global elimination.

We personally pledge to express our common humanity by standing up to and challenging the arrogance of power and apathy of bureaucracies behind which nuclear weapons policies hide, and to affirm our faith that human affairs can be governed with cooperation, courage, faith and wisdom.

\* We note the historic International Court of Justice opinion of July, 8, 1996 in which the Court unanimously held that "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control." This is consistent with moving the world from the law of power to the power of law.

## **1999 Parliament of the World's Religions**

*More than 7,000 persons from around the world assembled in Cape Town, South Africa in December 1999 for a Parliament of the World's Religions. In the course of the gathering religious leaders and people of many faiths presented **A Moral Call to Eliminate the Threat of Nuclear Weapons.** [<http://www.gs institute.org/archives/000029.shtml>] Among other elements *The Call states:**

The threat and use of nuclear weapons is incompatible with civilized norms, standards of morality and humanitarian law which prohibit the use of inhumane weapons and those with indiscriminate effects....We say that a peace based on terror, a peace based upon threats of inflicting annihilation and genocide upon whole populations, is a peace that is morally corrupting.

# Pax Christi International

International Secretariat  
Secrétariat International

*21, Rue du Vieux Marché aux Grains  
B-1000 Brussels · Belgium  
tel: 32/2/502.55.50  
fax: 32/2/502.46.26  
e-mail: [hello@paxchristi.net](mailto:hello@paxchristi.net)  
url: <http://www.paxchristi.net>*

## **New Challenges on Nuclear Disarmament Agenda**

### **A Call and Statement on Nuclear Disarmament**

#### **I. Background Briefing**

Pax Christi International stresses the need of the International Community and the Churches to insist once again on the continuing threat of nuclear weapons. We are at a very critical moment of new challenges to the international disarmament agenda. Statements alone will not be enough. Pax Christi International appeals to public opinion to raise its voice in the debate.

Like Pax Christi International, numerous religious bodies have a long history of addressing nuclear weapons issues. Many have condemned nuclear weapons and called for their abolition. In their joint statement to the NPT Review PrepCom of April 1998, Cardinal Danneels, President of Pax Christi International, and Dr. Konrad Raiser, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, stated: “Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and therefore morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment.”

In May 2000 at the conclusion of the Review Conference of the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the major nuclear powers made an important new commitment. They promised to make “an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals.” True, a commitment to nuclear abolition was and is one of the obligations of the NPT itself (Art. VI); but the nuclear weapons states never took it seriously. Time and again the Holy See asked for an “unequivocal commitment” during interventions in the United Nations.

Today, the window of opportunity for moves towards the elimination of nuclear weapons seems to be open again. However, there is still no concrete timeframe for the total abolition of nuclear weapons. The need for abolition exists because of a real possibility that nuclear weapons could be used in anger for the first time since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, with disastrous results for the whole of humanity. In recent years, we have witnessed policies by several states to extend the role for nuclear weapons in their security policies. India and Pakistan are the most prominent examples. The USA and the Russian Federation too are modernizing and extending the role of nuclear weapons.

Public opinion takes little notice of the problem. This is due in part to the mistaken belief

that with the end of the cold war nuclear weapons no longer pose serious dangers. However, the window of opportunity may be closed again if political leaders are not pressed by public opinion “to accomplish the total elimination” soon. Notwithstanding their proclaimed commitment to the nuclear disarmament required of them by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Nuclear Weapons States still insist that their own security depends on retaining nuclear weapons while at the same time insisting that the security of other states depends on their renunciation of exactly the same weapons. The incoherence of this position is obvious and must be rectified before it is too late.

### Some Special Dangers

The Churches and other religious organisations can play an important role in informing public opinion of some of the dangers that confront our common security:

1. The likely further proliferation of nuclear weapons following the example of India and Pakistan, where there is a danger of nuclear weapons being used inadvertently or by miscalculation over (for example) the Kashmir dispute.
2. The danger of a nuclear strike elsewhere in the world by chance, accident or inadvertence.
3. The refusal of Cuba, Israel, India and Pakistan to accede to the NPT and to place their nuclear facilities under comprehensive International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, or to accede to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
4. The refusal of North Korea to preserve and make available to the IAEA all information on its nuclear material, as it is obliged to do as a party to the NPT and its safeguard agreement with IAEA.
5. The presence, especially in Europe, of many tactical nuclear weapons.
6. The failure of the USA to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and to rule out the extension of the role of nuclear weapons deter attacks by other weapons of mass-destruction and attacks by terrorist groups and so-called “rogue states,” or “states of concern.”
7. The announcement by Russia of its intention to increase its reliance on nuclear weapons in response to its conventional military weakness and its sense of encirclement due to the expansion of NATO; and by China because of the alleged threat of Theatre Missile Defences in South East Asia.
8. The fact that the deployment of nuclear weapons provides a strong rationale for the development and proliferation of all kinds of weaponry, especially biological and chemical weapons, often thought of as the mass-destruction weapons “of the poor and the weak.”
9. US plans for “National Missile Defence,” a provocative and destabilising concept which threatens very serious damage to the arms control and disarmament efforts of other states.

## **II. The Elimination of Nuclear Weapons - A Statement by Pax Christi International**

We call upon all states to put urgent negotiation of a nuclear disarmament convention at the top of the international agenda. We welcome the overwhelming support given to the “New Agenda Resolution” in the United Nations General Assembly in November 2000, including that of most (though regrettably not all) of the states which possess nuclear weapons.

We see nuclear weapons abolition as a major component in the process of re-examining our traditional ideas about security and war. Our ultimate vision is of a peace built on common security based on justice and reconciliation. It is for all of us to work for the elimination of war, the priority of non-violence and the establishment of a global culture of peace.

The Holy See has summarised the measures that need to be pursued at the present time; measures largely agreed by the expert opinion-makers:

”It should be an immediate objective of the international community to eliminate non-strategic nuclear weapons, de-alert weapons by removing warheads from delivery vehicles, establish a legally binding negative security assurance regime, and secure from the Nuclear Weapons States a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.”

Negotiations do not have to start from scratch. A detailed scheme for nuclear abolition has been prepared and is lodged with the United Nations. We welcome the recent vote at the United Nations affirming the need of a universal and multilaterally negotiated legally binding instrument or a framework encompassing a mutually reinforcing set of instruments for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free world, although we are disappointed that the New Agenda Resolution’s adopted text has weakened the sense of urgency present in the earlier drafts.

Certain immediate steps should be taken which would move us closer to abolition. We urge:

1. Russia and the USA to make rapid progress towards Start III with lower limits than those envisaged at Helsinki.
2. The smaller Nuclear Weapons states to promote multilateral disarmament negotiations for the purpose of reducing nuclear arsenals in order to make progress towards the global elimination of nuclear weapons. The UK and France should take a lead here, by abandoning talk of relying on nuclear weapons for national security, promoting a no first use treaty among the Nuclear Weapons States, and announcing their intention not to replace their current arsenals at any time in the future.
3. All states to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and to promote its early entry into force.
4. The removal of nuclear weapons from the territory of all non-nuclear European states.
5. Nuclear weapons everywhere to be taken off alert, including removing warheads from all land-based missiles and placing them in secure internationally monitored storage.
6. A no first use pledge to be given by all nuclear weapon states, as a confidence building measure.
7. The establishment of nuclear weapon free zones where they do not yet exist, such as in the Middle East, Central Europe and South Asia.

# RELIGIOUS STATEMENTS

## Introduction

### INTERFAITH AND ECUMENICAL

World Council of Churches

Religious Statements to 1998 NPT PrepCom

1999 Parliament of the World's Religious

Nuclear Reduction/Disarmament Initiative (2000)

National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA

Canadian Council of Churches

Conference of European Churches

[others to be added]

### DENOMINATIONS

Baptist

Catholic

    Holy See

    U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

    Pax Christi International

    Pax Christi USA

Church of the Brethren

Etc.



**U A H C**

**UNION OF AMERICAN  
HEBREW CONGREGATIONS**

איחוד ליהדות מתקדמת באמריקה

## **Union of American Hebrew Congregations**

Founded in 1873, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations (<http://www.uahc.org>) is the central body of the Reform Jewish Movement in North America, encompassing 1.5 million Jews in 900 congregations across the United States and Canada. The UAHC has a long history of supporting arms control measures aimed at reducing nuclear dangers and eventually eliminating nuclear weapons entirely. Resolutions include:

Control of Nuclear Arms, 1981

<http://uahc.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=arms&year=1981D>

Preventing Nuclear Holocaust, 1983

<http://uahc.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=nuclear&year=1983>

To End the Manufacturing and Trade In Fissionable Material Suitable for the Production of Nuclear Arms, 1989

<http://uahc.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=nucleararms2&year=1989>

Halting the Nuclear Arms Race, 1989

<http://uahc.org/cgi-bin/resodisp.pl?file=nucleararms1&year=1989>

Vatican Representative's Address to U.N. Panel on Nuclear Arms  
"There Has Been Regression"

NEW YORK, APRIL 10, 2002 (Zenit.org).- Monsignor Francis Chullikat, deputy head of a Holy See delegation, on Monday addressed the preparatory committee for the 2005 review conference of the signatories to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Here is the text of the speech.

\* \* \*

Mr. Chairman,

As the international community begins preparation for the 2005 Review of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, my Delegation notes the deep concern that is widely felt about the state of nuclear disarmament.

At the 2000 Review, it was felt that progress was being made. The Review obtained a clear-cut commitment from the nuclear weapon states that systematic and progressive efforts to implement Article VI would include: "An unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear weapon states to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament to which all states parties are committed under Article VI."

This commitment was embodied in a list of 13 practical steps the conference unanimously agreed to take. However, the progress made in implementing the 13 steps over the past two years has been indeed discouraging. In fact, the prospects for future implementation are alarming.

As an examination of the 13 steps shows, there has not only been a lack of sufficient progress, there has been regression. Although, thankfully, there has been no nuclear testing in this period, the entry-into-force of the CTBT cannot be seen on the near horizon. The Conference on Disarmament is paralyzed. One of the parties to the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty has given notice of withdrawal. Nuclear weapons are still kept on alert status. The admonition of the International Court of Justice for the completion of negotiations towards elimination is ignored.

Even more serious than the lack of progress is the overt determination of some nuclear weapon states to maintain nuclear weapons in a critical role in their military doctrines. While the international community rightly welcomes the willingness of those with the most nuclear weapons to reduce their stocks of operationally deployed warheads, what is the real effect of such unilateral disarmament when it is not made irreversible, i.e., when such stocks can be remounted again quickly?

My Delegation is deeply concerned about the old posture of nuclear deterrence that is evolving into the possibility of use in new strategies. This must be stoutly resisted. The Holy See has constantly recalled the fact that the strategy of deterrance can be envisaged only as a stage in the process aimed at disarmament, even of a progressive nature. So long as it is taken as an end in itself, deterrance encourages the protagonists to ensure a constant superiority over one another, in ceaseless race of over-arming.

Mr. Chairman,

The concern of the Holy See mounts in seeing the non-proliferation regime, with the NPT as its cornerstone, in disarray. The old policies of nuclear deterrence, which prevailed in the Cold War, must lead now to concrete disarmament measures. The rule of law cannot countenance the continuation of doctrines that hold nuclear weapons as essential.

There can be no moral acceptance of military doctrines that embody the permanence of nuclear weapons. That is why Pope John Paul II has called for the banishment of all nuclear weapons through "a workable system for negotiation, even of arbitration." Those nuclear weapon states resisting negotiations should therefore be strongly urged to finally come to the negotiating table.

In fact, in clinging to their outmoded rationales for nuclear deterrence, they are denying the most ardent aspirations of humanity as well as the opinion of the highest legal authority in the world. In this regard, my Delegation wishes to reaffirm its well-known position: nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we seek for the 21st century; they cannot be justified. These weapons are instruments of death and destruction. The preservation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty demands unequivocal action towards their elimination. Only when such a noble goal is attained can the international community be assured that nations are acting in "good faith".

Mr. Chairman,

My Delegation is confident that the Preparatory Committee will seize this opportunity to develop a sharpened sense of urgency to root out nuclear weapons that are the biggest threat to mankind. To keep developing weapon systems that can jeopardize the natural structure upon which all civilization rests seriously undermines the genuine quest of the family of nations to build a culture of peace for the present and future generations.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Original text: English; distributed by Vatican Press Office]

ZE02041024

## Statement on Nuclear Weapons Disarmament

The Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches, meeting in Berlin, 26-27 January 2001,

Reiterates its deep and long-standing concern at the continued risk to Creation posed by the existence of nuclear weapons,

Welcomes the successful outcome of the Sixth Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in May 2000,

Welcomes the Final Document of the Review Conference, which established a new global agenda for nuclear disarmament,

Expresses its satisfaction at the overwhelming support received by the "New Agenda" resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in its 55th Session (Millennium Assembly, 2000), which reaffirmed states' commitment to the pursuit of this disarmament agenda,

Notes the significance of continuing deliberations within and among the member states of NATO on NATO nuclear policy and the future of nuclear disarmament,

Stresses the vital importance of ensuring that the policies of NATO members and NATO itself conform to the obligations undertaken by states in the Non-Proliferation Treaty and are consistent with pursuit of the global nuclear disarmament agenda, and

In the light of the recommendations made at the international gathering of church representatives in Brussels in October 2000,

Calls upon the member states of NATO and NATO itself to ensure that their nuclear weapons policies conform to the obligations undertaken by states in the Non-Proliferation Treaty and are consistent with pursuit of the global nuclear disarmament agenda, and in particular:

to affirm NATO's support for the rapid global elimination of nuclear weapons and to commit the

Alliance to take programmatic action to advance this goal;  
to commit NATO to reducing the alert status of nuclear weapons possessed by NATO members, and to pursuing effective arrangements for the rapid de-alerting of all nuclear weapons possessed by all states; and

to renounce the first-use of nuclear weapons by any NATO member under any circumstances, and to commit NATO to the pursuit of equivalent commitments from other states possessing nuclear weapons;

Encourages the member states of NATO and NATO itself to provide greater transparency and public access to NATO's decision-making processes on nuclear weapons issues;

Asks the WCC, in consultation with the Conference of European Churches, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA and the Canadian Council of Churches, to organize a delegation of church leaders to meet with government ministers and officials in key non-nuclear NATO states to encourage those states to support these policies;

Asks the WCC further to organize comparable processes on the role of nuclear arms and the ways toward nuclear disarmament in other regions of the world, like North East Asia or the Middle East, and

Calls upon member churches in the context of the Decade to Overcome Violence to renew their witness for peace and disarmament through education, public awareness building and advocacy to overcome the continuing threat of nuclear weapons.

## INTERFAITH AND ECUMENICAL

### World Council of Churches

[logo from web page] ***The World Council of Churches*** [[www.wcc-coe.org](http://www.wcc-coe.org)] is a fellowship of 342 churches (that is, denominations) from virtually all Christian traditions in more than 120 countries in all continents. It formed in 1948, not long after the end of World War II. For its legislative body the WCC has an Assembly composed of representatives of member churches. It meets every seven years. Between meetings the Central Committee and its Executive Committee serve as governing bodies.

#### Report of the Sixth Assembly (1983)

*The most fully development statement on nuclear disarmament by the World Council of Churches occurred in the Official Report of the Sixth Assembly, meeting in Vancouver, Canada in 1983, as follows:*

[PDF document]

Nuclear arms, doctrines and disarmament

[scan paragraphs 13-18 from that report]

#### Statement to 1998 NPT Preparatory Committee

*In 1998 Dr. Konrad Raiser, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, joined with Godfried Cardinal Danneels, president of Pax Christi International, in a statement entitled **Act Now for Nuclear Abolition*** [[linkage to the statement elsewhere on this page](#)], *presented to the 1998 session of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee. Among other things they stated:* [Insert a photo of Dr. Raiser.]

Nuclear weapons, whether used or threatened, are grossly evil and morally wrong. As an instrument of mass destruction, nuclear weapons slaughter the innocent and ravage the environment....When used as an instrument of deterrence, nuclear weapons hold innocent people hostage for political and military purposes. Therefore, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence is morally corrupt.

#### Policy Statement of 2001

*In 2001 the Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches, meeting in Potsdam, Germany, issued a **Statement on Nuclear Disarmament, NATO Policy and the Churches.*** [<http://www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/who/cc2001/pi5-e.html>] *Among other elements the Executive Committee:*

Reiterates its deep and long-standing concern at the continued risk of Creation posed by the existences of nuclear weapons.

Welcomes the Final Document [[linkage to another page on this web site](#)] of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, which established a new global agenda for nuclear disarmament.

Calls upon the member states of NATO and NATO itself to ensure that their nuclear weapon policies conform to the obligations undertaken by states in the Non-Proliferation Treaty and are consistent with pursuit of the global nuclear disarmament agenda.